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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 |