

Application Score Sheet Guide

Overview

Applicant Name:

Reviewer Name:

Rating Table

Rating or Score	Description
Excellent (highest)	Outstanding level of quality; significantly exceeds all aspects of the minimum requirements; high probability of success; no significant weaknesses
Very Good	Substantial response; meets in all aspects and in some cases exceeds, the minimum requirements; good probability of success; no significant weaknesses.
Good	Generally meets minimum requirements; probability of success; significant weaknesses, but correctable.
Marginal	Lack of essential information; low probability for success; significant weaknesses, but correctable.
Unsatisfactory (lowest)	Fails to meet minimum requirements; little likelihood of success; needs major revision to make it acceptable.

Public Health Infrastructure Projects- Continuing

Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Score
1. Does the application align with the purpose of these funds? Is it clear what foundational capability or area they will address? (5 points)	
2. Does the applicant clearly describe the project, what new delivery model(s) or process(es) they are testing and if this has evolved over the span of their project? (10 points) <i>This might include, but is not limited to: Intended outcomes are listed, description of how they are testing new delivery models and/or processes, impact on capacity to fulfill the Foundational Public Health Responsibilities, how the project benefits multiple jurisdictions, how they are building on past success, examples of how the project has evolved, etc.</i>	
3. Does the applicant provide information about new project team members? (5 points) <i>This might include, but is not limited to: The fiscal host, the lead coordinator, project sponsors, project managers, implementation team, leadership, and staff from the other jurisdictions and/or any other partners in the project.</i>	

INFRASTRUCTURE FUND REQUEST FOR APPLICATION

Criteria	Score
<p>4. Does the applicant clearly describe the key accomplishments from the first two years of funding and what was learned so far about transforming the ways in which foundational public health responsibilities are organized, funded and/or delivered? (10 points)</p> <p><i>This might include, but is not limited to: Delivery models that include outcomes or show promise, successful completion of grant workplans, increased capacity of jurisdictions to deliver foundational public health responsibilities, expansion or scalability of different models across Minnesota, distribution of resources (funding, staff, materials, etc.) across multiple jurisdictions, developing structures for collaboration and partnership across jurisdictions (joint initiatives, data sharing agreements, joint powers agreements), etc.</i></p>	
<p>5. Does the applicant clearly describe how this project and Minnesota’s public health system would benefit from an additional two years of funding for the project? Does the applicant describe what additional time and resources allow the project team to do and why it is important? (10 points)</p> <p><i>This might include, but is not limited to: Building on current results, list of outcomes that will have additional impact, increased capacity among multiple jurisdictions, engaging new jurisdictions or partners in the work, gather more data/information for delivery model used, test the current approach with additional CHBs, expand data sets, etc.</i></p>	
TOTAL	/40

Minnesota Department of Health
 Center for Public Health Practice
 625 Robert Street N.
 PO Box 64975
 St. Paul, MN 55164-0975
 651-201-3880
health.ophp.@state.mn.us
<https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/practice/systemtransformation>

02/26/26

To obtain this information in a different format, call: 651-210-3880.