



Funding Opportunity Scoring Tool

Attachment B: Scoring Tool

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 Rural Health Transformation Program (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.

RHTP Initiative and Theme Name and/or Number:	Make North Dakota Healthy Again: Building Connection and Resiliency
Funding Opportunity Name:	Parents Lead: Assessment and Train-the-Trainer Curriculum Development
Funding Opportunity Solicitation Number:	Completed by HHS before posting
Period of Performance:	The funding period will start upon execution of the agreement, with all required approvals and signatures. The funding period will end on September 30, 2027, and all funds must be expended by this date.
Method of Accountability:	Completed by HHS during scoring

Funding Opportunity Table 1

Reviewer Comments:



NORTH DAKOTA

RURAL HEALTH TRANSFORMATION

Applicant Name:	Example name
Review Date:	Example date
Reviewer(s) Name:	Example reviewer name

Funding Opportunity Table 2

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	Yes or No
Did applicant submit all required application components?	answer
Proposal provides a comprehensive plan to achieve the two primary objectives of a Statewide Needs Assessment and Train-the-Trainer Curriculum	answer

Section 1 Table 1

Reviewer Comments:

Section 2:

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

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
Project Narrative – Project Description and Goals (10 points) 10–9 points: Project description clearly defines a scope supported by robust	10	Points



NORTH DAKOTA

RURAL HEALTH TRANSFORMATION

qualitative and quantitative data, fully aligning with Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) and RHTP allowable uses. Goal(s) are specific, highly relevant and explicitly target Parents Lead primary (parents/caregivers) and secondary (professionals/community organizations) audiences, with a clearly defined and impactful focus on rural and/or tribal communities. Proposal clearly demonstrates how the project enhances and scales existing efforts (if applicable).

8–7 points:

Project description identifies a relevant scope and reasonable goals but lacks some detail or clarity. Project generally aligns with NOFO and RHTP allowable uses. The required connection to Parents Lead primary and secondary audiences is present, but not fully developed or integrated. It includes some mention of enhancing existing efforts.

6–3 points:

Project description and goals are unclear, loosely connected or show weak alignment with NOFO or RHTP allowable uses. There is limited or vague explanation of how the project will reach Parents Lead primary and secondary audiences are minimal. It provides little detail on how the project connects to or enhances existing efforts.

2–0 points:

Project description and goals are poorly defined and fail to align with NOFO or RHTP allowable uses. Proposal shows little to no intention of targeting Parents Lead primary and secondary audiences or completely omits rural or tribal community impact. No discussion of existing efforts.

Section 2 Table 1

Reviewer Comments:



NORTH DAKOTA

RURAL HEALTH TRANSFORMATION

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
Project Narrative – Strategies, Activities & Measurable Outcomes (40 Points) 40-35 points: Strategies and activities are clearly defined and are robust, evidence-based and seamlessly tied to overarching goals. Proposal delivers a comprehensive, realistic plan addressing both core priorities: Statewide Needs Assessment and Train-the-Trainer curriculum. Outcome measures provide a precise, data-driven map for validating success. Clearly addresses one or more key elements identified by CMS's Notice of Funding Opportunity. Demonstrates a realistic, well-defined sustainability plan beyond the grant period, including supporting documentation if required. 34-26 points: Strategies and activities are described, but lack some detail, and grounded in evidence. Proposal addresses both core priorities (Statewide Needs Assessment and Train-the-Trainer curriculum), though one component may be more thoroughly developed than the other. Proposed outcome measures logically track back to the project goals with minimal gaps. Addresses at least one key element identified by CMS's Notice of Funding Opportunity, although loosely. Sustainability plan is present but may lack specificity or supporting documentation. 25-15 points: Strategies and activities are loosely defined and/or the evidence base is thin. The proposal fails to adequately address one or both of the core priorities (Statewide Needs Assessment and Train-the-Trainer curriculum) leaving significant gaps in the scope of work. Limited connection to key elements identified by CMS's Notice of Funding Opportunity. Sustainability plan is minimal or unclear. 14–0 points: Strategies and activities are unclear and/or lack a clear evidence base or fail to relate to the project goals. The proposal completely omits or fundamentally misunderstands the two core priorities (Statewide Needs Assessment and Train-the-Trainer curriculum). Outcome measures are either missing or	40	Points



misaligned with the intended results. Does not address key elements identified by CMS's Notice of Funding Opportunity. No clear sustainability plan or documentation.		
---	--	--

Section 2 Table 2

Reviewer Comments:

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
Action Plan – Timeline and Milestones (10 Points) 10–9 points: Action plan is clear, organized and realistic with well-defined milestones and estimated timelines for all major strategies and activities. Strongly supports successful implementation and aligns with federal RHTP timelines. 8–7 points: Action plan 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. 6–3 points: Action plan is vague or incomplete, with limited detail on milestones or timing. Weak alignment with RHTP timelines. 2–0 points: Action plan is unclear, unrealistic or missing key components. Does not support implementation or align with RHTP timelines.	10	Points

Section 2 Table 3

Reviewer Comments:



Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
Action Plan – Metrics (10 Points) 10–9 points: Metrics are clear, relevant and strongly demonstrate potential for success. Outcomes are measurable, and the applicant clearly describes a feasible plan to collect and report data. 8–7 points: Metrics are appropriate and generally measurable but may lack some detail or clarity. Plan for data collection and reporting is present but could be more specific. 6–3 points: Metrics are vague, limited or weakly tied to outcomes. Data collection and reporting plan is unclear or incomplete. 2–0 points: Metrics are missing, not measurable or not relevant. No clear plan for data collection or reporting.	10	Points

Section 2 Table 4

Reviewer Comments:



Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
Key Personnel (20 Points) 20-18 points: Key personnel and partners demonstrate strong expertise, capacity and relevant experience. Roles are clearly defined and the team is well-positioned to manage project activities and funds. 17-14 points: Personnel and partners are appropriate but may lack some detail in roles, experience or capacity. Overall ability to manage the project is adequate. 13-8 points: Limited or unclear description of personnel and partners. Gaps in expertise, roles or capacity to manage activities and funds. 7-0 points: Key personnel and partners are not clearly identified or lack the necessary expertise and capacity. Significant concerns about ability to manage the project.	20	Points

Section 2 Table 5

Reviewer Comments:



Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
Budget and Funding Details (10 Points) 10–9 points: Budget is detailed, realistic and clearly justified. Demonstrates appropriate allocation of RHTP funds aligned with project activities and allowable uses. Includes all required budget components and supporting details. 8–7 points: Budget is generally appropriate but may lack some detail or clear justification for certain costs. Mostly aligns with RHTP allowable uses. 6–3 points: Budget is incomplete, unclear or weakly justified. Limited alignment with project activities or RHTP allowable uses. 2–0 points: Budget is missing, inadequate or not aligned with project activities or RHTP requirements.	10	Points

Section 2 Table 6

Reviewer Comments:

Total:
Points Possible: 100
Points Awarded:

Scoring total table 1