

Competitive Grant Proposal Scoring Rubric

Innovation			Score
	Project represents necessary advances with benefits specified	3	
	Project represents local implementation of emerging innovation or trend with benefits specified	3	
	Project represents common practice within the field with benefits specified	1	
	Insufficient information given about advancement, improvement or benefit	0	
Need			
	Strong need. Proposal addresses specific need(s) common among peer libraries	3	
	Need is somewhat evident in the proposal and the overall argument holds	2	
	Weak presentation of library or community need	1	
	Unconvincing or no evidence of need presented, or proposal does not address stated need	0	
Feasibility			
	Project activities, timeline, budget align with project description and outcomes	3	
	Outcomes appear achievable but variables are present with project activities, timeline, budget	2	
	Weak descriptions of project, timeline and budget. Success unlikely	1	
	Insufficient information given about project activities, timeline, budget	0	
Assessment			
	Clear picture of how data will be collected and used	3	
	Plan lacks details on data collection and usage	1	
	Insufficient information given, evaluation plan missing	0	
Sustainability			
	Evidence presented that project and impact can be sustained locally beyond the grant period	3	
	Project is complete, designed to end when grant ends	2	
	Insufficient information given, NO plans for future of project	0	
Prior Funding			
	Library has NOT received competitive grant funds in the previous year	3	
	Library received competitive grant funds in the previous year	0	
Total Score			0
Recommend Funding?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Partial: \$ <input type="text"/>	Not at this time <input type="checkbox"/>

Notes/Comments: (Use Alt+Enter for new paragraph)