

EVALUATION PROFILE FOR 2010 SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE GRANT PROGRAM

	5 Excellent	4 Very Good	3 Satisfactory	2 Doubtful	1 Unsatisfactory
1. Input Reduction Does the project reduce or make more efficient use of inputs?	Adoption of practice will <u>clearly result</u> in substantial quantifiable agri-chemical or energy reductions.	Adoption of practice is <u>likely</u> to result in significant quantifiable agri-chemical or energy reductions.	Agri-chemical and other input reductions will probably occur, some problems with methodology used to determine savings.	Practice is unlikely to result in reductions, difficult to measure or technique is not directly related to Agriculture production.	Project does not demonstrate an agrichemical, energy or other input reductions.
2. Environmental Impact Is there an environmental benefit to the proposed project?	Adopting the practice will <u>clearly result</u> in substantial positive environmental benefit.	Adopting the practice is <u>likely</u> to result in substantial positive environmental benefit.	Effect of practice is not clearly measurable but will probably be beneficial or at least not harmful to the environment.	Effect on the environment is uncertain and possibly harmful.	Adopting the practice is likely to be harmful to the environment.
3. Ability to Accomplish Project Do you feel the applicant has the ability to implement project as proposed?	Competent applicant will have no problems demonstrating or researching this practice.	Above average applicant should have few, if any problems demonstrating or researching this practice.	Applicant will be able to implement the demonstration/research satisfactorily.	Applicant lacks in management ability, questionable whether project could be completed with success.	The project is clearly above the management level of the applicant.
4. Project Design/Objectives Do the design and objectives look attainable? Can this project objectively measure what the applicant intends?	The research and/or demonstration plan is extremely well designed, the timelines are ambitious yet feasible and the measurements and data collection presented will more than adequately determine the project's success.	This is a very good plan that is technically sound and feasible. The design is adequate to obtain significantly valid data, and/or demonstration effect.	The project design is workable, but has some technical design problems or unfeasible timelines; measurements are adequate, but could be improved.	Project might not be doable because it is not adequately planned or has major technical problems; measurements are inadequate. Effect as a demonstration is marginal.	Project is poorly designed and/or technically not possible. Demonstration/Research is not on a working farm.
5. Transferability Will Minnesota farmers adopt the demonstrated technologies or techniques?	Over 75% of the farmers within the segments targeted by this project are able and a majority are likely, to adopt this technique within one or two years.	A majority of targeted farmers could potentially adopt this technique within two years and a significant number of farmers are likely to adopt.	A majority of targeted farmers could potentially adopt this technique, but it is questionable whether a significant number will incorporate it into their practices.	Only a small number of farmers are likely to adopt this technique.	This project is not useful to the agricultural community.
6. Budget Is the proposed budget request adequate, excessive?	Excellent fit between work to be accomplished and dollars budgeted. Budget is well detailed and demonstrates extensive planning. All costs are directly related to the project.	All significant expenditures are itemized and are well matched to work to be accomplished.	The budget is reasonable, some significant entries should have been itemized; unforeseen contingencies might arise that are not covered by the budget.	The fit between tasks and expenditures is questionable. Some costs are not directly related to the project.	Budget is unreasonable and costs are not directly related to project.
7. Overall Rating of the Application	Probably ranks in the top 20% of all applications reviewed and should definitely be funded.	Not outstanding but should rank in top 35% of grant applications and clearly merits funding.	Project within guidelines, good applicant with good plan, but not a clear case.	Risky or inadequate project that might not benefit the applicant.	There are significant reasons why this project should not be funded.