**CMGA 2024 grant evaluation rubric**

highest score rating possible - 48

lowest score rating possible -  17

| Project background | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Review criteria** : Clear description of the nature of the project (new or continuing), factors leading to project proposal; physical size of the project, if applicable; others applicant is working with, if any  /  maximum 3 pts | | |
| Unacceptable…......................................................................................................Ideal | | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** |
| One or more of the criteria is missing from the description | All criteria are included in description, but at least one factor's description is vague | Description includes all factors and is clearly written |

| Project objectives & tasks | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Review criteria** : Clear description of overall project goal, and how objectives and steps/plans to achieve objectives are connected to the overall goal / maximum 8 pts | | | |
| | Unacceptable…..........................................................................................Ideal | | |
| | **1** | **2** | |
| **Overall goal** | Goal is not described, is vague, and/or is written so that it's the same as the objectives | Goal is clearly written and is the 'umbrella' for the objectives | |
| | **1** | **2** | **3** |
| **Project objectives** | Objectives are vague, &/or not concrete, &/or not described, &/or not connected to each other and/or the overall goal | Objectives are more clearly described, but aren't clearly connected to each other and/or the overall goal, and/or some objectives are obviously missing | Includes all objectives needed to reach goal; Objectives are clearly described and clearly connected to each other and the overall goal in a flow |

Unacceptable…………………………………………………………………………………………………Ideal

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Steps / tasks to reach objectives** | Steps / tasks are vague, &/or not concrete, &/or not described, &/or not connected to objectives in an obvious way | Steps / tasks are concrete, but not well connected to objectives | Steps / tasks are concrete and clearly connected to objectives |

**Population(s) & accessibility**

**Review criteria** : Description clearly states who the population(s) are and how the project & its benefits will be promoted to the intended audience / maximum 6 pts

Unacceptable …………………………………………………………………………………………Ideal

| | 1 | | 2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Description of population** | Intended population is not specifically stated | | Intended population is specifically stated | |

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Description of how project and its benefits will be promoted** | No description is given for how project and its benefits will be promoted | Description includes how project *or* its benefits will be promoted, but description doesn't include both | Description includes how both the project and its benefits will be promoted, but it is vague | Description of how both the project and its benefits will be promoted is clear and complete |

**Community Impact**

**Review criteria** : Grant application describes, in concrete terms, how the project will benefit the intended population, including how it contributes to the CMGA mission to help promote horticultural knowledge and/or enhance the community it serves through gardening-based activities / maximum 6 pts

**Unacceptable …………………………………………………………………………………………………Ideal**

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Benefit to community** | Benefit to the community is not described, or is vague | Benefit to the community is described, but doesn't connect well to the objectives, and/or the potential benefits of some objectives are missing | Benefit to the community is clearly described and connected to the project objectives | |
| **Project's contribution to CMGA mission to educate public** | No description of how project contributes to CMGA mission | Project description vaguely explains how it will contribute to the CMGA mission, but details are not clear | Project description clearly explains how it will contribute to the CMGA mission | |

**Project continuation**

**Review criteria** : Application describes how the project will continue, once the grant phase is complete, and who/what funding / people resources will be needed and secured / maximum 13 pts

**Unacceptable……………………………………………………………………………………………….Ideal**

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Future continuation of project** | Applicant is unsure if project will be continued in the future, explanation for non-continuation might or might not be given | Project might or might not be continued in the future, with a plausible explanation as to why this is so | Project will be continued in the future | |

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Description of who will manage long-term care, and activities needed for long-term care** | No description of who will manage long-term care and the activities needed | Description includes who will manage long-term care *or* what activities are needed, but not both | Description includes both who will manage long-term care, and what activities are needed, but one or the other is vague | Description of who will manage long-term care and what activities are needed is complete and clear |

| | Unacceptable…………………………………………………………………………………….Ideal | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Future project funding & material resources; how they might be secured** | **1** There is no mention of how the project will continue to be funded, what material resources might be needed, and how these might be secured | **2** No future funding for the project is needed or language about future funding is vague; material resources that might be needed are described, but there is no mention of how they might be secured | **3** Project description includes possible future funding & material sources, and how they might be secured |
| **future people resources & how they might be secured** | **1** There is no description of what people resources might be needed and how they might be secured | **2** Description includes what people resources might be needed, but not how they might be secured | **3** Description of both what people resources might be needed, and how they might be secured is clear |

**Master Gardeners & other volunteers**

**Review criteria** : Application describes how many MGs, MG interns, and other volunteers the project aims to include, how they will be recruited, and how they will benefit from being involved in the project / maximum 7 pts

| | Unacceptable…………………………………………………………………………………….Ideal | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Anticipated number of MGs / MG interns / other volunteers needed** | **1** Anticipated number of MGs, MG interns, & other volunteers isn't stated | **2** Anticipated number of MGs, MG interns, & volunteers is stated | |
| **Plan for recruiting MGs / MG interns, / other volunteers** | **1** There is no mention of how how MGs and/or MG interns and / or other volunteers will be recruited | **2** Recruitment plan for any of these groups is vague, or any one group is excluded from recruitment plan | **3** Recruitment plan for MGs, MG interns, and other volunteers is clear |

| | Unacceptable………………………………………………………………………………..Ideal | |
|---|---|---|
| **Benefit to MGs / MG interns / other volunteers** | **1**<br>Benefit to MGs / MG interns / other volunteers is not described or is vague | **2**<br>Benefit to MGs / MG interns / other volunteers is clear and appropriate |

**Project Budget**

**Review criteria** : budget expenses are clearly described and include financial support from other sources / maximum 4 pts

| | Unacceptable………………………………………………………………………………..Ideal | |
|---|---|---|
| **Budget expenses** | **1**<br>Budget expenses are not itemized, are vague, or some are not included | **2**<br>Budget expenses are itemized clearly |
| **Outside financial support** | **1**<br>Project financial support is limited to CMGA grant funding | **2**<br>Project includes financial or donation support from outside sources |