

EVALUATION OF FULL PROPOSALS

Full Proposal Review and Selection Process: Once proposals have been submitted to the Association, they will be distributed to the National Grants Committee to review and score using the 10 technical scoring criteria discussed below.

Technical Scoring Criteria for 2017 MSCGP Proposals: The technical scoring criteria used to evaluate proposals are listed below. National Grants Committee members' responses will be used to develop a relative ranking of proposals for the final review stage of the grant selection process. Each criterion listed below should be scored on a scale from 0-5, with 0 representing the lowest score and 5 representing the highest score. (Please use whole numbers)

Scale: 5 = Exceptional
4 = Very Good
3 = Good
2 = Fair
1 = Poor
0 = Very Poor

The highest score possible for a proposal is 50 and the lowest score possible is 0. If bonus points (described below) are added to the final score, the highest score possible is 55.

1. What is the geographic scope of the proposal specifically regarding states or regions that will directly benefit from the results or outcomes of the proposal? (Refer to Section 10)

<u>Geographic Scope</u>	<u>Score</u>
Only localized benefits within a region ¹	0-1
Benefits to majority of states within a region	1-2
Benefits to all state fish & wildlife agencies within a region	3-4
<u>Benefits to all state fish & wildlife agencies in the nation</u>	<u>5</u>

¹ A Region can be a USFWS Region or a Regional Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies.

2. Does the proposed project address the desired outcomes described in the NCN under which this proposal was submitted, and does the proposal clearly explain the anticipated deliverables and/or outcomes relative to the NCN? (Refer to **Project Goals and Objectives** and **Deliverables and Benefits** Section)

Score: 0 = Project does not address the desired and measurable outcomes described in the NCN and does not explain the project's anticipated deliverables.
5 = Project clearly addresses the desired and measurable outcomes described in the NCN and clearly explains the project's anticipated deliverables.

3. Will/can the proposed objectives and methodology produce the desired outcomes identified in the NCN under which this proposal was submitted? (Refer to **Project Goals and Objectives** and **The Program Methods and Program Design** Sections)

Score: 0 = Objectives and methodology will not/cannot produce the desired outcomes identified in the NCN under which this proposal was submitted.

5 = Objectives and methodology will/can clearly produce the desired outcomes identified in the NCN under which this proposal was submitted.

4. Are the project objectives clearly defined, achievable, measurable, and connected to specific goals, milestones/deliverables, and timelines (i.e., a work plan) for completion? (Refer to **Project Goals and Objectives** Section)

Score: 0 = Project objectives are ambiguous; project lacks specific goals linked to milestones/timelines for project completion.

5 = Project objectives are clear, concise, and outline specific goals which are linked to milestones/timelines for project completion.

5. Does the project's proposed methodology and methods accomplish/produce the proposed project objectives/goals? (Refer to **The Program Methods and Program Design and Deliverables and Benefits** section)

Score: 0 = Objectives cannot be accomplished using the proposed methodology.

5 = Objectives can clearly be accomplished using the proposed methodology.

6. Are the proposed project costs reasonable and is the project's cost-benefit ratio reasonable? (Refer to **Budget** section)

Score: 0 = Project is too expensive for objectives/benefits; cost is too high for benefits received/produced.

5 = Project costs are reasonable for objectives/benefits; cost is reasonable for benefits received/produced.

7. Is the project compatible with the original source of the funds (Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Funds)?

Score: 0 = The project is incompatible with the original source of the funds.

5 = The project is completely compatible with the original source of the funds.

8. Will the project deliver intended value across multiple states, is there a clear plan for how the project's value will be shared / disseminated / delivered across multiple states? (Refer to **Deliverables and Benefits** Section)

Score: 0 = Project objectives and goals will not benefit the state fish and wildlife agencies and where relevant, there is no plan to for sharing / disseminating / delivering the projects' values among the states.

5 = Project objectives and goals will greatly benefit the state fish and wildlife Agencies and where relevant, there is a clear plan for how the project's value will be shared / disseminated / delivered.

9. What is the anticipated, extended use/life of the project's deliverables, and are they clearly stated in the proposal? (Refer to **Deliverables and Benefits** Section)

Score: 0 = Value of project results ends when the project ends.

5 = Value of project results continues for years after the project ends and is clearly stated and described in the proposal.

10. Does the proposal/project include a monitoring and evaluation process to assess and measure the project's meaningful contributions, benefits, and congruence of desired outcomes to those specified in the NCN under which this proposal was submitted. Is this evaluation process clearly identified, described, and included in the proposal as part of the tasks to be completed and information to be disseminated in a final report? (Refer to **Monitoring and Evaluation** section)

Score: 0 = Proposal does not include an evaluation process to assess/measure the project's meaningful contributions, benefits, and desired outcomes versus actual outcomes.

5 = Proposal does include a specific evaluation process to assess/measure the project's meaningful contributions, benefits, and desired outcomes versus actual outcomes.

Bonus Points Criteria: Does the proposal leverage additional matching funds, either from applicant's organization or through partnerships, to enhance and maximize the project's desired benefits and outcomes, effectiveness, and success?

Score: 0 = Less than 5% partnership/matching funds

1 = 5 to 15%

2 = 16 to 25%

3 = 26 to 50%

4 = 51 to 75%

5 = 76 to 100% or more

PROJECT SELECTION & THE NGC PRIORITY LIST

Review and Selection of Priority List of Projects: The Association’s National Grants Committee will recommend a “priority list” of project proposals for state directors to approve at the Business Meeting during the Association’s September Annual Meeting. The Association will submit its priority list of projects to the USFWS by the mandated October 1, 2018 deadline.

Applicants and other interested parties may attend the National Grants Committee’s selection meeting to be held during the Association’s Annual Meeting in September. However, applicants will only be allowed to speak about their proposal if asked a question by a member of the National Grants Committee. Any attempt to discuss a proposal with a Committee member outside of this meeting is considered lobbying and is strictly prohibited