

# Fiscal Year 2016 System Improvement Funding Request Scoring Tool

For use with system improvement 603(3)(c) funding requests only

<b>Service Need</b> Within each category there are high, medium and low priorities. Score each category individually using the guidance below. <span style="color: blue; font-weight: bold;">15 points possible per category of request</span>		
Level 1 (1-5 pts)	Level 2 (6-10 pts)	Level 3 (11-15 pts)
<b>Regional Medical Direction:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• little or no evidence of need for the project</li> <li>• deliverables not well defined or stated</li> <li>• outcome measures not well defined</li> <li>• provides little or no indication of local support</li> </ul>	<b>Regional Medical Direction:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• good evidence of need for the project</li> <li>• deliverables moderately defined</li> <li>• outcome measures somewhat defined</li> <li>• provides some indication of local support</li> </ul>	<b>Regional Medical Direction:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strong, convincing evidence of need for the project</li> <li>• deliverables well defined and clearly stated</li> <li>• outcome measures well defined and clearly stated</li> <li>• provides strong indication of local support</li> </ul>
<b>System improvement: planning, developing, implementing, maintaining and improving the statewide emergency medical and trauma services system:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• little or no evidence of need for the project</li> <li>• deliverables not well defined or stated</li> <li>• outcome measures not well defined</li> <li>• provides little or no indication of local support</li> </ul>	<b>System improvement: planning, developing, implementing, maintaining and improving the statewide emergency medical and trauma services system:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• good evidence of need for the project</li> <li>• deliverables moderately defined</li> <li>• outcome measures somewhat defined</li> <li>• provides some indication of local support</li> </ul>	<b>System improvement: planning, developing, implementing, maintaining and improving the statewide emergency medical and trauma services system:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strong convincing evidence of need for the project</li> <li>• deliverables well defined and clearly stated</li> <li>• outcome measures well defined and clearly stated</li> <li>• provides strong indication of local support</li> </ul>
<b>Technical assistance and support to local governments, local emergency medical and trauma service providers and RETACs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• little or no evidence of need for the project</li> <li>• deliverables not well defined or stated</li> <li>• outcome measures not well defined</li> <li>• provides little or no indication of local support</li> </ul>	<b>Technical assistance and support to local governments, local emergency medical and trauma service providers and RETACs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• good evidence of need for the project</li> <li>• deliverables moderately defined</li> <li>• outcome measures somewhat defined</li> <li>• provides some indication of local support</li> </ul>	<b>Technical assistance and support to local governments, local emergency medical and trauma service providers and RETACs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strong, convincing evidence of need for the project</li> <li>• deliverables well defined and clearly stated</li> <li>• outcome measures well defined and clearly stated</li> <li>• provides strong indication of local support</li> </ul>
<b>Conference or forum support:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• little or no evidence of need for the conference</li> <li>• deliverables not well defined or stated</li> <li>• little to no indication of how success of the event will be measured</li> <li>• provides little or no indication of local support</li> </ul>	<b>Conference or forum support:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• good evidence of need for the conference</li> <li>• deliverables moderately defined</li> <li>• some indication of how success of the event will be measured</li> <li>• provides some indication of local support</li> </ul>	<b>Conference or forum support:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strong, convincing evidence of need</li> <li>• deliverables well defined and clearly stated</li> <li>• strong indication of how success of the event will be measured</li> <li>• provides strong indication of local support</li> </ul>

