

Educator Mini-Grant Program Application Evaluation Form

Purpose

This document provides information on the funding decision process for the educator mini-grant program application.

Screening

All applications received on or before the deadline will be prescreened. Staff and members of the Citizen Advisory Committee will then review applications based on the project quality metrics below. Each application will be given a numerical score by each reviewing member. While funds last, funding recommendations will be presented to the Board of Managers using the assigned scores.

Incomplete or late applications will not be considered for funding.

Scoring

Applicants who do not meet the required prescreening criteria will not be considered for funding (i.e., if there is a "no" response to any of the questions). Applications who meet prescreening eligibility are then scored numerically based on project quality. Project quality will be ranked as follows:

Five or more points Forward to managers for funding approval					
Under five points Will not be considered for funding					
Note: Instructions on this form are for grant reviewers. No action is required by grant applicants.					
Eligibility Prescreening Is the applicant located within the LMRWD or a member city?Yes/No					
Is this the first mini-grant for this recipient for the current academic year?Yes/No					
Are all application questions complete?Yes/No					

<u>Project Quality</u> Instructions for reviewer: Rate all questions on a 0–2 scale and calculate the total score.						
How satisfactory is the level of detail in the project application?						
ve	ry <u>un</u> satisfactory	0	1	2	very satisfactory	
How well does this project address the LMRWD goals around education and awareness relating to water quality, water conservation, and wildlife habitat?						
,	very <u>un</u> satisfactory	0	1	2	very satisfactory	
How well does the activity or project enhance participant learning and engagement?						
	<u>not</u> well	0	1	2	very well	
Does the proposed activity or project seem like a sensible use of funds to further LMRWD goals?						

very <u>un</u>reasonable

Total Score

0 1 2 very reasonable