Basis Upon Which a Winner Will be Selected

Submissions from Participants received in advance of the submission deadline will first undergo an administrative triage step to review Participant eligibility to compete in this Challenge as well as submission completeness and applicability of scope. Complete and applicable submissions from eligible institutions will then be evaluated by an Evaluation Panel composed of technical experts with subject matter expertise relevant to the Challenge goals and using the Evaluation Criteria listed below. The Evaluation Panel will individually assess each submission and provide their scores to the Judging Panel. The Judging Panel, composed of federal employees from NIH and potentially other agencies, will select the winners pending final award decision approval by the Award Approving Official.

Please note that this Evaluation Guide is intended to complement, not replace, the official rules. It provides additional guidance to help you prepare your solution. In the event of any discrepancies, the official rules take precedence over this guide.

This Evaluation Guide applies to the Curriculum Overview document only. The Nutrition Education Toolkit will not be scored but will be reviewed on a pass/fail basis to confirm that it has been submitted and meets the required format and completeness expectations.

Evaluation Criteria - Exemplar and Developing applicants will be evaluated separately. Exemplar submissions are expected to demonstrate successful implementation and evaluation, while Developing submissions may be based on proposed or early-stage curricula.

The Evaluation Panel and Judging Panel will consider:

Exemplar Track (total possible: 45 points):

Does this submission describe an exemplar program that integrates nutrition education into medical education, and includes and addresses the following components?
(Global rating (0 = no inclusion, 5 = outstanding)

1. **Framework – How well does the program or course address elements of the HHS Medical Education Nutrition Competency Framework?**
    - 0 = Does not meaningfully address the HHS Medical Education Nutrition Competency Framework or fails to identify the competency domains or competencies included in the curriculum.
    - 3 = Partially addresses the framework, but the selected competency domains or competencies are incomplete, uneven, or insufficiently supported by the curriculum design or hours.
    -

- 5 = Fully and effectively addresses the framework through a clear and well-justified selection of competency domains and competencies, with strong alignment between the selected competencies, curriculum content, and sufficient instructional time for those selected areas.

Scoring considerations

- Does the curriculum clearly identify which competencies it has chosen to address?
- Is the selection of competencies appropriate and aligned with the goals, learner level, and program type?
- Does the curriculum provide meaningful depth and coverage for the selected competencies, rather than broad or superficial inclusion?
- Is there sufficient instructional time allocated to support mastery of the selected competencies?

2. **Innovation – How well does the program or course introduce new ideas or approaches in medical nutrition education?**
   - 0 = No meaningful innovation.
   - 3 = Some innovative elements, but limited in scope or impact.
   - 5 = Clear, meaningful innovation that enhances how nutrition education is delivered and could influence broader practice.

   Scoring considerations
   - What is new or different?
   - Are innovations central or peripheral?
   - Would others adopt this because it is better?
3. **Clarity of Teaching Methods – To what extent are the instructional strategies clearly described and easy to understand?**
   - 0 = Teaching methods are unclear, incomplete, or not described in a usable way.
   - 3 = Teaching methods are described but lack detail, structure, or clarity in implementation.
   - 5 = Teaching methods are clearly defined, structured, and actionable, showing how learning occurs over time.

   Scoring considerations
   - Can the curriculum be clearly understood in practice?
   - Is there a defined structure?
   - Could another institution implement it?
4. **Means to Address Identified Competency Gaps – How well does the program or course teach topics that are not included in the recommended competencies, but may be additive to current and future training programs?**
   - 0 = Does not identify or address meaningful gaps.
   - 3 = Identifies some gaps and partially addresses them.
   - 5 = Clearly identifies and effectively addresses meaningful gaps with targeted curriculum components.

   Scoring considerations

- Are gaps clearly defined and relevant?
- Does the curriculum meaningfully address them?

5. **Evaluation Methods – How well are the methods for assessing student or trainee outcomes defined?**
   - 0 = No evaluation methods or not usable.
   - 3 = Evaluation methods are present but limited, unclear, or weakly tied to outcomes.
   - 5 = Strong, clearly defined evaluation methods with measurable outcomes and a clear approach to assessing and improving the curriculum.

   Scoring considerations
   - Are outcomes measurable?
   - Are tools appropriate?
   - Is there a feedback loop?
6. **Evidence of Program Effectiveness – To what extent does the program or course have evaluation data to demonstrate program effectiveness?**
   - 0 = No evidence provided.
   - 3 = Some evidence provided, but limited in rigor or scale.
   - 5 = Strong, credible evidence demonstrating improved competency or meaningful outcomes.

   Scoring considerations
   - Is there real data?
   - Is it credible?
   - Does it support the claims?
7. **Integration of Innovative Approaches – To what extent are innovative approaches incorporated into the educational strategy?**
   - 0 = No meaningful integration of innovative approaches.
   - 3 = Some innovative approaches included, but limited in depth or integration.
   - 5 = Innovative approaches are fully integrated and clearly enhance learning outcomes.

