**Center for Human Health and the Environment  
Community Mini-Grant Program**

**Instructions**

* Read the application thoroughly before completing the scoring form.
* Scored materials begin on page 3 of the application.
* To help discriminate between applications, please use the NIH 1-9 ranking.
* There are **5 sections** of the proposal to be scored; each one should be scored individually.
* Please only score in whole numbers - no fractions or partial points.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Descriptor** | **Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses** |
| **1** | Exceptional | Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses |
| **2** | Outstanding | Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses |
| **3** | Excellent | Very strong with only some minor weaknesses |
| **4** | Very Good | Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses |
| **5** | Good | Strong but with at least one moderate weakness |
| **6** | Satisfactory | Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses |
| **7** | Fair | Some strengths but with at least one major weakness |
| **8** | Marginal | A few strengths and a few major weaknesses |
| **9** | Poor | Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses |
| **Minor Weakness:** An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact  **Moderate Weakness:** A weakness that lessens impact  **Major Weakness:** A weakness that severely limits impact | | |

* There is an **overall impact** score.
  + This should also be scored 1-9, but is not an average or sum of the individual sections’ scores.
  + This reflects your assessment of the likelihood for the project to have an impact and address environmental health concerns in the stated community. There is an **overall impact** score
* **Please highlight strengths and weaknesses in each section. Be specific and provide suggestions for improvement when possible. For many applicants, this is their first time writing a grant proposal. Your comments will be provided to applicants in an effort to build their grant-writing capacity.**

**Note:** These are nonprofit and community-based organizations, not academics applying for peer-reviewed, federal funding. Keep expectations of scientific rigor, research design, implementation, and evaluation within reason. **Proposals that address education or outreach without data collection are acceptable.**   
[**Click here**](https://chhe.research.ncsu.edu/coec/projects/community-grants/) to see examples of projects that have been funded in previous years.

Please email the completed scoring form to Katy May by **Friday October 22 at 5:00pm**. Scores will be compiled and the top applications will be discussed at a review meeting with CHHE leadership.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Name** |  |
| **Applicant Name** |  |
| **Organization Name** |  |
| **Project Title** |  |
| **Environmental Health Topic Areas** |  |
| **Community Served** |  |

**Reviewers will consider each of the criteria below in the determination of merit, and give a separate score for each. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major community impact.**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Project Overview**   Is there an environmental health topic clearly identified? Does the community demonstrate a need for this project? Does the project seem to address the need? |
| **Strengths**      **Weaknesses**      **Score** (1-9): |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Organizational Experience**   Does the organization’s past experience and/or personnel match the proposed project? Does the organization seem to have the appropriate capacity to conduct the project?  Are appropriate partners included to fill any gaps? |
| **Strengths**      **Weaknesses**      **Score** (1-9): |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Timeline and Implementation Plan**   Is the timeline realistic? Are specific project activities described? Do proposed activities support the community need identified? Do proposed activities support the environmental health issue identified? Are the activities listed sufficient to produce proposed outcomes?  Are potential barriers identified and addressed? |
| **Strengths**      **Weaknesses**      **Score** (1-9): |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Budget**   Is the budget reasonable? Is there anything questionable? Is anything notably missing? |
| **Strengths**      **Weaknesses**      **Score** (1-9): |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Evaluation of Outcomes**   Does the evaluation plan seem reasonable? Are outcomes listed and described?  Do metrics match the proposed outcomes? |
| **Strengths**      **Weaknesses**      **Score** (1-9): |
|  |
| **Overall Impact**  Provide an overall impact score for the proposal using the NIH scale of 1 to 9. This score is *not* an average or sum of the scores for each of sections below. Please explain what informed your score. **Use this section to include any overall grant writing notes to help build the capacity of our applicants.** |
| **Score** (1-9):  **Explanation:**  **Grantsmanship notes:** |