

**Grant Assessment**

**Application Assessment**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. The applicant describes the problem or issue. |  |  |
| 1. Statement of the problem/issue is clear. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left |
| 1. The root cause of the problem / issue has been identified. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left |
| 1. Ample background information is given including previous work done regarding the problem or issue. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. The applicant explains how/why the issue creates a problem for the local. |  |  |
| 1. The importance of the problem/issue is known within the local | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left |
| 1. There is evidence of the negative impact the problem/issue has on the local. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left |
| 1. The valid need for change regarding the problem/issues is apparent. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. The applicant explains how/why the action will improve the situation and promote effectiveness of the local | | |  |  |
| 1. The local(s)’ rationale for the proposed action is clearly stated. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left | | |
| 1. Specific aims of the project are focused on increasing the effectiveness of the local. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left | | |
| 1. There is evidence of sustainability of the desired project outcomes. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. The applicant identifies the items/activities for which the funds will be expended. | | |  |  |
| 1. The budget for the items/activities is appropriate and justified | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left | | |
| 1. Funded Items/activities represent cost effective benefits to the local | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left | | |
| 1. Accountability measures are apparent. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. The applicant provides a timeline and persons responsible for the execution of the plan. | | |  |  |
| 1. Methodology for implementation is clear and understandable. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left | | |
| 1. The execution of the plan is feasible. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left | | |
| 1. There is evidence of stakeholder support. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. The applicant describe specific objectives of the program. | |  |  | |
| 1. Objectives are in alignment with the desired outcomes of the project. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | | | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left |
| 1. Objectives are measurable and feasible. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | | | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left |
| 1. Objectives are indicative of an innovative project approach. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | | | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. The applicant outlines specific measurements for assessing the success of the program. | | |  |  |
| 1. The method of measurement is appropriate. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left | | |
| 1. The method of data collection is feasible and reliable. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left | | |
| 1. Project monitoring is ongoing – benchmarks are set. | 5 Point Rating Scale:  5 – is outstanding  4 – is better than expected  3 – is adequate  2 – is marginal  1 – is unacceptable | Rating:  Rate this question Below using the 5-Point scale at the left | | |
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