EVALUATION CRITERIA

All applications will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

Criteria	Excellent (4-5)	Above average (3-4)	Average (2-3)	Mediocre (1-2)	Needs Improvement (0-1)
Innovation	Project represents the implementation of new insight or idea, with potential benefits of change made clear.	Project represents local implementation of emerging innovation or trend, with potential benefits specified.	Project represents practice(s) commonplace within the field, or an adoption of a change with well-established benefits.	No innovation described or specific potential improvement defines.	Very little description or no answer.
Justification	Strong rationale and significance of proposed work. Addresses specific need(s).	Rational or significance of project tends toward the too-general, but overall argument holds.	Weak presentation of institutional or community need, or tenuous argument for grant's ability to address need.	Unconvincing or no evidence of need presented or grant proposal does not address stated need.	Very little description or no answer.
Relationship to Organizational Strategic Vision	Project outcomes or activities align with both WRC vision and goals and those of the community.	Project elements align with the vision and goals of either WRC or those of the community, but not both.	Project tangentially but not directly related to WRC strategic vision or community goals.	No explicit relationship between project and the agenda of WRC or community.	Very little description or no answer.
Feasibility	Personnel, project activities timeline, and budget expenditures congruent with project description and outcomes.	Deficiencies or overestimations exist in personnel, timeline, or budget within tolerable range, outcomes appear achievable despite gaps or leaps.	Project's assembled personnel, timeline, or budget expose weakness in plan design. Outcomes unlikely to be achieved in projects current form.	Insufficient information about personnel, project activities timeline or budget expenditures to gauge feasibility.	Very little description or no answer.
Efficiency of Tactic/Approach	Project plan leverages or contributes to existing infrastructure or precedents. Design appears scalable or replicable	Project plan overlooks or fails to mention important connections to relevant work by others, but redeemable. Represents a worthy contribution.	Project isolated from related work and duplicates effort. Extension or replication in current form unadvisable.	Plan presented lacks sufficient detail to judge how it fits into industry or local contexts.	Very little description or no answer.
Sustainability	Evidence presented that project or its impact can be sustained locally beyond grant period.	Project is temporary, designed to end when grant ends, or some effort to secure commitment beyond grant period is represented.	Plans for future are stated as assumptions without supporting arguments or evidence.	No meaningful plans for future beyond funding term appear in proposal.	Very little description or no answer.

NOTE: For any applications regarding coach, classifier and officials' development, ensure that the individuals receiving the training have the appropriate credentials to receive the desired training. (e.g. Wheelie Wilson is a certified physiotherapist, who is going to take the classification training.)