

HEP STEWARDSHIP PROPOSALS--RATING CRITERIA

Instructions: Please rate all items below, considering how the proposal addresses the key aspects noted for each. Please use as much space as needed for comments. If working on a printout, feel free to append additional pages.

Project Title:

Organization(s) Applying:

Review Committee Member:

Potential conflict of interest of applicant with HEP (Y/N):

Potential conflict of interest of applicant with reviewer (Y/N):

Previously funded (Y/N):

Requested funds: \$ Funds Expendable by Aug 31 2010: \$

Match: \$

EVALUATION (Please circle one or enter value in Rating cell)	Rating	Maximum points
1. GOALS & RATIONALE Does the project address one of the priority topics or a broad goal in the Action Plan? Does the proposal make the case of why the project is needed? Are goals clearly defined, realistic and relevant to HEP? 0 Not at all 1 Somewhat 2 Adequate 3 Excellent Comments:		3
2. WORKPLAN: COURSE OF ACTION Is the workplan well thought out, described in enough detail, and feasible? Does it identify specific actions (including permitting, insurance and other issues) that lead to the completion of the project and to achieving the goals? Is the location adequate? 0 Not at all 1 Somewhat 2 Adequate 3 Excellent Comments:		3
3. WORKPLAN: OUTREACH & EDUCATION Does the project include an appropriate educational/outreach component? Does it target a specific and suitable audience? Will the project communicate a specific and appropriate message (see section 6. Project Objectives in the RFP)? GI projects: does it include signage? Please rate the Outreach & Education component. 0 Inadequate 1 Modest 2 Adequate 3 Excellent Comments:		3
4. PROJECT RESULTS & EVALUATION Does the proposal clearly state the expected results (especially behavior changes and/or benefits to the Estuary ecosystem)? Are these realistic and relevant to HEP? Is the evaluation plan adequate? 0 Not at all 1 Somewhat 2 Adequate 3 Excellent Comments:		3
5. PROJECT CONTINUITY & DISSEMINATION Please rate the project's potential for extending its influence: Will it enable future related undertakings by this or other organizations? Is there a plan to share lessons learned and/or other resources? 0 Inadequate 1 Modest 2 Adequate 3 Excellent Comments:		3
6. PROFESSIONAL MERIT Please characterize the organization's and project team's qualifications to carry out the project. 0 Inadequate 1 Modest 2 Adequate 3 Excellent Comments:		3
7. SCHEDULE Is the schedule realistic and likely to be met? Is the project expected to be completed by August 1st 2011? Please characterize the proposed schedule as: 0 Inadequate 1 Poor 2 Adequate 3 Excellent Comments:		3
8. BUDGET Is the budget clearly presented and appropriate for the project? If matching funds or contributions are required, have these been secured? Please rate the proposed budget. 0 Inadequate 1 Poor 2 Adequate 3 Excellent Comments:		3
9. PREVIOUS FUNDING Has the applicant received HEP funding within the past 5 years? 0 Yes 2 No Comments:		2
OTHER COMMENTS:		
TOTAL	0	26