

Watershed Council Support
Grant Application Evaluation Work Sheet
June 2006

Project # _____ **Applicant:** _____ ***Your Name:** _____

* Your written evaluation will remain confidential. However, we will collect all your evaluations to prepare for the scoring session.

INSTRUCTIONS.

Introduction: Scoring of council support grant applications will be done in two stages: creation of pre-discussion scores by the individual Council Support Advisory Committee (CSAC) members (to be completed by February 8th) and conversion of those scores to consensus scores through discussion during the facilitated scoring sessions scheduled for the week of February 12th. These instructions provide a detailed explanation on how to evaluate the applications to derive the pre-discussion scores. If you have any questions about scoring, contact Lori Warner-Dickason at (503) 986-0046 or lori.warner-dickason@state.or.us.

The Framework for the Evaluation Criteria: The evaluation criteria can be divided into two broad categories: criteria that relate to the organizational structure of a council and criteria that contribute to the effectiveness of a council. There are four evaluation criteria within each of the two broad categories. They are listed as numbers one through eight (1-8) on the evaluation score sheet and represent the eight criteria scores that will be generated for each application.

Within each of the evaluation criteria, there are several characteristics that serve as indicators for the criteria (with the exception of criteria number eight (8), which has only one characteristic). These characteristics are listed below each of the criteria and are denoted by a, b, and c, as shown on the evaluation score sheet. The scores of the characteristics will be added to derive the score for each criterion.

Deriving the Pre-discussion Scores for the Eight Evaluation Criteria:

Step 1- You will have received a box of applications. Before you start to review them, mix the order of your applications so that all the CSAC members are not reviewing their applications in the same order.

Step 2- Taking one at a time, read the entire application.

Step 3-Starting with criterion number one (1), evaluate each of the characteristics (a, b, and c) using the information provided in the application. The score sheet lists the pertinent questions in the application for each of the characteristics. Assess whether the application “clearly demonstrates” (2), “weakly demonstrates” (1) or “does not demonstrate” (0) the characteristic, according to the Key for Scoring the Characteristics, below. Circle the appropriate number on your score sheet. **Make notes of the elements of the application that were important in your scoring decision.** These notes will help during the scoring session in February. Provide a total for the criteria in the space provided by adding the scores for each of the characteristics. Continue this for criteria 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

Step 4- For the first seven criteria, you will assign a score of 0-2 for each of the characteristics. For criterion number 8, you will assign a score of 1-5, as shown on the Key to Scoring the Characteristics, below.

Step 5: By February 8th, send the score sheets to OWEB, attn: Lori Warner-Dickason. We will provide a copy to you at the scoring sessions, but you might want to keep a copy for your records.

Thank you very much. Your assistance in this grant program is much appreciated!

Key to Scoring the Characteristics

Criteria 1-7	
2	The applicant’s answer clearly demonstrates the characteristic. The answer addressed the question and/or the applicant supplied relevant examples that are effective in creating the characteristic.
1	The applicant’s answer weakly demonstrates the characteristic. The applicant addressed the question, but the answers may have a weak effect on the characteristic we are trying to measure.
0	The applicant did not demonstrate the characteristic- the answer and/or examples do not address the question.
Criterion 8	
5	High- The accomplishments of the council exceed expectations relative to their 2005-2007 funding level.
4	Medium High- The accomplishments of the council are very good relative to their 2005-2007 funding level.
3	Medium- The accomplishments of the council are adequate relative to their 2005-2007 funding level.
2	Medium Low- The accomplishments of the council are lower than expected relative to their 2005-2007 funding level.
1	Low- The accomplishments of the council are not evident or are poor relative to their 2005-2007 funding level.

Evaluation Score Sheet

Organizational Structure: A well organized councils is one that:	Notes	Pre-discussion Score
1 represents a balance of interests in the watershed. Characteristics that demonstrate this are:		
a The council membership reflects the land use, ownership and issues of the watershed. (question 14, relative to Section II-Watershed information)		0 1 2
b The council has processes in place to maintain and enhance citizen involvement. (question 15, question 31, element 3)		0 1 2
c There is a significant level of citizen involvement in council activities. (question 16, question 31-volunteer and member roles)		0 1 2
Organization Make-up and Citizen Involvement (9%) Total		
2 is committed to its development. Characteristics that demonstrate this are:		
a The council conducted a self-evaluation (or equivalent process) within the past two years (question 17).		0 1 2
b The council has used the self evaluation and/or has done other things to make improvements in the organization. (question 18, question 31 element 5)		0 1 2
Organization Improvement Efforts (8%) Total		

Organizational Structure ‘cont. A well organized councils is one that:	Notes	Pre- discussion Score
3 is engaged in active management of the organization. Characteristics that demonstrate this are: a There are processes in place that ensure the work of the coordinator is directed by the council (question 19)		0 1 2
b Supervision is provided to the coordinator on a regular basis (question 20).		0 1 2
c The process for developing goals and priorities ensure that the council plays an important role in these decisions (question 21).		0 1 2
Management of the Organization (12%) Total		
4 is fiscally responsible. Characteristics that demonstrate this are: a The council has fiscal accountability processes in place (question 22).		0 1 2
b Fiscal performance is adequate, as shown in review of OWEB generated fiscal report.		0 1 2
Fiscal Management (8%) Total		

Council Effectiveness. An effective council is one that:	Notes	Pre-discussion Score
5 takes a leadership role in watershed activities. Characteristics that demonstrate this are: a The council engages in activities that augment or enhance agency efforts (question 23).		0 1 2
b The council is listed as playing a leadership role in many of the activities that are listed in their accomplishments and proposed activities (question 31).		0 1 2
Leadership Role in Watershed Activities (10%) Total		
6 plans strategically. Characteristics that demonstrate this are: a The council uses a current (last 5 years) action plan or equivalent (question 24).		0 1 2
b The council uses assessment tools to prioritize their restoration projects and there is a strong link between the proposed actions and the limiting factors in the watershed (question 25, question 31 compared with watershed information in section II.)		0 1 2
Planning Strategically (12%) Total		

Council Effectiveness ‘cont. An effective council is one that:	Notes	Pre-discussion Score (1-5)
7 works collaboratively with partners. Characteristics that demonstrate this are: a The council is effective in creating and maintaining partnerships (question 27, question 31, partner roles.)		0 1 2
b The council has been effective in leveraging funds from other sources (question 26, Budget section VI)		0 1 2
Working Collaboratively (16%) Total		
8 makes progress toward goals. A characteristic that demonstrates this is: The council has made significant accomplishments related to assessment, education, technical assistance, monitoring or restoration. (question 31 elements 1, 2 and 4, relative to current funding level and special circumstances reported in questions 28, 29 and 30). Score Low (1), Medium Low (2), Medium (3), Medium High (4) or High (5).	Accomplishments (25%)	1 2 3 4 5