

FY 2026 Engaging Neighborhoods, Organizations, Unions, Governments, and Households (ENOUGH) Grant Program Continuation Awards

Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO)

Issuance Date: July 9, 2025

Eligibility Limited to Existing ENOUGH Grantees in

Partnership Development <u>or</u> Plan Development

FY2026 Application Deadline: September 15, 2025 Projected FY2026 Start Date: November 1, 2025

Funded by: State of Maryland

Governor's Office for Children

45 Calvert Street Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Wes Moore, Governor Aruna Miller, Lt. Governor Carmel M. Martin, Special Secretary

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	3
II. Award Information	4
2.1 Competition Timeline	4
2.2 Anticipated Awards	4
III. Eligibility and Application Requirements	6
3.1 Qualifying Criteria for FY2026 Funding Categories	6
3.2 Application Checklist and Formatting Requirements	7
3.3 Project Narrative Instructions	8
NEW PLAN DEVELOPMENT (5 Pages Maximum)	8
PLAN DEVELOPMENT BRIDGE FUNDING (3 Pages Maximum)	9
EARLY IMPLEMENTATION / IMPLEMENTATION (10 Pages Maximum)	10
IV. Review Process	12
Appendix A Definitions	13
Appendix B Cohort Qualifying Criteria	17
Appendix C Checklists and Templates for New Plan Development and Bridge Applications	18
Appendix D Checklist and Templates for Early Implementation and Implementation Applications	18
Appendix E Budget Narrative Instructions	20
Appendix F Rubric for Collaborative Capacity and Civic Infrastructure	25
Appendix G Rubric for Needs Assessment, Asset Map, Neighborhood Action Plan	31
Appendix I Rubric for Budget and Strength of Evidence-Based Interventions	36

I. Executive Summary

Launched and administered by the Governor's Office for Children, Maryland's ENOUGH Initiative aims to reduce the number of children living in poverty through community-led, government-supported solutions. The initiative addresses the root causes of poverty in specific neighborhoods that have been historically left behind and impacted by barriers to economic mobility. Driven by data, residents' lived experiences and cross-sector collaboration, this grant initiative supports community-led organizations across every region of Maryland to improve access to quality healthcare, good schools, good jobs and safe neighborhoods so that more children and families can prosper. To learn more, click here.

This Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for the FY2026 ENOUGH Grant Program Continuation Awards includes qualifying progress requirements and application guidance for **existing grantees** awarded funds in the FY2025 grant cycle in the Partnership Development or Plan Development cohorts.

Maryland's FY2026 budget provides the Governor's Office for Children (GOC) with \$17 million for the ENOUGH grant program and \$2 million for ENOUGH Local Management Board Capacity Building grants. This represents a significant reduction in anticipated funding, but we remain steadfast in our commitment to ENOUGH grantees and offer the following options.

Current Partnership Development grantees may stay within their current pathway with no change to budget or timeline, or they may apply to move up to Plan Development.

Current Plan Development grantees may apply for Bridge Funding, Early Implementation grants or Implementation grants.

Current grantees may submit only one (1) application in this competition cycle.

Current Cohort	FY2026 Funding Options	Max Award Amount	Project Period
Partnership Development	Plan Development	\$225,000	11/1/2025-6/30/2027 (20 months)
Plan Development	Bridge Funding	\$225,000	11/1/2025-6/30/2027 (20 months)
Plan Development	Early Implementation	\$500,000	11/1/2025-6/30/2027 (20 months)
Plan Development	Implementation	Up to \$1.5M	11/1/2025-6/30/2026 (8 months)

Note: Awards made this fiscal year will not limit applicants' eligibility to apply for additional grants in future funding cycles. In addition, FY2026 Early Implementation awardees must apply for future competitions for Implementation awards and demonstrate readiness for all Implementation activities. Current Plan Development grantees that pursue but do not receive Implementation or Early Implementation awards will automatically be considered for Bridge Funding.

II. Award Information

2.1 Competition Timeline

Important Dates:

All Continuation Award Applications Due: September 15, 2025
Grant Award Notifications: October 2025
Projected Start Date for FY2026 Awards: November 1, 2025

2.2 Anticipated Awards

Current ENOUGH grantees may apply for FY2026 funds and robust technical assistance to continue to advance outcomes aligned with the four (4) ENOUGH Result Areas:

- Cradle-to-Career Education
- Healthy Families
- Economically Secure Families
- Safe and Thriving Communities

ENOUGH Grant Program Continuation Awards will be issued through the funding categories below. The actual number of awards per category will be based on a number of factors, including grantee progress towards current award benchmarks, quality of applications and funds available.

New Plan Development Grants

Maximum Award: \$225,000 Anticipated Number of FY26 Awards: Up to 12

Eligible Applicants: Current Partnership Development

Grantees

Project Period: 20 Months

<u>Plan Development Technical Support</u>: Access to GOC ENOUGH Coordinators to facilitate navigating state agency systems and supports, plus tailored technical assistance

from capacity-building organizations to support communities as they develop Neighborhood Action Plans. Areas of focus may include community needs assessments and asset mapping, budgeting, program evaluation, work plan development, logic models, braiding and blending funds, and participatory processes.

Plan Development Bridge Funding

Maximum Award: \$225,000 Anticipated Number of FY26 Awards: Up to 10

Eligible Applicants: Current Partnership Development

Grantees

Project Period: 20 Months

<u>Plan Development Technical Support</u>: Continued technical assistance from GOC ENOUGH Coordinators to facilitate navigating state agency systems and supports, plus tailored technical assistance from capacity-building organizations to support communities as they develop Neighborhood Action Plans. Areas of focus may include community needs assessments and asset mapping, budgeting, program evaluation, work plan development, logic models, braiding and blending funds, and participatory processes.

Early Implementation Grants

Maximum Award: \$500,000 Anticipated Number of FY26 Awards: Up to 3

Eligible Applicants: Current Plan Development Grantees

Project Period: 20 Months

<u>Early Implementation Technical Support</u>: All listed supports for Plan Development, plus adaptive coaching and technical assistance to launch implementation activities in *at least one* ENOUGH Result Area.

Implementation Grants

Maximum Award: Up to \$1,500,000 in Year 1

Anticipated Number of FY26 Awards: Up to 2

Eligible Applicants: Current Plan Development Grantees

Project Period: 8 Months in FY2026

(potential renewal for 3 additional

Fiscal Years)

<u>Implementation Technical Support</u>: All listed supports for Plan Development, plus adaptive coaching and technical assistance and support from representatives at state agencies, the GOC, and external partners to implement activities in *all four (4)* ENOUGH Result Areas.

III. Eligibility and Application Requirements

3.1 Qualifying Criteria for FY2026 Funding Categories

New Plan Development Grants

Partnership Development grantees that wish to apply for New Plan Development grants must have submitted all required programmatic and financial reports, have a partnering agreement (e.g., Memorandum of Understanding) signed by each partner, and **completed or made significant progress** towards the following Partnership Development activities:

- Identify Community Quarterback and build its capacity
- Convene local partners
- Engage community members and stakeholders
- Analyze existing local data

Plan Development Bridge Funding

Plan Development grantees that wish to apply for Bridge Funding must have submitted all required programmatic and financial reports and made **demonstrated progress towards** Plan Development activities:

- Solidify local partnerships
- Conduct community asset mapping and needs assessment
- Develop Neighborhood Action Plan

Early Implementation Grants

Plan Development grantees that wish to apply for an Early Implementation award must have submitted all required programmatic and financial reports and **completed** the following Plan Development activities:

- Solidify local partnerships
- Conduct community asset mapping and needs assessment in *all four (4)* ENOUGH Result Areas
- Develop Neighborhood Action Plan for at least one (1) ENOUGH Result Area

Early Implementation awards are appropriate for Plan Development grantees that are prepared to implement activities from their Neighborhood Action Plan aligned with *at least one (1)* ENOUGH Result Area. Early Implementation awardees are expected to continue developing their Neighborhood Action Plans in remaining ENOUGH Result Areas.

Implementation Grants

Plan Development grantees that wish to apply for a Implementation award must have submitted

all required programmatic and financial reports, completed all Plan Development activities, and be prepared to implement Neighborhood Action Plan activities in *all four (4)* ENOUGH Result Areas.

3.2 Application Checklist and Formatting Requirements

Formatting Requirements and Page Limits

1. Project Narrative

- o 5 pages maximum for New Plan Development applicants.
- o 3 pages maximum for Plan Development Bridge Funding applicants.
- o 10 pages maximum for Early Implementation and Implementation applicants.
- Organize the narrative with headings aligned with instructions and consecutively number all pages.
- Answer questions based on the category for which you have chosen to apply.
- Use 8.5 x 11 sized paper with 1-inch margins, single-spaced.
- Use Times New Roman or Arial font, minimum 11-point, black.

