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 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:	Strengthen and Stabilize Rural Health Workforce: Improve Retention in Rural and Tribal Communities
Funding Opportunity Name:	Workforce Retention funding opportunity for Critical Care Access Hospitals and their owned and operated clinics
Funding Opportunity Solicitation Number:	210-22102
Period of Performance:	Completed by HHS.
Method of Accountability:	Grantee will complete at least quarterly progress reports on prior quarter's program progress/activities completed. A final progress report will be completed by the 15th of the month, following the end of the grant end date, using a template provided by HHS.
	Grantee must submit quarterly expenditure reports, via HHS system, with accompanying progress report.

Reviewer Comments:

Applicant Name:	
Review Date:	
Reviewer(s) Name:	

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?	
Did the applicant identify any applicable metrics listed in the Notice of Funding Opportunity: - Increase the rural provider retention rate at 3 and 5 years - Expand remote monitoring and AI-assisted care to reduce staffing needs - Reduce Health professional Shortage Area (HPSA counties) - Increase the rural primary care provider retention rate	
Does the information in the application align with the eligible projects identified in the application guidance for this funding opportunity?	

Reviewer Comments:

Section 2:

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

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
Project Narrative – Identified Need and Proposed Goals **20–18 points:** Clearly defines a significant need with strong context. Goals are specific, aligned, and relevant to the target population, including rural impact. Demonstrates how the project enhances existing efforts (if applicable). Fully aligns with RHTP allowable uses. **17–14 points:** Identifies a relevant need and reasonable goals but lacks some detail or clarity. Connection to the target population and rural impact is present but not fully developed. Some mention of enhancing existing efforts. Generally, aligns with RHTP allowable uses. **13–8 points**: Need and goals are unclear or loosely connected. Limited explanation of the target population or rural relevance. Minimal detail on existing efforts. Weak alignment with RHTP allowable uses. **7–0 points**: The need and goals are not clearly defined. Little or no connection to the target population or rural impact. No discussion of existing efforts. Does not align with RHTP allowable uses.	20	

Reviewer Comments:

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
Project Narrative – Strategies, Activities & Measurable Outcomes (30 Points) **30–26 points**: Strategies and activities are clear, well-aligned with RHTP evaluation metrics, and supported by measurable outcomes. Strongly addresses one or more key elements. Demonstrates a realistic, well-defined sustainability plan beyond the grant period, including supporting documentation if required. **25–20 points**: Strategies and activities are appropriate and mostly aligned with RHTP metrics but lack some detail. Addresses at least one key element. Sustainability plan is present but may lack specificity or supporting documentation. **19–10 points**: Strategies and activities are loosely defined or weakly aligned with RHTP metrics. Limited connection to key elements. Sustainability plan is minimal or unclear. **9–0 points**: Strategies and activities are unclear or not aligned with RHTP metrics. Does not address key elements. No clear sustainability plan or documentation.	30	

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	

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	

Reviewer Comments:

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
Key Personnel (10 Points) **10–9 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. **8–7 points**: Personnel and partners are appropriate but may lack some detail in roles, experience, or capacity. Overall ability to manage the project is adequate. **6–3 points**: Limited or unclear description of personnel and partners. Gaps in expertise, roles, or capacity to manage activities and funds. **2–0 points**: Key personnel and partners are not clearly identified or lack the necessary expertise and capacity. Significant concerns about ability to manage the project.	10	

Reviewer Comments:

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
Priority (10 Points) **10–9** points: Clearly addresses one or more priority areas identified in North Dakota's RHTP application. Strong alignment with identified state needs and demonstrates meaningful impact. **8–7 points**: Addresses a priority area but with moderate alignment or limited detail. Connection to state-identified needs is present but could be stronger. **6–3 points**: Limited or unclear connection to priority areas. Alignment with state-identified needs is weak. **2–0 points**: Does not address identified priority areas or lacks alignment with state needs. .	10	

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	

Reviewer Comments:

TOTAL	Points Possible: 100	Points Awarded: