Reviewer Scorecard: NNLM Health Information Outreach RFP (Express)

Please direct any questions about this scorecard to your Regional Medical Library contact or to the NNLM National Evaluation Center Evaluation and Continuous Improvement Team.

NNLM Regional Medical Library or Office:

- Region 1: Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and District of Columbia
- Region 2: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands
- 🔿 Region 3: Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Texas
- O Region 4: Arizona, Idaho, Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming
- O Region 5: Alaska, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and U.S. Territories and Freely Associated
- States O Region 6: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin
- O Region 7: Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont
- NNLM Evaluation Center (NEC)
- NNLM Public Health Coordination Office (NPHCO)
- NNLM Training Office (NTO)
- NNLM Web Services Office (NWSO)
- All of Us Community Engagement Center (CEC)
- All of Us Training and Education Center (TEC)

Title of Applicant's Project or Proposal:

Applicant's Institution:

Reviewer's Initials:

Significance (10 points maximum)								
	Poor (1 point)	Fair (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Very Good (4 points)	Excellent (5 points)			
Application clearly explains the need for the project including demographic information about the target population or geographic area. (5 points)	0	0	0	0	0			
Application contributes to NNLM goals and objectives. See NNLM goals and objectives. (5 points)	0	0	0	0	0			



Methodology/Approach (20 J	points maxim	ium)			
	Poor (1 point)	Fair (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Very Good (4 points)	Excellent (5 points)
Application proposes an approach that is suitable for the target population and geographic area and includes data to support this. (5 points)	0	0	0	0	0
Application clearly outlines activities, milestones, and methods that are feasible and relevant to the project. (5 points)	0	0	0	0	0
Application provides a rationale for selecting the proposed approach(es) and includes the use of NLM products where appropriate. (5 points)	0	0	0	0	0
Application provides an effective plan to promote the project. (5 points)	0	0	0	0	0
Evaluation (5 points maximu	ım)				
	Poor (1 point)	Fair (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Very Good (4 points)	Excellent (5 points)
Evaluation plan is well aligned with the project goals and objectives and clearly indicates how to measure success and project outcomes. (5 points)	0	0	0	0	0
Project Staff (5 points maxir	num)				
	Poor (1 point)	Fair (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Very Good (4 points)	Excellent (5 points)
Application clearly explains qualifications, roles and time commitment of the project staff. (5 points)	0	0	0	0	0
Budget (5 points maximum)					
	Poor (1 point)	Fair (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Very Good (4 points)	Excellent (5 points)
Proposed budget is appropriate with a budget narrative that justifies expenses. (5 points)	0	0	0	0	0

Page 2



Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (5 points maximum)

Project promotes diversity, equity and inclusion or applicant is a first-time applicant within the five-year funding period*.

No (0 points)
Yes (5 points)
(*First-time applicant criteria not applicable for external reviewers)

Summary and Recommendation for Funding

Summary of Primary Strengths: (This information will be shared with the applicant)

Summary of Primary Weaknesses: (This information will be shared with the applicant)

Other Comments:

Total Score:

Final Recommendation for Funding:

- Application does not fit in the NNLM mission.
- The project will not advance the goals of NNLM.
- O Limited impact or there are concerns about the proposed plan or quality.
- \bigcirc Has strong potential.
- Excellent Application. Will have major impact on NNLM goals.