2. Line-Item Budget and Budget Narrative

- Use Excel Budget Form available <u>here</u>.
- Upload a separate Budget Narrative document to provide rationale and more detailed calculations for budget line items (this is not included in Project Narrative page limit).
- See Appendix E: Budget Narrative Instructions.

Application Checklist

A complete application package includes an online cover page form and multiple attachments that must be uploaded into Submittable. The chart below summarizes application materials by category and identifies whether the materials are required, optional, or not applicable (N/A).

Application Requirements by FY2026 Award Category	New Plan Development	Plan Development Bridge	Early Implementation	Implementation
Cover Page Details [Submittable Form Fields]	Required	Required	Required	Required
Project Narrative	Required (5 pages)	Required (3 pages)	Required (10 pages)	Required (10 pages)
Line-Item Budget Form	Required	Required	Required	Required
Budget Narrative	Required	Required	Required	Required
Project Work Plan	Required	Required	Required	Required
Partner Organizations Table	Required	Optional*	Optional*	Optional*

Application Requirements by FY2026 Award Category	New Plan Development	Plan Development Bridge	Early Implementation	Implementation
• Signed Partnering Agreement (e.g., MOU or MOA)	Required	Optional*	Optional*	Optional*
Preliminary Needs Assessment: Crosswalk of Existing Assessments and Opportunities for Action	Required	Optional	N/A	N/A
Comprehensive Asset Mapping and Community Needs Analysis for All Four (4) ENOUGH Result Areas	N/A	N/A	Required	Required
Neighborhood Action Plan	N/A	N/A	Required (1 or More Result Areas)	Required (All Four Result Areas)
Programs + Evidence Table	N/A	Required**	Required	Required
Results Based Accountability (RBA) Plan	N/A	Optional**	Required (1 or More Result Areas)	Required (All Four Result Areas)
Governance Structure Documentation	N/A*	N/A*	Required*	Required*

^{*} Please submit if documents have been updated since prior submission. If not attached, reviewers will use original FY2025 attachments or most recent documentation provided in progress reports.

Note: Several templates are available to support application development in Appendices C and D.

3.3 Project Narrative Instructions

NEW PLAN DEVELOPMENT (5 Pages Maximum)

PART 1 | Capacity for Collaborative Action

1. Describe how the Partnership Development award has been used to build the infrastructure, staffing, competencies, and/or assets of the Community Quarterback organization to increase its capacity to provide daily management of ENOUGH activities and secure aligned funds.

^{**} Only if Plan Development Bridge Funding request includes pilot programs, direct services, or child/youth interventions.

- 2. Provide examples of how the partnership has clear roles for youth, families, people, and groups with lived experience and/or those most impacted by decisions locally.
- 3. Describe key partner organizations' experience conducting needs assessments, asset mapping, cross-sector service integration and/or braiding and blending of resources.
- 4. Identify any technology platforms, data systems, or financial management software that were purchased, enhanced or secured during the Partnership Development project period.

PART 2 | Project Status and Aligned Resources

- 5. Outline the steps that the partnership is taking at the time of the application to identify the needs of the community and engage in a community-driven planning process aligned with one or more ENOUGH Result Areas.
- 6. Describe community assets and other collaborative efforts (including programs funded by Federal, State and local sources) within, or accessible to, the community and how activities / programs funded through ENOUGH complement and build on these assets.
- 7. Describe how the partnership engages (or will engage) funders/investors to support the Community Quarterback's operations and the collaborative work of the partners.
- 8. Identify any capacity building, partner convening, community engagement, and/or technical assistance support that your partnership received from your Local Management Board during your Partnership Development project period and how it has impacted your work to date.

PLAN DEVELOPMENT BRIDGE FUNDING (3 Pages Maximum)

PART 1 | Capacity for Collaborative Action

- 1. Describe how the Plan Development award has been used to build the infrastructure, staffing, competencies, and/or assets of the Community Quarterback organization to increase its capacity to provide daily management of ENOUGH activities and secure aligned funds.
- 2. Identify any technology platforms, data systems, or financial management software that were purchased, enhanced or secured during the Plan Development project period.

PART 2 | Project Status and Aligned Resources

- 3. Briefly summarize the status of your Plan Development activities to date, identifying key successes and early wins, as well as primary challenges that have been encountered.
- 4. Provide examples of community assets and other collaborative efforts (including programs funded by Federal, State and local sources) that have been leveraged and/or intentionally aligned with your Plan Development ENOUGH activities and planning.
- 5. Describe how the partnership engages (or will engage) funders/investors to support the Community Quarterback's operations and the collaborative work of the partners.

PART 3 | Bridge Funding Investment Strategy and Rationale

6. Outline how Bridge Funding will be used to bolster, expedite or enhance Plan Development activities, launch pilot programming, build collaborative capacity, or otherwise advance strategies and outcomes aligned with the ENOUGH Theory of Action.

EARLY IMPLEMENTATION / IMPLEMENTATION (10 Pages Maximum)

PART 1 | Capacity for Collaborative Action

- 1. Describe how community leaders have been involved in your Partnership Development activities and in preparing this application for an Early Implementation or Implementation award.
- 2. Describe how the partnership has used and shared data (including community school data) to inform efforts, promote transparency and accountability, and establish systems to monitor progress towards shared goals during the Partnership Development project period.

PART 2 | Neighborhood Action Plan Development and Rationale

Eligible Implementation applicants have developed a Neighborhood Action Plan based on community asset mapping and needs assessment across all four (4) ENOUGH Result Areas. Eligible Early Implementation applicants have developed a Neighborhood Action Plan focused on at least one (1) ENOUGH Result Area.

All Neighborhood Action Plan strategies should be aligned with ENOUGH Result Areas and:

- Build on and incorporate existing programs in your community;
- *Involve community partners wherever possible;*
- Demonstrate that the strategies proposed are research and evidence-based; and
- Show how they are interlinked and part of a continuum of service delivery that clearly benefits families of children living in poverty.

2-A. Neighborhood Action Plan Rationale

- 3. Summarize activities that will be accomplished in the first 8 months of the project (FY2026), including investments to bolster the capacity of the Community Quarterback to manage the Neighborhood Action Plan (e.g., hiring, sub-award agreements) and how members of the Partnership will contribute to early success aligned with ENOUGH Result Areas.
- 4. Articulate the long-term goals of the Neighborhood Action Plan, including how successful implementation will improve the partnership's capacity for collaborative action and strengthen resident engagement in local decision-making.
- 5. *Implementation Only*: Identify the total number of children the Partnership plans to serve during the multi-year project period (through FY2029) and how you plan to grow that number over time if the initial plan does not serve all children living in poverty in the community.

2-B. Data-Driven Needs Assessment and Prioritized Outcomes

- 6. Describe the process that the partnership used to prioritize outcome indicators from the ENOUGH Outcome Indicators Bank using needs assessments, disaggregated data, and the perspectives and insights of community residents.
- 7. Describe how the partnership has identified tangible and intangible resources and assets that contribute to quality of life for children and families in the focus community.
- 8. Provide examples of networks, strategies, and/or tactics that were used to engage local youth and families in community asset mapping and needs analysis.
- 9. Outline the steps that the partnership is taking at the time of the application to address the needs and gaps identified in the community needs assessment.

PART 3 | Leveraged Resources and Durable Civic Infrastructure

- 10. Describe community assets and other collaborative efforts (including programs funded by Federal, State and local sources) within, or accessible to, the community and how activities / programs funded through ENOUGH complement and build on these assets.
- 11. Provide examples of how proposed ENOUGH activities will connect individuals to existing government benefits and state services like nutrition assistance, Medicaid, WIC, Child Tax Credit, Earned Income Tax Credit, Temporary Cash Assistance / Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), child care scholarships and/or job training and employment assistance programs.

12. Describe the partnership's sustainability plan for maintaining momentum of ENOUGH-funded activities, including how the partnership engages funders/investors to support the Community Quarterback's operations and the collaborative work of the partners.

IV. Review Process

GOC staff will evaluate FY2026 application materials (narratives, required attachments, and other submitted documentation) and other observable evidence of grantee progress and capacity using standard review rubrics aligned with the activities and deliverables expected for each cohort of the ENOUGH Grant Program, including review criteria in Appendices F, G and I.

Staff may also consider previously submitted materials, reports, documents, and engagements during the FY2025 project period to assess readiness and capacity to perform proposed activities.

Financial Due Diligence. GOC staff will perform a cost analysis of each recommended project to ensure that costs clearly relate to the activities and objectives of the project, are reasonable, allowable, and allocable. Staff will also take into consideration the size of the community and the number of children to be served. Budget requests may be altered or reduced based on this review.

Appendix A | Definitions

Authorized Official: The Authorized Official must possess the authority to enter into a legal agreement on behalf of the entity and bind it to the award terms and conditions. The Authorized Official on the submitted application is the head of the entity receiving the grant.

Collaborative Action: When community leaders and organizational partners collectively adopt aligned tools, processes, and skill sets to make powerful contributions that shift policies, practices, resources, and power structures leading to more equitable outcomes. Partnerships often form networks or collaboratives that focus on improving particular outcomes or eliminating disparities in a system. Collaborative action requires that community members come together to collect, interpret, and act on local data in a continuous process of improvement and iteration to drive outcomes for agreed upon priorities. They use continuous improvement practices to test strategies, with the goal of scaling what works and shifting or abandoning what doesn't.

Communities: Recognizing that communities (including neighborhoods) are resident-identified social constructs with variable and dynamic geographic markers and characteristics, the ENOUGH Grant Program requires that applicants identify the community(ies) of focus using verifiable geographic boundaries such as Census tracts, city blocks, street boundaries, government-endorsed "zones," or planning districts.

Community-Based Organization: A community-based organization is an organization that is responsive to, and governed by, community residents. By that we mean:

- It is preferred that the governing body and/or staff leadership include community members and individuals with lived experience;
- The organization has a strong, established presence in the prioritized community;
- Priority issue areas are identified and defined by residents;
- Solutions to address priority issues are developed with residents; and
- Program design, implementation, and evaluation components have residents intimately involved, in leadership positions with authority to make critical decisions.

Community Quarterback (lead applicant): The Community Quarterback may be any of the following: community-based organization; non-profit organization; local government organization; Local Management Board; or Community Action Agency. The Community Quarterback organization should have deep relationships in the focus community and the capacity to drive implementation across multiple partners. The Community Quarterback will be responsible for coordinating partner organizations and, under Plan Development and Implementation, the responsible entity for driving Neighborhood Action Plan planning, development, and implementation. The Community Quarterback must have capacity to administer grant funds and generate reporting data or demonstrate that these functions can be executed through a partnership with a fiscal sponsor. The Community Quarterback (or the fiscal sponsor where relevant) will serve as the primary grant recipient, but may transfer, subcontract, or sub-grant funds to Partnership member organizations to accomplish grant-funded activities.

Community School: A local public school that establishes a set of strategic partnerships between the school and other community resources that promote student achievement, positive learning conditions, and the well—being of students by providing wraparound services. A community school is a whole school model designed to promote positive, equitable outcomes by providing students and families with the physical and mental health, academic, and extracurricular supports needed to thrive. In Maryland, community schools receive annual, formula-based Concentration of Poverty Grants (CPGs). Eligibility is based on the four-year

average of the percentage of the school's students living in poverty, as determined by compensatory education enrollment. See also the <u>Blueprint for Maryland's Future</u>.

ENOUGH Partnership Collaborative: The ENOUGH Partnership Collaborative (Partnership) <u>must</u> include at least one community-based non-profit organization, one local government entity, and one local public school as core partners. Partnerships may include, among others, local community leaders and residents, faith-based organizations, businesses and employers, unions or worker organizations, local government, tribal entities, institutions of higher education, health care and care management organizations, community development organizations (like Community Development Enterprises or Community Development Financial Institutions), philanthropy and donor collaboratives, civic groups, entrepreneur support organizations, workforce investment boards, chamber organizations, local law enforcement and justice system offices, schools and school districts, community-based organizations, community-based non-profit organizations and other non-profit partners.

The term "local" for partnership members means residing in the defined eligible area or serving members of the defined community. The community school serving the geography should be a member of the partnership, but another local public school may serve as the required local public school.

Evidence-Based: "Evidence-based" means that there is evidence from an experimental or quasi-experimental study that a project component has been effective in improving a relevant outcome with similar populations or in similar settings. Sources of evidence include (among others): programs rated as "evidence-based" in government clearinghouses, rigorous evaluation and research findings, academic literature, professional or academic convening reports, government publications, and empirically robust research briefs. Clearinghouse resources focused on identifying and evaluating evidence-based programs available here.

Fiscal Officer: The person who will be responsible for financial reporting and record keeping for the project. The Fiscal Officer is a primary contact for the grant who will receive communications from the Office and will be responsible for disseminating information to others within the Applicant Agency as needed.

Fiscal Sponsor: An entity with capacity to manage the financial stewardship, reporting, and compliance aspects of an awarded grant. This can be the Community Quarterback, a non-profit or county/municipal government or quasi-government actor, including a Local Management Board or Community Action Agency. The fiscal sponsor for the grant must have the capacity to:

- Implement controls to ensure that grant funds are expended in ways consistent with legislative requirements and the commitments made in the application or otherwise negotiated upon award.
- Track and report data across outcome indicators and progress measures.
- Support community groups in building capacity to participate in the ENOUGH activities including their "back office" capacity to administer grant funds and generate reporting data.
- Identify and braid in other funding sources in alignment with the ENOUGH award.

Leadership Team: A formal leadership team that is representative of the key partner organizations with authority to review and act on progress and outcome data, promote equitable governance structures, and advise the Community Quarterback to carry out all legislative requirements of the ENOUGH Grant Program. At a minimum, the leadership team must include the three required core partners and may also include representatives from other partner organizations and community members.

Lived Experience: Refers to understanding yielded from an individual's human experiences, personal identities, history, and options. People with lived experience are those directly affected by social, economic, health, or other issues and by the strategies that aim to address those issues. This gives them insights that can

inform and improve systems, research, policies, practices, and programs. Centering lived experience helps develop a deeper understanding of the conditions affecting certain populations, the solutions that are most appropriate for those impacted by the issue, and the potential harm or unintended consequences of actions.

Local Government Entity: This may include: (A) a county, municipality, city, town, township, local public authority, special district, intrastate district, council of governments, regional government entity, or agency or instrumentality of a local government; (B) a state-recognized Indian tribe or authorized tribal organization; or (C) a rural community, unincorporated town or village, or other public entity, for which an application for assistance is made by a political subdivision of the State.

Local Management Board (LMB): LMBs were established to change the way services are provided to Maryland children and their families. They identify priorities and target resources for their assigned jurisdiction's communities, while also coordinating child and family services and administering state resources. LMBs improve coordination across agencies and ensure local stakeholders are empowered to drive local priorities. There is an LMB jurisdiction in each Maryland county and in Baltimore City.

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA): Applicants to Plan Development and Implementation must submit a formal partnering agreement (MOU/MOA) signed by all organizational partners that: (1) defines the purpose or vision of the cross-sector partnership as it relates to place-based work conducted in the focus community; (2) details the roles, responsibilities, and commitments of partnering organizations; and (3) describes any agreed upon norms or protocols related to collaborative decision-making, establishing and refining partnership priorities, community engagement, data sharing, equitable practices, or other mutual understandings or agreements. The MOU/MOA does not have to be developed specifically for the ENOUGH Grant Program application, but it should be broad enough to cover proposed grant-funded activities.

Neighborhood Action Plan: A community-driven, place-based plan of action that was developed based on a comprehensive asset mapping and needs analysis, including an assessment of physical, behavioral, mental health, education, housing, economic, and safety needs of the community. Neighborhood Action Plan development and prioritization should acknowledge and leverage existing needs assessments, including those conducted for the community school serving the eligible community.

A Neighborhood Action Plan should include: (1) immediate action items and long-term goals for the community; (2) geographic boundaries for requested state investment; (3) evidence-based strategies and interventions that are tied to clear outcome metrics across ENOUGH Result Areas; (4) processes for ongoing progress monitoring, ensuring mutual accountability, and engaging community leadership; (5) identification of the community-based organizations, municipal entities, and anchor institutions engaged in the planning process and their proposed roles for implementation; and (6) evidence that residents were actively involved in developing the plan. The Neighborhood Action Plan may cross-reference the Work Plan, RBA Plan and Program + Evidence Table attachments rather than duplicating these details. Neighborhood Action Plans developed for the purposes of the ENOUGH Initiative and ENOUGH Grant Program should be submitted for review by the GOC. See guidance for Neighborhood Action Plan development here.