   Scoring considerations
   - Are innovations actually used?
   - Do they improve learning?
   - Are they scalable?
8. **Context within Medical Education – How well is the program clearly described in relation to the broader medical or nursing education curriculum?**
   - 0 = No clear context provided.
   - 3 = Some context provided, but integration is unclear or incomplete.
   - 5 = Clearly integrated into the broader curriculum with defined placement and alignment.

   Scoring considerations
   - Where does this fit?
   - Is it integrated or standalone?

- Does it connect to clinical or academic structures?

9. **Interdisciplinary Approach – To what extent does the program involve collaboration across multiple disciplines?**
    - 0 = No interdisciplinary collaboration described.
    - 3 = Some collaboration, but limited or superficial.
    - 5 = Strong, meaningful interdisciplinary collaboration that enhances learning.

    Scoring considerations
    - Which disciplines are involved?
    - Is collaboration meaningful?
    - Does it improve outcomes?

Developing Track (total possible 40 points):

Does this submission describe a program that is in the process of developing and implementing nutrition education into medical education and includes and addresses the following components?
(Global rating (0 = no inclusion, 5 = outstanding)

1. **Framework – Does the program or course address elements of the HHS Medical Education Nutrition Competency Framework?**
    - 0 = Does not meaningfully address the HHS Medical Education Nutrition Competency Framework or fails to identify the competency domains or competencies the program intends to include.
    - 3 = Partially addresses the framework, but the planned selection of competency domains or competencies is incomplete, uneven, or not clearly supported by the proposed curriculum structure or planned hours.
    - 5 = Clearly addresses the framework through a thoughtful and well-justified planned selection of competency domains and competencies, with strong alignment between the selected competencies, proposed curriculum design, and sufficient planned instructional time for those selected areas.

    Scoring considerations
    - Does the proposal clearly identify which competencies it plans to address?
    - Is the selection of competencies appropriate for the intended learners and program goals?
    - Does the proposal show how the selected competencies will be meaningfully taught?
    - Is sufficient instructional time planned to support those selected competencies?
2. **Innovation – Does the program or course introduce new ideas or approaches in medical nutrition education?**
    - 0 = No meaningful innovation.
    - 3 = Some innovative elements, but limited in scope or impact, and/or feasibility is unclear or unrealistic.

- 5 = Clear, meaningful innovation that enhances the proposed curriculum design and is realistic and feasible.

Scoring considerations

- What is new?
- Is it central?
- Is it realistically implementable?

3. **Clarity of Teaching Methods – Are the instructional strategies clearly described and easy to understand?**
   - 0 = Teaching methods are unclear or not described.
   - 3 = Teaching methods are described but lack clarity or structure.
   - 5 = Teaching methods are clearly defined and actionable for implementation.

   Scoring considerations
   - Is the approach understandable?
   - Is there structure?
   - Could it be implemented?
4. **Means to Address Identified Competency Gaps – Does the program or course teach topics that are not included in the recommended competencies, but may be additive to current and future training programs?**
   - 0 = Does not identify or address gaps.
   - 3 = Identifies some gaps and partially addresses them.
   - 5 = Clearly identifies and effectively addresses meaningful gaps.

   Scoring considerations
   - Are gaps defined?
   - Are they addressed effectively?
   - Are they relevant?
5. **Evaluation Methods – Are the methods for assessing student or trainee outcomes well-defined?**
   - 0 = No evaluation plan.
   - 3 = Basic or incomplete evaluation plan with limited clarity or feasibility.
   - 5 = Strong, well-defined evaluation plan with measurable outcomes and a realistic approach that will generate meaningful results.

   Scoring considerations
   - Are outcomes measurable?
   - Are methods appropriate?
   - Is the plan realistic?
6. **Integration of Innovative Approaches – To what extent are innovative approaches such as teaching kitchens incorporated into the educational strategy?**
   - 0 = No meaningful integration.
   - 3 = Some innovative elements, but limited in depth or feasibility.
   - 5 = Innovative approaches are well-integrated and realistically implementable.

   Scoring considerations
   - Are innovations integrated?

- Do they enhance learning?
- Are they feasible?

7. **Context within Medical Education – Is the program clearly described in relation to the broader medical or nursing education curriculum?**
   - 0 = No clear context provided.
   - 3 = Partial or unclear integration.
   - 5 = Clearly integrated with defined structure and realistic implementation pathway.

   Scoring considerations
   - Where will this fit?
   - Is it integrated?
   - Does it connect to broader training?
8. **Interdisciplinary Approach – To what extent does the program involve collaboration across multiple disciplines?**
   - 0 = No interdisciplinary elements.
   - 3 = Some collaboration, but limited or not well integrated.
   - 5 = Strong, clearly defined interdisciplinary collaboration that is feasible within the proposed program.

   Scoring considerations
   - Which disciplines are involved?
   - Is collaboration meaningful?
   - Is it realistic?