Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **ACE Award****CIAC Review Sheet** |

**Instructions**

To be eligible for award consideration, applicants must receive a “yes” to the three initial requirements. For the remaining application sections, check the appropriate box and briefly note any strengths or weaknesses. To provide a starting point for our review discussion, rank the project High, Medium, or Low (see above) when you have completed your individual reviews.

**Initial Requirements**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | The applicant is an individual community member, a representative of a community organization, OR a government representative. |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | The project has completed *at least* one phase of public outreach in the fifteen month period leading up to the award deadline (typically Jan-Mar), which ideally has been assessed and evaluated. |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | The application is no more than 10 typed pages and was submitted with or accompanied by the ACE Award application form. |

**Project Description**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | ❑ N/A | **RATIONALE / INTENTIONAL DESIGN.** A rationale exists for the project’s public participation engagement strategy. Evidence of an intentional public process and plan design exists. Strengths/weaknesses: |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | ❑ N/A | **STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS.** Conducted early in project planning to ensure the project has reached out to the relevant stakeholder groups.Strengths/weaknesses: |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | ❑ N/A | **PEOPLE CENTERED**. Stakeholders have been actively involved in the project’s design and development, with a strong emphasis on community input.Strengths/weaknesses: |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | ❑ N/A | **DIVERSITY AND EQUITY**. The project has promoted stakeholder diversity and equity with early notice and input opportunities for people likely to be affected by the project, with a focus on diverse, historically marginalized communities.Strengths/weaknesses: |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | ❑ N/A | **COMMUNICATION.** Clear and accessible communication, and as appropriate, provided in multiple languages and in non-traditional ways.Strengths/weaknesses: |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | ❑ N/A | **RESOURCES.** Available resources used prudently and effectively. Strengths/weaknesses: |

**Project Outcomes**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | ❑ N/A | **PARTNERSHIP BUILDING.** The project has resulted in strengthened partnerships with local stakeholders, community organizations, government entities, etc.Strengths/weaknesses: |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | ❑ N/A | **INNOVATION.**  New or creative strategies that can be used as an example and tool for implementation in future planning and community engagement efforts.Strengths/weaknesses: |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | ❑ N/A | **FEEDBACK ON COMMUNITY INPUT.** Public participants made aware of how their input was/will be incorporated into final outcomes.Strengths/weaknesses: |

**Assessment/Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | ❑ N/A | **EVALUATION METRICS.** Methods of public engagement have been evaluated as the project has evolved. Evidence exists of project adaptation as a result of evaluation.Strengths/weaknesses: |

**Lessons Learned**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ❑ Yes | ❑ No | ❑ N/A | **LESSONS LEARNED.** Lessons learned, areas for improvement identified, methodological strengths/weaknesses identified.Strengths/weaknesses: |

**Overall Project Rank: ❑ High ❑ Medium ❑ Low**

**Comments, if any, on your ranking:**