Project Title:		
Reviewer Name:		

RESEARCH PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

TOTAL SCORE:

Project proposals will be evaluated on a numerical scale based upon the following criteria. Total points available = 140

	Problem Statement: (Max 10 points)
6-10 points	The proposal clearly defines the problem or issue and describes how the project will resolve the problem.
1-5 points	The proposal clearly defines the problem, however, it does not clearly describe how the project will resolve the problem.
0 points	The proposal does not clearly define a problem or there is no connection shown between the project and the problem.
	Project Outcomes: (Max 10 points)
6-10 points	The project outcomes are clear and concise; the proposal shows how the goal and objectives are attainable and how useful information will be produced.
1-5 points	The project outcomes are clear and concise; however, it is not clear that the goal and objectives are attainable or that they will produce useable results.
0 points	The project outcomes are not clear and concise.
	Project Work Schedule, Deliverables and Budget: (Max 15 points)
8-15 points	The project work schedule and budget are clearly stated, clearly linked, and provide a logical sequence to produce well- defined deliverables <i>and</i> the budget optimizes funding through an efficient use of funds as illustrated by budget and budget narrative.
1-7 points	The project work schedule and budget are clearly stated, clearly linked and provide a logical sequence to produce well-defined deliverables.
0 points	The project work schedule, deliverables and budget are unclear or unrealistic.
	_Coastal Resource Management and Planning/Practicality: (Max 20 points)
11-20 points	The proposed project clearly describes its application to the Georgia Coastal Management Program mission and specifically identifies practical uses for the project information or findings by coastal managers (federal, state and/or local level).
1-10 points	The proposed project clearly states its application to the Georgia Coastal Management Program mission, but the application does not specifically identify the practical use of the information or findings by coastal managers.
0 points	The proposed project does not state its application or utility to coastal managers.

Project Title:	
Reviewer Name: _	
	Scientific Merit: (Max. 10 points)
6-10 points	The proposed project clearly demonstrates that it is based upon sound science and current research methodologies, and will generate cutting-edge information and/or technology supportive of the goals and objectives of the Georgia Coastal Management Program.
1-5 points	The proposed project clearly demonstrates that it is sound science, but it is not clear how it will generate cutting-edge information and/or technology that is supportive of the goals and objectives of the Georgia Coastal Management Program.
0 points	The proposed project is not sound science.
	Transferability to Practical Use (Max 20 points)
11-20 points	The application has clearly set out a process for transferring results and outcomes to practical use.
1-10 points	The application has clearly set out a process for transferring results, but outcomes have no practical use.
0 points	The application has no process for transferring results and outcomes to practical use.
	Coastal Management Need (Max 10 points)
6-10 points	The application has clearly identified and described a coastal management need to be addressed, as per the CRD Needs List.
1-5 points	The application has clearly identified and described a coastal management need to be addressed, but it is not on the CRD Needs List.
0 points	The application has not clearly identified and described a coastal management need.
	Immediacy (Max 10 points)
6-10 points	The proposed project clearly describes and fulfills an immediate research need of coastal resource managers.
1-5 points	The proposed project clearly describes and fulfills a coastal management research need, but the need is not necessarily immediate.
0 points	The proposed project does not describe nor fulfill a coastal management research need.
	Community Partnership and Volunteer Involvement: (Max 10 points)
6-10 points	The project involves cooperation with two or more coastal municipalities, community agencies or organizations, or volunteers will contribute a substantial amount of time and effort to the project. The application clearly describes how partners will contribute and does not just make a conclusory statement.
1-5 points	The project involves cooperation with one coastal municipality, community agency or organization, or volunteers will contribute a moderate amount of time and effort to the

Project Title:	
Reviewer Name: _	
	project. The application clearly describes how the partner will contribute and does not just make a conclusory statement.
0 points	The project involves only the applicant agency and does not include the use of volunteers or partner organizations.
	Communications Component: (Max 15 points)
8-15 points	The proposed project clearly describes an educational and/or training component which provides information and findings to multiple audiences (i.e. scientific community, local governments, general public, key stakeholders, etc.).
1-7 points	The proposed project clearly describes an educational and/or training component which provides information and findings to a specific targeted audience or the general public, but not to both.
0 points	The proposed project does not clearly describe an educational and/or training component.
	Matching of Sub-Grant Funds: (Max 10 points)
10 points	The project provides other public and/or private investments (match) equal to or greater than 200% (i.e. 2:1) of the requested federal funds.
7 points	The project provides other public and/or private investments (match) equal to or greater than 150% (i.e. 1.5:1) of the requested federal funds.
4 points	The project provides other public and/or private investments (match) equal to or greater than 125% (i.e. 1.25:1) of the requested federal funds.
0 points	The project does not provide more than the required 100% (i.e. 1:1) of requested federal funds in support of the project.
	REVIEWER TOTAL (Max 140 points)

Reviewer Comments: