National Association of Parliamentarians Educational Foundation
Grant Application Evaluation Worksheet

Grant Applicants: This form is provided for information only so that you are aware of the evaluation process used by the Grants Committee. This form will be completed by the Grants Committee.

1. Date of Grant Submission

Date / Time

Date

MM/DD/YYYY

2. Name of Person Submitting Grant

3. Email address of person submitting grant

4. Name/Title of Grant

5. At the outset, does this grant advance the mission and vision of NAPEF which is "to fund and support NAP and others to provide 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)

6. Does this grant continue to promote the parliamentary profession and parliamentary education and development?

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

7. Comments regarding questions 5 and 6.

8. Does this grant provide a unique parliamentary education?

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

9. How does the grant provide a unique parliamentary education opportunity?

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

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

11. Does this grant reach a large number or wide variety of NAP members, potential members and/or general public?

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

12. Does the grant reach a large number or wide variety of NAP members, potential members and/or general public.

- NAP members
- Potential members
- General public

13. How many people is the grant estimated to reach?

14. Does the grant provide a justification for the funding requested from NAPEF to accomplish the outcome sought?

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

15. Does the 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 (minimal)

16. Does the 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)

17. Does the 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)

18. Does the 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)

19. Additional comments