



Grant Review Panel Scoring Criteria

Each grant application will be reviewed by at least three reviewers from the community. Reviewers will consider each of the following selection criteria:

- **Impact 25%:** 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?
- **Statement of Need 15%:** 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?
- **Project Design 20%:** 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?
- **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?
- **Monitoring and Evaluation 15%:** 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 are the applicant’s monitoring and evaluation (M&E) resources/ expertise likely to adequately evaluate project success?
- **Social Determinants of Health [10%]:** To what extent does the proposed project have the capacity, plans, and partnerships in place to successfully address social determinants of health? How relevant and appropriate are the partners (if applicable) listed to addressing social determinants of health? Does each Pathway have a clearly defined Completion Step that is achievable and measurable? Are the patient needs assessment and Pathways forms included in the Project Work Plan appropriate, measurable, and comprehensive?

The grant application process is competitive, regardless of whether or not an organization has received a grant in the past. Funding in subsequent years is never guaranteed.

A score is assigned to each of the above five categories. Categories are assigned a number on a scale of 0-7, with 0 being the lowest and 7 being the highest, based on the following definitions:

7	Exceptional	Very strong with no 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		