

Users and Needs (6 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
No need is listed or the need focuses entirely on the library.	Community need is mentioned, but application focuses on library need.	Clearly address a community need, not a library need.
Description of need does not include direct evidence of community input.	Description of needs demonstrates some evidence of community input.	Description of need demonstrates clear community input, like surveys, focus groups, anecdotes, etc.
An intended audience is either, vague, too broad, or not mentioned.	An intended audience is listed but how they will benefit from this project is unclear.	The specific intended audience benefitting from this project is clearly described with an understanding of their current challenges.

Project Description (8 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
Description does not outline how the activities will meet the community need.	Description addresses how these activities will meet the community need, but some clarity is missing.	Description makes apparent that these activities will help meet the community need.
Multiple activities seem unnecessary to the project.	Most activities seem relevant to the project, but necessity of some are questionable.	Activities included in the description are relevant and serve to meet the overall goals of the project.
Timeline is missing and/or seems unreasonable. Dates fall outside of LSTA requirements.	Timeline is outlined, but major milestones are missing. Dates are mostly in accordance with LSTA requirements.	Timeline is reasonable and thoughtfully prepared. Dates are in accordance with LSTA requirements.
The project is not clearly described, is too vague, and/or is missing key information.	The project is mostly outlined by some key details are missing from the description.	Project is clearly outlined from start to finish. Reviewers have few to no questions about the project plan after reading the description.

Evaluation (4 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
Outcomes are not listed or are weak. Outcomes are not tied to project activities or participants.	The project has outcomes but they aren't detailed, participant focused, or achievable. Outputs (numbers) are emphasized over outcomes (changes).	Project has detailed, achievable outcomes that focus on the change that will happen to participants as a result of the grant.
The evaluation process is missing.	The evaluation process has some, but not all components of a successful evaluation.	The evaluation process describes all components of a successful evaluation.

Budget (6 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
Key budget requests are largely unallowable, unreasonable, and/or unnecessary for the project.	Some budget requests seem unreasonable and unnecessary but align with the project.	Budget requests appear allowable, reasonable, and necessary to complete the project.
Multiple items are listed in the budget or description that are not listed in the corresponding section.	The items listed in the budget and the description mostly align, but some are only shown in one section or the other.	Items listed in the budget and description align.
Matching funds are undermatched AND used for unallowable costs.	Matching funds are undermatch OR used for unallowable costs.	Matching funds are allowable and calculated correctly.