

STATEWIDE PROGRAM EVALUATION CRITERIA Use Only for Education Section	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 other related educational tools (groups, materials, etc.) that has been previously developed will increase knowledge of noxious weeds and/or improve an important aspect of noxious weed management. • 0 = Applicant did not list any related educational tool or listed non-related educational tools. • 1-3 = Applicant identified one related education 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 educational 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 educational 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 educational 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)	Participants and/or the public will become more knowledgeable about noxious weeds and their management by attending listed events and venues for information dissemination. • 0 = Applicant did not describe how participants and/or the public will become more knowledgeable about noxious weeds and their management. • 1-3 = The events or venues, as well as how participants and/or the public will become more knowledgeable about noxious weeds and their management is unclear and lacks detail. • 4-6 = Applicant provides one example of how participants and/or the public will become more knowledgeable about noxious weeds and their management. Details, events, and venues are unclear or not included. • 7-9 = Applicant provides two examples of how participants and/or the public will become more knowledgeable about noxious weeds and their management. Some details, events and venues are included. • 10 = Applicant includes a clear plan which includes three or more examples for how participants and/or the public will become more knowledgeable about noxious weeds and their management and lists specific events and venues to share the information.	0 - 10
5)	The project will create opportunities for the public to take action against noxious weeds. • 0 = The project does not target the public and/or create opportunities for the public to act. • 1-3 = Applicant did not describe any opportunities for the public to act. • 4-6 = The description of how the project will create opportunities for the public to act is unclear and lacks detail. • 7-9 = Applicant provides some detail for how the project will create opportunities for the public to act, but it is unclear if it will be implemented. • 10 = Applicant describes how the project will create opportunities for the public to act in detail and has a clear plan for how it will be implemented.	0 - 10
6)	The project will build coalitions and partnerships with available weed management resources. • 0 = The project is not meant to build coalitions and partnerships. • 1-3 = Applicant did not describe how the project builds coalitions and partnerships. • 4-6 = The description of how the project will build coalitions and partnerships is unclear and lacks detail. • 7-9 = Applicant clearly describes how the project will build coalitions and partnerships but with which available weed management resources is unclear and lacks detail. • 10 = Applicant clearly describes how the project will build coalitions and partnerships and lists available weed management resources used.	0 - 10
7)	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.	0 – 10

• 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.	
8) Many participants or members of the public will be impacted and/or benefit from this project and aspects of this project could be used in the future by weed managers. • 0 = The project will not directly interact with participants or members of the public. • 1-3 = Applicant was vague and lacked detail when describing the impact or benefit to the public. • 4-6 = The project will impact or benefit a small local group (5-50), and applicant provided some detail. • 7-9 = The project will impact or benefit a large local group (50-200), and applicant provided some detail. • 10 = The project will reach many participants or members of the public across the state (500-2000), and applicant described the impact and/or benefits well.	0 – 10
9) The project has an appropriate evaluation process that will be used to determine the effectiveness, impacts, and benefits of the project. • 0 = Applicant did not describe how the effectiveness, impacts, and benefits of the project will be analyzed or evaluated. • 1-3 = Applicant only described how one outcome (effectiveness, impacts, or benefits) will be evaluated, not all three. • 4-6 = Applicant only described how two outcomes (effectiveness, impacts, or benefits) will be evaluated, not all three. • 7-9 = Applicant described how all three outcomes (effectiveness, impacts, or benefits) will be evaluated, but they were unclear and lacked detail. • 10 = Applicant includes a clear plan for evaluating the effectiveness, impacts, and benefits of the project. All three outcomes are explained in detail.	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. • 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.	0 – 10

STATEWIDE PROGRAM EVALUATION CRITERIA Use Only for Taskforce Section	Scoring Range
1) This project includes collaborative resources from private, state, and/or federal sources. • 0 = The project only includes resources from one source, including support and match (private, state, or federal sources). • 1-3 = The project includes resources from two different sources, including support and match (private, state, or federal sources) and the description of participation may lack detail. • 4-6 = The project includes resources from three different sources, including support and match (private, state, or federal sources) but the description of participation lacks detail. • 7-9 = The project includes resources from four or more different sources, including support and match (private, state, or federal sources) and provides some description of participation. • 10 = The project shows a collaboration of resources from various sources, including support and match (private, state, or federal sources) and provides a detailed description of participation for each.	0 - 10
2) 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
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) This project includes both short-term (1-3yrs) and long-term goals (4-10yrs) that are attainable and appropriate with available resources. • 0 = Applicant did not include both short- and long-term goals. • 1-3 = Applicant provided only one goal, either short- or long-term, or goals were not attainable and/or appropriate. • 4-6 = Applicant provided one short- and long-term goal each. Goals may be attainable and/or appropriate. • 7-9 = Applicant provided two short- and long-term goals each. Most of the goals are attainable and appropriate. • 10 = Applicant provided two or more short- or long-term goals. Most of the goals are attainable and appropriate.	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) This project utilizes integrated management techniques that are both appropriate and applicable for the noxious weed species to be treated in the designated area. • 0 = Applicant does not describe any integrated management techniques being used in the project. Only one management method is being used. • 1-4 = Applicant describes integrated management techniques being used in the project, and/or the methods are not appropriate or directly related to management of noxious weeds (i.e. grazing cattle). • 5-9 = Applicant describes two integrated management techniques being used in the project, both of which are appropriate and applicable. • 10-14 = Applicant clearly describes three or more integrated management techniques being used in the project, all of which are appropriate and applicable. • 15 = Applicant describes in detail several integrated management techniques being used in the project, including planning and evaluation, and it is clear the group has gone above and beyond to improve the landscape.	0 - 15
7) This project incorporates an appropriate annual monitoring plan that will effectively track progress. • 0 = Applicant does not provide an appropriate annual monitoring plan. • 1-3 = Applicant provides an annual monitoring plan, but it will not effectively track progress.	0 - 10

• 4-6 = Applicant provides an appropriate annual monitoring plan that may effectively track progress but did not provide a detailed description. • 7-9 = Applicant provides an appropriate annual monitoring plan that may effectively track progress and provides some detail like timing and locations. • 10 = Applicant provides a clear and detailed plan for effectively tracking progress. Methods are appropriate and can be sustained for several years.	
8) Project participants are actively mapping weed infestations by using or sharing data on EDDMapS. • 0 = Project participants do not map weed infestations and/or share data with EDDMapS. • 3 = Some project participants map weed infestations and use or share with EDDMapS. Maps have been provided in application. • 5 = Most or all project participants map weed infestations and use/share data with EDDMapS. Detailed maps were provided in application.	0,3,5
9) The taskforce has a current Weed Management Plan, either a county plan or state-wide plan, and the plan is comprehensive and at minimum follows the template provided. a. 0 = The taskforce does not have a current WMP. b. 1-3 = The taskforce works from a county WMP, but it is not specific to the taskforce. c. 4-6 = The taskforce has a WMP but is not current and/or does not at minimum follow the template provided. d. 7-9 = The taskforce has a WMP, but it is lacking important details like maps, infestation levels, goals, partner responsibilities, etc. • 10 = The taskforce has a current and comprehensive WMP that is updated on a regular basis.	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. • 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.	0 - 10