

KAULUNANI GRANT APPLICATION PROPOSAL SCORING RUBRIC - IRA HAWAII 2023					PROPOSAL TITLE	
Category (10 points each)	8 - 10 Exemplary	5 - 7 Sufficient	2 - 4 Needs Improvement	0 - 1 Insufficient	Score (x/10)	Comments/Notes
ALIGNMENT: Relationship to funding purposes, Kaulunani Program Goals, Forest Action Plan Priority Areas (Issue Four: Urban & Community Forestry) (max 10):	Project activities and outcomes are all strongly aligned with purpose(s) of the RFP, Kaulunani program goals, and FAP priority areas.	There are substantial elements of the project that align with the purpose(s) of this grant opportunity, Kaulunani program goals, and/or the FAP priority areas.	Project tangentially but not directly related to either Kaulunani goals or FAP priority areas.	No explicit relationship between the project and Kaulunani.		
PARTNERSHIPS: People & Partners (max 10):	Personnel, volunteers and other partners congruent with project description and outcomes. Demonstrate strong and appropriate community partnerships with <i>letters of support</i> .	Deficiencies or overestimations exist in descriptions of personnel, volunteers or other partners <i>within tolerable range</i> ; outcomes appear achievable despite gaps.	Project's assembled personnel, volunteers or other partners expose weaknesses in project design. Outcomes unlikely to be achieved in project's current form.	Insufficient information about personnel, volunteers or other partners to gauge feasibility or positive impact.		
BUDGET: Reasonable and Accurate (max 10):	Project activities and budget expenditures congruent with project description and outcomes. Budget is realistic and achievable.	Deficiencies or overestimations exist in activities or budget <i>within tolerable range</i> ; outcomes still appear achievable despite gaps.	Project's assembled activities or budget expose weaknesses in project design. Outcomes unlikely to be achieved in project's current form.	Insufficient information about activities or budget expenditures to gauge feasibility.		
Category (5 points each)	4-5 Exemplary	3 Sufficient	2 Needs improvement	1 Insufficient	Score (x/5)	
CLARITY (max 5):	Purpose and objectives of the project are clearly defined.	Purpose or objectives are vague or unspecific, but deliverables show potential to be achieved based on other information in the application	Purpose and objectives are loosely defined or inconsistent with each other	Purpose and objectives of project are missing or in contradiction with Kaulunani program goals		
READINESS (max 5):	Long-term history of work at the site(s) and with the beneficiary community. Expertise of the organization in the proposed fields, e.g., arboriculture, curriculum development, or event planning, plus appropriate project partnerships, may substitute for history of work at the site. Land use permissions are provided.	Some history of work in the site and with the beneficiary community. Plans and land use permissions are solid but leave some questions within reason. Personnel need minimal increased capacity or training.	Little history of work in the site and with the beneficiary community. Plans and land use permissions are provided but are unclear. Personnel needs to be hired or needs significant additional training.	No history of work in the site and with the beneficiary community. Plans and landowner permission forms leave significant questions or are not provided. Personnel need to be recruited, but no recruitment plan is provided.		
LOCATION: Priority community (Tree Canopy Viewer IRA)* This is objective and Kaulunani staff will calculate. (max 5)	All priority metrics are met by at least one project site, if multiple, on the IRA tool on the Tree Canopy Viewer	3-4 IRA priority metrics on the Tree Canopy Viewer are met by total project sites. (Each project site must meet at least one priority.)	2 IRA priority metrics on the Tree Canopy Viewer are met by total project sites. (Each project site must meet at least one priority.)	1 IRA priority metric is met by all sites on the Tree Canopy Viewer. (Project is ineligible if any site meets no IRA priorities.)		
RELATIONSHIP to IRA priority layers (max 5):	Project has a strong relationship to the IRA priorities (regardless of the number of priorities met by the site(s)), and the applicant has clearly described this relationship.	Relationship to IRA priority layers is described generally, but the connection to project could be made more apparent.	Relationship to IRA priority layers is mentioned but a tangent to the project.	Relationship to IRA priority layers is weak and insufficiently described.		
ASSESSMENT: Well-planned (max 5):	Applicant outlines a clear picture of how success will be measured and communicated in order to demonstrate degree to which outcomes are met.	Plan provides a good understanding of anticipated specific results or success, but lacks some details about methods and communication of success.	Based on assessment planned, it seems difficult to ascertain markers of success. Outcomes appear difficult to assess and/or articulate, or there is a lack of useful methodologies outlined.	A plan to evaluate and share project outcomes is missing or unusable.		
Total Score (out of 55)					0	0.00%
Additional Comments						
Recommend consideration for funding?	Yes					
	Type Yes, No, or Maybe in the cell above					