			Name of Applicant:		
			Name of School/Business/Organization		
Part 1: Basic Requirements					
If you answer NO to any of the basic requirement questions, discard application.					
1. Are all appropriate fields of the application filled out? YES NO					
2. Did the applicant respond in the affirmative to all five components in Agreement section? YES NO					
3. Is the Habitat Design included, with plant placement? YES NO					
4. Are the Pollinator Habitat Certification qualifications (host and nectar plants, habitat components, and conservation practices) met? YES NO					
5. Does the budget ONLY include permitted items and not exceed $300.00? YES NO					
6. Is the last date on timeline June 15, 2020 or earlier? YES NO					
If application meets all of the basic requirements, proceed to Part 2.					
Part 2: Scoring					
Rank each category from 1-4. Add all total points to determine the final score.					

	1 - Weak	**2- Satisfactory**	**3 - Compelling**	**4 - Exceptional**	**Your Score**
Project Description How well does the description explain the proposed project?	Project is not well defined and description is vague or incomplete.	Project shows promise.	Project is clearly articulated. Demonstrates a thoughtful, well-conceived plan.	Well-written, organized, and clear. Demonstrates a thoughtful, well-conceived plan.	
Pollinator Habitat Design How well does the habitat design meet or exceed the qualifications for MAG Pollinator Habitat Certification?	Does not meet minimum requirements	Meets the minimum requirements for Pollinator Habitat Certification.	Exceeds SOME minimum requirements - host plants, nectar plants, habitat components, and conservation practices.	Exceeds ALL minimum requirements - host plants, nectar plants, habitat components, and conservation practices. Habitat design is innovative and creative.	
Project Objectives How comprehensive and realistic is the expected AUDIENCE and reach?	Program has an inadequate reach.	Will reach a small number of learners for a limited time.	Will reach a large number of learners in initial year OR will reach a smaller but growing population over multiple years OR reaches a small group through a long-term, in-depth project.	Will reach a large number of learners in both initial and subsequent years OR reaches a small group through a long-term, in-depth project.	

Project Objectives How comprehensive are the OBJECTIVES and METHODS ?	Objectives and methods are vague or very limited.	Objectives and methods are appropriate and descriptive, but are limited to two or three components.	Objectives and methods are appropriate and descriptive and include innovative curriculum and other varied teaching tools.	Objectives and methods are appropriate and descriptive and include innovative, multi-displinary curriculum and other varied teaching tools.	
Measurement of Success How comprehensive is the MEASURE OF SUCCESS?	Measure of success is unsuitable or untestable.	Measure of success specific, but limited in scope.	Measure of success is specific and and includes user feedback. Effort to obtain and analyze empirical evidence is shown.	Measure of success is specific, appropriate, and testable, and and includes multiple facets, such as, user feedback, mechanisms to analyze data, and empirical evidence.	
Promotion of MAG How comprehensive is the PROMOTION OF MAG Pollinator Habitat	Promotion of MAG PHC is inadequate.	Promotion of MAG PHC is adequate.	Promotion of MAG PHC is adequate and ongoing.	Promotion of MAG PHC is exemplary, enthusiastic, creative, and ongoing.	
Team Members and Partnerships How comprehensive and varied are the team members and partnerships?	2 or fewer combined team members and project partners. Roles of team members and project partners are vague OR very similar.	3 combined team members and project partners. Roles of team members and project partners are descriptive, but similar.	4 combined team members and project partners. Roles of team members and project partners are descriptive and distinctive.	5+ combined team members and project partners. Roles of team members and project partners are descriptive and distinctive and each has an important part in the success of the project.	
Sustainability How comprehensive are the proposed sustainability efforts?	Descriptions of responsible person or group, maintenance, or funding is vague, incomplete, or unrealistic (ie. Assuming grant funding each year).	Descriptions of responsible person or group, maintenance, and funding is complete and realistic.	Descriptions of responsible person or group, maintenance, and funding is complete, realistic, and detailed.	Descriptions of responsible person or group, maintenance, and funding is complete, realistic, and detailed, and includes a Plan B in case initial efforts fail.	
Timeline How complete, descriptive, and reasonable is the project timeline?	Dates, task descriptions, or responsible persons are vague or incomplete OR the timeline is unrealistic for the scope of the project (ie. Planting annuals in winter, classroom visits after school has ended).	Dates, task descriptions, or responsible persons are complete but basic, and the timeline is realistic for the scope of the project.	Dates, task descriptions, or responsible persons are complete, detailed, and descriptive and the timeline is realistic for the scope of the project.	Dates, task descriptions, or responsible persons are complete and descriptive, timeline is realistic for the scope of the project and includes all aspects (pre-planning, implementation, education programs, and ongoing maintenance).	
Budget How complete, descriptive, and reasonable is the budget?	Budget descriptions and cost are vague, incomplete, or unrealistic.	Budget descriptions are complete.	Budget descriptions are complete and demonstrate an effort to maximize the potential of the grant.	Budget descriptions are complete and varied and demonstrate an effort to maximize the potential of the grant.	
				SCORE (max 40)	4