

## Reviewer Rating Sheet

### Instructions:

---

Please assign a numerical rating for each of the criteria below. Scores may range from 1 to 7, with 1 being the worst and 7 being the best. Each scoring criteria is weighted equally. Score descriptors and definitions are as follows:

---

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

---

### CRITERIA

**Impact (30%)** – Will the project have a substantial positive impact on increasing the percentage of people who enter, stay in, or progress through the continuum of care? Will the project have a substantial impact on the priority selected? How closely does the project align with the funding priorities stated in the RFA? Does the project have a sufficient and documented plan to evaluate its impact?

Comments:

### POINTS (1-7):

---

**Feasibility (20%)** – How likely is it that the objectives and activities will be achieved within the scope of the funded project? Is the project well planned? Is the budget appropriate and realistic? Does the budget justification explain in detail the reasoning and need for the costs associated with the project?

Comments:

### POINTS (1-7):

---

**Capacity (20%)** – Does the organization, Project Director and his/her team have the expertise to effectively implement all aspects of the project? Is the organization respected and valued by the target population? Is it culturally competent?

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

---

**Collaboration (15%)**– Does this project enhance collaboration among organizations with similar or complementary goals? Are the roles of the partners appropriate and relevant?

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

---

**Sustainability (10%)** – Is the project likely to be sustained? Are partnerships likely to be sustained past project period? Is the impact likely to be long-term

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

---

**Addressing Affiliate Priority Areas (5%)** –Does the project address the needs of the priority areas defined by the Dallas County Affiliate Community Profile? Is the project likely to have an impact on reducing late stage breast cancer diagnoses and breast cancer mortality in the Affiliate priority areas?

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

---

<b>Total Points:</b>	<b>Average Score (Total score / 5):</b>
----------------------	---

Additional Comments: