



## KMTA GRANT EVALUATION & SCORING CRITERIA

### INITIAL SCREENING - *completed by KMTA Program Staff*

Grant Publication Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_

### SECTION A: ESSENTIAL CRITERIA (Pass/ Fail)

- All application materials are submitted and complete (Project Synopsis; Narrative Application; Publication Sample; Bibliography of previous work; Budget Worksheet)
- Publication is relevant to KMTA National Heritage Area.
- Matching non-federal funding of 50% or more of the total cost is committed to the project.
- Project proposal includes a Project Budget Narrative that describes allocation of funding requested and non-federal match funding sources. In-kind sources are accurately accounted for and described, budget worksheet is correctly completed.
- An author, artist or publisher who is responsible for accomplishing the project has been identified.
- Target audience is identified.
- Project will adequately publicize KMTA sponsorship/ involvement with the publication through public outreach, advertisement, logo visibility, and any published materials.
- Expected publication date and associated timeline is addressed.

Does project pass all of the above criteria? (Yes/ No)\_\_\_\_\_

### SECTION B: ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Desirable, but not required (1 point each)

- Project creates a new partnership benefiting the purposes of the Heritage Area.
- Project is over-matched by partnership funding that also helps accomplish the Heritage Area purposes of the project.
- Project involves young people and helps them learn about the Heritage Area.
- Project will build on a proven success by expanding and enhancing a successful project that fulfills the KMTA mission.

**Total boxes checked = \_\_\_\_\_ \* 1 pts = \_\_\_\_\_ (4 max)**

*\*Program Staff will alert applicant of short-comings and explain the application will not be reviewed by the Board until complete and compliant. Program Staff will offer one preliminary draft review of applications per applicant, as long as it is received at least two weeks prior to grant deadline.*

---



KENAI MOUNTAINS-TURNAGAIN ARM  
**NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA**

**SECTION C: EVALUATION** – *completed by KMTA Grant Work Group Board Members*

On a Scale of 1–5, rate each item below

Scale of 1 = *project doesn't meet criteria*

2 = *project somewhat meets criteria*

3 = *project meets criteria 50%*

4 = *project mostly meets criteria*

5 = *project highly meets criteria*

**Support your numerical score with written comments**

*Reviewers are required to write down and list Strengths & Weaknesses that correspond with score given. In addition, reviewers may recommend approval or disapproval for the application; or recommend deferral for future consideration.*

**Evaluate each application and score (1-5) based on the following criteria:**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Mission-Driven Impact:** Project is consistent with Heritage Area purposes, and increases public awareness and appreciation for the natural, historical and cultural resources of the Heritage Area.

REASONS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ **Relevance:** Publication audience is defined, appropriate, and relevant to subject matter and publication content.

REASONS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ **Public Support:** The sponsoring organization has exhibited involvement, collaboration, and communication with stakeholders and partners as part of the project proposal.

REASONS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ **Project Objectives:** The applicant has provided measurable objectives to effectively manage and evaluate the success of the completed publication.

REASONS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ **Publication Feasibility & Endurability:** Project is feasible within proposed timeline. Application addresses publication longevity and future maintenance.

REASONS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



KENAI MOUNTAINS-TURNAGAIN ARM  
**NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Publication Personnel:** The applicant has the right staff and/or contractors with the right qualifications and/or experience to effectively manage and complete the publication.

REASONS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ **Budget:** The budget is *reasonable* and *feasible*, includes necessary and allowable expenses, and includes reasonable in-kind match amounts and sources.

REASONS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluation Score** \_\_\_\_\_ (max 35 pts)

**Overall comments/ recommendations:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATION SUMMARY**

Initial Screening Section A (pass/fail): \_\_\_\_\_

Initial Screening Section B (max 4 pts): \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Section C (max 35 pts): \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL SCORE (max=39 points) =** \_\_\_\_\_

Please also complete the section below for additional consideration in evaluating the grant applicant

**SECTION D: ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS**

**Need:** Does this publication directly addresses a critical need or problem identified as a priority for the NHA? Please describe: *Grant Work Group Members to complete*

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Past Performance:** If the grant applicant previously received a KMTA grant, project was completed on-time, within scope and budget, and reporting requirements were adequately met. Was it easy for KMTA Program Staff to contact and communicate with the grant applicant. (Write N/A if new grant applicant) *Program Staff to complete.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*After reviewers have completed their rating, an aggregate numerical list reflecting the relative merit of each application will be prepared. This numerical eval will be based solely on scores assigned by reviewers. KMTA Program Staff will consolidate numerical scores and share with Board Members.*