|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Question Number (if applicable)** | **Scoring Descriptions & Point Values** |  |  |  | **Score** |
| **Grant Application Narrative** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Summary** |  | **Excellent (10)**  The summary provides a succinct, clear description of the proposed project including how the funds will be used, who the project will benefit, the estimated time for project completion, and how the project fits with the selected grant program. | **Good (8)**  The application provides a solid description of the services provided, but detail about any of the following is lacking: how the funds will be used, who the project will benefit, the estimated time for project completion, and how the project fits with the selected grant program. | **Average (5)**  The application provides a description of the services provided, but detail about multiple of the following is lacking: how the funds will be used, who the project will benefit, the estimated time for project completion, and how the project fits with the selected grant program. | **Poor (1)**  The project summary is missing and/or all of the following is missing: how the funds will be used, who the project will benefit, the estimated time for project completion, and how the project fits with the selected grant program. |  |
| **Project Description** | **Question 1: Community Need** | **Excellent (6)**  The application clearly defines the community and uses data to demonstrate a clear and compelling need in the community (for example waiting lists for classes, requests from employers for specific training, regional economic development reports suggesting need for program, etc.). It’s clear how the proposed project will positively impact the community and/or the agriculture industry. The proposal explains how the project is the best solution to meet the need. | **Good (5)**  The application may or may not clearly define the community. There appears to be need as some data is provided but not necessarily enough. A case is made for how the proposed project meets the need but it may or may not be clear the positive impact it will have and why it’s the best solution. | **Average (3)**  The community is loosely defined. There appears to be need in the community for the project but specific data was not provided to show the depth of need. A case is made for how the proposed project meets the need but it isn’t clear the positive impact it will have on the community and/or the agriculture industry, nor how it’s the best solution. | **Poor (1)**  The community and need for the project is unclear and/or isn’t supported by data. It’s unclear how the project meets the need, positively impacts the local community and/or the agriculture industry, or how it is the community’s best solution to meet the need. |  |
|  | **Question 2:**  **Advisory Committee Involvement** |  | **Excellent (6)**  The letter from the advisory committee describes how the committee was actively involved in the development of the proposed projected from identifying the need to choosing the proposed project as the best solution. | **Average (3)**  The letter from the advisory committee indicates that the committee had limited involvement in the development of the proposed project. | **Poor (1)**  There is a letter from the advisory committee but their involvement is unclear. |  |
|  | **Question 3: Alignment with the Workforce Needs Assessment** | **Excellent (12)**  The project is closely aligned with the Workforce Needs Assessment of Missouri’s Food, Agriculture and Forestry Industries report and the application provides data and a clear, detailed explanation of the alignment. | **Excellent (9)**  The project is aligned with the Workforce Needs Assessment of Missouri’s Food, Agriculture and Forestry Industries report. The application does provide an explanation of the alignment but it could use more data or detail. | **Average (6)**  The project aligns with the Workforce Needs Assessment of Missouri’s Food, Agriculture and Forestry Industries report but there isn’t data or a clear, detailed explanation of the alignment. | **Poor (1)**  The project only loosely aligns with the Workforce Needs Assessment of Missouri’s Food, Agriculture and Forestry Industries report. |  |
|  | **Question 4: Project Audience** | **Excellent (6)**  Multiple audiences will be impacted by the project and those identified seem appropriate. The number of participants impacted on an annual basis is clear and reasonable. The project will have a multi-year impact and the projected years of impact seem reasonable. | **Good (5)**  The project will really only impact one audience, but the identified audience seems appropriate. The number of participants impacted on an annual basis is clear and reasonable. The project will have a multi-year impact and the projected years of impact seem reasonable. | **Average (3)**  The audience is identified but the number of annual participants or the number of years of impact are unclear or don’t seem reasonable. | **Poor (1)**  The audience, audience numbers, and/or the projected years of impact aren’t clear or don’t seem reasonable. |  |
|  | **Question 5: Goals** | **Excellent (12)**  At least three goals are identified (3 pts). Goals are measurable, align with the overall project purpose, and make sense for the project (3 pts). An evaluation method is identified for each goal. (3 pts). Each method is appropriate for the goal and will demonstrate progress towards meeting the identified need/reason for the project. (3 pts). | **Good (9)**  At least three goals are identified (3 pts). However, only two of the following are clear: 1) Goals are measurable, align with the overall project purpose, and make sense for the project. 2) An evaluation method is identified for each goal. 3) Evaluation method is appropriate for the goal and will demonstrate progress towards meeting the identified need/reason for the project. | **Average (6)**  At least three goals are identified (3 pts). However, only one of the following is clear: 1) Goals are measurable, align with the overall project purpose, and make sense for the project. 2) An evaluation method is identified for each goal. | **Poor (1)**  Goals may be identified but they aren’t measurable, don’t seem to align with the overall project purpose or make sense for the project. Evaluation methods are either missing or don’t seem appropriate for the goals, project or demonstrating progress towards meeting the identified need. |  |
|  | **Question 6:**  **Timeline** |  | **Good (6)**  The timeline for the project is detailed (including when purchasing, construction or other crucial actions will occur, along with when instruction and evaluation will happen) and seems reasonable. | **Average (3)**  The timeline for the project isn’t thorough but does share enough key actions to ascertain that the project can be completed and that the timeline is reasonable. | **Poor (1)**  There is a timeline, but it seems vague and/or isn’t reasonable. |  |
|  | **Question 7:**  **Sustainability** |  | **Good (6)**  The proposal contains detailed and well-thought-out strategies for project sustainability after the initial funding from the Missouri FFA Foundation. The sustainability plan meets the estimated cost and seems reasonable. | **Average (3)**  The proposal shares some sustainability strategies; however, it is somewhat vague. The plans that are provided do seem reasonable but may not fully meet the estimated cost. | **Average (3)**  The proposal’s sustainability strategies are vague and do not seem reasonable. |  |
| **For Rising Sun Grant applications only** | **Question 1: Comparable Project** |  | **Excellent (6)**  Two comparable projects (in size and scope) were identified and described, including the dollar amount of the projects, the time needed to complete the projects, number of people served by each project, whether the project is still in use, etc. | **Average (3)**  Only one comparable project (in size and scope) was identified and described as having been implemented, or two previous projects were described but were unsuccessful or are no longer in use. | **Poor (1)**  No comparable past projects completed by the teacher, school, or school district. |  |
|  | **Question 2: Local Economic Development Support** | **Excellent (8)**  There are multiple letters from local entities such as the Chamber of Commerce, a Regional Economic Development group, employers, etc. describing the need they see for the project and how they plan to support it (this may include providing funds or volunteer support for the project, etc.). | **Good (6)**  There is one letter from a local entity such as the Chamber of Commerce, a Regional Economic Development group, employers, etc. describing the need they see for the project and how they plan to support it (this may include providing funds or volunteer support for the project, etc.). | **Average (3)**  There is a letter of recommendation from a local entity such as the Chamber of Commerce, a Regional Economic Development group, employers, etc. However, it isn’t clear how or if the entity will provide support for the project. | **Poor (1)**  There is a letter from a local entity but their involvement with the project is unclear. |  |
| ***Grant Narrative Total Points*** |  |  |  | ***For Horizon Grants*** | ***58 Points Possible*** |  |
|  |  |  |  | ***For Rising Sun Grants*** | ***72 Points Possible*** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Financial Details** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Budget Attachment** | Grant Request Amount |  | **Good (9)**  Line items are specific, quantifiable, and it’s clear that they are directly related to the project as identified within the project summary, project description and/or goals. The budget appears to be thorough in including all potential costs with the project. | **Average (6)**  Line items are specific, quantifiable, and seem to be related to the project as identified within the project summary, project description and/or goals. The budget may be missing some potential costs with the project. | **Poor (1)**  Line items aren’t always clearly defined and not all costs can be directly related back to the project summary, project description and/or goals. The budget may also be missing some potential costs with the project. |  |
|  | Matching Funding Amount |  | **Good (5)**  The appropriate amount of match has been met and the sources of the match are indicated. There are multiple sources of matching funding in the proposal. | **Average (3)**  The appropriate amount of match has been met and the sources of the match are indicated. | **Poor (1)**  It’s not entirely clear what the sources of match are and/or if the amount of match has been met. |  |
| **Budget Justification** | 1. Explain Costs |  | **Good (5)**  The explanation of costs is detailed, reasonable, and accurate. | **Average (3)**  The explanation of costs is reasonable and accurate but could be more detailed. | **Poor (1)**  The explanation of costs isn’t detailed enough and doesn’t always seem reasonable and accurate. |  |
| **Budget Justification** | 1. Match Sources |  | **Good (5)**  The proposal describes a detailed, reasonable, and logical plan for covering all costs beyond those funded by the grant. reasonable, and accurate. | **Average (3)**  The proposal for covering all costs beyond those funded by the grant are reasonable and logical but could be more detailed. | **Poor (1)**  The proposal plan for covering all costs beyond those funded by the grant isn’t detailed enough and doesn’t seem entirely accurate or reasonable. |  |
| ***Financial Details Total Points*** |  |  |  | ***For both grants*** | ***24 Points Possible*** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Combined Points Awarded*** |  |  |  | ***For Horizon Grants*** | ***82 Points Possible*** |  |
|  |  |  |  | ***For Rising Sun Grants*** | ***96 Points Possible*** |  |