

COF Barclay-Giel Seed Grant Applications - 2019

Round Two Scoring Guide

Instructions to reviewers about scoring:

Thank you for volunteering to participate in this year's grants scoring process. The first round of scoring was based on most, but not all, of the information provided in each application. The top 25% (approximately) of the applications scored in the first round will be scored in the second round. This next round of scoring will be based on a holistic review utilizing all the information provided in the application (including the budget spreadsheet and letter of recommendation). Thus, your evaluation/scores will be somewhat more subjective. Please use the full range of points for scoring each criterion. Enter the total scores into the on-line spreadsheet. Score sheets must be completed, scanned and emailed to CDR Mark Milner at mark.miller2@nih.gov. If you have any formal connection to an organization that provided an application, please recuse yourself from participating in the scoring process.

The American Public Health Association (APHA) describes the practice of public health this way: "Public health promotes and protects the health of people and the communities where they live, learn, work and play. While a doctor treats people who are sick, those of us working in public health try to prevent people from getting sick or injured in the first place. We also promote wellness by encouraging healthy behaviors. From conducting scientific research to educating about health, people in the field of public health work to assure the conditions in which people can be healthy." (www.apha.org/what-is-public-health)

Although nearly all the application projects to be reviewed in Round 2 address some aspect of an important public health issue and no doubt are of value, the review of the second round of applications will primarily focus on the tenants of public health described above. These are projects that have a strong disease and injury prevention aspect which could include promoting wellness, early detection and early interventions, and/or protecting community health. Projects that provide health care to individuals (e.g., dental repairs) or emergency health treatment (e.g., distributing naloxone) may or may not have a prevention component. As a reviewer, you must determine the disease or injury prevention value of the proposed project. This distinction is critical in scoring each project. You also will need to make determinations about other aspects of the proposed project including the organization's experience and capability, significance of the COF contribution amount to the success of the project, community support, and the project viability if the applicant is offered less COF funds than requested. Your brief written comments are important to supporting each of the scores that you provide.

Again, thank you for your willingness to review and score these applications.

Round Two Score Sheet

Reviewer's Rank and Name: _____

Reviewer's Email Address: _____

Please complete and submit the score sheet as directed.

| Criterion | Score | Reviewer's Comments |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| The disease or injury <u>prevention</u> value of the proposed project. Prorate the points based on degree of <u>prevention</u> . Less if mixed prevention and treatment. No points if there is no prevention aspect. Maximum number of points: 20 | | |
| The potential of the project to protect or improve the health of the specific population targeted, factoring in the likelihood of achieving the project's goals successfully as described. (E.g., potential to actually reduce obesity in children targeted by project). Maximum 15 points for high potential; prorate for lesser potential. | | |
| Organization capability to manage the project well and achieve the desired outcome (consider experience, a well-documented plan/budget; and ability to track progress). Maximum 10 points for fully capable; fewer points if there is uncertainty about capability. | | |
| Significance of COF funds to the success of the project. Maximum 10 points for the COF funds being critical, to no points if the COF funds are a very small percentage of the overall project funding. | | |
| Evidence of community support for the project based on having partner organizations and/or letters of support. 10 points for strong support, prorated to no points if there is no evidence of community support. | | |
| Add up points (max total = 65): TOTAL | | |
| Also, as a reviewer, please provide your opinion about the likelihood the organization could proceed with a viable scaled down project if given half the COF funds requested. | | |

4/3/2019