Outcome Indicator: The population-level data point which helps quantify the amount of impact a strategy has yielded within a particular Result Area. Outcome indicators show what has increased/decreased/improved, by how much, and for whom. Outcome indicators are often longer-term, and it may take time to see results. Examples include, increased high school graduation rates, decreased infant mortality, increased household income, and reductions in crime.

Progress Measure: The measure or metric that tells us how well a program, agency, or services system is working and if the project is on track to succeed as planned. Progress measures are often more immediate and can be tracked throughout the duration of a project. They can also help identify when to look for problems and consider tactical pivots during implementation. Examples of progress measures include increased access to after-school programs, increased reported consumption of nutritious food, increased enrollments in job training, increased availability of affordable housing.

Project Director: The person who will be responsible for oversight and administration of the project on behalf of the applicant organization. The Project Director is a primary contact for the grant who will receive communications from the Office and will be responsible for disseminating information to others within the Applicant organization as needed.

Result Area: Aligned with the ENOUGH Theory of Action, Result Areas describe the broader systems, structures, and social determinants that will be changed or improved through ENOUGH. Collectively, the Result Area indicators describe the condition of well-being for children, families, or the focus community. ENOUGH Results Areas include Cradle-to-Career Education, Healthy Families, Economically Secure Families, and Safe and Thriving Communities.

Results Based Accountability (RBA) Plan: The RBA Plan integrates strategies, programs, progress measures, and linked population outcome indicators aligned with principles of Results Based Accountability and "turn the curve" analysis required for demonstrating impact of ENOUGH investments. See RBA Plan <u>Template</u> and training slide deck <u>here</u>.

Systems Measure: A data point used to assess the performance and functionality of a system to equitably deliver information, benefits, and/or services to a population. System measures are qualitative and quantitative measurements that can reveal inequities in how resources, decision-making power, and opportunities are distributed to inform policies and practices within institutions, organizations, and programs that are interdependent and/or related. When systems measures are coupled with individual indicators, institutions and organizations can be held accountable to create conditions where every child, every family, and every community member has the opportunity to thrive regardless of race or place.

Appendix B | Cohort Qualifying Criteria

Each cohort of the ENOUGH Grant Program has minimum qualifying criteria to apply, progressing from Partnership Development to Plan Development, and, finally, Implementation. Consult the ENOUGH Cohort Selector decision tool and the information below to evaluate your application cohort.



MEETS COMMUNITY ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Communities that have at least one U.S. Census tract where more than 30% of children are living in poverty AND (2) is served by a community school with a concentration of poverty level of at least 80%



COMMUNITY QUARTERBACK

Community-led organization with resources and capacity to lead ENOUGH activities and manage ENOUGH funds, in coordination with community partners



PARTNERSHIP COLLABORATIVE

A robust partnership of community-led organizations representing each of the ENOUGH results areas

An established partnership governance structure to ensure alignment, information sharing, and resource deployment



COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Completed needs assessment identifying assets and gaps, informed by community data and residents' input



NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION PLAN

An action plan that leverages various funding streams to address gaps identified in the needs assessment and provide a continuum of services for the community across ENOUGH results areas

TRACK 1: PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

TRACK 2: PLAN DEVELOPMENT

TRACK 3: IMPLEMENTATION

Criteria Required to Qualify				
Criteria	Partnership Development	Plan Development	Implementation	
Meets Community Eligibility Criteria	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Community Quarterback	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Partnership Collaborative	No	Yes	Yes	
Community Assets and Needs Assessment	No	No	Yes	
Neighborhood Action Plan	No	No	Yes	

Appendix C | Checklists and Templates for New Plan Development and Bridge Applications

New Plan Development Application Checklist	Format	Template
Application Cover Page	Form	
• Project Narrative (5 Pages)	Upload	
Line-item Budget Form	Upload	<u>Excel</u>
Budget Narrative	Upload	
Partner Organizations Table	Upload	Excel
Preliminary Community Needs Assessment: Crosswalk of Existing Assessments and Opportunities for Action	Upload	Word
Project Work Plan	Upload	Word
Memorandum of Understanding/Agreement or Similar Partnering Agreement Signed by Partners	Upload	

Plan Development Bridge Funding Application Checklist	Format	Template
Application Cover Page	Form	
Project Narrative (3 Pages)	Upload	
Line-item Budget Form	Upload	<u>Excel</u>
Budget Narrative	Upload	
Project Work Plan	Upload	<u>Word</u>
• Programs + Evidence Table*	Upload	Word

^{*}Only required if Plan Development Bridge Funding request includes pilot programs, direct services, or child/youth interventions.

Template Instructions: Download the template via the download hyperlink, complete required information, and upload final documents as attachments in the ENOUGH Grant Program online submission via Submittable.

Appendix D | Checklist and Templates for Early Implementation and Implementation Applications

Templates below are intended to facilitate and streamline application development. Several of the templates are provided in Word and Excel formats for your convenience.

Early Implementation and Implementation Application Checklist	Format	Template
Application Cover Page	Form	
• Project Narrative (10 Pages)	Upload	
Line-item Budget	Upload	Excel
Budget Narrative	Upload	
Project Work Plan	Upload	Word
Comprehensive Asset Mapping and Community Needs Analysis for Selected Outcomes in All Four (4) ENOUGH Result Areas	Upload	
Neighborhood Action Plan*	Upload	
Programs + Evidence Table*	Upload	Word
• RBA Plan*	Upload	<u>Excel</u>
Governance Structure Documentation (Staffing Plan, Organizational Chart, Articles of Incorporation, etc.)	Upload	

^{*} For Early Implementation applicants, these documents should focus on at least one (1) ENOUGH Result Area. Implementation applicants must include all four (4) Result Areas.

Template Instructions: Download the template via the download link, complete required information, and upload final documents as attachments in the ENOUGH Grant Program online submission in Submittable.

Early Implementation and Implementation Resources	Access Link
RBA Plan Tutorial	<u>PDF</u>
Clearinghouses and Ratings for Evaluating Evidence	<u>Word</u>

Appendix E | Budget Narrative Instructions

Each application must include a line-item budget in the provided Budget Template (Excel) plus a separate Budget Narrative. Use the Excel template to briefly explain how costs were calculated or projected. The Budget Template also offers an opportunity to identify leveraged cash and in-kind resources and assets. Use the Budget Narrative attachment (Word) to provide additional calculation details and robust rationale/justification for the requested investments aligned with proposed goals, objectives and outcomes of the ENOUGH proposal.

Funds awarded to the Community Quarterback as primary grantee may be transferred, subcontracted, or sub-granted to partners to accomplish proposed activities.

Matching Funds

- No matching funds are required, though Early Implementation and Implementation applicants are expected to detail plans and processes for identifying other sources of public and private funding to implement the Neighborhood Action Plan.
- All non-ENOUGH Grant Program revenue that is paid/awarded/administered to and by the Community Quarterback organization in support of a program/strategy/planning activity must be identified as one of the following types of leveraged resources.
 - Cash Contributions: Funding that flows directly through/to the Community Quarterback organization (or Fiscal Sponsor) to support ENOUGH Grant Program activities. This can include philanthropic funding, corporate earned revenue or funding; earned revenue or funding, and/or government revenue or funding.
 - In-Kind: Donation or provision of goods or services other than cash contribution. Examples include supplies, furniture, facilities or services/labor.

Ensuring Funds are Allowable, Allocable and Reasonable

Funds received, expended and/or sub-granted under the ENOUGH Grant Program must be monitored, tracked, and reported using Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, as well as systems and protocols in full compliance with the State of Maryland Finance and Procurement statutes. The Generally Accepted Accounting Principles - commonly known as GAAP - are a set of agreed-upon accounting standards that provide a framework for recording and reporting financial information. They ensure consistency and comparability in financial management among all organizations in the United States, both for-profit and non-profit. All direct costs must be reasonable, allowable, and allocable expenditures detailed by budget category and line item, as applicable.

Please provide an **itemized budget breakdown** for the grant period and the **basis for estimating the costs** of all cost categories, including personnel salaries, benefits, project staff travel, materials and supplies, consultants and subcontracts, indirect costs, and any other projected expenditures.

Personnel

Project personnel salaries, wages, and fringe benefits only. Include fees and expenses for consultants under the Contractual Services category. For each position, list salary and fringe benefits (e.g., employer-provided health insurance) as separate line items.

Note: You may request partial full-time Equivalent (FTE) compensation and benefits of existing staff, but Time and Effort reports (Timesheets) must be maintained for all personnel included in the grant project.

- For each salary line item, you must include the **full annual salary amount, the percentage of time that will be spent on the project, and the hourly rate.** Full-time weekly commitment is assumed to be 40 hours per week, and an hourly rate can be calculated using a person's annual salary divided by 2,080.
- Fringe benefits may not exceed 35% of reported salary costs. For each line item of personnel, please connect the staff member's function and role to the activities described in your Project Narrative.

Example justifications based on the Personnel category:

- Justification (line 1): The Community Outreach Coordinator helps prepare, schedule, and develop training targeted for hospitals and other medical facilities. Annual salary is \$60,000. She will be devoting 33.33% of her time to this project. We are requesting \$60,000 *.3333 = \$19,998, rounded to \$20,000, in grant funds to support her time on this project. Her hourly rate is \$28.85.
- Justification (line 2): Fringe benefits @ 10% of salary. \$20,000 * .10 = \$2,000
- Justification (line 3): The Community Outreach Trainer makes presentations at hospitals and other medical facilities. This position is supported with cash match funds from a private donor. Annual salary is \$40,000. She will be devoting 25% of her time to this project. We are contributing \$40,000 *.25 = \$10,000 to support her time on this project. Her hourly rate is \$19.23.
- Justification (line 4): Fringe benefits @ 10% of salary. \$10,000 * .10 = \$1,000

Operating Expenses

This includes project supplies, expendable materials, information technology, software, dedicated or allocable office rental, printing, telephone, fax, postage, photocopying, and other coordination and communication expenses. Provide calculation and rationale for each line item, including how the expense directly connects to activities described in the Project Narrative.

Travel

Travel expenses may include mileage and/or other transportation costs, meals, and lodging consistent with the local jurisdiction's travel regulations and may not exceed the State of Maryland reimbursement rate specified below.

For each line item entered, include a justification that ties that item to the activities described in the Project Narrative. **Dates for travel and training must be provided in the justification and must fall within the award period.**

- Mileage Reimbursement Allowance cannot exceed the \$.70 cents/mile rate as of 1/1/2025.
 - Current mileage rates can be located at: Fleet Management Services
- Per Diem/Meal Allowance cannot exceed the State's Meal & Incidental Expenses Reimbursement Rates.
 - Current per diem rates can be located at: <u>https://dbm.maryland.gov/Pages/TravelManagementServices.aspx</u> .
- Lodging Per Diem Allowance cannot exceed the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) rates (excluding taxes).
 - Current lodging rates can be located at: Per Diem Rates | GSA.

Contractual Services

The contractual category should include consultant, service provider, and vendor contracts for services like training, evaluation, program delivery, or website design. Payments to an outside agency for the work of their

employee(s) or any other services are considered Contractual Services. Include consultant fees, expenses, and travel costs in this category if the consultant's services are obtained through a written binding agreement or contract.

For this line item description, provide the agency (consulting firm, temporary agency, etc.), a dash, and then the nature of the service to be provided (e.g., Consultants ABC – training for Seminar). Each contractual line item requires the following budget narrative details:

- Identify the name(s) of the contracting party, including consultants, if available.
- Provide the cost per contractor.
- Provide the amount of time that the project will be working with the contractor(s).
- For professional services contracts, provide the amount of time to be devoted to the project, including the costs to be charged to this proposed grant award.
- Provide the basis for cost estimates or computations.

<u>Note</u>: For the Community Quarterback Budget, **partner organization** subcontract or sub-grant budgets are detailed in separate tabs that roll up into a "Partner Summary" tab. These partner budgets should not be included in the Community Quarterback's Contractual Services budget category.

Equipment

Equipment is defined as having a useful life in excess of one year and a procurement cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. Costs may include taxes, delivery, installation and similarly related charges. Equipment with a unit cost less than \$5,000 should be recorded in the 'Other' category (see below).

Indicate the cost of tangible, non-expendable personal property that has a usefulness greater than one year and acquisition costs that are the lesser of the capitalization level established by the applicant entity for financial statement purposes or \$5,000 per article. Lower limits may be established to maintain consistency with the applicant's policy.

Equipment Calculation and Rationale

- Indicate the estimated unit cost for each item to be purchased.
- Identify each type of equipment.
- Provide the basis for cost estimates or computations.

Fixed assets purchased, generated or arising from the use of state funds are the sole and exclusive property of the state. The Office has the first right of refusal to reclaim or dispose of the assets, and can also waive its right of recovery. The grantee should not transfer or dispose of any fixed assets purchased with funds from the Office unless prior approval is obtained by the Office. The grantee should first contact the Office prior to any action occurring.

Maintaining internal inventory records for equipment procured under this funding source is mandatory.

Other

Indicate all direct costs not covered above. Examples include food, facilities or event space rental (not rent/mortgage), and professional dues/subscriptions, and **equipment with a useful life less than one year and a procurement cost of less than \$5,000**. Do not include costs that are included in the indirect cost rate.

• Provide the cost per item (e.g. food = \$500, subscriptions = \$100).

Provide the basis for cost estimates or computations.

Allowable costs include:

- Food and beverages under the following circumstances:
 - Those incurred by Partnership members and employees traveling overnight on official Partnership business;
 - Bulk drinking water for coolers where tap water is not potable;
 - Those routine expenses for the operation of a program serving children and youth (e.g. snacks served to children on a regular basis at an out-of-school time program funded by the organization;
 - Meetings/focus groups/forums where the majority of attendees expected are family and/or youth; and/or,
 - Special events where the majority of attendees are not partnership members or staff or State/local Agency representatives.
- Gift Card expenditures (in any form or format) are allowable for incentives for participants attending meetings/focus groups/forums where:
 - Only the necessary number of gift cards are purchased based on the number of participants;
 - The organization, or its vendor/consultant, does not establish or maintain an inventory of gift cards; and,
 - The participants are families and or children/youth

Indirect Costs

- Up to 15% of Modified Total Direct Costs (MTDC)* may be requested for indirect costs if the grantee or sub-grantee is a non-profit organization.
- Indirect costs are those incurred for a common or joint purpose benefiting more than one cost objective, and not readily assignable to the cost objectives specifically benefited.
- Calculation of indirect costs must comply with <u>State Finance and Procurement Article § 2–208</u> of the Annotated Code of Maryland and the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) definition of Modified Total Direct Costs (MTDC) per the <u>OMB Guidance for Grants and Agreements</u>.

*If there are no individual subcontracts over \$50,000 then it is presumed that applicants may calculate indirect costs using their total project direct costs (Community Quarterback direct costs + partner budgets). If any <u>single</u> subcontract/sub-grant exceeds \$50,000 you must "modify" the cost base by subtracting the amount over \$50,000 from the total project direct cost base before calculating indirect cost. For example:

• A project with \$300,000 total direct costs includes a \$75,000 subcontract. To calculate indirect costs the applicant would subtract the extra \$25,000 (amount above \$50,000) from their total direct costs before calculating the 15% indirect line item. So they would use \$275,000 x 0.15 = \$41,250 in indirect costs.

Unallowable Costs

Funding from the Governor's Office for Children will not be used for unallowable costs including, but not limited to:

- 1. Alcoholic beverages;
- 2. Bad debts:
- 3. Contributions and donations to charitable organizations not in support of a defined activity;
- 4. Defense and prosecution of criminal and civil proceedings, claims, appeals and patent infringement;
- 5. Entertainment costs;

- 6. Personal use by employees of organization-furnished automobiles (including transportation to and from work) and other assets;
- 7. Fines and penalties and interest on fines and penalties;
- 8. Assets, goods or services for personal use;
- 9. Interest on borrowed capital/lines of credit;
- 10. Costs of organized fundraising events (galas, auctions, tournaments);
- 11. Costs of investment counsel/management;
- 12. Lobbying;
- 13. Losses on other awards;
- 14. Renovation/remodeling and capital projects;
- 15. Gifts for Board members and/or Board employees;
- 16. Costs of training/technical assistance offered by consultants that the Office and/or the Children's Cabinet or one of its member Agencies makes available at no cost. A list of offerings will be made available by the Office;
- 17. Any plaque or item presented to a speaker, official, legislator, vendor, or other person in recognition of service provided with a value in excess of \$50;
- 18. Any expenses relating to the establishment, maintenance or liquidation of foundation or other accounts used for the purpose of maintaining earned reinvestment and other State funds;
- 19. Investment fees and losses;
- 20. Flex fund expenditures;
- 21. For fee-for-service contracts, vendor staff vacation, sick leave and other leave time during which services were not provided; and
- 22. Trinkets/promotional/giveaway items (e.g., pens, notepads, hats, mugs, portfolios, t-shirts, coins, gift bags, etc., whether or not they include the program/vendor name and/or logo) except when materials are program supplies for participants and/or staff participating in a specified program or event.

