DEVELOPMENT PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA Use Only for Development Projects	Scoring Range
1) The project assists the state in accomplishing Coordination, Prevention, Detection, Rapid Response, or Control goals, outlined in Appendix A of the State Weed Management Plan, by carrying out specific tasks listed for this project. • 0 = Applicant did not identify any tasks as requested. • 1-3 = Applicant identified one or two tasks but did not describe how the project would accomplish them. • 4-6 = Applicant identified one or two tasks, but the description of how the project would accomplish them was vague and lacked detail. • 7-9 = Applicant identified more than two tasks, but the description of how the project would accomplish them needs more detail. • 10 = Applicant identified more than two tasks and described how the project would accomplish them very well.	0 - 10
2) The project differs from related management tools and skills that have been previously developed and will increase knowledge of noxious weeds and/or improve an important aspect of noxious weed management. • 0 = Applicant did not list any related management tools or listed non-related management tools. • 1-3 = Applicant identified one related management tool but the description of how the proposed project differs and/or how it would increase knowledge or improve management was lacking. • 4-6 = Applicant identified at least two related management tools but the description of how the proposed project differs and/or how it would increase knowledge or improve management was vague. • 7-9 = Applicant identified more than two related management tools, description of how the proposed project differs and/or how it would increase knowledge or improve management needs more detail. • 10 = Applicant identified more than two related management tools and described how the proposed project differs and how it would increase knowledge or improve management very well.	0 - 10
3) The project was developed using several steps such as conception, planning, resource gathering, solicitation of funding and/or cooperators, etc. • 0 = Applicant did not include any steps of development. • 1-3 = Applicant included only one or two steps of development and the explanation may lack detail. • 4-6 = Applicant included more than two steps of development, but the explanation lacks detail. • 7-9 = Applicant included more than two steps of development and some detail. • 10 = Applicant included a detailed description of how the project was developed using several steps.	0 - 10

4) Describe how aspects of this project could be used in the future by weed managers to address land management needs. • 0 = The product is not intended to be used by weed managers and/or does not address a land management need. • 1-3 = How the product will be used in the future and how it will address a land management need is unclear or the description lacks detail. • 4-6 = Applicant provides some detail of how the product will be used in the future by land managers to address a land management need but utilization is unlikely. • 7-9 = Applicant clearly describes how the product will be used in the future by weed managers, but it does not seem to address a high priority land management need. • 10 = Applicant clearly describes how the product will be used in the future by weed managers and addresses a high priority land management need.	0 - 10
5) The plan of work for this project is detailed and appropriate and will be achieved through objectives. Objectives should be specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and timely (SMART). • 0 = Applicant did not include any clear objectives. • 1-3 = Applicant included only one or two objectives, but they did not include SMART descriptions or descriptions lacked detail. • 4-6 = Applicant included more than two objectives, but they did not include SMART descriptions or descriptions lacked detail. • 7-9 = Applicant included more than two objectives, and all have SMART descriptions but the plan of work lacks detail or is not efficient to accomplish the project. • 10 = Applicant included a detailed plan of work; all objectives have SMART descriptions; and the plan of work is efficient to accomplish the project.	0 - 10
6) The project will provide the foundation for creating a positive long-term effect on natural resources that are challenged or threatened by noxious weeds. • 0 = Applicant did not describe how the research will contribute to creating positive long-term effects on natural resources. • 1-3 = The research does not directly contribute to creating positive long-term effects on natural resources. • 4-6 = Description of how the research will contribute to creating positive long-term effects on natural resources is unclear and lacks detail. • 7-9 = How the research will contribute to creating positive long-term effects on natural resources is clearly described, but the impact is small and/or localized. • 10 = How the research will contribute to creating positive long-term effects on natural resources is clearly described and the impact is landscape scale or state/region wide.	0-10
7) The methods for accomplishing the objectives are detailed and appropriate and the developer(s) have the expertise and facilities to successfully carry out the proposed work. • 0 = Applicant did not describe methods for accomplishing the objectives and/or the developer's expertise and facilities. • 1-3 = Methods for achieving the objectives are unclear and/or the developer's expertise is unclear or unknown.	0 - 10

• 4-6 = Methods for achieving the objectives and the description of the developer's expertise or facilities lacks enough detail to gauge the success of the project. • 7-9 = Some methods for achieving the objectives and the description of the developer's expertise or facilities are included but success of the project is questionable. • 10 = Methods for achieving the objectives and the description of the developer's expertise or facilities are explained in detail and there is confidence in the success of the project.	
8) Methods for analyzing, testing, and evaluating the collected data to determine project outcomes are appropriate and explained in detail. • 0 = Applicant did not describe how the outcomes will be analyzed, tested, or evaluated. • 1-3 = Applicant only described one process (analyzing, testing, or evaluating) to determine project outcomes, not all three. • 4-6 = Applicant only described two processes (analyzing, testing, or evaluating) to determine project outcomes, not all three. • 7-9 = Applicant described methods for all three processes (analyzing, testing, and evaluating) to determine project outcomes, but they were unclear and lacked detail. • 10 = Applicant includes a clear plan for analyzing, testing, and evaluating project outcomes. All three processes are explained in detail.	0 - 10
9) The information will be effectively disseminated to the end user or on-the-ground manager at specific events, venues, or through appropriate journals and publications. • 0 = Applicant did not describe how information will be disseminated and/or the information will not be given directly to the end user or on-the-ground manager. • 1-3 = The events or venues, as well as how the information will be disseminated is unclear and/or it is unknown how the information will get to the end user or on-the-ground manager. • 4-6 = Applicant only describes how the information will be disseminated or how the information will get to the end user or on-the-ground manager, not both. Specific events and venues are not included. • 7-9 = Applicant describes how the information will be disseminated and how the information will get to the end user or on-the-ground manager but does not list specific events and venues. • 10 = Applicant includes a clear plan for disseminating information and lists specific events and venues to share the information with the end user or on-the-ground manager.	0 – 10
10) This application was well prepared, the group is well organized, and the project reflects a likelihood of success in meeting the goals and objectives set forth. • 0-3 = Application was not well prepared, was missing information, lacked detail, methods and evaluation is not organized or appropriate, and it is unlikely the developer will meet the goals and objectives set forth.	0 – 10

• 4-7 = Application included all necessary information but lacked detail, methods and evaluation was not clear and/or appropriate, and the developer may struggle meeting the goals and objectives set forth. • 7-10 = Application included detailed and specific information including clear and appropriate methods and evaluation, and there is confidence that the developer will meet the goals and objectives set forth.	