

WFF Grant Review

Application Name:
 Committee Member:
 Conflict of Interest Y/N:

1. Alignment with Regenerative Agricultural Practices - 30 Points Total Possible

| Criteria | Point Range | Description | Points Awarded | Justification |
|---|-------------|--|----------------|------------------------|
| Strong alignment. Multiple regenerative practices clearly described with long-term goals. | 21-30 | Project shows deep understanding of regenerative principles and high potential for lasting impact. | | Strength: Weakness: |
| Moderate alignment. Some regenerative practices, but plan lacks detail or integration. | 11-20 | Practices are sound but need stronger justification or implementation clarity. | | Strength: Weakness: |
| Weak alignment. Few or poorly explained practices. | 0-10 | Proposal lacks clear regenerative knowledge. | | Strength: Weakness: |

2. Participation in Local/Regional Institutional Food Access Programs - 30 Points Total Possible

| Criteria | Point Range | Description | Points Awarded | Justification |
|---|-------------|--|----------------|------------------------|
| Currently serves multiple institutions (schools, hospitals, food pantries, etc) and has strong community ties | 21-30 | Strong, active engagement with local food access systems. | | Strength: Weakness: |
| Serves at least one institution or has a clear, actionable plan to do so | 11-20 | Moderate engagement or planning phase with credible steps. | | Strength: Weakness: |
| No participation or unclear/incomplete plans for involvement | 0-10 | Limited or no connection to local food access efforts. | | Strength: Weakness: |

3. Feasibility & Quality of Project Proposal - 30 Points Total Possible

| Criteria | Point Range | Description | Points Awarded | Justification |
|---|-------------|---|----------------|------------------------|
| Clear, realistic project plan with appropriate budget and timeline. Appropriate funding request relative to farm size and income; high financial need demonstrated. | 21-30 | Proposal is well thought-out, achievable, and cost-effective. Request aligns with guidelines and demonstrates clear financial need. | | Strength: Weakness: |
| Moderate clarity or small concerns about feasibility. Moderate alignment with funding tier; Adequate need | 11-20 | Plan is reasonable but may have gaps in detail or execution. Some ambiguity in financial justification or tier selection. | | Strength: Weakness: |
| Vague, incomplete, or unrealistic proposal. Misaligned tier or low need demonstrated. | 0-10 | Major concerns about feasibility or unclear goals. Funding request seems excessive or unjustified. | | Strength: Weakness: |

4. Scale of Impact (Acres and Community Benefit) - 10 Points Total Possible

| Criteria | Point Range | Description | Points Awarded | Justification |
|--|-------------|--|----------------|------------------------|
| High potential for impact (e.g., significant acreage, multiple community outcomes) | 7-10 | Substantial environmental and social benefits projected. | | Strength: Weakness: |
| Moderate potential for impact | 4-6 | Meaningful, but limited in scope. | | Strength: Weakness: |
| Low potential or unclear impact | 0-3 | Minimal effect on land or local food systems. | | Strength: Weakness: |

5. Bonus Points - 5 Points Total Possible

| Criteria | Point Range | Description | Points Awarded | Justification |
|--|-------------|---|----------------|------------------------|
| Creative/self-defined performance measures | 1-2 | Proposes innovative ways to track success. | | Strength: Weakness: |
| Willingness to participate in storytelling, demos, or outreach | 1-2 | Helps build community knowledge-sharing. | | Strength: Weakness: |
| Collaboration with other farmers, organizations, or cooperatives | 1 | Indicates broader impact and partnership potential. | | Strength: Weakness: |

TOTAL POINTS

Award Range Recommendations

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| 90-105 Points | Strong candidate for full award amount |
| 75-89 Points | Competitive; may receive partial funding or clarification request |
| Below 75 Points | Not recommended for funding in current round |