

**Certified Swine Sample Collector (CSSC) Training
Subaward Application Scoring Rubric 2024**

This is the scoring rubric used when assessing a subaward application. First, the funding applications will be scored by the training description, training to national standards, and evaluation of the training. Applications which score well on those criteria will then be evaluated and scored for cost effectiveness. An application that receives a score of zero for any category will not be considered for funding.

Criteria	Excellent Score 9-10	Good Score 6-8	Adequate Score 2-4	Needs Improvement Score 0-2	Score
Training Description	Training description is clear with strong evidence of careful planning and thought	Training description is general, but it is still a good project/idea that can be understood	Training description needs clarity and further planning. Still, it is possible to understand what the project/idea is	Unclear training description or lacks planning and may need additional thought	
Training to National Standards	Training description appears to follow the national program standards	Training description appears to follow the national program standards but adds an additional element.	Training description appears to follow the national program standards but adds significant additional elements.	Training description appears to deviate from the national program standards. May not be fundable	
Planned Evaluation of the Training	There is a detailed and clearly defined plan for evaluating the training experience and outcomes	There is a clear robust plan for evaluating the training experience	There is a minimal plan for evaluating the training	No plans for documenting and/or evaluating the training approach or plans are limited or unclear	

Description / Standards / Evaluation Score: _____

Criteria	Excellent Score 9-10	Good Score 6-8	Adequate Score 3-5	Needs Improvement Score 0-2
Cost Effective/Number of CSSCs Trained	Large impact for amount of funding requested. Excellent benefit for cost.	Moderate impact for amount of funding requested. Good benefit for cost.	Low impact for amount of funding requested. Average benefit for cost.	Lacks potential to impact industry or is unclear. Low benefit for cost.

Cost effectiveness score: _____

Funding Recommendation:

_____ Fully Fund _____ Partially Fund _____ Do Not Fund

Reviewer Comments: