RESEARCH PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA Use Only for Research Projects	Scoring Range
1) This project supports one or more of the six research areas listed in the State Weed Management Plan which include impacts, prevention, weed biology and plant dynamics, IWM, land reclamation, and effects of natural disturbances. • 0 = Applicant did not identify any research areas of the WMP as requested. • 1-3 = Applicant identified one or two research areas of the WMP but did not describe how the project supports them. • 4-6 = Applicant identified one or two research areas of the WMP, but the description of how the project supports them was vague and lacked detail. • 7-9 = Applicant identified more than two research areas of the WMP, but the description of how the project supports them needs more detail. • 10 = Applicant identified more than two research areas of the WMP and described how the project supports them very well.	0 - 10
2) The project differs from related research that has been done in the past and will increase knowledge of noxious weeds and/or improve an important aspect of noxious weed management. • 0 = Applicant did not list any related research or listed non-related research previously done. • 1-3 = Applicant identified one related research project/paper 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 research projects/papers 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 research projects/papers, 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 research projects/papers 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 but lacked detail. • 4-6 = Applicant included more than two steps of development but lacked 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) The project was developed in cooperation with land managers to address land management needs will benefit future weed managers. • 0 = Applicant did not work with any land managers to develop the project and/or the product is not intended to be used by weed managers. • 1-3 = Applicant mentioned working with land managers but did not describe collaboration, management need, or future use. • 4-6 = Applicant identified one land manager but lacked details when describing the collaboration, management need, or future use. • 7-9 = Applicant identified more than one land manager and included some details when describing the collaboration, management need, or future use. • 10 = Applicant identified more than one land manager and described the collaboration process clearly, identified how this would address their management needs, and how this project could be used in the future.	0 - 10
5) The research 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
6) 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
7) The methods for accomplishing the objectives are detailed and appropriate and the researcher(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 researcher's expertise and facilities. • 1-3 = Methods for achieving the objectives are unclear and/or the researcher's expertise is unclear or unknown.	0 - 10

• 4-6 = Methods for achieving the objectives and the description of the researcher'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 researcher's expertise or facilities are included but success of the project is questionable. • 10 = Methods for achieving the objectives and the description of the researcher'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 outcomes of the experiment are appropriate and explained in detail. • 0 = Applicant did not describe how the data will be analyzed, tested, or evaluated. • 1-3 = Applicant only described one process (analyzing, testing, or evaluating) to determine outcomes, not all three. • 4-6 = Applicant only described two processes (analyzing, testing, or evaluating) to determine outcomes, not all three. • 7-9 = Applicant described methods for all three processes (analyzing, testing, and evaluating) to determine outcomes, but they were unclear and lacked detail. • 10 = Applicant includes a clear plan for analyzing, testing, and evaluating collected data to determine outcomes of the experiment. 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.	