# Fiscal Year 2016 System Improvement Funding Request Scoring Tool

For use with system improvement 603(3)(c) funding requests only

<p><b>RETAC Operations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• little or no evidence of need for why additional funding is needed to help support RETAC operations</li> <li>• deliverables not well defined or stated</li> <li>• outcome measures not well defined</li> <li>• provides little or no indication of local support</li> </ul>	<p><b>RETAC Operations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• good evidence of need for why additional funding is needed to help support RETAC operations</li> <li>• deliverables moderately defined</li> <li>• outcome measures somewhat defined</li> <li>• provides some indication of local support</li> </ul>	<p><b>RETAC Operations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strong, convincing evidence of need for why additional funding is needed to help support RETAC operations</li> <li>• deliverables well defined and clearly stated</li> <li>• outcome measures well defined, clearly stated</li> <li>• provides strong indication of local support</li> </ul>
<p><b>Priority to Underdeveloped or Aged Systems</b>                  Highest priority must be given to applicants where emergency medical and trauma services systems are underdeveloped or aged.  <b>10 points possible</b></p>		
<p>Level 1 (1-3 pts)</p>	<p>Level 2 (4-7 pts)</p>	<p>Level 3 (8-10 pts)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides little or no evidence the project addresses underdeveloped or aged emergency medical and trauma services systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides good evidence the project addresses underdeveloped or aged emergency medical and trauma services systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides strong and convincing evidence the project addresses underdeveloped or aged emergency medical and trauma services systems</li> </ul>
<p><b>Cost Effective Project Budget</b>                  Does the budget correlate to the deliverables, and is there evidence of cost effectiveness?  <b>10 points possible</b></p>		
<p>Level 1 (1-3 pt)</p>	<p>Level 2 (4-7 pts)</p>	<p>Level 3 (8-10 pts)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• did not evaluate alternatives or shows little or no evidence the project is the most cost effective option</li> <li>• does not include a budget or has only a vague indication showing slight correlation between expenditures and the proposed project and deliverables</li> <li>• does not clearly state how funds will be spent and provides little to no reference to cost effectiveness</li> <li>• provides vague budget notes justifying items listed</li> <li>• does not show how the project will be sustained financially in following years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• evaluated some alternatives and shows good evidence project is the most cost effective option</li> <li>• includes a budget but line items not well defined or don't directly show a correlation between expenditures and the proposed project and deliverables</li> <li>• states how funds will be spent but provides only vague references to cost effectiveness</li> <li>• provides adequate budget notes that somewhat justify each item listed</li> <li>• provides an adequate explanation for how the project will be sustained in following years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• evaluated alternatives and shows strong evidence project is most cost effective option</li> <li>• includes a budget with clear line items showing strong correlation between expenditures and the proposed project and deliverables</li> <li>• clearly states how funds will be spent and specifically demonstrates the cost effectiveness of the budget</li> <li>• provides convincing budget notes justifying each item listed</li> <li>• provides a detailed explanation and an anticipated budget for how the project will be sustained in following years</li> </ul>

## Fiscal Year 2016 System Improvement Funding Request Scoring Tool

For use with system improvement 603(3)(c) funding requests only

<p><b>Applicant's Qualifications</b>                  Does the applicant demonstrate the resources and experience necessary to successfully implement the project? Will the applicant's qualifications help ensure long-term sustainability?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5 points possible</b></p>		
<p>Level 1 (1 pt)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not show the applicant has the resources and experience needed to successfully implement the project</li> <li>• does not clearly explain how the applicant's qualifications will help ensure long-term sustainability</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 (2-3 pts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides good evidence the applicant has the resources and experience needed to successfully implement the project</li> <li>• somewhat explains how the applicant's qualifications will help ensure long-term sustainability</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 (4-5 pts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides strong evidence the applicant has the resources and experience needed to successfully implement the project</li> <li>• clearly explains how the applicant's qualifications will help ensure long-term sustainability</li> </ul>
<p><b>Systems Integration</b>                  Is the project compatible with Colorado's EMS and trauma systems? Is there any indication there will be unnecessary duplication?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5 points possible</b></p>		
<p>Level 1 (1 pt)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides little or no evidence the project addresses and improves system compatibility</li> <li>• project duplicates services already available in the area</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 (2-3 pts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides good evidence the project addresses and improves system compatibility</li> <li>• little indication project duplicates services already available in the area</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 (4-5 pts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides strong evidence the project addresses and improves system compatibility</li> <li>• no indication project duplicates services already available in the area</li> </ul>
<p><b>Statewide and Regional Impact</b>                  Does the request clearly indicate statewide or regional impact?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5 points possible</b></p>		
<p>Level 1 (1 pt)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides little or no evidence there is statewide or regional impact</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 (2-3 pts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides good evidence of statewide or regional impact</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 (4-5 pts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provides strong and convincing evidence of statewide or regional impact</li> </ul>