



The Review Committee will review and score each application based on the following criteria and 100 point scoring system.

OVERALL PROJECT (15 POINTS)

Project is poorly constructed; lack of documented potential and/or community support.	Project outlines some detail but does not gauge or demonstrate community impact.	Project is well-described and demonstrates ability to collaborate with the community.	Project indicates high potential for success through a novel proposal and community collaboration.
(0-3)	(4-7)	(8-11)	(12-15)

PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES (15 POINTS)

Goals are unclear; objectives are not offered or not SMART; both are unrelated to GPTEC goals and objectives.	Goals are clear; objectives are offered that are weak or lack specificity or measures; both are somewhat related to GPTEC goals and objectives.	Goals are well-framed and adequate; objectives are adequate but may be enhanced; both clearly related to GPTEC goals and objectives.	Goals are exceptionally well-crafted; objectives are rich and help substantially define success; definitely match GPTEC goals and objectives.
(0-3)	(4-7)	(8-11)	(12-15)

IMPACT AND SUSTAINABLE SUCCESS (25 POINTS)

Demonstration of project activities lacking or unclear; proposal unsure of itself in terms of what successful implementation would look like.	Activities are offered but need enhancement; methods indicating a potential impact not well-defined.	Activities and efforts are adequate as offered; elements of the ability to make an impact are strongly identified.	Activities are clearly identified and integrated into the project. Project demonstrates a positive impact in the community and includes a well-defined plan and vision for success.
(0-6)	(7-12)	(13-18)	(19-25)

PROJECT PLAN (25 POINTS)

Proposed steps are not offered or inappropriate; person(s) responsible for different tasks are not stated or unclear; Time for completing steps not well established or may not be feasible	Proposed steps seem misguided or could be significantly improved; person(s) responsible for completing tasks are somewhat appropriate but could be improved, time for completing steps is offered but could be improved significantly	Proposed steps are adequate as presented; person(s) responsible for completing steps are adequate for the proposed effort; Time for completing steps seen as well founded and very achievable	Proposed steps are polished and well thought out; person(s) responsible for completing steps are well suited for the effort; Time for completing tasks is correctly assessed and confident this applicant can deliver on the planned work
(0-6)	(7-12)	(13-18)	(19-25)

PROJECT BUDGET (20 POINTS)

Budget is very poorly constructed; disconnected from project	Budget marginally constructed, appropriately connected to the project with some exceptions	Budget matches well with scope or work as offered and is appropriate to the work	Budget is well crafted and in synergy with project plan
(0-5)	(6-10)	(11-15)	(16-20)