

John M. Scott Heath Care Trust FY2025 Category II Grant Cycle Application Scoring Criteria Guidance

Scoring Instructions: Scorers are to use the recommended point values as a reference when evaluating applications for Trust funds. Any questions can be directed to City of Bloomington Grant Management Division staff (wbessler@cityblm.org).

Category II-Program (100 Points Total)

1. Project Summary (15 Points)

- A. 15 Points Awarded: The application provides a clear and concise executive summary that communicates what the funding request is for, who the intended service population is, and what the proposed health care benefit would be for the target population and community.
- B. 10 Points Awarded: The application provides an adequate executive summary that communicates what the funding request is for, who the intended service population is, and what the proposed health care benefit would be for the target population and community. However, the executive summary lacks clarity or was not concise enough to explain with limited time.
- C. 5 Points Awarded: The application provides an ambiguous and/or lengthy executive summary that does not adequately communicate what the funding request is for, who the intended service population is, and what the proposed health care benefit would be for the target population.
- D. 0 Points Awarded: The application fails to provide information on what the funding request is for, who the intended service population is, and what the proposed health care benefit would be for the target population and community well.

2. Project or Program Proposal (50 Points)

- A. 50 Points Awarded: The application lists at least one Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) goal that the project/program will address, and the proposal information clearly demonstrates how the project/program will address the CHIP goal. The application clearly articulates how the project/program will address the root cause of the health problem. Local data from reputable sources support actions outlined in the project/program. The application effectively demonstrates how many community members they will serve with the project/program and what their target groups will be with the funding. The organization has a robust procedure in place to ensure legal requirements of the Trust are met with the project/program and financial management will ensure funds are only used for eligible community members. Additionally, the applicant expressed a robust understanding of how the project/program will address the

social determinants of health or provide direct health care services. Application clearly demonstrates how the project/program will help advance health equity.

- B. 35 Points Awarded: The application lists at least one Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) goal that the project/program will address, and the proposal information demonstrates how the project/program will address the CHIP goal. The application provides an adequate explanation on how the project/program will address the root cause of the health problem. Local data from reputable sources support actions outlined in the project/program. The application effectively demonstrates how many community members they will serve with the project/program and what their target groups will be with the funding. The organization has a sufficient procedure in place to ensure legal requirements of the Trust are met with the project/program and financial management will ensure funds are only used for eligible community members. Additionally, the applicant expressed adequate understanding of how the project/program will address the social determinants of health or provide direct health care services. Application demonstrates how the project/program will help advance health equity.
- C. 20 Points Awarded: The application lists at least one Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) goal that the project/program will address, but the proposal information does not clearly demonstrate how the proposed project/program will address a CHIP goal. A connection between the project/program and addressing the root cause of the health problem can be conceived, but the explanation is too vague or unstructured to provide a clear picture of the connection. The application does not provide a clear picture of how many community members they will serve with the project/program and what their target groups will be with the funding. Procedures to ensure the legal requirements of the Trust are met raise questions or may allow non-qualifying community members benefit from Trust funds. The application does not fully address how the project/program will address the social determinants of health or provide direct health care services. Application does not adequately demonstrate how the project/program will help advance health equity.
- D. 0 Points Awarded: The application does not list a Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) goal that the project/program will address. A connection between the project/program and addressing the root cause of the health problem is not demonstrated. The application does not provide or has several inconsistencies regarding how many community members they will serve with the project/program and what their target groups will be with the funding. Procedures to ensure the legal requirements of the Trust are met are insufficient and will allow non-qualifying community members benefit from Trust funds. The application fails to address how the project/program will address the social

determinants of health or provide direct health care services. Application does not demonstrate how the project/program will help advance health equity.

3. Budget (15 Points)

- A. 15 Points Awarded: The budget provided clearly outlines specific project/program line-item costs for Trust funds and other funding sources. The budget includes detailed information about how the project/program will change if full funds are not awarded.
- B. 10 Points Awarded: The budget provided outlines specific project/program line-item costs for Trusts funds but does not outline other funding sources. The budget includes information about how the project/program will change if full funds are not awarded, but it does not list specific expense reductions or other revenue used to cover the difference.
- C. 5 Points Awarded: The budget does not clearly outline the project/program expenses or revenues. Discrepancies between revenues and expenses exist. The budget does not include information about project/program changes that would occur if full funds were not awarded.
- D. 0 Points Awarded: The budget document does not include specific line-items for revenues or expenses.

4. Evaluation (15 Points)

- A. 15 Points Awarded: The application provides more than one quantitative and more than one qualitative evaluation outcome that will measure project/program performance. The evaluation metrics are clearly described and possible to measure. Evaluation tools are listed and discussed. A sample evaluation tool was submitted.
- B. 10 Points Awarded: The application provides at least one quantitative and at least one qualitative evaluation outcome that will measure project/program performance. The evaluation metrics are possible to measure. Evaluation tools are listed and discussed. An evaluation tool sample was not provided.
- C. 5 Points Awarded: The application provides at least one quantitative and at least one qualitative evaluation outcome that may measure project/program performance, but the evaluation metric is not likely possible to measure. No description is provided related to the evaluation tools. An evaluation tool sample was not provided.
- D. 0 Points Awarded: A quantitative and/or qualitative evaluation outcome was not provided.

5. Diversity (5 Points)

- A. 5 Points Awarded: The organization has a board of directors (or equivalent body) that is comprised of $\geq 25\%$ BIPOC members.
- B. 0 Points Awarded: The organization does not have a board of directors (or equivalent body) that is comprised of $\geq 25\%$ BIPOC members.

