

Friends of RDCO Regional Parks Capacity Building Grant – Evaluation Rubric



1. Project Description: 30%

<p>Objectives of project are clearly stated, measurable and attainable.</p>	<p>Proposal includes a section where objectives are clearly stated. The way objectives are stated makes them easily measurable. Objectives can reasonably be achieved with the available timeline.</p>	<p>Exceptional (9-10pts): The objectives are directly aligned to the goals of the funding, are clearly detailed and articulated, can be easily measured and can be easily understood. Objectives can reasonably be attained within the proposed timeline. Excellent (6-8pts): The objectives are somewhat aligned to the goals of the funding, are clearly stated, but not detailed, are measurable and easily understood. Objectives can reasonably be attained within the proposed timeline. Acceptable (2-5pts): The objectives are stated and can be measurable. They seem appropriate to the goals for funding. Objectives seem reasonable for the proposed timeline. Incomplete (0-1pts): The objectives are not clearly stated, are not measurable and leave questions about alignment with the goals for funding. There are serious questions about whether or not they can be attained within the proposed timeline.</p>
<p>Plans for carrying out the work and any approaches to be employed are clear, relevant, and feasible</p>	<p>Proposed methodology, strategies, or approaches clearly support attainment of project objective. Key activities and procedures to complete the project are clearly articulated and reasonable.</p>	<p>Exceptional (9-10pts): The proposed methodology, strategy or approach are clearly described, are reasonable in terms of facilitating the completion of the project and support the attainment of the project goals. Key activities are articulated, outlining how the project goals are to be achieved. Excellent (6-8pts): The proposed methodology, strategies, or approach are reasonable and clearly stated, and will support the attainment of the project goals. A high-level outline of activities to attain the project goals is provided. Acceptable (2-5pts): Some information is provided regarding methodology or approach to be used to address the project objectives. Incomplete (0-1pts): Insufficient information is provided regarding approach or methodology to be used to attain the project goals.</p>

Section score: _____ points * 1.5 = _____/30

Friends of RDCO Regional Parks Capacity Building Grant – Evaluation Rubric



2. Public Benefits: 20%

<p>Benefits to the public are clearly identified. Specific benefits to certain demographics are identified.</p>	<p>The proposal explains how the project enhances the public experience of Regional Parks. Opportunities for connections to other groups or activities are identified. Target demographic groups and benefits are clear.</p>	<p>Exceptional (9-10pts): The proposal articulates how the project enhances the public experience of Regional Parks. The proposal makes clear how the project might be transferable to support other groups or parks. Target demographic groups are identified and their specific benefits are clearly explained.</p> <p>Excellent (6-8pts): The proposal articulates how the project enhances the public experience of Regional Parks. It outlines how the project might be transferable to support other groups or parks. Demographic groups are identified, but benefits are not be clearly explained.</p> <p>Acceptable (2-5pts): The proposal partially articulates how the project enhances the public experience of Regional Parks. Target demographic group are identified with no rationale as to how the project benefits the group.</p> <p>Incomplete (0-1pts): The proposal provides limited information regarding the contributions and value of the project.</p>
<p>Clear explanation and rationale of how this project fills a specific need for the community and the public.</p>	<p>Rationale for the project is clearly explained and aligns with the funding goals.</p>	<p>Exceptional (9-10pts): Proposal provides detailed explanation of the rationale for the project that clearly aligns it within the goals of the funding. Explanation includes reasons why the project is needed, how it is relevant to the Regional Park and to the funding goals.</p> <p>Excellent (6-8pts): Proposal provides detailed explanation of the rationale for the project that aligns it within the goals of the funding. Explanation includes partial rationale for why the project is needed, how it is relevant to Regional Parks.</p> <p>Acceptable (2-5pts): Proposal provides a partial explanation of the rationale for the project that aligns it within the goals of the funding. Explanation includes a brief description about the relevance of the project, but includes some invalid points.</p> <p>Incomplete (0-1pts): Inadequate information is provided to support the rationale for the project.</p>

Section score: _____ points = _____/20

Friends of RDCO Regional Parks Capacity Building Grant – Evaluation Rubric



3. Park Benefits: 20%

<p>Benefits to the park are clearly identified.</p>	<p>The benefits to the parks in clearly identified and the rationale for their benefit is reasonable. These benefits may be to park infrastructure, habitat improvement for wildlife or benefits not listed in 'Public Benefits'</p>	<p>Exceptional (9-10pts): The proposal clearly articulates how the project enhances the proposed Regional Park. The proposal includes ways how the project might be transferable to support other groups or Regional Parks. Unique characteristics, considerations or needs of the specific Regional Park have been identified in the application and are addressed in the proposal.</p> <p>Excellent (6-8pts): The proposal articulates how the project enhances the Regional Park. Some thought or mention of the unique characteristics, considerations or needs of the specific Regional Park have been included in the application.</p> <p>Acceptable (2-5pts): The proposal articulates how the project enhances the Regional Park. No mention of the unique characteristics, considerations or needs of the specific Regional Park have been included in the application.</p> <p>Incomplete (0-1pts): The proposal provides limited information regarding the contributions to the specific Regional Park and value of the project.</p>
---	--	--

