

Evaluation Instructions:

- Every committee member should fill out an Individual Evaluation Scoring Sheet for each proposal submitted. The notes do not need to be in paragraph form and can be brief.
- The state National Conservation Lands coordinator should fill out the Final State Ranking Sheet after the evaluating committee comes to consensus. Please ensure that the justification for rankings is provided.
- All Individual Evaluation Scoring Sheets and Final State Ranking Sheets should be uploaded into the corresponding state folders for the L17AS00001 funding opportunity in the Financial Assistance Sharepoint Site: <https://blmspace.blm.doi.net/blm/blmfa/SitePages/Home.aspx>
- Please work with your state Grants Management Officer (GMO) with any questions regarding project evaluation and review.
- Please have all evaluations completed and uploaded by COB February 27th, 2017.

Example Financial Assistance Evaluation Rating Factors:

Below are the rating factors that can be used by the Evaluation Team when assessing the quality and responsiveness of an applicant's proposal to each Evaluation Criteria. You may also develop your own criteria as a state. Please contact your GMO with questions on proposal evaluation.

OUTSTANDING - Very comprehensive, in depth, clear response. Proposal consistently meets this standard with no omissions. Consistently high quality performance can be expected.

EXCELLENT - Extensive, detailed response to the opportunity similar to outstanding in quality, but with minor areas of unevenness or spottiness. High quality performance is likely but not assured due to minor omissions or areas where less than excellent performance might be expected.

GOODNo deficiencies in the response. Better than acceptable performance can be expected but in some significant areas there is an unevenness or spottiness which might impact performance.

FAIRThe response generally meets minimum requirements but there is no expectation of better than acceptable performance. Deficiencies are confined to areas with minor impact on performance and may be corrected during negotiation without major revision to the proposal.

POOR.....The response fails to address one or more areas of the opportunity. Either, deficiencies exist in significant areas but may be corrected during negotiations without major revision to the proposal, or serious deficiencies exist in areas with minor impact.

UNSATISFACTORY - Serious deficiencies exist in significant areas. The proposal cannot be expected to address the opportunity without major revisions. The proposal only indicates a willingness to perform without specifying how or demonstrating the capacity to do so.