



Category	Criterion	Exceeds (3)	Good (2)	Fair or Poor (1 or 0)	Score/notes
<b>Organizational Fit</b>	Proposed project is aligned well with the organization's areas of expertise	Proposed project aligns fully with organization's areas of expertise	Proposed project is tangentially, but not directly, related to organization's areas of expertise	No clear relationship between the project and the organization's areas of expertise	
<b>Project Design</b>	Project design is clearly described and activities are compelling. There is strong rationale for the proposed work. The project leverages or expands existing infrastructure.	Goals and activities are clearly defined. Strong rationale exists for the proposed work. Addresses specific need(s) common amongst the field. Project plan clearly leverages or contributes to existing infrastructure.	Goals and activities are generally clear but may require additional clarification. Rationale for the project may be overgeneralized, but the overall argument holds. Project plan has some connection to existing infrastructure.	Weaknesses are present in project design. Unconvincing evidence of need presented. Plan presented lacks sufficient detail to judge how it connects to existing infrastructure.	
<b>Funding Category Alignment</b>	The project design is a clear fit with one RFP funding category. The project accomplishes all or many of the specified objectives within the category.	The project design is a clear fit with one RFP funding category. The project accomplishes all or many of the specified objectives within the category.	The project design somewhat fits with one RFP funding category. The project accomplishes some of the specified objectives within the category.	The project design does not clearly fit with an RFP funding category. The project accomplishes few of the specified objectives within the category.	

**Applicant/Organization Name:**

**Amount Requested:**

**Funding Category:**

**Geographic Scope:**

<b>Timeline Feasibility</b>	The project appears feasible and could be completed within 12-24 months of receiving the funding.	The project appears feasible and could be completed within 12-24 months of receiving the funding.	The project appears feasible with minor adjustments to the timeline	It is questionable whether or not the project could be completed in the specified timeline.	
<b>Budget</b>	Costs have been researched and are within reasonable limits.	No modifications needed. The project budget is realistic and clearly connects to grant activities.	Minor modifications will be needed to the scope or requested amount to accomplish activities.	Major modifications will be needed to either the scope or the requested amount to accomplish activities.	
<b>Success and Learning</b>	The project will teach the field of stakeholders something important. Clear metrics are detailed	A detailed rationale explains why and how the project is expected to create meaningful learning. Project implements a new insight or idea, with potential benefits of change made clear	A rationale somewhat explains the expected impact of the project on learning. Project implements an emerging innovation or trend, with some potential benefits specified	The rationale is underdeveloped. The project contains little innovation or represents practice(s) commonplace within field	
<b>BONUS: Leverage/Catalyzation of additional funding</b>	The project leverages or catalyzes additional funds.	The project will definitely leverage or catalyze additional funds.	The project might potentially leverage or catalyze additional funds.	The project does not leverage or catalyze additional funds.	
<b>BONUS: Disparities/Equity</b>	The project impacts a population of focus experiencing inequities	The project directly impacts a population of focus experiencing inequities	The project potentially or peripherally impacts a population of focus experiencing inequities	The project has little or no impact on a population of focus experiencing inequities	
<b>Total Score</b>					