

Reviewer Packet – Consortium Health Justice Series Proposals

Instructions and Process

This packet includes evaluation guidance, scoring rubric, and the reviewer score sheet.

Reviewers are asked to review and submit scoring in advance of the last CAB meeting of the year. Scores and any comments will be held confidential and aggregated to provide the CAB with a preliminary sense of the standing of each proposal and a snapshot of the portfolio. We will not employ a scoring “cutoff” to eliminate any proposals. Discussion at the CAB meeting will allow members to further evaluate individual proposals on their own merits as well as in light of the entire portfolio.

Scoring Rubric

1. Relevance to Health Justice (5 points)
Excellent (5): Clear, compelling tie to health justice on significant topic
Good (3-4): Reasonable connection, but underdeveloped.
Fair (1-2): Minimal or vague connection.
Poor (0): Not adequately explained.
2. Multidisciplinary & Multistakeholder Inclusion (5 points)
Excellent (5): Diverse disciplines and community voices included. Clear inclusion of UCSF stakeholders and/or UC Law stakeholders in planning, design, or intended audience for event. The diverse perspectives clearly relate to and enhance the goals of the event.
Good (3-4): Some diversity, but actionable gaps remain. Or the proposed diversity is not clearly related to the goals of the event.
Fair (1-2): Limited diversity.
Poor (0): Single perspective only.
3. Event Design Clarity & Feasibility (5 points)
Excellent (5): Clear goals, format, activities, and realistic timeline.
Good (3-4): Generally clear, but missing details.
Fair (1-2): Vague or unrealistic.
Poor (0): Confusing or unfeasible.
4. Audience Reach & Impact (5 points)
Excellent (5): Clearly-articulated target audience that is appropriate to theme, design, and intended impacts of the event.
Good (3-4): Reasonably articulated, with some gaps
Fair (1-2): Unclear or limited articulation of target audience.
Poor (0): No clear audience or inappropriate to theme, design and intended impacts of the event.
5. Budget Appropriateness (5 points)
Excellent (5): Realistic, proportionate, policy-compliant.
Good (3-4): Mostly appropriate, minor issues.
Fair (1-2): Incomplete or questionable.
Poor (0): Missing or unrealistic.

Reviewer Score Sheet

Proposal Title: _____

Lead Organizer: _____

Reviewer Name: _____

Category	Description	Max Points	Score	Reviewer Comments
Relevance to Health Justice	Strength of connection to health justice, equity, disparities, and systemic issues.	5		
Multidisciplinary & Multistakeholder Inclusion	Relevant diversity of disciplines, community perspectives, and stakeholder engagement.	5		
Event Design Clarity & Feasibility	Clarity and feasibility of goals, format, activities, and timeline.	5		
Audience Reach & Impact	Potential for meaningful engagement, participation, and lasting impact.	5		
Budget Appropriateness	Alignment with UC Law SF fiscal policies; proportionate to scope.	5		

Total Score (Max 25): _____