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Objectives

Participants will:

- Understand the basic CATCH scoring process
- Understand the three-section system for scoring CATCH grants
- Be aware of upcoming changes to CATCH scoring and CATCH grant guidelines
Disclosures

- I have no relevant financial relationships with the manufacturers of any commercial products or provider of commercial products or services discussed in my presentation.

- I will not discuss unapproved use of any commercial products in my presentation.
Scoring Basics
Who, What, and Why of CATCH Scoring
Why Score?

• Ensure funded proposals meet criteria as “CATCH grants” as outlined in the Call for Proposals

• Give preference to proposals meeting CATCH program priorities as outlined in the Call for Proposals

• Fund the best proposals
Scoring Timeline

- After deadline, CATCH staff review applications for certain ineligibilities
- For potential ineligibles, District CATCH Facilitator confirms ineligible or determines should be scored
- Applications posted for scoring
- Comments to applicant not seen by staff until after scoring period has closed
- *If you have a question, directly contact staff and/or DCF during the scoring period*
Who Scores?

- Planning & Implementation applications
  - Chapter CATCH Facilitator
  - District CATCH Facilitator
  - Random District CATCH Facilitator
  - CATCH Staff

- Resident applications
  - Chapter CATCH Facilitator
  - District CATCH Facilitator
  - District Resident CATCH Liaison
  - Randomly selected District Resident CATCH Liaison or at-large Resident Liaison
  - Randomly selected National Resident Liaison
  - CATCH staff
Items Scored Only by CATCH Staff

- Application is for a new project or a new component of an existing program
- CATCH is the sole source of funding for the proposed project
- New or previously unfunded applicant to CATCH
  - Does not apply to former resident grantees who are applying for a Planning or Implementation Grant
Local Knowledge & Conflict of Interest

- Facilitator’s local knowledge is desirable in the scoring process
- If facilitator has a conflict of interest, facilitator should notify staff
- Providing TA to the applicant does not constitute a conflict of interest
- CCF applicants may only score resident applications
- CCF resident applicant mentors are ineligible to score all resident applications
- DRL applicants and coapplicants are ineligible to score all applications
Scoring Do’s

- Always re-read the Call for Proposals before scoring
  - Prerequisites
  - Priorities
  - “Cannot support” list
  - Unallowable expenses
  - Budget guidelines

- Always provide constructive comments to the applicant
Scoring System

Anatomy of a Score

Sections
Anatomy of a Score

- Letter grade: A or B
  - CATCH vs. Not CATCH
  - Indicates if proposal meets CATCH criteria as outlined in the Call for Proposals
  - Multiple B grades make an application ineligible for funding
    - Planning & Implementation: B from two scorers makes ineligible
    - Resident: B from three scorers makes ineligible
  - Score a B if you think it’s a B: Will not be ineligible unless someone else made the same assessment

- Number score
  - Reflects quality of the application in meeting CATCH requirements and priorities
Scoring Structure

- Section I: Application Criteria
- Section II: Prerequisites
- Section III: Priorities
- The forest and the trees
  - Order of the scoring sections has you score the individual items in the application (the “trees”) and then the proposal overall (the “forest”)
## Scoring: Section I - Application Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION I: APPLICATION CRITERIA</th>
<th>Inadequate (0 points)</th>
<th>Meets Criteria (1 point)</th>
<th>Exceeds Criteria (2 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keywords and proposal abstract clearly stated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target population is described: number of children affected identified and demographic information supplied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community in which target population is located is clearly described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community barriers impacting access to a medical home and other needed health care services are clearly described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed project addresses access barriers in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present and future collaborative partners and their roles described, including community members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatrician’s leadership is evident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-related planning activities completed to date documented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall goals of the program clearly stated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project activities for grant period described, with timeline clearly presented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-range goals described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for sustainability described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods for measurement of project goals and objectives described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and budget justification provided, including appropriate expenses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past, current and future funding sources identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section I: Did they answer the questions?

- Follows the application questions although not all questions are specifically scored
- Scored as 0-1-2 points
- Change not in scoring but in descriptors for 0-1-2
  - 0 = Inadequate: does not have all the required information
  - 1 = Meets Criteria (was “Adequate”): all required information for the item provided
  - 2 = Exceeds Criteria (was “Superior”): answer demonstrates a deep understanding
- Scores of 2 (“Exceeds Criteria”) should be given rarely
## Scoring: Section II - Prerequisites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION II: PREREQUISITES</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project is for planning activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project includes plans for community partnerships.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget reflects project timeline and activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning activities will lead to a program that increases children’s access to a medical home or specific health services not otherwise available.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods for measurement of project goals and objectives described.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section II: Does the project meet the prerequisites?

