Document Control Information Date Created: 8/15/2015

Document Type: Policy, Procedure,

Standard Date Revised: 12/03/2016

Board Approval Date: Date Approved: 11/05/2015

Control Number: CG-0003 Ver 1.3

Old Pueblo Trout Unlimited Chapter - Evitts Fund Program 2016 Fund Application Scoring Worksheet

Date Rec'd:

Name of Proposed Program: Submitted by: Approved by:		
P/F Criteria: Is project based on best available science or accepted best practices? (Y or N)		
If P/F Criteria is Y (Yes) continue with the following review. If P/F Criteria is N (No) do not continue; application is denied.		
I. Project Impact	Max Points	Youi Scor
A. Conservation & Education Impact		
1) Does the project address an important conservation issue for native or wild trout? (Least Benefit =0, Most benefit=15)	15	
2) If the project is not performed what immediate impact may result? (Urgent=10)	10	
3) Does the project address needs not addressed previously? If addressed successfully, answer No. If addressed previously but not successfully answer is Yes. $(No = 0, Yes = 3)$	3	
4) Does the applicant(s) or project participant(s) have a history of research or conservation work? (No=0, Yes=2)	2	
Conservation & Education Impact Total	30	
B. Strengthening TU Impact		
1) Does the project incorporate measures to increase the internal strength of the OPTU Chapter (i.e. marketing, partnering, advocacy, member participation and/or recruitment, raise awareness of TU goals with the general public, attracting additional funding)? (No = 0, Somewhat = 1-4, Significantly=5-8, Most Significantly = 9-10	10	
Strengthening TU Impact Total	10	
C. Outreach Impact		
1) Does project significantly increase the skills and knowledge about coldwater conservation issues to a non-Trout Unlimited audience? (Very significant=3)	3	
2) Is there a clearly articulated plan for communicating the project work products or results with the broader community? (Very significant=3)	3	
3) Does the project involve non-Trout Unlimited community leaders, research managers and/or other conservation organizations in the project? (Very significant=4)	4	
Outreach Impact Total	10	

II. Technical Merit & Proposal Write Up 1) Is the work plan feasible? (Very feasible=10) 2) Are the costs detailed in the budget reasonable and commensurate with anticipated effort and benefit? (Very realistic=10) 3) Is there a clear plan to measure and evaluate project outcomes? (Very clear=15)	Max Points 10 10	Your Score
2) Are the costs detailed in the budget reasonable and commensurate with anticipated effort and benefit? (Very realistic=10) 3) Is there a clear plan to measure and evaluate project outcomes? (Very clear=15)		
(Very realistic=10) 3) Is there a clear plan to measure and evaluate project outcomes? (Very clear=15)	10	
	15	
4) Has the project been reviewed and approved by an appropriate and credible "Sponsoring Professional" (e.g. fishery biologist, restoration engineer, educator, watershed planner, policy expert, training coordinator, etc.) and / or by a government agency that are involved in administering or regulating the projects? (No=0, Full Review &	10	
Add Above Scores For Technical Merit & Proposal Write Up Total Score	45	
III. Overall Impression & Discretionary Points	Max Points	Your Score
Based on your overall impression you can provide up to 5 additional discretionary points if you believe this is a particularly deserving project. ($max = 5 points$).	5	
Reviewer's Comments (Use the back of this sheet if more space is needed)		

In the table below enter your scores from each section.

Summary & Overall Total of Scores (100 Points Max)		
Category	Your Scores	
I. Project Impact Total (From 50 Points Max)		
II. Technical Merit and Proposal Write Up Total (From 45 Points Max)		
III. Overall Impression & Discretionary Points Total (From 5 Points Max)		
Your Total Score For This Project (out of a possible 100)=		