
“ENDING HIV IN ALABAMA” FULL APPLICATION SCORING RUBRIC

Full Applications will be evaluated on the three following areas:

1. Project Focus
2. Resources
3. Outcomes

Project Focus (up to 5 points)

Weak (0 - 1 point)

- Application is confusing or unclear
- Project/service is not relevant to the 90-90-90 targets
- The project/service is not well thought-out
- The target audience is not at-risk

Average (2 - 3 points):

- Application provides clear and basic information and how it ties to the organization's ongoing initiatives
- Project/service is tied to at least one of the 90-90-90 targets
- The project/service is not innovative or not evidence-informed/based.
- The target audience is at-risk for HIV

Strong (4 – 5 points)

- Application provides detailed information regarding the scope of the project/service and how it will work in conjunction with ongoing inter- and extra-organizational projects
- Project/service is tied to two or more of the 90-90-90 targets
- The project/service is extremely innovative
- The target audience or audiences are at very-high risk for HIV and/or are disproportionately affected by HIV

Resources (up to 5 points)

Weak (0 - 1 point)

- Organization(s) has/have no experience in this initiative
- Project/service is not sustainable outside of this funding source
- If collaboration project, no clear guidelines of duties

Average (2 - 3 points):

- Organization has some experience in this initiative
- Project/service is sustainable outside of this funding source
- If collaboration project, clear and defined duties between organizations

Strong (4 – 5 points)

- Organization has considerable experience in this initiative
- Project/service is sustainable and may serve as a model for future projects

- If collaboration project, duties between organizations are specific to the strengths of each collaborating partner and are clearly defined with a realistic timeline

Outcomes (up to 5 points)

Weak (0 - 1 point)

- The outcomes are missing one or more SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound) elements
- The evaluation plan is unclear or doesn't measure the project adequately
- The project/service does not utilize any of UAB CFAR's services
- The project/service brings no new information about HIV in Alabama

Average (2 - 3 points):

- The outcomes adhere to SMART and are clear and concise
- The evaluation plan includes formative and summative evaluation
- The project/service utilizes one of UAB CFAR's services
- The project/service has the potential to bring new information about HIV in Alabama

Strong (4 – 5 points)

- The outcomes adhere to SMART and provide a deep understanding of the impact of this project in relation to the local HIV efforts
- The evaluation plan has the above as well as how the project will course-correct in case outcomes are not met during the formative phase
- The project/service utilizes more than one of UAB CFAR's services
- The project/service brings new information about HIV in Alabama that may open new avenues to explore