



**FUNDING OPPORTUNITY SCORING TOOL**  
 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
 RURAL HEALTH TRANSFORMATION PROGRAM (RHTP)  
 SFN 1500 (7-2026)

Reviewers should base their scores solely on the information provided in the application. Applications will be reviewed on what is presented within the submitted Qualtrics materials. Please do not make inferences or speculate. Applicants will be scored to determine if the project meets RHTP guidelines and supports North Dakota's RHTP goals.

**Conflict of Interest**

Personal financial gain and private benefit to North Dakota Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) team members is prohibited. If an evaluator has a conflict of interest, they may not evaluate the grant applicant and shall recuse themselves from the review of that particular grant application. If a non-HHS team member assisting the evaluators has a conflict of interest, that individual shall recuse themselves from assisting HHS team members for that particular grant application.

Funding Opportunity Name	Funding Opportunity Solicitation Number
--------------------------	---

Applicant Name	
Reviewer Name	Review Date

**SECTION 1**

**If the answer is no to any of the questions in section 1, the review will stop. Applications will not be awarded if any of the answers are no to questions in section 1.**

**Criteria**

Did applicant submit all required application components, including answering all questions and a complete budget, using the correct template and, if applicable, creating a duplicate tab for each strategy?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Were multiple applications with varying scopes submitted by the same entity and location or this funding opportunity?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Does the application align with the scope and eligibility requirements?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If multiple strategies are included, does the first strategy align with the estimated award amount, if applicable?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Reviewer Comments	

## SECTION 2

Points will be awarded based on how well the application addresses the criteria.

### Criteria for 1- Background Information - Maximum points possible: 10

#### 10-8 points:

- All required organizational information is complete and clear.
- Overarching goal is clear, meaningful, and directly aligned with the funding opportunity's purpose. Goal reflects a high-level change that is realistic, impactful, and related to RHTP.
- Key personnel fully identified with strong relevant experience and credentials. Roles and responsibilities well-defined.

#### 7-5 points:

- Most required information included but missing some detail.
- Overarching goal is stated but may lack depth, specificity, or strong alignment.
- Roles are mostly clear, but some lack specificity or depth. Some personnel experience partially aligned but acceptable.

#### 4-2 points:

- Information incomplete or unclear.
- Overarching goal is vague, overly broad, or weakly aligned with rural health transformation priorities.
- Key personnel are missing detail or not well aligned to duties. Experience unclear or not sufficiently justified.

#### 1-0 points:

- Major required elements missing.
- Overarching goal missing, unclear, or unrelated to funding opportunity purpose.
- Key personnel roles not identified or inadequate to support the project.

Points Awarded

Reviewer Comments

**Criteria for 2 - Project Narrative-Identified Need - Maximum points possible: 15**

**15-12 points:**

- Clearly defines a significant need with strong context, using local data. Strongly relevant for this funding opportunity.
- Clearly identify target population with a strong rural impact and alignment with the target populations identified in the funding opportunity; may include tribal residents, Medicaid members, or other.
- Demonstrates how the project enhances existing efforts, if applicable.

**11-8 points:**

- Need is described but lacks detail or supporting evidence. Moderate relevance with funding opportunity.
- Target population is identified and aligns with funding opportunity and rural requirement, but details are limited.
- Some connection to existing efforts but limited clarity, if applicable.

**7-4 points:**

- Need statement vague or minimally supported. Weak relevance to funding opportunity.
- Limited explanation of the target population or unclear alignment with funding opportunity and rural relevance.
- Minimal detail on existing efforts, if applicable.

**3-0 points:**

- Need not demonstrated. Not relevant for funding opportunity.
- Target population not defined, does not align or is not relevant.
- No detail on existing efforts, if applicable.

