

2026 Clean Water Indiana Grants Rubric for Reviewers					
Criterion	Exemplary	Adequate	Needs Improvement	Insufficient	Score Range
Need/Problem Statement (20 points) What is the "why for this project what information led to this being the right project at this time?"	Problem clearly articulated with compelling local info/references.	Need outlined but loosely connected to local info; somewhat compelling.	Need stated but unclear; hard to follow; weak connection to info.	Need not clearly stated.	16-20 / 10-15 / 9 / 0-4
Project Design/Planning Approach (10 pts.) What are the main project tasks and activities and how it will be accomplished? Will proposed plans enhance or complement Indiana's natural resources and in your county and neighboring counties.	Logical, impactful, reasonable, scalable; timeline achievable; builds on other work.	Likely impact; reasonable but timeline questionable; achievable despite gaps.	Limited impact; unclear details; challenging to complete.	Not logical; insufficient info; feasibility unclear; funds not secured.	8-10 / 5-7 / 2-4 / 0-1
Project Impact/Outcomes (30 pts.) How will the resources and the public (insert perception??) change because of this project? How will ISDA/SSCB and partner know if this project is successful?	Profound positive impact; broad benefits to natural resources/public.	Positive impact; narrower scope; some benefit.	Little impact; limited benefit.	No demonstrated impact or benefit.	22-30 / 21-13 / 12-6 / 0-5
Relationship to the SSCB, ISDA vision and/or your local counties goals. (20 pts.) Does this project help meet the goals and objectives of each entities business plan?	Strong alignment w/ SSCB, ISDA and local organizations business and/or strategic planning.	Aligns with SSCB, ISDA and local organizations business and/or strategic planning.	Aligns only with SWCD business plan	No alignment shown.	16-20 / 10-15 / 9 / 0-4

<p>Budget/Budget Narrative (10 pts.) What funds are being used to support this project? Are all funds secured and minimum match is being met? If not what is the plan for achieving additional resources during the grant agreement timeline.</p>	<p>Clear expenditures; reasonable costs; funds secured OR plan to secure remaining. Minimum match is being met.</p>	<p>Somewhat clear; costs reasonable; secured funds but unclear remaining. If match is not met, move score to insufficient.</p>	<p>Needs more detail; unclear if funds secured. If match is not met, move score to insufficient.</p>	<p>Expenditures do not logically support project. Minimum match is not met.</p>	<p>8-10 / 5-7 / 2-4 / 0-1</p>
<p>Project Sustainability (10 pts.) Please describe the systems, plans, and commitments your organization has in place to ensure this project can be maintained after the grant funding ends. What systems, plans, or agreements does your organization already have, or intend to develop to ensure the project continues once grant funds are fully expended?</p>	<p>Positive impact; clear maintenance plan; sustainability assured.</p>	<p>Adequate impact; maintenance mentioned but unclear.</p>	<p>Some impact; no maintenance/support plan.</p>	<p>No impact; no sustainability.</p>	<p>8-10 / 5-7 / 2-4 / 0-1</p>
<p>Note: The rubric will serve as a guide to the CWI Scoring Committee and SSCB board.</p>					
<p>They will not be required to complete and submit a rubric for each application they review.</p>					