

Application Information

Applicant Name:

Project Title:

Amount Requested: Matching Amount:

Comments for applicant (required):

Evaluation Criteria Scoring Summary

Criteria	Maximum Points	Your Score*
1. Project Purpose	25	0
2. Measurable outcomes/Indicators	25	0
3. Project Plan	25	0
4. Budget	25	0
5. External support	10	0
Total	100	0

*Note the scores in this column auto-populate from your scores below

Evaluation Criteria

Project Purpose (25 Points):

1) The extent to which the applicant defines the specific, and existing issue, problem, or need the project will address.
 2) The extent to which the applicant addresses the timeliness and relevance to the Colorado specialty crop industry.
 3) The extent to which the project will provide a direct benefit to Colorado's specialty crop industry.

Excellent	No deficiencies. Strong, convincing justification. Contains a concise, well-conceived problem/issue statement. The approach is innovative and is likely to succeed. The project will have broad impact to Colorado specialty crops.	21 - 25
Very Good	Slight deficiencies. Convincing justification. Contains a very good problem/issue statement. The approach is rational and sound. The project will most likely succeed. The project will have broad impact to Colorado specialty crops.	15 - 20
Good	Minor deficiencies. The justification is sound. Contains a good problem/issue statement. The approach is reasonable. The project seems likely to succeed. The project will have an impact on Colorado specialty crops.	8 - 14
Fair	Several deficiencies. The justification could use further development. The problem/issue statement could have been better stated. The issues are not well-developed and may not be feasible to support a successful project or significantly impact the beneficiaries.	1 - 7
Poor	Major deficiencies in one or more aspects of the project. Fails to make a case for the project. The project does not fit the intent of the grant program. Required section or details are missing.	0
Reviewer Score:		

Evaluation Criteria

Measurable outcomes/Indicators (25 points):

1) The objective or purpose, available and meet the purpose of the grant program and will significantly benefit stakeholders.

Excellent	No deficiencies. The proposed project is extremely likely to succeed based on its goals, objectives, and selected performance measures. The outcome and indicator(s) are well-selected for the over-riding objectives of the project. The outcome and indicator(s) align well with the activities outlined in the plan. The goals are reasonable and attainable within the time frame of the grant. The indicator is complete - contains the number of producers, consumers, acres, etc., that would be affected by the project.	16-20
Very Good	Slight deficiencies. The proposed project is likely to succeed based on its goals, objectives, and selected performance measures. The outcome and indicator(s) match the over-riding objectives of the project. The outcome and indicator(s) are well-selected for the over-riding objectives of the project. The outcome and indicator(s) align well with the activities outlined in the plan. The goals are reasonable and attainable within the timeframe of the grant. The indicator is complete - contains the number of producers, consumers, acres, etc., that would be affected by the project.	11-15
Good	Minor deficiencies. The proposed project may succeed, but it is difficult to tell to what degree. The challenges discussed may be realistic and the strategies to address them relevant. The outcome and indicators are not in precise alignment with the goals and objectives, or with the project activities. The indicator is complete - contains the number of producers, consumers, acres, etc., that would be affected by the project.	6-10
Fair	Several deficiencies. The proposed project is unlikely to succeed and the work has been done before. The challenges discussed are not realistic and the strategies to address them may not be adequate. Relationship of outcomes and indicator(s) to project plan is unclear. The indicators may or may not be complete.	1-5
Poor	Major deficiencies. The proposed project cannot fulfill its goals, objectives, and selected performance measures and the work is unoriginal. Required information and details are missing. The indicators are not complete.	0
Reviewer Score:		

Evaluation Criteria

Project Plan (25 Points):

1) The extent to which the application presents a clear, well-conceived, and suitable overall methodology for fulfilling the goals and objectives of the proposed project.