Category II-Capital (100 Points Total)

1. Capital Project Summary (15 Points)

- A. 15 Points Awarded: The application provides a clear and concise executive summary that communicates what the funding request is for, who the intended service population is, and what the proposed health care benefit would be for the target population and community.
- B. 10 Points Awarded: The application provides an adequate executive summary that communicates what the funding request is for, who the intended service population is, and what the proposed health care benefit would be for the target population and community. However, the executive summary lacks clarity or was not concise enough to explain with limited time.
- C. 5 Points Awarded: The application provides an ambiguous and/or lengthy executive summary that does not adequately communicate what the funding request is for, who the intended service population is, and what the proposed health care benefit would be for the target population.
- D. 0 Points Awarded: The application fails to provide information on what the funding request is for, who the intended service population is, and what the proposed health care benefit would be for the target population and community well.

2. Capital Project Proposal (50 Points)

- A. 50 Points Awarded: The application lists at least one Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) goal that the project will address, and the proposal information clearly demonstrates how the project will address the CHIP goal. The application clearly articulates how the project will address the root cause of the health problem. Local data from reputable sources support actions outlined in the project. The application effectively demonstrates how many community members they will serve with the project and what their target groups will be with the funding. The organization has a robust procedure in place to ensure legal requirements of the Trust are met with the project and financial management will ensure funds are only used for eligible community members. Additionally, the applicant expressed a robust understanding of how the project will address the social determinants of health or provide direct health care services. If applicable, equipment purchase lifetime and use is clearly explained. Application clearly demonstrates how the project/program will help advance health equity.
- B. 35 Points Awarded: The application lists at least one Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) goal that the project will address, and the proposal information demonstrates how the project will address the CHIP goal. The application provides an adequate explanation on how the project will address the

root cause of the health problem. Local data from reputable sources support actions outlined in the project. The application effectively demonstrates how many community members they will serve with the project and what their target groups will be with the funding. The organization has a sufficient procedure in place to ensure legal requirements of the Trust are met with the project and financial management will ensure funds are only used for eligible community members. Additionally, the applicant expressed adequate understanding of how the project will address the social determinants of health or provide direct health care services. If applicable, equipment purchases lifetime and use is adequately explained. Application demonstrates how the project/program will help advance health equity.

- C. 20 Points Awarded: The application lists at least one Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) goal that the project will address, but the proposal information does not clearly demonstrate how the proposed project will address a CHIP goal. A connection between the project and addressing the root cause of the health problem can be conceived, but the explanation is too vague or unstructured to provide a clear picture of the connection. The application does not provide a clear picture of how many community members they will serve with the project and what their target groups will be with the funding. Procedures to ensure the legal requirements of the Trust are met raise questions or may allow non-qualifying community members benefit from Trust funds. The application does not fully address how the project will address the social determinants of health or provide direct health care services. If applicable, equipment purchase lifetime and use is not clearly explained. Application does not adequately demonstrate how the project/program will help advance health equity.
- D. 0 Points Awarded: The application does not list a Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) goal that the project will address. A connection between the project and addressing the root cause of the health problem is not demonstrated. The application does not provide or has several inconsistencies regarding how many community members they will serve with the project and what their target groups will be with the funding. Procedures to ensure the legal requirements of the Trust are met are insufficient and will allow non-qualifying community members benefit from Trust funds. The application fails to address how the project will address the social determinants of health or provide direct health care services. If applicable, equipment purchase lifetime and use is not explained. Application does not demonstrate how the project/program will help advance health equity.

3. Budget (15 Points)

- A. 15 Points Awarded: The budget provided clearly outlines specific project line-item costs for Trust funds and other funding sources. The budget includes

detailed information about how the project will change if full funds are not awarded.

- B. 10 Points Awarded: The budget provided outlines specific project line-item costs for Trusts funds but does not outline other funding sources. The budget includes information about how the project will change if full funds are not awarded, but it does not list specific expense reductions or other revenue used to cover the difference.
- C. 5 Points Awarded: The budget does not clearly outline the project expenses or revenues. Discrepancies between revenues and expenses exist. The budget does not include information about project changes that would occur if full funds were not awarded.
- D. 0 Points Awarded: The budget document does not include specific line-items for revenues or expenses.

4. Evaluation (15 Points)

- A. 15 Points Awarded: The application provides more than one quantitative and more than one qualitative evaluation outcome that will measure project/program performance. The evaluation metrics are clearly described and possible to measure. Evaluation tools are listed and discussed. A sample of the evaluation tools was submitted.
- B. 10 Points Awarded: The application provides at least one quantitative and at least one qualitative evaluation outcome that will measure project/program performance. The evaluation metrics are possible to measure. Evaluation tools are listed and discussed. An evaluation tool sample was not provided.
- C. 5 Points Awarded: The application provides at least one quantitative and at least one qualitative evaluation outcome that may measure project/program performance, but the evaluation metric is not likely possible to measure. No description is provided related to the evaluation tools. An evaluation tool sample was not provided.
- D. 0 Points Awarded: A quantitative and/or qualitative evaluation outcome was not provided.

5. Diversity (5 Points)

- A. 5 Points Awarded: The organization has a board of directors (or equivalent body) that is comprised of $\geq 25\%$ BIPOC members.
- B. 0 Points Awarded: The organization does not have a board of directors (or equivalent body) that is comprised of $\geq 25\%$ BIPOC members.