- Designed to assist in determining letter grade
- Does the project meet the minimum criteria for being a CATCH project?
  - Section III allows scoring how well the proposal meets criteria
- Prerequisites clearly outlined in Call for Proposals
- Scored as 0 (No) or 1 (Yes)
Section II: A or B Letter Grade

- Any “no” in Section II makes letter grade B likely
  - Exception: budgets can be adjusted within reason
  - Might be other case-by-case exceptions

- All “yes” in Section II does not mandate letter grade A
  - “Cannot support” list and unallowable expenses not detailed in Section II
    - Planning/implementation grant focused only on internal improvements to a practice or outreach only to practice patients
    - Proposal focused only on professional education for physicians or residents
    - Etc.
### Scoring: Section III - Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION III: PRIORITIES</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning activities will lead to a program that assesses children’s medical home status and connects children who previously had none with a medical home.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning activities will lead to a program that increases access to needed health services not otherwise available.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning activities will lead to a program that predominantly serves a population known to be underserved or with demonstrated health disparities.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning activities will lead to a program that assesses children’s health insurance status and connects them with available insurance programs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project addresses an important need, and project activities are likely to achieve the stated goals.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant is a practicing community-based pediatrician.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The applicant pediatrician plays a leadership role in the project.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community partnerships are broad-based.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A CATCH Facilitator provided technical assistance to this applicant. Do not check “yes” unless you, the reviewer, or (for CCFs) your co-CCF provided the assistance.</td>
<td>□ Yes (1 pt)</td>
<td>□ No (0 pt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III: How well does the proposal reflect CATCH priorities?

- Principal section for scorer to rate quality of the project and degree to which proposal meets priority criteria
- Priorities are clearly outlined in Call for Proposals
- Scored on 0 to 4 point scale
  - Except item on provision of technical assistance (yes/no)
- *Change:*
  - *Addition of new item:* “The proposal is creative or innovative”
Section III: Notes

- A proposal creating a new medical home for a population that has not previously had one will score highly on multiple of the Section III criteria.

- Regarding likelihood of achieving stated goals, consider 6 month project timeframe.

- Scorers will disagree on the definition of a “practicing, community-based pediatrician”.

- If there are two CCFs and one provides TA and the other scores:
  - CCFs should communicate so that scoring CCF will provide the point for TA.
Updates

Scoring
New Budget Guidelines
Clarifications to Call for Proposals
Changes in Scoring (previously noted)

• Section I
  • Descriptors for 0-1-2 points change
    • From: Inadequate (0) / Adequate (1) / Superior (2)
    • To: Inadequate (0) / Meets criteria (1) / Exceeds criteria (2)

• Section III
  • New item: “The proposal is creative or innovative.”
New Budget Guidelines

- Change from focus on specific budget items to broader budget categories
  - Less prescriptive
  - Less restrictive
  - Encourage innovation and creativity
  - Increase relevance by allowing expenditures on what applicant feels he/she needs
  - Require less “policing” by staff

- Each broad category has maximum allowable amount
## New Budget Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category/Activity Description</th>
<th>Maximum (Planning &amp; Implementation)</th>
<th>Maximum (Resident)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Expenses (eg, childcare, transportation, incentives)</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources, Equipment, &amp; Educational Materials (Planning grants exclude Equipment)</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies (eg, printing, office supplies)</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Development</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>Case by case</td>
<td>Case by case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Budget Guidelines

- No change to “cannot support” list or to unallowable expenses
- Sample budgets will be provided to applicants
- Maximums are absolute dollar amounts not percentages
  - Applicant could submit for funds in just 1 or 2 of the categories provided the category maximum is not exceeded
- Less micromanagement of individual budget items
- Trust scoring system to award grants to appropriate projects
Clarifications in Call for Proposals

- Resident Grant Call for Proposals will clarify that projects focused on a continuity clinic are acceptable
  - “CATCH projects focused on resident continuity clinics are acceptable if they meet the criteria for broad-based community partnerships.”

- In all Call for Proposals, capital equipment remains an unallowable expense but new language will clarify what is meant by capital equipment
  - “While a precise definition of capital equipment is not provided because final determinations will be made in the context of the overall proposal, generally capital equipment is considered to be durable items of significant cost that will last beyond the length of the grant project and which will not be used by children/families who participate in the project. For example, CATCH cannot fund computer hardware/software, electronics, cellular telephones, or furniture/office equipment.”
A CATCH grant is...

- Funding for a project
- A learning experience
- A means to an end for the community

*Keep in mind all 3 when providing TA, reviewing proposals, and scoring proposals.*