

# Attachment B: Grant Application Scoring Criteria

## Overview

A numerical scoring system will be used to evaluate eligible applications. Scores will be used to develop final recommendations.

Rating Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating or Score | Description |
| Excellent **or 5** | Outstanding level of quality; significantly exceeds all aspects of the minimum requirements; high probability of success; no significant weaknesses |
| Very Good **or 4** | Substantial response; meets in all aspects and in some cases exceeds, the minimum requirements; good probability of success; no significant weaknesses. |
| Good **or 3** | Generally meets minimum requirements; probability of success; significant weaknesses, but correctable. |
| Marginal **or 2** | Lack of essential information; low probability for success; significant weaknesses, but correctable. |
| Unsatisfactory **or 1** | Fails to meet minimum requirements; little likelihood of success; needs major revision to make it acceptable. |
| Blank/did not answer **or 0** | Did not answer the question or offered no response |

## Section C: (scored- 100 points)

Organizational History, Values and Capacity (20 points)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria | Score |
| Described the lead organization, including history mission, services, and major programming. | /5 |
| Described how heart disease has impacted the population the organization serves. | /5 |
| Demonstrated advancing racial equity for focus populations. | /5 |
| Applicant has the capacity to address the proposed project plan. Described who will do the work and qualifications. Provided detail about working with other organizations. | /5 |
| Total points for this section | /20 |

Project Narrative (30 points)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria | Score |
| Provided an overview of their project. This includes partners engaged, key activities or strategies highlighted from their workplan, and anticipated outcomes. | /5 |
| Category 1,2 or/and 3 is marked.  b. Described plans to create or enhance community clinical linkage to increase referrals to support adults with hypertension, high cholesterol, or other risk of cardiovascular disease. Activities/strategies are proven or likely to be effective with the focus population  c. Described how their organization will sustain the linkage between community partner and clinic. | /5  X2= |
| Described how they will know their project is successful. | /5 |
| Described plan for ensuring participation from focus population in activities. | /5 |
| Project includes working with a community health worker/patient navigator. OPTIONAL | /5 |
| Total points for this section | /30 |

Community Engagement and Collaboration (20 points)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria | Score |
| There is evidence of collaboration with other eligible community clinics, hospitals, health care providers, or community organizations and/or letters of support are attached. Letters of support are not required but are strongly encouraged. | /10 |
| The focus population is involved in decision making and/or there’s evidence of effective and inclusive engagement with community members. | /5 |
| Project describes how it aligns with at least one of the outcomes in Minnesota’s Action Plan to Address Cardiovascular Disease, Stroke, and Diabetes 2035. | /5 |
| Total points for this section | /20 |

Evaluation and Impact (10 points)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria | Score |
| Described reach of project that include how many participants/patients are expected to benefit from the project. | /5 |
| Described plan to measure project goals and outcomes:   * Create or enhanced existing linkage between clinic and community partner. * Increased referrals to one or more of the three categories to support adults with hypertension, high cholesterol, or other risk of cardiovascular disease. * Improved understanding of social determinants of health and cardiovascular health in priority populations, particularly those that have faced historical health inequities. * Aligned project with at least one of MN 2035 State Plan outcomes. | /5 |
| Total points for this section | /10 |

Workplan-(10 points)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria | Score |
| Data, cultural considerations, lived experience or other evidence that methods are effective in focus populations. | /5 |
| Includes SMART goals, objectives, activities, responsible person, timeline. | /5 |
| Total points for this section | /10 |

Budget and Budget Justification – (10 points)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria | Score |
| Accuracy of proposed budget. | /5 |
| Budget narrative is consistent with the proposed objectives. | /5 |
| Total points for this section | /10 |
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