

Minnesota Public Health Infrastructure Fund: Application Score Sheet Guide

Applicant Name:

Reviewer Name/Code:

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.

Project Description (For all projects)

Criteria	Score
Does the application align with the purpose of these funds? Is it clear what foundational capability or area they will address? (5 points)	
<p>1. Does the applicant clearly describe the project, what new delivery model(s) or process(es) they are they testing and how this aligns with the purpose of the funds? (10 points)</p> <p><i>This might include, but is not limited to: Intended outcomes are listed, specific and realistic plan, testing new delivery models and/or processes that benefit multiple jurisdictions, focused on population-based public health, demonstrates understanding of foundational public health responsibilities, etc.</i></p>	
<p>2. Does the applicant clearly describe what led them to this project and why it is important to the project partners? (10 points)</p> <p><i>This might include, but is not limited to: Steps that were taken, meetings that were held, who was involved, who made decisions, how decisions were made, who was engaged, how needs were assessed or identified, etc.</i></p>	

INFRASTRUCTURE FUND REQUEST FOR APPLICATION SCORING CRITERIA

Criteria	Score
<p>3. Does the applicant clearly describe the benefits partnering jurisdictions will gain as a result of the project? (10 points)</p> <p><i>This might include, but is not limited to: Describing benefits such as expert/technical support, coaching, information sharing, ability to access more funding, innovation through new models of delivery, cost savings and or efficiencies gained by new processes, sharing knowledge or best practices, increasing specific knowledge, skills, and capacities, etc.</i></p>	
<p>4. Does the applicant clearly describe how this project will support transforming Minnesota’s public health system into one that is seamless, responsive, and publicly supported? (10 points)</p> <p><i>This might include, but is not limited to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sharing expertise, financial and material resources, staff, etc. across jurisdictions.</i> • <i>Identifying ways to fulfill the Foundational Public Health Responsibilities that leverage state, local, regional, and/or tribal resources.</i> • <i>Work across all levels of governmental public health, e.g., city, county, and state.</i> • <i>Data systems and technology communicate with each other.</i> • <i>Align policies, practices at local, regional, and state levels to promote collaboration.</i> • <i>Cost savings and/or more efficient use of public resources</i> • <i>Work across geographic boundaries to address community needs.</i> • <i>Ensure that public health initiatives are geographically, financially, physically, and virtually accessible to address inequities and eliminate barriers.</i> 	
<p>5. Does the applicant list the names, roles, and responsibilities of up to eight people who are on the project team? (10 points)</p> <p><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></p>	
<p>6. With each jurisdiction and/or partner identified, does the applicant clearly describe what has been done, and/or what they are currently doing, to set a strong foundation for successful collaboration on this project? (10 points)</p> <p><i>This might include, but is not limited to: Common vision/goal for the project, clear roles and responsibilities for all who are contributing to the work, partners understanding their roles/responsibilities, multiple communication options, ongoing communication, feedback sought and used, technical collaboration tools (Teams, WebEx, SharePoint, etc.), project management or tracking systems, training and development for all levels of staff, clear goals for the work, principles/rules identified for working together, how decisions are made, what happens if there is conflict, etc.</i></p>	
<p>7. Does the applicant clearly describe how public health leadership from all involved jurisdictions will actively support this project? (10 points)</p> <p><i>This can include, but is not limited to: Inclusion/involvement in the project from the beginning; historical support for the jurisdictions/partners working together on this project or others (joint initiatives, data sharing agreements, joint powers agreements, MOUs); documented meetings</i></p>	

INFRASTRUCTURE FUND REQUEST FOR APPLICATION SCORING CRITERIA

Criteria	Score
<i>where project was/is discussed as leaders, resolution of support from county boards; highlighting the project internally/externally; etc.</i>	
TOTAL	/85

Additional Items for Continuation Projects

Criteria	Score
<p>1. 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, challenges faced and how they were addressed, 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>2. 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	/20

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>

02/26/24

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