Appendix F | Rubric for Collaborative Capacity and Civic Infrastructure

Community Quarterback Leadership

Community Quarterback Leadership and Decision-Making Processes

- Excellent: The Community Quarterback exhibits a strong and clear commitment to involving community members in leadership roles. The organization demonstrates diverse partner engagement in decision-making processes and community representation in key leadership positions.
- Good: The applicant has described how decisions will be made across partners and how community members are consulted or engaged with organizational processes of the Community Quarterback organization, though a commitment to community leadership and authority may not be clear.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The applicant has provided minimal details about partner decision-making or examples of community involvement.

Partner Engagement and Community Co-Creation Processes

Partnership Experience Achieving Impact through Collaborative Action

- Excellent: Members of the partnership have extensive experience achieving impact through collaborative action and conducting work similar to what is proposed and/or required for identified grantees. The applicant has clearly detailed how these partners work together and how their combined efforts have led to significant community impact in ENOUGH Result Areas, including data demonstrating effectiveness of these collaborative efforts.
- Good: Members of the partnership have considerable experience collaborating with local organizations and the applicant has provided multiple, specific examples of the partnership's collaborative actions that have achieved impact in ENOUGH Result Areas. Current partnerships are strong, but there is a need for additional detail about how they collaborate and their experience conducting work required for identified grantees.
- Marginal: The applicant has not clearly communicated the partnership's experience conducting similar work and/or may offer only one or two examples of collaborative actions in ENOUGH Result Areas. Data demonstrating effectiveness and/or evidence of outcomes is minimal or insufficient.
- Unsatisfactory: The applicant has not clearly described the partnership's experience with collaborative actions in ENOUGH Result Areas, and/or there are few or no examples of achieved impact from prior actions. It may be unclear how the partnership collaborates or the nature of existing partnerships engaged in the project.

Leveraging Partnership Assets, Networks, and Resources

- Excellent: The applicant has provided evidence of engagement and mutual agreement across a diverse range of partners who have committed to leverage their expertise, networks, and assets for the project. The ENOUGH Partnership has a fully executed partnering agreement that meets ENOUGH Grant Program expectations, which means that it:
 - o is signed by all partnership organizations;
 - defines the purpose or vision of the cross-sector partnership as it relates to place-based work conducted in the focus community;

- o details the roles, responsibilities, and commitments of partnering organizations;
- describes any agreed upon norms or protocols related to collaborative decision-making, establishing and refining partnership priorities, community engagement, data sharing, equitable practices, or other mutual understandings or agreements.
- Good: The applicant has provided evidence of partner engagement and agreements, but minor aspects of the partnering agreement are missing or lack significant detail. The applicant may or may not have provided rationale, justification, and/or documentation to account for missing components. The reviewer is confident that the observed flaws or weaknesses will have only a minor impact on the partnership's capacity to carry out the project.
- Marginal: The applicant has not clearly demonstrated how the partnership will leverage insights, assets, and resources of the core partners and other existing partnerships. The partnering agreement provides some level of detail but has significant flaws that could negatively impact the project.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The partnering agreement is incomplete or otherwise insufficient in a way that significantly hinders the reviewer's ability to evaluate the quality of partnerships and commitments.

Existing Governance Structure

- Excellent: There is strong evidence of an operational governance framework and a system for holding partners accountable. The applicant has provided a clear, detailed description of a robust governance structure (e.g., one that aligns partners, addresses challenges, tracks data, and deploys resources effectively). Submitted documentation affirms details of the organizational infrastructure (e.g., organizational charts, data sharing agreements, etc.)
- Good: The described governance framework appears functional but could benefit from further development and detail. The applicant has described a basic plan for holding partners accountable. Documentation may or may not be included as attachments in the application.
- **Marginal:** The applicant has provided a superficial description of a governance structure that lacks detail or comprehensive functions. Some critical aspects may be inadequately addressed, and/or accountability measures may be unclear. The observed flaws or weaknesses could significantly impact the partnership's ability to align partners or manage the collaborative project effectively.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The applicant has mentioned a governance structure, but it is poorly described, with minimal details. Significant improvements are needed for the proposed governance structure to be functional. There are little to no details about a system for holding partners accountable.

Authoritative Roles for Youth, Families, and People/Groups with Lived Experience

- Excellent: The applicant has clearly detailed examples of authoritative roles for youth, families, and specific people/groups with lived experience who are directly impacted by the issues being addressed.
- Good: The applicant has described roles for youth, families, and groups with lived experience, but lacks detail about the specific groups most impacted or how these roles will influence decision-making or governance.
- **Marginal:** The applicant asserts it has or will provide roles for youth, families, and groups with lived experience, but the description is general with few specific details provided.
- **Unsatisfactory:** Applicant has no clearly identified roles for youth, families, or groups with lived experience.

Data Capacity and Fiscal Infrastructure

Data Systems and Progress Monitoring Processes

- Excellent: The applicant has provided a comprehensive and detailed description of highly feasible and reliable data processes, systems, and technology solutions that allow the partnership to effectively share and analyze data, promote transparency and accountability, monitor progress towards shared goals, and/or provide insights to advise continuous quality improvement or otherwise inform project activities.
- Good: The applicant has clearly described how it uses and shares data using reliable processes and systems, but there are some nuanced aspects of data use that are missing or incomplete. The observed flaws and weaknesses are expected to have minor impact on the partnership's capacity to successfully carry out the project.
- Marginal: The applicant has described data systems, processes, and technology solutions; but there are moderate gaps in details or the applicant has not clearly connected this capacity with progress monitoring or accountability.
- Unsatisfactory: The applicant has provided a high level or superficial discussion of data collection processes and infrastructure, or there are significant gaps in details about how data will be leveraged to inform efforts.

Technology for Financial Management and Collaborative Action

- Excellent: The applicant has provided clear details about existing or planned financial management systems required to integrate and/or distribute funds across multiple partners. The applicant has also identified technology solutions that support a connected continuum of services designed to support children living in poverty and their families and/or technology systems or software that will improve the partnership's capacity for collaborative action.
- **Good:** The applicant has shared most aspects effectively but lacks clarity or detail in areas that could moderately impact the partnership's capacity to implement the project.
- Marginal: The applicant has provided minimal descriptions with significant gaps in how the systems will support infrastructure competencies. Observed weaknesses or flaws could significantly hinder project success.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The applicant has provided very limited, unclear, or incomplete descriptions of how technology systems address partnership competencies and capacity.

Preliminary Community Needs Assessment and Opportunities

Partnership Actions to Identify Community Needs and Planning

- Excellent: The applicant has provided clear details about the steps the partnership is taking to engage community members and identify community needs in at least one ENOUGH Result Area. The partnership's processes and structures indicate that it has capacity to carry out the proposed activities, including resident engagement structures required to conduct community needs assessment and asset mapping.
- Marginal: The applicant has described partnership activities related to community engagement and needs assessment in at least one ENOUGH Result Area, but the description of these activities lacks sufficient detail to demonstrate existing resident engagement structures required to conduct asset mapping and needs assessment.

• **Unsatisfactory:** The applicant has provided a generic or superficial description of activities or does not clearly align current activities to at least one ENOUGH Result Area.

Identification and Synthesis of Multiple Existing Analyses

- Excellent: The applicant has identified a comprehensive range of existing data tools, asset mapping, needs assessments, and gap analyses, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the community context and existing sources of data and insights. The applicant has shared a synthesized analysis for at least three (3) ENOUGH Result Areas and demonstrates willingness and capacity to examine all four (4) ENOUGH Result Areas.
- **Good:** The applicant has identified several existing data tools and analyses, showing a good understanding of community assets, needs, and gaps, but may miss some key areas or standard needs assessments. The applicant has shared a synthesized analysis of at least two (2) ENOUGH Result Areas and demonstrates willingness and capacity to examine all four (4) ENOUGH Result Areas.
- Marginal: The applicant has identified a few existing data tools, analyses, and needs assessments, but lacks depth and breadth in their understanding of how these could be used to understand community context. The applicant has provided a synthesized analysis in at least one (1) ENOUGH Result Area, but does not clearly demonstrate capacity to examine all four (4) ENOUGH Result Areas during the project period.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The applicant has failed to identify existing data tools and/or demonstrates a poor or otherwise insufficient understanding of where to find information about community assets, needs, and gaps.

