

NAPEF Grant Application Evaluation Worksheet

Name of Grant:

Person(s) and Organization(s) submitting Grant (with contact information):

Date of Submission of Grant:

- A. At the outset, does this Grant advance the mission and vision of NAPEF which is “to fund and support NAP and others to have educational programs that promote effective meetings” and to be “the leader in supporting superior parliamentary procedure educational programs and resources”?

4 points (excellent) 3 points (very good) 2 points (good) 1 point (minimal)

Comments:

- B. Does this Grant continue to promote the parliamentary profession and parliamentary education and development in some way(s)?

4 points (excellent) 3 points (very good) 2 points (good) 1 point (minimal)

Comments:

- C. Does this Grant provide a unique parliamentary education opportunity in some way(s)?

4 points (excellent) 3 points (very good) 2 points (good) 1 point (minimal)

Comments:

- D. Does this Grant include and/or emphasize a category(ies) and domain(s) of the NAP *Body of Knowledge* listed on the *napef.org* website?

4 points (excellent) 3 points (very good) 2 points (good) 1 point (minimal)

Comments:

- E. Does this Grant reach a large number, or wide variety, of NAP members, potential members and/or the general public?

4 points (excellent) 3 points (very good) 2 points (good) 1 point (minimal)

Comments:

- F. Does this Grant provide a justification for funding requested from NAPEF to accomplish the outcome sought?

4 points (excellent) 3 points (very good) 2 points (good) 1 point (minimal)

Comments:

- G. Does this Grant include a built-in method to evaluate its ongoing or final effectiveness?

4 points (excellent) 3 points (very good) 2 points (good) 1 point (marginal)

Comments:

- H. Does this Grant produce significant deliverables such as videos, transcripts, other written materials, workshops, syllabi, etc.?

4 points (excellent) 3 points (very good) 2 points (good) 1 point (minimal)

Comments:

I. Does this Grant provide for parliamentary presenters, leaders and/or other contributors to enhance its success?

4 points (excellent) 3 points (very good) 2 points (good) 1 point (minimal)

Comments:

J. Does this Grant inspire the creation or development of new ideas and proposals for new grants to arise?

4 points (excellent) 3 points (very good) 2 points (good) 1 point (minimal)

Comments:

Total points assigned (out of 40): _____