

Asthma Grant 2010-2011 SCORING RUBRIC

Name of reviewer: _____

Name of applicant: _____

Applications will be evaluated by a grant review panel of three according to the following rubric. Final funding decisions will be made by the Indiana State Department of Health's Asthma Program. Category One and Category Two have two different scoring rubrics. The reviewer will use the scoring rubric that corresponds to the category chosen by the applicant. Each applicant will be awarded a total number of points which will then be divided by the total possible number of points. Each of the two categories has a different total number of points and the final total points will not be comparable between the two categories. Only the highest scoring applicants from each of the two categories will be awarded funding.

CATEGORY ONE

I. Organizational Capacity

1. The extent to which the applicant demonstrated the need and readiness for an asthma coalition within a region.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description is partial or vague; applicant demonstrates poor understanding of needs; applicant demonstrates poor ability to meet needs.	Description is generally clear; applicant demonstrates adequate understanding of needs; applicant demonstrates adequate ability to meet needs.	Description is extensive; applicant demonstrates deep and extensive understanding of needs; applicant demonstrates strong ability to meet needs.

2. The extent to which the applicant demonstrated alignment with the Indiana State Asthma Program's Work Plan goals, objectives, and/or strategies.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description is partial or vague; little evidence of is provided to support accomplishing the ISDH Asthma Program Work Plan goals, objectives, and/or strategies.	Description is clear; some evidence is provided to support accomplishing the ISDH Asthma Program Work Plan goals, objectives, and/or Strategies.	Description is extensive; extensive evidence is provided to support accomplishing the ISDH Asthma Program Work Plan goals, objectives, and/or strategies.

3. The extent to which the applicant demonstrated collaboration with other organizations.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description is partial or vague; little evidence of collaboration is provided; collaboration appears to be on paper only.	Description is clear; some evidence of collaboration is provided; collaboration appears adequate but not extensive.	Description is extensive; extensive evidence is provided; collaboration appears extensive.

II. Budget

1. The extent to which the proposed budget is reasonable and appropriate. (Format should resemble page 11 and 12 of grant application.)

0	1	2	3
No budget proposal is provided.	Budget is partial or vague; budget appears inadequate or inappropriate; budget appears poorly planned.	Budget is generally clear; budget appears appropriately planned; budget seems adequate.	Budget is very clear; budget is very well-planned.

2. The extent to which the budget items are justified.

0	1	2	3
No budget justification is provided.	Proposal/Justification is unclear; activities and expenditures are not clearly linked to outcomes; outcomes provided in plan are very different from overarching project goals; outcomes are unrealistic or not measurable.	Proposal/Justification is generally clear; activities and expenditures are somewhat clearly linked to outcomes; outcomes provided in plan are somewhat similar to overarching project goals; outcomes are measurable and somewhat realistic.	Proposal/Justification is extensive; activities and expenditures are very clearly linked to outcomes; outcomes provided in plan are very similar to overarching project goals; outcomes are ambitious yet realistic and measurable.

III. Grant Narrative

1. Described the need for a county or regional asthma coalition.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description is partial or vague; applicant demonstrates poor understanding of needs; applicant demonstrates poor ability to meet needs.	Description is generally clear; applicant demonstrates adequate understanding of needs; applicant demonstrates adequate ability to meet needs.	Description is extensive; applicant demonstrates deep and extensive understanding of needs; applicant demonstrates strong ability to meet needs.

2. Included the names of possible coalition partners along with letters indicating their intent to participate.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Partner list is partial or vague; Does not have letters indicating the partner's intent to participate.	Partner list is generally clear; Includes letters for some of the partners but not all.	Partner list is extensive; Every partner on the list has a corresponding letter indicating their intent to participate.

3. Explained how they will collaborate with other agencies/organizations, especially those who have agreed to be partners.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description of the collaboration is partial or vague.	Description of collaboration is generally clear; most of the partners with letters have collaboration explanations.	Description of collaboration is extensive; all of the partners with letters have collaboration explanations.

4. Described how they will recruit community members to be a part of the county or regional coalition. Included their plans for publicizing and marketing the coalition.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description of recruitment plans are partial or vague; did not include their plans for publicizing/marketing the coalition.	Description of recruitment plans are generally clear; Included a general description of their plans for publicizing/marketing the coalition.	Description of recruitment plans are extensive; Included an extensive and detailed plan for publicizing/marketing the coalition.

