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| **Criteria** | **High** | **Medium** | **Low** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Builds fellow’s leadership skills** | * Fellow given a significant leadership role in the project
* Builds directly upon fellow’s academic and/or technical training. Project is a good “fit”
* Significant professional development opportunities made available for fellow
* Project has potential to put fellow in prominent position or role
* Fellow will be challenged in a positive way by the project
* In-house support systems (mentor or otherwise) in place
* Fellow will achieve significant recognition or credibility
 | * Fellow given significant responsibilities
* Project moderately draws upon fellow’s training and experience
* Some mentoring or training available for fellow through in-house resources
* Fellow will achieve some recognition or credibility through the project
 | * Fellow role and responsibilities not clear
* Project responsibilities are outside of fellow’s significant experience and no clear mentoring provided
* No other professional development opportunities given other than retreat attendance
* Project will not necessarily be a positive challenge for fellow, may be a good project but not a growth experience for fellow
* Project may not be a good “fit” for fellow
 |
| **Builds organizational capacity** | * Project would add new program or expertise to the organization
* Organization has track record of success in building new programs, or if new organization, has funding and plans in place to sustain project
* Program strategy or project is well thought-out
 | * Organization has capacity to launch new program area with fellow’s help.
* Project goals fit with organizational strengths
* Commitment to fellow/project is high even if long-term plans still not entirely set
 | * Unclear evidence of strong commitment either to the fellow or the project
* Poor evidence of strategic program goals into which project fits
* Project and strategy appear opportunistic, not much groundwork laid
 |
| **Addresses critical environmental issue** | * Project addresses critical environmental issue, on any scale
* Documentation and evidence of critical issue or need is provided
* Application of fellow’s skills and training to the issue is a good fit
* Organization is very well positioned to make an impact
* Potential for high impact/leverage
* Precedent-setting potential
 | * Issue relevance is supported through documentation of issue and identification of how organization fits into other efforts addressing the issue
* Organization will grow into expanded role on the issue and evidence exists to assume impact will result
* Impact is limited in scope, but has the potential to be used as a model
 | * Project issue is not very compelling
* Project need is not well-documented
* Fellow’s skills are not very clearly applied to the strategy
* Not clear if organization has capacity to address issue
 |
| **Program strategy** | * Proposed actions are realistic and strategic
* Results are quantifiable, evaluation measures described
* Project is collaborative where appropriate
* Realistic, well thought-out work plan submitted, with timeline
* Innovative
 | * Proposed actions are likely to produce results
* Project is collaborative where appropriate
* Results may not be immediately quantifiable but careful thought given to measures of success
* Work plan submitted, could be more realistic or specific needs minor modifications
 | * Not clear if proposed actions will produce results
* Project reinvents the wheel or otherwise operates in a vacuum
* Work plan not submitted, or is vague and unrealistic
 |
| **Social equity and constituent engagement** | * Project includes analysis of social justice and equity dimensions of the problem being addressed
* Appropriate constituencies are engaged and involved in the project
* Project benefits distributed equitably across affected communities
 | * Organization is engaging or collaborating with appropriate or affected communities or constituencies
* Organization or project has demonstrated commitment to integrating social equity into project scope
 | * Project does not address social equity
* Project does not engage constituencies affected by the environmental problem being addressed.
 |
| **Matching funds** | >50% cost share from organization | 30-50% cost share from organization | <30% cost share from organization |
| **Project outcomes** | * Project outcomes are clearly described with measures suggested
* Project aims to directly improve environmental quality
 | * Project outcomes clearly described, some question as to whether measures are realistic
 | * Project shows unclear or marginal environmental benefits
* Environmental outcomes are not clearly defined or are unrealistic within org limitations
 |
| **Strategic role of Switzer money** | * Project not likely to occur without our support
 | * Project needs Switzer money for launch
 | * Project may occur without our funding
 |
| **Commitment to project** | * Both fellow and organization are committed to project
* Proposal developed jointly
 | * Organization’s or fellow’s commitment to project is vague
 | * Organization’s or fellow’s commitment to the project appears weak
 |
| **Post-grant plans** | * Steps outlined to secure position or project funding after grant, follow-through ensured
 | * Uncertainty about subsequent funding or ability of organization to follow through
 | * Organization does not appear to have capacity to undertake follow-through after grant is expended
 |
| **For projects that are based at academic institutions, the following considerations will also apply** | * Project will significantly elevate the fellow’s position through an applied project
* Project is tied to current policy debates and/or will provide practical benefits that go beyond the university setting
* Project clearly places fellow in a new leadership position on their issue
* Project/position has significant financial backing of the university
 | * Project/position will provide incremental improvement in fellow’s leadership role on the issue
* Project will result in limited environmental improvement or policy change
* Project engages external stakeholders with broader outcomes likely but not assured
* Fellow may move from soft money into more permanently funded secure position
* Fellow is responsible for fundraising
 | * Project is research- or education- focused with limited applied dimension
* Benefits are internal to university setting
* Fellow is on soft money and project does not increase likelihood that position will become more secure
* Limited or no financial contribution from university
 |