

**GRANT APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS  
NAPA COUNTY WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
(DRAFT BY ALLEN XIE)**

**Section 1: Selection Process Comparison**

<b>Step</b>	<b>Old Process</b>	<b>New Process</b>	<b>Reason for change</b>
Review Panel	WCC members review applications	Add 1 educator, 1 ecologist if necessary	More opinion from experts
Evaluation Criteria	General priorities without a rubric	Adopt a weighted scoring rubric based on 5 categories: Impact, Education, Equity, Feasibility, Collaboration	Provide transparent scoring guide
Scoring Format	Informal discussion-based decisions	Use a 1-5 scale per criterion with the clear definitions and total weighted score	Reduce bias, standardizes decisions, enables justification.
Final Decision	Based on collective agreement	Based on top scores, followed by short pitch/interview for finalists if needed	Allows a deeper understanding of proposals
Feedback for applicants	No formal feedback	All applicants receive written feedback on strengths and areas for improvement	Encourage growth, and future participation.

## Section 2: Grant Award Criteria Comparison

Category	Old criteria	New Criteria	Reason for Change
Legal Basis	Must align with Fish and Game Code § 13103	Still must comply with § 13103, but must show measurable ecological or educational outcomes	Shifts focus from just legality to demonstrate impact, making results more trackable
Wildlife Focus	Projects that generally benefit wildlife	Prioritize projects with clear benefit to native species, critical habitats, or biodiversity hotspots	Focuses funding on scientifically urgent and locally relevant conservation needs
Education Projects	Environmental education programs broadly accepted	Curriculum-aligned programs and field trips with defined learning outcomes and assessment methods	Encourages educational accountability and deeper impacts in schools and communities
Budget Justification	Budget required, basic explanation	Must provide a detailed, itemized budget, showing cost-effectiveness and funding breakdown	Enhances financial transparency and ensures responsible use of funds
Community Benefit	Community benefit vaguely mentioned	Must describe who benefits, like students, volunteers and how they are engaged	Promote equity, inclusion, and public engagement
Innovation	Not addressed	Prioritize innovative, scalable, or replicable models	Supports new ideas and increases the chance for success beyond one-time use

## Sample scoring guide

### Scoring scale

Score	Description
5	Excellent: fully meets and exceeds expectations
4	Strong:meets expectations with minor improvements needed
3	Adequate:meet basic expectations
2	Limited:partially meets expectations
1	Inadequate:does not meet expectations

### Evaluation Categories:

#### 1.Conservation Impact (Weight: 40%)

Does the project benefit native species or critical habitats?  
Are the expected outcomes clear, measurable, and supported by data?

#### 2.Education Value (Weight: 25%)

Is the program aligned with school standards or environmental literacy goals?  
Are learning outcomes defined and is there a plan for assessment

#### 3.Community Engagement & Equity (Weight: 15%)

Does the project engage the public, especially underrepresented communities?  
Are volunteers, students, or local organizations meaningfully involved?

#### 4.Feasibility & Accountability (Weight: 10%)

Is the budget clear, itemized, and reasonable?  
Are there realistic timelines, responsibilities, and success metrics?

#### 5.Collaboration & Matching Support (Weight 10%)

Are partnerships with other groups or agencies involved  
Does the project include matching funds or in-kind support?

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weight (%)</b>	<b>Score (1-5)</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Justification</b>
<b>Conservation Impact</b>	<b>40</b>			
<b>Educational Value</b>	<b>25</b>			
<b>Community Engagement &amp; Equity</b>	<b>15</b>			
<b>Feasibility &amp; Accountability</b>	<b>10</b>			
<b>Collaboration &amp; Matching Support</b>	<b>10</b>			

**Total Score (out of 100)**

**Example : Next Page**

# Project Example: "Habitat Heroes: Student-Led Restoration in Napa Foothills"

A local nonprofit partners with a middle school to restore native plant species in a degraded foothill zone, involving 100+ students over one year.

## Scoring Table

Criteria	Weight (%)	Score (1-5)	Weighted Score	Justification	
Conservation Impact	40%	5	40	Targets native species with a well-researched habitat plan. Uses baseline biodiversity data and outlines measurable ecological outcomes.	
Educational Value	25%	4	20	Strong curriculum tie-ins and leadership by science teachers. Some assessment methods could be more detailed.	
Community Engagement & Equity	15%	4	6	Includes diverse student body and outreach to parents. Could improve on accessibility and language inclusivity.	
Feasibility & Accountability	10%	5	5	Detailed timeline, milestones, and budget. Clear roles for all partners.	
Collaboration & Matching Support	10%	3	3	Includes school and land trust but lacks outside funding or major in-kind support.	

**Total Score: 74 / 100**