



APPENDIX C: Scoring Rubric

Name of County

Name of Reviewer

--	--

Target Population, Burden, and Need (15 points)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jurisdiction and/or target population(s) not identified or evidence does not support why it's being selected Significant details missing that would help identify burden Need is missing or not well demonstrated Health equity is not considered or is incomplete 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jurisdiction and/or target population(s) identified and some details are provided, but could be strengthened Some information is provided on burden, but could be enhanced Need is described but lacks important detail Health equity considerations are adequate, but could be strengthened 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audience and/or target population(s) identified and data/evidence supports why selected Burden is clear and well identified Need is well developed and clearly defined Health equity considerations are thoughtful and will strengthen project
(0-4 points)	(5-10 points)	(11-15 points)

Comments

Score

--	--

Project Description (15 points)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of project is missing or unclear; project is not well-defined Amount of information provided is not commensurate with points Limited detail in description 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of the project is given but some pieces are missing and/or clarity is needed Adequate detail provided but could be improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project description is clear and well-defined; all pieces of project are addressed Detail provided in description is complete and clear
(0-4 points)	(5-10 points)	(11-15 points)

Comments

Score

--	--

Partners and Stakeholder Engagement (15 points)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate partners or stakeholders are not involved or no partners are identified • No consideration of stakeholder engagement • No letter(s) of support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some key partners or stakeholders appear to be missing • Roles and buy-in of partners or stakeholders are not clearly stated • Letter(s) of support is(are) generic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners and stakeholders identified are appropriate and will strengthen the project • At least one community partner is engaged • Letter(s) of support is(are) specific and clearly indicates partner roles and buy-in
(0-4 points)	(5-10 points)	(11-15 points)

Comments	Score

Project Work Plan and Performance Measurement (Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures, Activities, Person(s) Responsible, and Timeline) (50 points)

Goals and Objectives (15 points)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project goals and objectives are unclear or unsuitable • Objectives are not tangible and do not specify how to achieve the goal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project goals and objectives are well-framed and adequate to the task but could be strengthened 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project goals and objectives are exceptionally well-crafted • Objectives are specific and measurable and outline actions that can be reached in a short amount of time
(0-4 points)	(5-10 points)	(11-15 points)

Performance Measures (10 points)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consideration of performance measures for each objective • No detail provided on how information and data will be collected for performance measures • Unclear what success will look like 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some performance measures are noted for objectives, but not well thought out or not enough • Adequate detail provided on how information and data will be collected for performance measures, but could be improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least two performance measures per objective are presented; they are well thought out and will measure progress • Thorough detail is provided on how information and data will be collected for performance measures • Performance measures help with measuring progress toward objective or outcome
(0-3 points)	(4-6 points)	(7-10 points)

Activities (15 points)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities are not aligned with objectives No detail in activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities are adequate and connect to the objectives but link could be stronger Some detail in activities, but could be improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities follow directly from the objectives; connection is evident Details are provided in activities
(0-4 points)	(5-10 points)	(11-15 points)

Person(s) Responsible (5 points)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Person(s) responsible for different activities are not stated or unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Person(s) responsible for completing activities are satisfactory for proposed effort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Person(s) responsible for completing activities is well documented and aligns
(0-1 points)	(2-3 points)	(4-5 points)

Timeline (5 points)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeline is not given or is inappropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeline is included but could be strengthened; timeline seems somewhat unreasonable or challenging 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeline clearly presented and seems reasonable within the scope of the project
(0-1 points)	(2-3 points)	(4-5 points)

*** Notes section is optional; it's available to provide additional description or elaboration.*

Comments

Score

--	--

Budget (5 points)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is missing or poorly constructed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is appropriate and connected to the project with some exceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is well-crafted and connected to the project plan
(0-1 points)	(2-3 points)	(4-5 points)

Comments

Score

--	--

Application Score	
Bonus (15 points if applicant has not been funded in past)	
Bonus (15 points if applicant is a federally recognized Wisconsin Tribe)	
Final Application Score (with bonuses, if applicable)	