

**Leadership Grant Program
 Grant Review Evaluation Matrix**

Rev. September 2016

	3 – (High)	2 – (Med)	1 – (Low)
Builds Fellow’s Leadership Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 org. plans in place to sustain project - Program strategy or project is well thought-out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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

	3 – (High)	2 – (Med)	1 – (Low)
Addresses Critical Environmental Issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed actions are realistic and strategic - Results are quantifiable, evaluatable - Project is collaborative where appropriate - Realistic, well thought-out work plan submitted, with timeline - innovative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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
Matching Funds*	>50% cost share from organization	30-50% cost share from organization	<30% cost share from organization
Project Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project outcomes are clearly described with measures suggested - Project aims to directly improve environmental quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project outcomes clearly described, some question as to whether measures are realistic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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

	3 – (High)	2 – (Med)	1 – (Low)
Commitment to Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Both Fellow and organization are committed to project. - Proposal developed jointly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organizational or Fellow’s commitment to project is vague 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organizational or Fellow’s commitment to the project appears weak.
Post-grant plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steps outlined to secure position or project funding after grant, follow-through ensured 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uncertainty about subsequent funding or ability or organization follow-through 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organization does not appear to have capacity to undertake follow-through after grant is expended.
For Projects that are academically based, the following considerations will ALSO apply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project will <u>significantly elevate</u> the Fellow’s position through an APPLIED project - Project is tied to current policy debates and will provide practical benefits that go beyond the university setting - Project clearly places Fellow in a new leadership position through the project - Project/position has significant financial backing of the university 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project/position will provide incremental improvement in Fellow leadership role. - Project will result in limited environmental improvement or policy change - Project engages external stakeholders with broader outcomes likely - Fellow may move from soft money into more permanently funded secure position. - Fellow is responsible for fundraising 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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
	-	-	-