5. Provided a description of the goals and planned activities for the first year of the coalition.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description of the goals/planned activities is partial or vague.	Description of the goals/planned activities is generally clear.	Description of the goals/planned activities is extensive.

6. Provided an evaluation plan to assess the effectiveness of the coalition.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Evaluation plan is partial or vague.	Evaluation plan is generally clear.	Evaluation plan is extensive.

7. Identified other potential future funding sources and created a sustainability plan to support the coalition.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Potential future funding list is partial or vague; Does not have a sustainability plan.	Potential future funding list is generally clear; Sustainability plan is clear but not detailed.	Potential future funding list is extensive; Sustainability plan is clear, extensive, and detailed.

8. Provided a written justification for each item listed in their proposed budget.

0	1	2	3
No budget justification is provided.	Justification is unclear; activities and expenditures are not clearly linked to outcomes; outcomes provided in plan are very different from overarching project goals; outcomes are unrealistic or not measurable.	Justification is generally clear; activities and expenditures are somewhat clearly linked to outcomes; outcomes provided in plan are somewhat similar to overarching project goals; outcomes are measurable and somewhat realistic.	Justification is extensive; activities and expenditures are very clearly linked to outcomes; outcomes provided in plan are very similar to overarching project goals; outcomes are ambitious yet realistic and measurable.

IV. Extra Comments

Please write any extra comments in the space provided below. (Please also indicate, in this section, if the applicant has requested funding for any item that is on the Funding Restrictions list):

V. Total Score

_____ out of a possible **39 total points**

Please add up the scores from each question in order to receive a total score for the applicant.

CATEGORY TWO

I. Organizational Capacity

1. The extent to which the applicant demonstrated the need for the evidence-based practice in the community.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description is partial or vague; applicant demonstrates poor understanding of needs; applicant demonstrates poor ability to meet needs.	Description is generally clear; applicant demonstrates adequate understanding of needs; applicant demonstrates adequate ability to meet needs.	Description is extensive; applicant demonstrates deep and extensive understanding of needs; applicant demonstrates strong ability to meet needs.

2. The extent to which the applicant justified the selection of the specific evidence-based practice.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description is partial or vague; applicant demonstrates poor reasoning for the selection of the intervention; the intervention is not evidence-based.	Description is generally clear; applicant demonstrates adequate reasoning for the selection of the intervention; the intervention is evidence-based.	Description is extensive; applicant demonstrates deep and extensive reasoning for the selection of the intervention; the intervention is evidence-based.

3. The extent to which the applicant demonstrated the ability to implement the proposed activities.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description is partial or vague; applicant demonstrates poor ability to implement the proposed activities.	Description is generally clear; applicant demonstrates adequate ability to implement the proposed activities.	Description is extensive; applicant demonstrates extensive ability to implement the proposed activities.

4. The extent to which the applicant demonstrated alignment with the Indiana State Asthma Program's Work Plan goals, objectives, and/or strategies.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description is partial or vague; little evidence of is provided to support accomplishing the ISDH Asthma Program Work Plan goals, objectives, and/or strategies.	Description is clear; some evidence is provided to support accomplishing the ISDH Asthma Program Work Plan goals, objectives, and/or Strategies.	Description is extensive; extensive evidence is provided to support accomplishing the ISDH Asthma Program Work Plan goals, objectives, and/or strategies.

5. The extent to which the applicant demonstrated collaboration with other organizations.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description is partial or vague; little evidence of collaboration is provided; collaboration appears to be on paper only.	Description is clear; some evidence of collaboration is provided; collaboration appears adequate but not extensive.	Description is extensive; extensive evidence is provided; collaboration appears extensive.

II. Budget

1. The extent to which the proposed budget is reasonable and appropriate. (Format should resemble page 11 and 12 of grant application.)

0	1	2	3
No budget proposal is provided.	Budget is partial or vague; budget appears inadequate or inappropriate; budget appears poorly planned.	Budget is generally clear; budget appears appropriately planned; budget seems adequate.	Budget is very clear; budget is very well-planned.

2. The extent to which the budget items are justified.

0	1	2	3
No budget justification is provided.	Proposal/Justification is unclear; activities and expenditures are not clearly linked to outcomes; outcomes provided in plan are very different from overarching project goals; outcomes are unrealistic or not measurable.	Proposal/Justification is generally clear; activities and expenditures are somewhat clearly linked to outcomes; outcomes provided in plan are somewhat similar to overarching project goals; outcomes are measurable and somewhat realistic.	Proposal/Justification is extensive; activities and expenditures are very clearly linked to outcomes; outcomes provided in plan are very similar to overarching project goals; outcomes are ambitious yet realistic and measurable.

