



Confidential Reviewer Rating Sheet

Instructions:

Please assign a score and comment for each of the review criteria below. Scores may range from 1 to 7, with 1 representing a poor application and 7 representing an exceptional or ideal application. Score descriptors and definitions are as follows:

7 Exceptional	Very strong with <u>no</u> weaknesses identified
6 Excellent	Very strong with a few minor weaknesses identified
5 Good	Strong with at least one moderate weakness identified
4 Satisfactory	Some strengths and several moderate weaknesses identified
3 Fair	A few strengths and at least one major weakness identified
2 Marginal	Very few strengths and a few major weaknesses identified
1 Poor	No strengths and several major weaknesses identified

Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen ability to meet criteria

Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens ability to meet criteria

Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits ability to meet criteria

Review Criteria

Impact [20%]: How successful will the project be at increasing the percentage of people who enter, stay in or progress through the continuum of care, thereby reducing breast cancer mortality? To what extent has the applicant demonstrated that the project will have a substantial impact on the selected funding priority?

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

Statement of Need [5%]:: How well has the applicant described the identified need and the population to be served, including race, ethnicity, economic status and breast cancer mortality statistics? How closely does the project align with the funding priorities and target communities stated in the RFA?

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

Project Design [30%]: : How likely is it that proposed activities will be achieved within the scope of the project? How well has the applicant described the project activities to be completed with Komen

funding? To what extent is the proposed project designed to meet the needs of specific communities including the cultural and societal beliefs, values and priorities of each community? How well does the applicant incorporate an evidence-based intervention and/or a promising practice? To the extent collaboration is proposed, how well does the applicant explain the roles, responsibilities and qualifications of project partners? How well does the budget and budget justification explain the need associated with the project?

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

Organization Capacity [15%]: To what extent does the applicant's staff have the expertise to effectively implement all aspects of the project and provide fiscal oversight, including the appropriate licenses, certifications, accreditations, etc. to deliver the proposed services? How well has the applicant demonstrated evidence of success in delivering services to the target population described? To what extent has the applicant demonstrated they have the equipment, resources, tools, space, etc., to implement all aspects of the project?

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

Monitoring and Evaluation [30%]: To what extent will the documented evaluation plan be able to measure progress against the stated project goal and objectives, and the resulting outputs and outcomes? To what extent does the evaluation plan aim to collect the relevant required metrics in Appendix A of the RFA? To what extent are the applicant's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) resources/ expertise likely to adequately evaluate project success?

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

Additional Comments: