



Boundless San Francisco Evaluation Rubric

Transformative Ambition

Will this approach meaningfully shift conditions for San Franciscans? Will the solution go beyond delivering services by changing systems, policies, norms, or opportunity structures? Is the theory of change bold, coherent, and proportionate to the resources requested?

Incremental	
1	Does not demonstrate potential to shift conditions for San Franciscans. It focuses exclusively on service delivery without engaging the systems, policies, norms, or opportunity structures that sustain the problem. The theory of change is absent, unclear, or not proportionate to the resources requested.
2	Shows limited potential to shift conditions for San Franciscans beyond direct service delivery. It references broader change but does not articulate a credible path toward it. The theory of change is underdeveloped or only loosely proportionate to the resources requested.
3	Demonstrates some potential to shift conditions for San Franciscans by moving beyond service delivery to engage systems, policies, norms, or opportunity structures that contribute to the problem. The theory of change is coherent and generally proportionate to the resources requested.
4	Presents strong potential to shift conditions for San Franciscans by clearly targeting systems, policies, norms, or opportunity structures that sustain the problem. The theory of change is bold, coherent, and well-proportionate to the resources requested. Where service delivery is present, it serves as a foundation for that broader structural ambition rather than an end in itself.
5	Offers exceptional potential to fundamentally shift conditions for San Franciscans by targeting systems, policies, norms, or opportunity structures that sustain the problem at scale. The theory of change is bold, rigorous, and compellingly proportionate to the resources requested. Any direct service work is explicitly connected to and in service of that structural ambition.
Transformative	

Viability

Does the proposal demonstrate a credible and specific plan for achieving results in San Francisco? Does the team have an understanding of the city's context, the communities to be served, and the partnerships, relationships, or strategies needed to execute here? For applicants without an existing San Francisco presence, is there a realistic and well-reasoned path to establishing that presence?

Implausible	
1	Lacks a credible plan for achieving results in San Francisco. It shows little to no understanding of the city's context, the communities to be served, or the partnerships, relationships, and strategies needed to execute. Where applicable, applicants without an existing San Francisco presence offer no realistic path to establishing one.
2	Shows limited evidence of a credible plan for achieving results in San Francisco. Understanding of the city's context and the communities to be served is surface-level. Partnerships, relationships, or strategies described are vague and insufficient for successful implementation. Where applicable, applicants without an existing San Francisco presence offer a weak or unconvincing path to establishing one.
3	Offers a credible plan for achieving results in San Francisco. Demonstrates a working understanding of the city's context and the communities to be served. Partnerships, relationships, or strategies are adequately identified and suggest the team has a reasonable foundation for successful implementation. Where applicable, applicants without an existing San Francisco presence offer a plausible path to establishing one.
4	Presents a strong and specific plan for achieving results in San Francisco. Reflects a clear understanding of the city's context and the communities to be served. Partnerships, relationships, or strategies are well-defined and clearly positioned to support successful implementation. Where applicable, applicants without an existing San Francisco presence offer a realistic and well-reasoned path to establishing one.
5	Offers an exceptional and detailed plan for achieving results in San Francisco. Demonstrates deep understanding of the city's context and the communities to be served. Partnerships, relationships, or strategies are concrete and constitute a significant asset for successful implementation. Where applicable, applicants without an existing San Francisco presence offer a compelling and thoroughly reasoned path to establishing one.
Compelling	

Evidence of Results

Is there compelling evidence (quantitative or qualitative, internal or external) that this approach works or is working? For early-stage applicants, is the theory of change grounded in a well-reasoned logic and relevant analogous evidence, even if direct results data is limited?

Unsubstantiated	
1	Provides no meaningful evidence (quantitative or qualitative, internal or external) that the approach works. For established applicants, there are no results to speak of. For early-stage applicants, the theory of change is poorly reasoned and draws on no relevant analogous evidence.
2	Provides weak evidence (quantitative or qualitative, internal or external) that the approach works. For established applicants, results are limited. For early-stage applicants, the theory of change is underdeveloped and loosely connected to relevant analogous evidence.
3	Provides adequate evidence (quantitative or qualitative, internal or external) that the approach works. For established applicants, results are present but not compelling. For early-stage applicants, the theory of change is sound and grounded in relevant analogous evidence, even if direct results data is limited.
4	Provides strong evidence (quantitative or qualitative, internal or external) that the approach works. For established applicants, results are clearly documented and speak to the effectiveness of the approach. For early-stage applicants, the theory of change is well-reasoned and supported by meaningful analogous evidence.
5	Provides compelling evidence (quantitative or qualitative, internal or external) that the approach works. For established applicants, results are robust, well-documented, and directly relevant. For early-stage applicants, the theory of change is rigorous and supported by strong analogous evidence that makes a persuasive case for the proposed approach.
Well-Evidenced	

Durability

Will this work generate lasting benefits beyond the grant period? Does the proposal demonstrate a credible vision for how results will be sustained—whether through financial sustainability, policy change, institutional adoption, community ownership, or other mechanisms? Does the organization have a realistic plan for the five-year horizon and beyond?

Fleeting	
1	Lacks a credible vision for sustaining results beyond the grant period. There is no meaningful plan for financial sustainability, policy change, institutional adoption, community ownership, or other sustaining mechanisms. There is no articulation of what lasting benefit looks like for the people or systems served. No realistic plan for the five-year horizon and beyond.
2	Offers limited evidence of a credible vision for sustaining results beyond the grant period. Plans for sustainability are vague or rely on assumptions that are not well-supported. The plan for the five-year horizon and beyond is underdeveloped.
3	Demonstrates a vision for sustaining results beyond the grant period. Identifies plausible mechanisms for sustainability, whether financial, policy-related, institutional, or community-based, though the plan for the five-year horizon and beyond could be more fully developed.
4	Presents a strong and credible vision for sustaining results beyond the grant period. It articulates clear mechanisms for sustainability, whether financial, policy-related, institutional, or community-based, and offers a realistic picture of the lasting benefits those mechanisms are designed to protect. Offers a realistic plan for the five-year horizon and beyond.
5	Outlines an exceptional and well-substantiated vision for sustaining results well beyond the grant period. Demonstrates a comprehensive approach to sustainability through multiple reinforcing mechanisms and offers a compelling articulation of the lasting benefits those mechanisms are designed to protect. The proposal offers a thorough, realistic plan for the five-year horizon and beyond.
Lasting	