



STAC FY17 Workshop Proposal Scoring Rubric

Please take a moment to evaluate each of the workshop proposals submitted for FY17. The following criteria may serve as a checklist for what each proposal should include. For each proposal, please provide a score (0-4, with four being the highest) based on how well the given proposal fulfills each criterion. Workshops are listed in alphabetical order by title:

- 4 – Agree Strongly
- 3 – Agree
- 2 – Neutral
- 1 – Disagree
- 0 – Not evaluated

- 1. Demonstrated policy relevance to the Chesapeake Bay Ecosystem:** The scientific/technical objectives and products of the proposed workshop are strongly relevant to current and/or future conditions of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem.
- 2. Appropriateness for STAC:** The scientific/technical objectives and products of the proposed workshop are strongly linked to STAC activities and priorities.
- 3. Clearly organized plan:** A clear plan and timeline is presented that will likely lead to the workshop successfully achieving its objectives.
- 4. SC qualifications:** The steering committee contains appropriate representation on this topic, and members are well qualified to conduct the proposed activities and ensure that workshop products are produced in a timely manner.
- 5. Effectiveness as a workshop activity:** A workshop, rather than a review, literature synthesis/white paper, or factsheet, is clearly the appropriate vehicle for the proposed activity.

Criterion for Evaluation	Proposal #1	Proposal #2	Proposal #3	Proposal #4	Proposal #5	Proposal #6
Criteria #1 Demonstrated policy relevance to the Chesapeake Bay						
Criteria #2 Appropriateness for STAC						
Criteria #3 Clearly organized plan						
Criteria #4 SC qualifications						
Criteria #5 Effectiveness as a workshop						