



National Library of Medicine

Network of the National Library of Medicine

Health Information Outreach RFP Scorecard

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:

* must provide value

- 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
- Region 4: Arizona, Idaho, Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming
- Region 5: Alaska, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and U.S. Territories and Freely Associated States
- Region 6: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin
- Region 7: Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont
- NLM User Engagement Program (UEP)
- NNLM Evaluation Center (NEC)
- NNLM Public Health Coordination Office (NPHCO)
- NNLM Training Office (NTO)
- NNLM Web Services Office (NWSO)
- NNLM National Center for Data Services (NCDS)
- NNLM All of Us Program Center (NAPC)

Title of Applicant's Project or Proposal:

Applicant's Institution:

Reviewer's Initials:

Significance (15 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)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Applicant effectively uses data (e.g., statistics, anecdotes, needs assessment) to demonstrate the project need. (5 points)

Application contributes to NNLM goals and objectives. See [NNLM goals and objectives](#). (5 points)

Methodology (40 points maximum)

	Poor (1 point)	Fair (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Very Good (4 points)	Excellent (5 points)
Application demonstrates the ability to execute the project within the proposed timeline. (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Application proposes an approach that is suitable for the target population and geographic area and includes data to support this. (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Application demonstrates appropriate use of NLM materials and products, if available. (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Application provides a rationale for selecting the proposed approach(es). (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Application is creative, original, or demonstrates the potential to serve as a model for a similar NNLM project. (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Application clearly outlines activities, milestones, and methods that are feasible and relevant to the project. (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Application provides a long-term plan to sustain and continue the project, sustain one or more key components, or incorporate lessons learned into future projects. (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Application provides an effective and/or creative plan to promote the project. (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Evaluation (15 points maximum)

	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. (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evaluation plan clearly indicates how to measure success and project outcomes. (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evaluation clearly explains types of data that would be collected, who will collect the data, methods of data collection (instruments/ tools and frequency of data collection) and analysis, and how project findings will be shared and used. (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Note: Plans with only 1 component should be scored as poor, 2 components as fair, 3 components as good, 4 components as very good, and all 5 components as excellent.

Project Staff (15 points maximum)

	Poor (1 point)	Fair (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Very Good (4 points)	Excellent (5 points)
Application clearly explains qualifications (expertise and experience) of the project lead and the project staff. (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Application clearly identifies and outlines roles and time commitment of the project lead, project staff, (and project partners, if needed). (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Application provides information on institutional resources (e.g. equipment) and support to be utilized for the project. (5 points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Budget (10 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)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Proposed budget includes only expenses that are allowable under the Regional Medical Library or Office and NIH regulations. (5 points) See NIH Regulations .	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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:

As of 02/04/2025, the maximum Total Score possible is 95, not 100.

Final Recommendation for Funding:

* must provide value

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

Submit

Powered by REDCap