III. Grant Narrative

1. Described the need for asthma awareness in the community.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description is partial or vague; applicant demonstrates poor understanding of needs.	Description is generally clear; applicant demonstrates adequate understanding of needs.	Description is extensive; applicant demonstrates deep and extensive understanding of needs.

2. Described the evidence-based intervention they plan to implement.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description is partial or vague; Did not explain how the intervention was evidence-based.	Description is generally clear; Provides some examples of other similar evidence based interventions but did not explain how their intervention would be evidence-based.	Description is extensive; Gave examples of other similar evidence based interventions and explained in detail how their intervention is evidence-based.

3. Described the rationale for picking this evidence based intervention.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description is partial or vague; no complete rationale given.	Description is generally clear; some rationalization is given but the rationalization is not explained in detail.	Description is extensive; rationalization is complete and detailed.

4. Provided a source of reference for the specific evidence-based intervention they plan to implement.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description of source of reference is partial or vague; only one source given.	Description of source of reference is generally clear; only a few sources given.	Description of source of reference is extensive; many sources are provided.

5. Provided an overview of how they plan to implement the evidence-based intervention they have selected.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Overview of the implementation plan is partial or vague.	Overview of the implementation plan is generally clear.	Overview of the implementation plan is extensive.

6. Describe how you will collaborate with other agencies/organizations.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description of the collaboration is partial or vague; no documents to support collaboration.	Description of collaboration is generally clear; some documents to support collaboration.	Description of collaboration is extensive; many documents to support collaboration.

7. Provide a description of the goals and planned activities for the first year of the evidence-based intervention.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Description of the goals/planned activities is partial or vague.	Description of the goals/planned activities is generally clear.	Description of the goals/planned activities is extensive.

8. Provide an evaluation plan of the selected evidence-based intervention.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Evaluation plan is partial or vague.	Evaluation plan is generally clear.	Evaluation plan is extensive.

9. Identify other potential future funding sources and create a sustainability plan for your evidence-based intervention.

0	1	2	3
No information is provided.	Potential future funding list is partial or vague; Does not have a sustainability plan.	Potential future funding list is generally clear; Sustainability plan is clear but not detailed.	Potential future funding list is extensive; Sustainability plan is clear, extensive, and detailed.

10. Provide a written justification for each item listed in your proposed budget.

0	1	2	3
No budget justification is provided.	Justification is unclear; activities and expenditures are not clearly linked to outcomes; outcomes provided in plan are very different from overarching project goals; outcomes are unrealistic or not measurable.	Justification is generally clear; activities and expenditures are somewhat clearly linked to outcomes; outcomes provided in plan are somewhat similar to overarching project goals; outcomes are measurable and somewhat realistic.	Justification is extensive; activities and expenditures are very clearly linked to outcomes; outcomes provided in plan are very similar to overarching project goals; outcomes are ambitious yet realistic and measurable.

IV. Extra Comments

Please write any extra comments in the space provided below. (Please also indicate, in this section, if the applicant has requested funding for any item that is on the Funding Restrictions list):

V. Total Score _____ out of a possible **51 total points**

Please add up the scores from each question in order to receive a total score for the applicant.

Asthma Grant Funding Restrictions

Restrictions, which must be taken into account while writing the budget, are as follows:

- Recipients may not use funds for research. Public health surveillance and program evaluation activities for the purpose of monitoring program performance are not considered research. However, any identifiable information collected must be kept confidential.
- Recipients may not use funds for patient clinical care.
- Recipients may not use funds for personal health services, medications, medical devices (such as spacers or peak flow meters), or other costs associated with the medical management of asthma.
- Recipients may not use funds to pay for scholarships for children to attend asthma camps.
- Recipients may not use funds for asthma screenings, asthma screenings supplies, or population-based asthma registry activities.
- Recipients may not use funds for construction.
- Recipients may not use funds to purchase items such as pillow case/mattress covers, vacuum cleaners, cleaning supplies, or remediation projects.
- Recipients may not use funds to pay fees to take the Asthma Educator Certification exam.
- Recipients may not use funds for promotional items such as t-shirts, pens, etc.
- Recipients may not generally use HHS/CDC/ATSDR funding for the purchase of furniture or equipment.
- Recipients may only expend funds for reasonable program purposes, including personnel, travel, supplies, and services, such as contractual.