Excellent	No deficiencies. Clear, well-described, focused, feasible plan and methodology with proper resources. The methodology is suitable and feasible. A clear plan is articulated. The project has a complete plan for sharing data with stakeholders through different channels and will benefit multiple Colorado specialty crop stakeholders, organizations and/or businesses and individuals. The approach is innovative and can be completed within the timeframe of the project. (Approximately 18-20 months)	21 - 25
Very Good	Slight deficiencies, but overall a solid project. Project is feasible, personnel and partnerships are appropriate, and timeframe is doable. The project has a complete plan for sharing data with stakeholders through different channels and will not solely benefit one organization. The approach is realistic and can be completed within the timeframe of the project. (Approximately 18-20 months)	15 - 20
Good	Minor deficiencies. Would benefit from more detail or a stronger focus. The project's work plan/approach generally outlines the applicant's goals and intent, but there is room for improvement as far as specificity of the work and/or the timeline. The project has a plan for sharing data with stakeholders through different channels and will likely benefit more than one organization. The approach is well-described and can likely be completed within the timeframe of the project. (Approximately 18-20 months)	8 - 14
Fair	Several deficiencies. Omits discussion of one or more relevant aspects of the work plan, or personnel involved if there is a plan for sharing data or if the project will benefit more than one organization. The approach is unclear and may be completed within the timeframe of the project. (Approximately 15-20 months)	1 - 7
Poor	Major deficiencies. Vague and confusing work plan. Unclear who is responsible for the project. Timeline difficult to understand, unrealistic or not discussed. No plan for sharing data. It is likely that the project will only benefit one organization or individual. The approach is unrealistic and it is likely the project will not be completed within the timeframe. (Approximately 15-20 months)	0
Reviewer Score:		

Evaluation Criteria

Budget:

1) The extent to which the application Budget Narrative/Justification provides a sufficient description for each budget category, and
 a. Budget is consistent with the size and scope of the project
 b. Budget relates logically to the Project Plan and objectives describing the project.

Excellent	No deficiencies. Budget clearly correlates to program goals. All items are allowed and reasonable. The overall budget is fully appropriate for the scope of the project. The budget includes the required matching funding of 25%. The project leverages matching funding or in-kind funds to improve the scope of the project. The return on investment is significant, and there is little doubt this budget contributes to making Colorado specialty crops more competitive.	13-15
Very Good	Slight deficiencies. Budget largely correlates to program goals. All major items and most minor items are allowed and reasonable. The overall budget is appropriate for the scope of the project. The budget includes the required matching funding of 25%. The return on investment is good, and it is clear how the budget will make Colorado specialty crops more competitive.	8-12
Good	Minor deficiencies. Budget may not consistently correlate to program goals but goals will likely be met. Most major and minor items are allowable and reasonable. The budget includes the required matching funding of 25%. The return on investment is fair and it is the budget will likely make Colorado specialty crops more competitive.	4-8
Fair	Several deficiencies. Budget does not correlate well to the intent of the project. Some major and multiple minor items are not allowable and/or reasonable. The overall budget request may be one or underestimate the cost of the project. The return on investment is limited and it is not clear that the budget will make Colorado specialty crops more competitive.	1-4
Poor	Major deficiencies. Many serious shortcomings in the budget. Many items are clearly not allowable and/or reasonable. There is no correlation between the budget and the program objectives. The overall budget request is significantly either too large or too small for the scope of the project. Required information and details are missing. There is no matching component. There is no obvious return on investment and it is not likely this project will make Colorado specialty crops more competitive.	0
Reviewer Score:		

Evaluation Criteria

External Support

1) The extent to which the project is supported by external stakeholders.

Excellent	Multiple letters of support are attached. Supporters are from the state of Colorado, involved in the industry in Colorado. Supporters are actively engaged in the project and have a vested interest in helping the applicant fulfill the project's activities and outcomes, and indicate how they will support the project.	9-10
Very Good	Multiple letters of support are attached. Support is shown by industry members in Colorado. Supporters are engaged in the project and have an interest in the applicant fulfilling the project's activities and outcomes.	7-9
Good	More than one letter of support. Most are from Colorado. Supporters mention how the project is important to them and how it will affect their industry.	4-6
Fair	Only one letter of support, or letters of support are not clearly from stakeholders. Does not mention how they will support the project or missing details on how the project is important to them. Not clear what role the supporter will play. Supporter may or may not be from Colorado.	1-3
Poor	Missing letters of support.	0
Reviewer Score:		