


Project Title

I. RELEVANCE AND IMPACT

1. Relevance to [campus sustainability principles and values](#).



2. Impact on [campus' sustainability strategies](#).



3. Impact on campus community.

Will this project potentially become an enduring part of campus procedures, infrastructure or behaviors? Does this project encourage open debate and dialog on campus sustainability issues?



4. Implications beyond the campus.



Average desirability for "Relevance and Impact"



II. INNOVATION

5. Applicant originality.

Does this project have applicants who fill a niche that other projects may or have not -- students, staff or faculty make-up? Is it collaborative?




6. Audience originality.

Does this project have an audience who fill a niche that other projects may or have not – students, staff or faculty make-up? Does this project reach an audience that is not already "onboard" with campus sustainability goals? (Both direct and indirect audiences should be taken into account.)



7. Project originality.

In the context of other grant applications, in this round and in past awards, is this project diverse in the area(s) of sustainability that it addresses? (Sustainability is more than just a "greening" of campus or even implementation of technology – sustainability encompasses ecological, social, human and economic vitality.)



Average desirability for "Innovation"

low 0 ←—————→ 10 high **Score:**

III. COST-EFFECTIVE USE OF FUNDS

8. Development costs (asking price).

\$\$\$\$ \$15K + 0 ←—————→ 10 \$ \$250 **Score:**

9. Matching funds and in-kind contributions.

no match 0 ←—————→ 10 1:1 match or more **Score:**

10. Are there other (perceived) ways for this project to be funded? *

yes 0 ←—————→ 10 no **Score:**

* requires comment if the rank is below 8

11. Direct target audience size.

small (~5) 0 ←—————→ 10 large 250+ **Score:**

12. Indirect target audience size (through education, events, visibility or otherwise).

small 0 ←—————→ 10 large **Score:**

13. Projected benefit timeline.

What are the projected benefits and will those impacts be short-lived or long-term?

short term 0 ←—————→ 10 long term **Score:**

Average desirability for "Cost-effective Use of Funds"

low 0 ←—————→ 10 high **Score:**

IV. POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS

14. Scope vs. timeline feasibility.

not feasible 0 ←—————→ 10 feasible **Score:**

15. Relevant experience or sufficient preparation for the scope of the project.

low exp/prep 0 ←—————→ 10 high exp/prep **Score:**

16. Permissions and contacts. *

Have all the necessary connections been made? Have the applicants talked to the appropriate people on campus to obtain permissions, ensure long-term maintenance (if needed) or determine that the project is building upon practices already in place?

Campus Sustainability Grants Spring 2008 Proposal Evaluation



no 0 ←—————→ 10 yes or none needed **Score:**

* requires comment if the rank is below 8

17. Did the applicant(s) use the appropriate forms, follow instructions and address all relevant issues or guidelines suggested in the Call for Proposals?

no 0 ←—————→ 10 yes **Score:**

Average desirability for "Potential For Success"

low 0 ←—————→ 10 high **Score:**

VI. Totals (transferred from above)

Average desirability for "Relevance and Impact"

low 0 ←—————→ 10 high **Score:**

Average desirability for "Innovation"

low 0 ←—————→ 10 high **Score:**

Average desirability for "Cost-effective Use of Funds"

low 0 ←—————→ 10 high **Score:**

Average desirability for "Potential For Success"

low 0 ←—————→ 10 high **Score:**

Average Project Desirability

low 0 ←—————→ 10 high **Score:**

Comments