Work Plan Methodology

Methodology, Infrastructure, Capacity, and Expertise

- Excellent: The work plan presents a detailed and robust methodology, including detailed activities, time frames, and responsible parties with authority and expertise to conduct comprehensive asset mapping and needs assessment. The application clearly describes how the partnership will prioritize systems-level outcome indicators associated with all four (4) ENOUGH Result Areas, including data from the ENOUGH Data Hub.
- Good: The work plan provides clear activities, responsible parties, and time frames, but some minor details or elements may be unclear. The application describes how the partnership will prioritize or evaluate data indicators associated with all four (4) ENOUGH Result Areas, including data from the ENOUGH Data Hub.
- Marginal: The partnership's methodology and plan for prioritizing outcome indicators are moderately detailed but have some significant gaps in responsible parties or methods of measuring the ENOUGH Result Areas.
- Unsatisfactory: The partnership presents an incomplete or unclear methodology. For example, work plan activities may be high level or generic, or critical aspects of the ENOUGH Result Areas are not clearly addressed.

Commitment and Strategies for Youth and Family Engagement

- Excellent: The applicant has demonstrated a deep understanding and strong commitment to engaging youth and families in participatory processes, with clear and comprehensive strategies for their involvement to shape proposed planning and asset mapping activities.
- **Good:** The applicant has shown a good understanding and commitment to engaging youth and families, with clear, but slightly less comprehensive, strategies for their involvement. Observed weaknesses would have a minor impact on the partnership's capacity to successfully engage youth and families in proposed activities.
- Marginal: The applicant has demonstrated a limited or moderate understanding and commitment to engaging youth and families, with some strategies for involvement but overall lacking sufficient depth or detail.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The applicant has provided insufficient commitment to engaging youth and families, with generally vague or superficial strategies for their involvement.

Practices and Structures for Community Engagement

- Excellent: The applicant has demonstrated that the partnership has well-established practices and structures to solicit and integrate community residents' perspectives and insights in planning and asset mapping activities, with clear examples described in the narrative and reflected in the work plan details.
- Good: The applicant has described the partnership's practices and structures for authentic community engagement, with minor areas needing more detail or clarity. The work plan includes activities that clearly engage community residents or rely on participatory processes to conduct proposed activities.
- **Marginal:** The applicant has described some practices and structures for community engagement, but lacks comprehensive detail or consistent application or commitment to these structures in the work plan.
- Unsatisfactory: The applicant has described unclear, infeasible, or otherwise insufficient practices and structures for community engagement, with very few examples or details reflected in the work plan.

Leveraged Resources and Sustainability

Leveraging Community Assets and Other Collaborative Efforts

- Excellent: The applicant has clearly articulated concrete strategies and detailed plans that demonstrate how the partnership will identify other collaborative efforts and assets (including programs funded by Federal, State, and local sources) within, or accessible to, the community.
- Good: The applicant has provided clear strategies for identifying other collaborative efforts and resources, with minor areas benefiting from additional detail. Plans may be somewhat vague or superficial.
- Marginal: The applicant has described limited strategies for identifying other collaborative efforts and resources, with some significant gaps or unclear plans. Observed weaknesses could hinder the success of the project.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The applicant has described insufficient or infeasible strategies for identifying other collaborative efforts and resources, with very few details or specific plans.

Plans to Leverage and Braid Assets

- Excellent: The applicant has provided a thorough description and detailed examples of community assets, specific revenue streams, and other collaborative efforts, as well as clear plans for integrating and aligning these assets with ENOUGH resources. The applicant details how these elements will be used to develop robust partnership infrastructure, fill identified gaps, assess community needs, and/or create a comprehensive continuum of programs. All aspects of the response are well-integrated and demonstrate strong potential for sustainable impact.
- Good: The applicant has offered a clear description of community assets and other collaborative efforts, along with some discussion of how assets will be aligned to support the development of partnership infrastructure and/or advise a continuum of programs. Most aspects are well-integrated, with minor areas needing further detail.
- Marginal: The applicant has provided a general description of community assets and collaborations, but does not demonstrate a concrete plan for building on these assets or integrating resources.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The applicant has provided minimal or unclear information about community assets or collaborative efforts. It fails to adequately explain how ENOUGH will complement these resources or how they will be used to develop partnership infrastructure, assess community needs, or create a continuum of programs.

Relationships with Funders and Investors

- Excellent: The partnership has a strong track record of establishing and managing relationships with a diverse range of philanthropic funders and investors, as well as the demonstrated capacity to secure the resources needed to support the Community Quarterback's operations and fuel the collaborative work of partners.
- Good: The partnership has at least some experience securing philanthropic funding, clear fund development protocols, strong funding prospects and a specific plan for identifying and pursuing leveraged funds from a range of philanthropic funders and investors.
- Marginal: The partnership shows moderate experience forming and managing relationships with funders and investors, with limited evidence of capacity to sustain support for the Community Quarterback and collaborative work of partners.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The partnership has very limited or no demonstrated experience establishing relationships with funders and investors.

Appendix G | Rubric for Needs Assessment, Asset Map, Neighborhood Action Plan

Data-Driven Needs Assessment and Prioritized Outcomes

Comprehensive Asset Mapping and Data-Driven Needs Assessment

- Excellent: The application demonstrates that the partnership has conducted an exceptionally thorough and detailed asset mapping and needs assessment covering all four (4) ENOUGH Result Areas, including physical, behavioral, mental health, education, housing, economic, and safety needs.
- Good: The application shows the partnership has conducted a comprehensive asset mapping and needs assessment, but the assessment includes some minor gaps or weaknesses. The assessment covers all ENOUGH Result Areas and covers most, but not all, of the social determinant categories above.
- Marginal: The application describes a basic asset mapping and needs assessment, with significant gaps or weaknesses in multiple ENOUGH Result Areas and/or social determinant categories.
- **Unsatisfactory**: The partnership has conducted a minimal or superficial asset mapping and needs assessment with little to no coverage of the ENOUGH Result Areas or social determinant categories.

Methodology and Evidence

- Excellent: The methodology for the community asset mapping and needs assessment is clearly detailed, robust, and includes examination of disaggregated data. There is strong evidence of comprehensive engagement of youth and families in the community. The rationale for any applicant-identified measures is clearly evidence-informed and well-supported by reliable baseline data.
- Good: The methodology for the community asset mapping and needs assessment is clearly described with some minor gaps. There is clear evidence of engagement with youth and families, but less emphasis on disaggregated data. Any applicant-identified measures are described as evidence-informed, though some aspects would benefit from additional detail or could be more strongly supported.
- **Marginal**: The methodology is described in the application but lacks detail or robustness. Engagement with youth and families is mentioned but not well-documented.
- **Unsatisfactory**: The methodology is unclear or insufficient, with little to no evidence of engagement with youth and families or examination of disaggregated data.

Prioritization of Local Needs and Guiding Steps Towards Action

- **Excellent**: The partnership has clearly prioritized local needs based on comprehensive community engagement and local data, with well-defined steps towards action.
- Good: The partnership has prioritized local needs and defined steps towards action, though some areas could be more clearly articulated.
- **Marginal**: The prioritization of local needs and steps towards action are somewhat defined but lack clarity, depth, or comprehensiveness.
- Unsatisfactory: The partnership has not clearly prioritized local needs or defined steps towards action.

Leveraged Assets and Funding

Leveraging Community Assets and Collaborative Efforts

- Excellent: The application provides a thorough description and detailed examples of community assets, specific revenue streams, and other collaborative efforts, including those funded by Federal, State, and local sources. The application includes clear plans for integrating and aligning these assets with ENOUGH resources and describes how these elements will be used to support partnership infrastructure, fill identified gaps, and/or create a comprehensive continuum of programs. All aspects of the response are well-integrated and demonstrate strong potential for sustainable impact.
- Good: The application offers a clear description of community assets and other collaborative efforts, along with some discussion of how assets will be aligned to support partnership infrastructure, fill identified gaps, and/or create a continuum of programs. Most aspects are well-integrated, with minor areas needing further detail.
- Marginal: The application provides a general description of community assets and collaborations, but may not demonstrate a concrete plan for building on these assets or integrating resources.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The application provides minimal or unclear information about community assets or collaborative efforts. It fails to adequately explain how ENOUGH will complement these resources or how they will be used to develop partnership infrastructure, assess community needs, or create a continuum of programs.

Connecting Individuals to Existing Government Benefits and State Services

- Excellent: The application provides a well-structured plan with clear, innovative, and practical tactics for connecting individuals to government benefits and state services. Access points are clearly identified, easily accessible, and well-integrated into existing systems or infrastructure. The application demonstrates thorough understanding of potential barriers to accessing benefits and proposes effective solutions for overcoming them.
- Good: The application outlines clear tactics with practical access points for connecting individuals to services. The plan is mostly comprehensive, with only minor gaps in detail or execution. Access points are functional, and the application demonstrates a solid understanding of the challenges individuals face when accessing benefits, offering feasible solutions.
- Marginal: The application provides some tactics for connecting individuals to government benefits and state services, but the plan lacks full clarity or depth. Access points are mentioned but may be vague or impractical. Discussion of potential barriers and solutions to overcoming them is limited.
- Unsatisfactory: The application offers minimal tactics for connecting individuals to services. Access points are unclear, impractical, or poorly defined. There is little consideration of barriers or challenges individuals face in accessing services, and proposed solutions, if any, lack detail or feasibility.

Sustainability Plan

Relationships with Funders and Investors

• Excellent: The partnership has a strong track record of establishing and managing relationships with a diverse range of philanthropic funders and investors, as well as the demonstrated capacity to secure the resources needed to support the Community Quarterback's operations and fuel the collaborative work of

partners. The partnership has a well-documented, diverse portfolio of funders and investors, with formal agreements or significant financial commitments already in place. Evidence of long-term relationships and ongoing engagement with funders is clear.

- Good: The partnership has established relationships with multiple funders and investors, with some formal agreements or financial commitments that demonstrate capacity to support proposed work. There is evidence of active engagement and ongoing discussions with funders.
- **Marginal:** The partnership has identified several potential funders and investors and has initiated contact with them. There are some preliminary agreements or expressions of interest.
- Unsatisfactory: The partnership shows limited experience forming and managing relationships with funders and investors or capacity to sustain support for the Community Quarterback and collaborative work of partners. The partnership has identified a few potential funders and investors but has minimal formal engagement or financial commitments. Efforts to establish relationships are in early stages.

Sustaining Work Across All ENOUGH Result Areas

- Excellent: The partnership presents a comprehensive, detailed, and realistic plan for sustaining momentum across all ENOUGH Result Areas. The plan includes specific strategies, timelines, and roles/responsibilities, demonstrating a high likelihood of success after the grant period ends.
- Good: The partnership has a detailed plan for sustaining momentum, covering most ENOUGH Result Areas. The plan is realistic and includes specific strategies, though some areas may need further development.
- **Marginal:** The application describes solid strategies for sustaining work across most ENOUGH Result Areas, with promising, but less detailed, plans that may require further development.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The application presents limited strategies for sustaining work across ENOUGH Result Areas, with vague, infeasible, or otherwise insufficient plans for promoting long-term sustainability.

Neighborhood Action Plan (NAP)

I. General/Holistic Neighborhood Action Plan Criteria

Evidence of Community Engagement in Plan Development

- Excellent: The application provides strong, clear evidence that the community was actively and meaningfully engaged in the development of the proposed plan. Multiple, well-documented methods of engagement (e.g., meetings, surveys, focus groups) were used, reaching a diverse and representative group of community members. Community input directly influenced key aspects of the plan, with specific examples of how feedback was incorporated.
- **Good:** The application provides adequate evidence of community engagement, showing that a range of community members were consulted through several methods. The engagement process lacks specific detail on how diverse groups were involved. Some community input was used to shape the plan, though limited examples are provided.
- Marginal: The application provides limited evidence of community involvement, with engagement mostly occurring through fewer methods or reaching a narrow segment of the community. The connection between community input and the proposed plan is unclear or only loosely demonstrated.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The application provides minimal to no evidence that the community was engaged in developing the proposed plan. Engagement, if mentioned, was tokenistic or limited to a small,

non-representative group. The narrative provides no meaningful examples of how community input influenced the plan.

Ongoing Progress Monitoring and Mutual Accountability

- Excellent: The Neighborhood Action Plan (narrative, logic model and work plan) includes clear, detailed, feasible, and realistic strategies and activities that will ensure ongoing progress monitoring, mutual accountability across partners, and community leadership in decision-making processes.
- Good: The Neighborhood Action Plan includes strong strategies and activities for progress monitoring and accountability with substantial engagement of community leadership. Some additional details may be needed, but most elements are presented and observed gaps or weaknesses are minor.
- Marginal: The Neighborhood Action Plan includes adequate strategies and activities for progress monitoring and accountability with some engagement of community leadership. Observed weaknesses are significant.
- **Unsatisfactory**: The Neighborhood Action Plan includes limited strategies and activities for progress monitoring and/or accountability to partners and community.

II. Neighborhood Action Plan Criteria Evaluated for EACH Result Area

Potential for Impact: Metrics Alignment for Each Result Area

- Excellent: The application details strategies and interventions that are identified as evidence-based and tied to outcome metrics pertinent to the Result Area. Proposed activities are clearly tied to long-term goals using reliable data sets, evidence-informed frameworks, and robust participatory processes. Strategies are likely to improve conditions for children in poverty, increase collaborative capacity, and/or strengthen resident engagement in the Result Area. The application prioritizes progress, outcome and systems-level metrics and indicators appropriate for the Result Area systems, structures, and policies.
- Good: The application details strategies that are mostly evidence-based with clear outcome metrics that align with pertinent Result Area systems, structures, and policies. Most strategies can be expected to improve conditions for children in poverty, increase collaborative capacity, and/or strengthen resident engagement in the Result Area. The application prioritizes progress, outcome and systems-level metrics and indicators
- Marginal: Application strategies are partially evidence-based with limited connection to pertinent progress, outcome and/or systems-level metrics and indicators for the Result Area. Observed weaknesses may have significant impact on the project's potential to achieve measurable impact.
- Unsatisfactory: The application includes unclear or insufficient information on how planned activities will improve conditions for children in poverty, increase collaborative capacity, and/or strengthen resident engagement in the Result Area. Key details are missing or inadequately explained, making it difficult to assess the potential impact of the proposed activities.

Quality and Feasibility of Activities in Work Plan and RBA Plan for Each Result Area

• Excellent: The application and work plan clearly and comprehensively demonstrate how activities will be carried out and by whom using evidence-informed frameworks of collaborative action. Detailed strategies and examples are provided, showing a deep understanding of the community's issues and priorities in the Result Area and a clear plan for addressing them through systems and structures appropriate for the Result Area.

- Good: The application and work plan adequately demonstrate how planned activities will be carried out in systems and structures appropriate for the Result Area. Most aspects are well-explained and supported by relevant information, though some minor details or connections may be less clear.
- Marginal: The application and work plan demonstrate how planned activities will be carried out to advance priorities or address issues in the Result Area. However, explanations are somewhat vague or lack sufficient detail, and the connections between activities, timelines, and/or responsible parties are not fully developed.
- Unsatisfactory: The application includes unclear or insufficient information about how planned activities will be carried out through Result Area systems and structures. Key details are missing or inadequately explained, making it difficult to assess the quality and feasibility of proposed activities.

Appendix I | Rubric for Budget and Strength of Evidence-Based Interventions

Line-Item Budget (Excel Template) + Budget Narrative

Reasonableness and Alignment of Costs

- Excellent: All costs are reasonable, necessary, and directly aligned with the scope of work and scale of population impacted. No unnecessary or unexplained expenses. Key staff have adequate time devoted to the project to fully achieve project objectives and/or staff time allocation is well-justified.
- Good: Most costs are reasonable and aligned with the scope of work and scale of population impacted, but a few expenses need further justification. Key staff time dedicated to the project may be unclear, but this is expected to have a minor impact on the project.
- **Unsatisfactory:** Multiple expenses need further justification and/or key staff time allocation is insufficient such that the reviewer is concerned that it may limit project capacity or impact the potential for successful implementation.

Clarity and Detail of Budget Justification

- Excellent: The budget justification provides clear, detailed, and accurate calculations for all budget line items.
- **Good:** The budget justification is generally clear and detailed, but some items need additional explanation or calculation details.
- **Unsatisfactory**: Budget justification does not include calculations and accompanying rationale for all line item expenses.

Strength of Evidence-Based Interventions

- **Excellent:** The applicant proposes several project components, direct interventions and/or programs that appear in a clearinghouse database with a strong rating of evidence.
- Good: The applicant proposes interventions and programs that are not identified as evidence-based in a clearinghouse database, but they likely meet the NOFO definition of evidence-based and the table includes significant detail and rationale for cited programs.
- **Unsatisfactory:** Direct interventions are proposed but the Programs + Evidence Table is missing or reviewers are unable to easily confirm that the identified program(s) meet the NOFO definition of evidence-based.