

Health Information Outreach RFP Scorecard

Please complete the scorecard below. All sub-criteria will be scored on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being poor, 2 being fair, 3 being good, 4 being good and 5 being excellent. If you have any questions, please refer to the reviewer's instruction sheet.

-
- 1) Regional Medical Library
- SEA
 - NER
 - PSR
 - GMR
 - PNR
 - MAR
 - SCR
 - MCR
-

- 2) Title of Project or Proposal
-

- 3) Institution
-

- 4) Reviewer's Initials
-

Significance (15 points maximum)

- 5) Application clearly explains the need for the project including demographic information about the target population or geographic area. (5 points)
- Poor
 - Fair
 - Good
 - Very Good
 - Excellent
-
- 6) Applicant effectively uses data (e.g., statistics, anecdotes, needs assessment) to demonstrate the project need. (5 points)
- Poor
 - Fair
 - Good
 - Very Good
 - Excellent
-
- 7) Application contributes to NNLM goals and objectives. See NNLM goals and objectives. (5 points)
- Poor
 - Fair
 - Good
 - Very Good
 - Excellent

Methodology/Approach (40 points maximum)

- 8) Application proposes an approach that is suitable for the target population and geographic area and includes data to support this. (5 points)
- Poor
 - Fair
 - Good
 - Very Good
 - Excellent
-
- 9) Application clearly outlines activities, milestones, and methods that are feasible and relevant to the project. (5 points)
- Poor
 - Fair
 - Good
 - Very Good
 - Excellent

-
- 10) Application provides a rationale for selecting the proposed approach(es). (5 points)
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent
-
- 11) Application demonstrates the ability to execute the project within the proposed timeline. (5 points)
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent
-
- 12) Application demonstrates appropriate use of NLM materials and products, if available. (5 points)
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent
-
- 13) Application is creative, original, or demonstrates the potential to serve as a model for a similar NNLM project. (5 points)
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent
-
- 14) 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)
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent
-
- 15) Application provides an effective and/or creative plan to promote the project. (5 points)
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent

Evaluation (15 points maximum)

-
- 16) Evaluation plan is well aligned with the project goals and objectives (5 points)
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent
-
- 17) Evaluation plan clearly indicates how to measure success and project outcomes. (5 points)
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent
-
- 18) 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)
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent
- (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)

- 19) Application clearly explains qualifications (expertise and experience) of the project lead and the project staff. (5 points)
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent
-
- 20) Application clearly identifies and outlines roles and time commitment of the project lead, project staff, (and project partners, if needed). (5 points)
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent
-
- 21) Application provides information on institutional resources (e.g. equipment) and support to be utilized for the project. (5 points)
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent

Budget (10 points maximum)

- 22) Proposed budget is appropriate with a budget narrative that justifies expenses. (5 points)
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent
-
- 23) Proposed budget includes only expenses that are allowable under the Regional Medical Library or Office and NIH regulations. (5 points) See
- Poor
 Fair
 Good
 Very Good
 Excellent

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (5 points maximum)

- 24) 1) Application identifies inequities and disparities and suggests appropriate approaches to enhance diversity, equity, and inclusion *OR*
 2) The target population of the project is underrepresented in biomedical research (UBR). See definitions of UBR populations.
- No
 Yes

Summary and Recommendation for Funding

- 25) Summary of Primary Strengths

(This information will be shared with the applicant)

- 26) Summary of Primary Weaknesses

(This information will be shared with the applicant)

27) Other Comments

28) Total Score

29) Final Recommendation for Funding

- 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.