

BENEVITY GRANTS MANAGEMENT

Faster grant reviews that keep every decision human

How Benevity AI grant summaries and AI grant scoring help grantmakers reduce the manual burden, accelerate reviews and deliver evidence-backed decisions.



Table of contents

1

Closing the gap in grant reviews

2

How the review process shifts with AI

What changes for your team
Decisions are still made by humans

3

The engine behind the shift

Benevity AI grant summaries
Benevity AI grant scoring

4

What to consider when evaluating an AI grants tool

5

Path forward

Closing the gap in grant reviews

Grant teams rarely face a shortage of applications. They face a shortage of time. From determining basic alignment to applying consistent criteria across hundreds of applications, the entire review process demands a massive amount of manual administrative effort. This time-consuming workflow widens the gap between when an application lands and when your team can make a confident, evidence-backed decision – leaving nonprofits waiting and delaying community impact.

Benevity Grants Management AI features, built around your program's own criteria, are closing that gap. They don't decide who gets funded. Instead, they take on the rudimentary work – the initial reading and triaging – that happens before a decision is ever made. What changes is not who makes the final call, but how much of your team's time it takes to get there.

This guide breaks down how AI grant summaries and grant scoring work, the immediate impact on your team and how to evaluate the right AI tools for your program.

How the review process shifts with AI

	Manual review	AI-assisted review
Intake	Every application gets a full read before anyone knows if it aligns with program goals.	A structured summary of purpose, funding need and intended impact is ready before anyone opens the full file.
Consistency	Standards shift depending on the reviewer and their current capacity.	Criteria are applied the same way to every application, documented automatically.
Evidence	Reviewers reconstruct their reasoning from memory after the fact.	Every score includes the reasoning behind it, pulled directly from the applicant's own words.
Reviewer time	Most time goes into reading and triaging applications.	Time goes into strategy, nonprofit relationships and the final decisions that require human expertise.
Board defensibility	Reasoning is reconstructed under pressure if and when leadership asks.	Documented, consistent reasoning is ready for any decision at any time.

What changes for your team



For the reviewer

It changes what Monday morning looks like. Instead of starting the week re-reading an application from scratch just to figure out if it's worth a closer look, a shared set of criteria, tied to corporate initiatives, has already given every reviewer the same starting point. That same morning goes to a call with a nonprofit whose renewal is due, or a borderline application that needs the full read.



For the foundation leader

It changes what trust in the process looks like. Knowing every application was measured against the same criteria removes the guesswork around bias and frees up more time for nonprofit relationships and program strategy. That same confidence carries into board preparation. Instead of piecing together why an application scored the way it did months ago, the reasoning is already documented, consistent and ready to present.

Decisions are still made by humans

Even though 87% of companies agree that AI will reduce the burden for nonprofits, they are drawing a clear line: AI is a tool for efficiency, not a decision-maker.

Grant decisions carry real weight, so a person makes the final call on approvals and denials, not a model. AI brings all the critical information to the forefront through structured summaries and evidence-backed scores, cutting down on the triage time to enable better decision-making. This empowers reviewers to step away from the administrative heavy lifting and spend more time building relationships and driving community impact.



The engine behind the shift



Benevity Enterprise Impact Platform

Before AI can be trusted in your grantmaking program, it requires a secure, reliable infrastructure.

Benevity is an [AI-native Enterprise Impact Platform](#) built to unite people in purpose. But we didn't launch AI first and bolt governance on later. For nearly two decades, we've provided the infrastructure that makes global social impact trustworthy – delivering global [regulatory compliance](#), secure international [disbursements](#) and rigorous [nonprofit due diligence](#).

A platform created specifically for this work is capable of things a general-purpose AI is not. It identifies whether a nonprofit is legitimate, ensures funds can move securely and flags compliance issues before they become problems.

For Benevity, AI-native means the development lifecycle, the workflow design and the platform infrastructure are all built around AI from the ground up, not retrofitted after the fact.

[Read our responsible AI policy.](#)

AI grant summaries

AI grant summaries change what happens the moment an application lands. It evaluates the submission upon receipt and generates a structured overview covering the nonprofit's purpose, funding needs and intended impact.

Built directly into the review queue, this entry point ensures every reviewer sees the same consistent overview. The full file is always one click away, giving your team complete context whenever they need it.



Benevity AI grant summaries cuts what used to take a full read just to check basic alignment down to just 30 seconds.

AI grant scoring

Where intake needs speed, evaluation requires consistency. AI grant scoring applies your program's existing criteria, like budget fit, eligibility and alignment, to every application the same way.

Instead of an unsorted stack of applications, reviewers get a ranked, structured queue. Your program's standards stay the same, but now they're applied consistently across hundreds of applications. Every score includes a per-criterion justification, pulled directly from the applicant's own words, so reviewers weigh verified reasoning rather than accepting arbitrary figures.



Benevity AI grant scoring saves grantmaking teams 10-15 minutes per application in manual review time.

See it in action

[Get an interactive demo](#)

What to consider when evaluating an AI grants tool



Does it work off your program's own criteria, or a generic model?

An industry template won't reflect what your program actually prioritizes.



Does it show its reasoning?

A number with no explanation is hard to trust and even harder to defend later.



Can you test and validate it against past applicants before going live?

Validating against real, completed grant cycles ensures summaries capture critical context and rubrics apply criteria accurately before touching live submissions.



Does it perform as quickly and consistently at 10,000 applications as it does at 100?

Review quality shouldn't degrade when submission volume surges.



Does it connect to an infrastructure that prioritizes governance, compliance and nonprofit due diligence for international and cross-border grants?

A score or summary only matters if the nonprofit is validated, funds can move and compliance holds up.



Does a person still make the final call?

AI should surface evidence, synthesize details and organize your queue, never approve or deny funding on its own.

Path forward

By evaluating submissions faster, applying criteria consistently and anchoring every step in enterprise-grade governance, you strip away the administrative friction holding your program back. Instead of spending hours triaging applications, you help your team get back to focusing on the nonprofit relationships and strategic decisions that brought them into this work in the first place.

Get a personalized demo