

## Proposal Scoring Criteria for New York’s Great Lakes Basin (NYGLB) Small Grants Program

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>High (8-10 points)</b>	<b>Medium (4-7 points)</b>	<b>Low (1-3 points)</b>
<b>Local Plan Integration (Topical Focus)</b>	The proposal clearly and convincingly demonstrates alignment with one or more approved, local, community-based plan. Specific actions are directly tied to local priorities, and there is evidence of intentional integration that reflects a thorough understanding of local goals.	The proposal indicates a general connection to one or more approved, local, community-based plans, but the alignment is not well-defined. Specific actions or priorities are mentioned but lack clarity on how they are integrated into the project’s goals.	The proposal provides little to no evidence of alignment with an approved, local, community-based plan. Connections, if mentioned, are vague, incomplete, or lack documentation to support the claim.
<b>Great Lakes Action Agenda (GLAA) Linkage</b>	The proposal provides a strong and well-defined link to one or more GLAA goals and metrics. Specific actions and metrics are clearly outlined, demonstrating intentional and actionable steps toward achieving the stated goal(s).	The proposal identifies one or more GLAA goals and associated metrics but provides only a partial or general connection. Specific steps for implementation may be mentioned but lack sufficient detail or clarity.	The proposal demonstrates minimal or unclear alignment with GLAA goals. Specific actions and/or metrics are either not identified or lack relevance to the stated goal(s).
<b>Integration of Ecosystem-Based Management (EBM) Principles</b>	The proposal thoroughly integrates EBM principles, demonstrating a clear and balanced approach to ecological, economic, and community values. Multiple EBM principles are intentionally and explicitly addressed, including stakeholder participation, collaboration, scientific rigor, and adaptive management.	The proposal addresses some EBM principles but lacks depth or a comprehensive approach. While one or more of the 9 principles may be present, they are not fully developed or integrated into the project’s overall framework.	The proposal demonstrates minimal integration of EBM principles. Key concepts, such as balancing ecological, economic, and community values, are either absent or vaguely addressed.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>High (8-10 points)</b>	<b>Medium (4-7 points)</b>	<b>Low (1-3 points)</b>
<b>Appropriateness of Measurable Outcomes or Deliverables</b>	The proposal outlines specific, realistic, and measurable outcomes that are directly aligned with the project goals. The deliverables are well-defined and clearly achievable within the 18-month timeframe, demonstrating a strong likelihood of success.	The proposal outlines outcomes or deliverables that are generally well-defined and relevant to the project goals. However, they may lack sufficient detail, clarity, or feasibility, raising concerns about whether they can be fully achieved within the project term.	The proposal provides vague or poorly defined outcomes and deliverables. They lack clear connections to the project's stated goals and appear unrealistic or unattainable within the 18-month term.
<b>Qualifications of the Project Team</b>	The project team demonstrates strong qualifications and extensive experience directly aligned with all aspects of the project. Each member brings relevant skills and expertise that will support the project's success.	The team members possess relevant experience and qualifications, though some gaps in expertise may exist in critical areas. While generally capable, the team's collective skills may not fully align with all project needs.	The proposal provides limited evidence of relevant experience or qualifications. Team members lack demonstrated expertise in key areas essential to project success.
<b>Coordination with Appropriate Partners</b>	The proposal exhibits strong coordination with appropriate partners, clearly avoiding duplication of existing efforts. Collaboration is well-documented and actively enhances the project's goals, demonstrating a unified and strategic approach.	The proposal demonstrates some level of coordination with partners, with moderate collaboration to support project outcomes. However, the extent of collaboration may lack depth, and there may be some overlap with existing efforts.	The proposal provides little to no evidence of coordination with partners. Collaboration efforts are unclear or minimal, and the project risks duplicating existing initiatives without adding value.
<b>Appropriateness of Budget</b>	The budget is thoroughly documented, transparent, and reasonable. Costs are clearly justified and closely aligned with the project's scope, goals, and	The budget is generally reasonable and aligned with the project's scope and needs, though minor gaps, inconsistencies, or areas requiring	The budget lacks sufficient detail, is poorly documented, or appears unrealistic for the project's scope.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>High (8-10 points)</b>	<b>Medium (4-7 points)</b>	<b>Low (1-3 points)</b>
	deliverables, demonstrating efficient use of funds.	clarification are present. Some costs may lack full justification or transparency.	Costs may seem inflated, misaligned, or unjustified.
<b>Outreach Component</b>	The proposal clearly integrates a robust outreach component, with well-defined and thoughtful strategies to communicate results widely and engage a diverse range of community stakeholders.	The proposal includes an outreach component with basic strategies for communication and engagement, but these are underdeveloped or lack sufficient detail to ensure broad reach or effective application of results.	The proposal demonstrates little to no evidence of incorporating outreach into the project. There are minimal or no strategies presented for communicating results or engaging the broader community.
<b>Building Capacity for Future Projects</b>	The proposal strongly supports capacity-building for future efforts. It includes a clear, well-developed plan for sustaining and expanding the project's impacts, with detailed strategies for follow-up actions and long-term growth.	The proposal suggests some potential for future capacity-building, but the plans lack sufficient detail or clear strategies for ensuring long-term sustainability or follow-up actions.	The proposal provides little to no evidence of opportunities for future capacity-building or follow-up projects. There is minimal or no mention of sustainability or plans for expanding the project's impacts after completion.
<b>Benefits to Environmental Justice Communities</b>	The proposal explicitly targets Environmental Justice or underserved communities and is designed to deliver clear, measurable benefits to these areas. The project demonstrates a strong commitment to addressing the needs and priorities of these communities.	The proposal identifies some benefits to Environmental Justice or underserved communities but does not fully emphasize or clearly articulate these impacts.	The proposal demonstrates limited or unclear benefits to Environmental Justice or underserved communities. There is little or no indication that these communities are prioritized or explicitly considered in the project's design.