Scoring Rubric for Scale Readiness

The following key can be used to score each program on a 1-3 scale.

Scalable program		
1. Evidence of demand for the program where it is currently operating (i.e. teen programming is regularly filled to capacity/with a critical mass, teens/parents are asking for/approaching organizational leaders to develop more offerings, etc.)		
1: Program not usually filled to capacity and little demand from local teens/parents for more offerings	2: The program has had a critical mass of teens before, but this is not consistent. There is little demand for developing more offerings.	3: The program is usually full to capacity or has a critical mass, with teens and parents asking for further offerings.
2. The program's outcomes have been proven and evaluated: there is at least a theory of change or similar framework, and before and after data in place		
1: Internal evaluation process has shown a reasonable level of evidence of the program's impact	2: Internal evaluation process has shown high level of evidence of significant programmatic impact	3: At least one rigorous external evaluation process has been conducted on the program and shows significant impact
3. The core elements of the program and 'what' would be replicated is clear		
1: It's not clear whether it is a program, set of values, approach, methodology, or other aspect that should and can be replicated	2: Some clarity on what should or can be replicated, but more analysis needed	3: Clear understanding of what should be replicated
4. Program has been replicated 1+ times in local community, or has serviced multiple groups (i.e. multiple rounds of teen innovation awards)		
1: Program only operating in one location or has only serviced one group	2: Program is operating in 2-3 locations or has had serviced two groups	3: Program is operating in 3+ locations and has services more than two groups

5. The processes and systems necessary are well defined and developed to ensure quality		
1: Few or no processes and systems exist or they are fragmented and difficult to find.	2: Most processes and documentation for delivery and replication are in place but with some gaps.	3: Accurate documentation is in place for process, systems, training, legal agreements, procedures and ensuring quality.
6. The program has a clear sustainability plan (multiple funders, diversified revenue, plan for next 3-5 years)		
1: There is little evidence that the program will be sustained locally	2: There is evidence demonstrating the program's sustainability, including a track record of securing sufficient income and rationale for this to continue	3: There is detailed evidence around sustainability including documentation around income sources, profit levels, reserve amounts, income ratios etc.
7. The program has evaluated cost efficacy, and has taken steps to lower costs to make the program more scalable		
1: The program has not yet conducted a cost efficacy analysis	2: The program has evaluated cost efficacy and is beginning to take steps towards improving cost-efficacy	3: The program has rigorously evaluated cost efficacy and is currently operating a more cost-effective model than previously
Capable organization to act as the originator		
8. There is no resistance on the part of local funders and programs team to scaling the program into new geographic locations		
1: Stakeholders are hostile towards replication and/or there has been no consultation at all.	2: Stakeholders are neutral towards replication and/or there has been limited consultation.	2: Stakeholders fully support replication and have been consulted.
9. Local funders and/or programs team that have deep programmatic knowledge have the capacity to spend to work with Spring Impact and the Funder Collaborative to develop and implement the replication model		
1: There is no capacity among knowledgeable members of the local community to work towards replication	2: There is sufficient capacity among members of the local community to work towards replication	3: There is significant capacity and buy-in among members of the local community to work towards replication
10. There is a clear project owner to lead replication efforts (can be external)		
~~clear project owner/cilla and capacity to lead~~ replication efforts	2: There is a clear project owner for replication with a relevant skill set	3: There is a clear project owner with previous experience in scaling and is trusted by stakeholders

Attracting implementers and funding		
11. There is at least one clear unique selling point (USP) compared to other Jewish teen engagement programs		
1: Have developed some theory behind their USPs but no evidence.	2: Have defined their USPs with some evidence	3: Evidenced significant improvements compared to other programs
12. The program has the potential to work in other contexts (as assessed by program staff interviews)		
1: Success is specific to the current local community, reliant on specific individuals, and/or unable or very difficult to adapt to different conditions	2: Some evidence the program is able to work in another community and condition however work is needed to understand the adaptation that will be required	3: Program is able to work in other communities and conditions without significant barriers or additional work needed
13. The program's goals would align with the goals of Jewish communities in other areas		
1: Goals are specific to the local community	2: Some evidence that goals would align with other communities'	3: Shares common goals within the national Jewish community and strong evidence that goals would align with other local communities
14. The program has the potential to attract funds needed to run it in a new place (can be assessed partially by its current financial strategy in terms of diverse and numerous funders)		
1: Little evidence that there would be demand from other funders to fund program in another community	2: Moderate evidence that other funders in another community would be interested in funding the program	3: Other funders have already approached the program seeking replication in their community
15. There is known demand for the program from other communities (i.e. organizational leaders and funders within other communities are asking for its programs or services)		
1: No other communities have shown demand for the program	2: There has been moderate expressed demand from other communities	3: Numerous other communities are asking for local replication