Section score: _____ points * 2 = _____/20

Friends of RDCO Regional Parks Capacity Building Grant – Evaluation Rubric



4. Budget: 10%

<p>Major cost projections. In-kind contributions. The budget is reasonable in regards to the work proposed.</p>	<p>The budget is easy to understand and clearly outlines the most significant cost line items required for the development of the project, along with a reasonable timeline for the expenses. Direct and in-kind costs are identified in sufficient detail to be clear.</p>	<p>Exceptional (9-10pts): The budget clearly outlines cost projections and the numbers accurately reflect the priorities of the project. The budget is easy to understand and provides sufficient detail for clarity about how funds will be used and when expenses will be incurred. The budget outlines all in-kind contributions, and is completely reasonable to the work proposed.</p> <p>Excellent (6-8pts): The budget outlines cost projections and the numbers generally reflect the priorities of the project. The budget is clear and some level of detail is provided, but some questions remain. In-kind contributions are noted along with a broad timeline for incurring expenses. The budget is mostly reasonable to the work proposed.</p> <p>Acceptable (2-5pts): The budget provides some cost projections; the numbers are not entirely reflective of project priorities. The budget is difficult to read and understand and provides insufficient detail. There is minimal indication of a timeline of expenses and no in-kind contributions are noted. The budget is not entirely reasonable to the work outlined.</p> <p>Incomplete (0-1pts): The budget does not outline cost projections and the numbers do not reflect the priorities of the project. The budget is not clear and does not provide sufficient detail. The budget is not reasonable to the work proposed.</p>
---	---	--

Section score: _____ points = _____/10

Friends of RDCO Regional Parks Capacity Building Grant – Evaluation Rubric



5. Matching: 10%

<p>How will you match the 'Friends' Grant funding? Identify donations or in-kind services.</p>	<p>The source of matching funds is easy to understand and clearly outlines the source of cash contributions. In-kind volunteer hours are quantified and assigned to specific tasks. The sum of matching funds and in-kind volunteer hours equals the requested grant amount.</p>	<p>Exceptional (9-10pts): The application clearly outlines the sources of matching funds and the tasks for associated in-kind volunteer hours. Calculations of in-kind volunteer hours for each associated task have been estimated and seem reasonable. The sum of matching funds and in-kind volunteer hours equals the requested grant amount. Excellent (6-8pts): The application includes the amount of matching funds and the amount of in-kind volunteer hours. Some tasks for the in-kind volunteer hours have been estimated and seem reasonable. The sum of matching funds and in-kind volunteer hours equals the requested grant amount. Acceptable (2-5pts): The application includes a partial or unclear accounting for the amount of matching funds and the amount of in-kind volunteer hours. Some tasks for the in-kind volunteer hours have been identified. The sum of matching funds and in-kind volunteer hours equals the requested grant amount. Incomplete (0-1pts): The application includes incomplete or missing amounts of matching funds and the amount of in-kind volunteer hours. No tasks for the in-kind volunteer hours have been estimated. The sum of matching funds and in-kind volunteer hours does not equals the requested grant amount.</p>
--	--	---

Section score: _____ points = _____/10

Friends of RDCO Regional Parks Capacity Building Grant – Evaluation Rubric



6. Evaluation: 10%

<p>Measures of success are identified and meaningful.</p>	<p>Measures of success are included. Reflection on what a successful project looks like is evident. A plan on how the groups will report on these measures is included and clear.</p>	<p>Exceptional (9-10pts): The evaluation plan clearly outlines measure(s) of success. These measures are measurable, easy to understand and achievable in a reasonable period following the project. A plan of how the measures and final budget will be reported on is included.</p> <p>Excellent (6-8pts): The evaluation plan outlines measure(s) of success. These measures have 1 or 2 of these traits: measurable, easy to understand and achievable in a reasonable period following the project. Some plans to report these measures or budget is included.</p> <p>Acceptable (2-5pts): The evaluation plan outlines measure(s) of success. These measures are not measurable, easy to understand and achievable in a reasonable period following the project. No plans to report these measures or budget is included.</p> <p>Incomplete (0-1pts): The evaluation plan does not outline measure(s) of success. These measures are not measurable, easy to understand and achievable in a reasonable period following the project. No plans to report these measures or budget is included.</p>
---	---	---

Section score: _____ points = _____/10

Total score:

Section 1: _____/30

Section 2: _____/20

Section 3: _____/20

Section 4: _____/10

Section 5: _____/10

Section 6: _____/10

Total: _____/100