

IRA UCF Subgrant Proposal Scoring Criteria

Proposal ID: _____

All project proposals will be screened and evaluated based on the following Scoring Criteria. Only full point scores will be assigned; no zeros will be assigned. The maximum *total score* any one application can receive is 40. Non-tree planting projects will be evaluated under a 35 point maximum.

Eligibility

Box 1: Applicant is a Municipal, County, Tribal Govt. or non-profit 501 C 3	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No Ineligible
Box 2: Proposed project area is within CEJST identified disadvantaged area	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No Ineligible

Box 3:	
Budget	Proposals less than \$10,000 or greater than \$100,000 will be considered ineligible Proposal fits within these parameters Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Ineligible <input type="checkbox"/>

Scoring

Box 4:	5 pts - High	3-4 pts - Medium	1-2 pts - Low
Budget Narrative	Well written. Budget is complete, easy to understand, and budget items are clearly labeled. Narrative provides clear and concise explanation of each budget line item and its function within the project. All numbers align with Box 3.	Budget items are present and align with Box 3, but one or more budget line items lacks explanation and function within project.	Major errors in budget calculations. Expenditures and budget line item functions are unclear. Poorly written.
<p>1 point deductions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor error in budget calculations • Somewhat unclear how expenditures activities tie to goals <p>2-3 point deductions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major errors in budget numbers • Unclear expenditures and budget item functions • Poorly written 			

Box 5:	5 pts - High	3-4 pts - Medium	1-2 pts - Low
Project Narrative & Goals	<p>General: Applicant provides a clear and well-organized narrative that explains the project purpose and goals. Describes project activities and how grant funds and leveraged resources will be used and scope/magnitude of positive impact on a landscape/community in the defined project area.</p>	<p>Describes project activities and how grant funds and leveraged resources will be used but lacks detail. Project deliverables and outputs are described, though how success is measured for one or two activities is unclear. Narrative provides specific activities but outcomes are vague.</p>	<p>Insufficient detail is provided as to what the project type is and associated goals. Does not include project need and where implementation will take place. Poorly written.</p>
<p>1 point deduction: Project type described, but minor lack of clarity</p> <p>2-4 point deduction: Narrative lists deliverables but some activities are vaguely described, generic or unclear Missing one or two key metrics that would logically be assumed with specific activities, i.e. acres treated, cost per acre, number of citizens to be reached, etc. Narrative and associated deliverables are mostly clear.</p> <p>5 or more point deduction: Narrative and associated goals are not well-described and most logical metrics are missing from activities Narrative omits description of one or more essential project goals Poorly written</p>			

Box 6:	10 pts - High	6-9 pts - Medium	1-5 pts - Low
Proposed Activities	<p>General: Applicant provides a clear and well-organized narrative that explains the activities to take place and how they will be completed (i.e. scope of work). The narrative demonstrates that activities have been planned with forethought, during preparation of the application. Describes project activities and how grant funds and leveraged resources will be used and scope/magnitude of positive impact on a</p>	<p>Describes project activities and how grant funds and leveraged resources will be used but lacks detail. Project deliverables and outputs are described, though how success is measured for one or two activities is unclear. Narrative provides specific activities but outcomes are vague.</p> <p>Organized as an easy-to-follow timeline of events, but missing one or two required elements such as milestones or</p>	<p>Insufficient detail is provided as to what work will be completed using grant funds and leveraged resources. Does not include how the proposed activities will be completed. Poorly written.</p> <p>Provides beginning and end dates, but no milestones or timeline of specific deliverables. Has a flavor of “give us the money, we’ll tell you how we spent it.”</p>

	<p>landscape/community in the defined project area.</p> <p>Project timeline is organized and has clearly established beginning and end dates, project milestones, and specific targets completed at specific times.</p>	<p>accomplishment markers.</p>	
<p>1 point deduction: Project activities described, but minor lack of clarity Minor lack of clarity or specificity in deliverables, targets, or milestones</p> <p>2-4 point deduction: Narrative lists deliverables but some activities are vaguely described, generic or unclear Missing one or two key metrics that would logically be assumed with specific activities, i.e. acres treated, cost per acre, number of citizens to be reached, etc. Narrative and associated deliverables are mostly clear.</p> <p>5 or more point deduction: Narrative and associated deliverables are not well-described and most logical metrics are missing from Activities No milestones No begin end/dates Narrative omits description of one or more essential project activities Poorly written</p>			

Box 7:	5 pts - High	3-4 pts - Medium	1-2 pts - Low
<p>Relation to FAP & Ten Year National UCF Plan</p>	<p>Activities (if any) are relevant to the project and described clearly and the general impact of results of planning efforts are described.</p>	<p>Covers required elements but does not explicitly or clearly describe relation of the project to FAP activities are outlined but does not clearly address challenges</p>	<p>Poorly written. Does not include how this project fits into the broad goals of the FAP or how it meets the goals and objectives of UCF</p>
<p>1 point deductions: Project includes relation to FAP, and 10- Year UCF Plan, but does not fully describe linkage to specific goals in those documents</p> <p>2-3 point deductions: Describes relation to FAP or 10-Year UCF Plan, but not both Narrative mentions planning documents, but does not describe how the project aligns with them Poorly written</p>			

Box 8:	5 pts - High	3-4 pts - Medium	1-2 pts - Low
Collaboration	All partner contributions are listed and described as relevant to project success. Narrative clearly demonstrates commitment from multiple stakeholders and/or on-going multi-partner collaboration.	Lists partners and contributions, but specific roles are unclear or lacking detail.	Very little or no collaboration appears to exist.
<p>1 point deductions: Project partners listed, but contributions of one or two are ambiguous.</p> <p>2-3 point deductions: Project collaborators lack specificity and clarity Multiple, undefined acronyms Poorly written and organized</p>			

Box 9:	5 pts - High	3-4 pts - Medium	1-2 pts - Low
Project Impacts	Well written. Narrative clearly demonstrates forethought given to positive impact on a landscape/community beyond the defined project area Explains how the project ties into a greater landscape or community goal of other projects, and how it impacts past, current and future projects.	Landscape level activities or community reach are described in general or other nearby projects are listed, but it is not clear how or why the project complements them directly at a landscape or community level.	Narrative not clearly written; key descriptions of landscape level activities and overall project impact are absent.
<p>1 point deduction: Community-wide impact is evident, but complementary activities are not mentioned</p> <p>2-3 point deduction: Project occurs over a broad landscape, but does not sufficiently demonstrate contiguity No complementary projects are mentioned</p>			

Tree Planting Applications Only	5 pts - High	3-4 pts - Medium	1-2 pts - Low
<p>1 point deduction:</p> <p>2-3 point deduction:</p>			