Points Awarded

Reviewer Comments

**Criteria for Project Narrative-Proposed Project - Maximum points possible: 50****Proposals with multiple strategies will receive a combined score for all strategies.****50-37 points:**

- Strategies, services and tasks are clear, well-supported, feasible, and connected to the identified need. Outcomes are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound (SMART). Strong alignment with funding opportunity.
- Metrics are measurable, relevant and well-detailed with a thorough plan for tracking and reporting.
- Sustainability plan is detailed and highly feasible, clearly explaining how work continues after funding.
- Service commitment requirements are clear, detailed, and align with RHTP requirements, if applicable.
- Strong alignment with key elements, ND RHTP metrics identified in funding opportunity.
- Timeline is clear, organized, realistic with well-defined milestones. It strongly supports successful implementation and aligns with RHTP timelines.

**36-24 points:**

- Strategies, services and tasks are appropriate and generally clear but lack some detail, connection or feasibility. Outcomes are present but have limited SMART elements. Alignment with funding opportunity is present, but limited.
- Metrics included with connection to outcomes. Generally measurable but lack some detail. Plan for data collection is present but limited.
- Sustainability plan is present but not fully detailed or feasible. Limited clarity on how work continues after funding.
- Service commitment plan is present but lacking details, clarify or alignment if applicable.
- General alignment with one or more key element, ND RHTP metrics identified in funding opportunity.
- Timeline is generally clear and feasible but may lack some detail in milestones or timing. Alignment with RHTP timelines is adequate but could be more clearly demonstrated.

**23-11 points:**

- Strategies, services and tasks are vague, generic or not clearly linked to identified need. Outcomes are vague and do not include SMART elements. Unclear alignment with funding opportunity.
- Metrics are unclear or loosely connected to outcomes. Data collection and reporting plans are vague or incomplete.
- Sustainability plan is minimal, vague or unrealistic.
- Service commitment plan is vague or has weak alignment with RHTP requirements.
- Limited or unclear alignment with one or more key elements, ND RHTP metrics identified in funding opportunity.
- Timeline is vague, with limited detail or missing some milestones and timing. Weak alignment with RHTP timelines.

**10-0 points:**

- Strategies, services and tasks are missing, not described, unclear or lack relevance to identified need. Outcomes missing or unclear. No alignment with funding opportunity.
- Metrics missing or unrelated to outcomes. Data collection and reporting plans missing.
- No clear sustainability plan provided.
- Service commitment not addressed when applicable.
- No alignment with key elements, ND RHTP metrics identified in the funding opportunity.
- Timeline is unclear, unrealistic, or missing key components. Does not support implementation or align with RHTP timelines.

Points Awarded

Reviewer Comments

**Criteria for Priority Consideration, if applicable - Maximum points possible: 10**

**If no priority area is identified in the funding opportunity application guidance, all applicants will receive 10 points for this area.**

**10-8 points:**

- Clearly addresses one or more priority areas identified in application guidance with strong RHTP alignment and demonstrates meaningful impact.

**7-5 points:**

- Addresses a priority area but with moderate alignment or limited detail. Connection to RHTP and impact are present but limited.

**4-2 points:**

- Limited or unclear connection to priority areas. RHTP alignment and impact are weak.

**1-0 points:**

- Does not address identified priority areas. No RHTP alignment or impact.

Points Awarded

Reviewer Comments

**Criteria for Budget Submission - Maximum points possible: 15**

**15-13 points:**

- Budget is detailed, realistic, fully justified and matches narrative.
- Fully aligns with RHTP requirements.
- If applicable, strong vendor sales quotes are included.

**12-10 points:**

- Budget is complete but may lack some detail or justification, with some misalignment to the narrative.
- Mostly aligns with RHTP requirements.
- If applicable, vendor sales quotes are included but limited.

**9-4 points:**

- Budget is unclear or weakly justified, with weak alignment to the narrative.
- Limited alignment RHTP requirements.
- If applicable, vendor sales quotes are missing key information.

**3-0 points:**

- Budget components are missing or inadequate with no alignment to the narrative.
- No alignment with RHTP requirements.
- If applicable, vendor sales quotes are not included.

Points Awarded

Reviewer Comments

**TOTAL**

Points Possible

**100**

Total Points Awarded