

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:	Make North Dakota Healthy Again: Building Connection and Resiliency
Funding Opportunity Name:	Behavioral Health Promotion Community Grants
Funding Opportunity Solicitation Number:	210-121
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

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?	

Reviewer Comments:

Section 2:

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

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

Reviewer Comments:



Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
<p>Project Narrative – Strategies, Activities & Measurable Outcomes (30 Points)</p> <p>30–26 points: Strategies and activities are clearly defined and are robust, evidence-based, and seamlessly tied to overarching goals. 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.</p> <p>25–20 points: Strategies and activities are described, but lack some detail, and grounded in evidence. 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.</p> <p>19–10 points: Strategies and activities are loosely defined and/or the evidence base is thin. Limited connection to key elements identified by CMS’s Notice of Funding Opportunity. Sustainability plan is minimal or unclear.</p> <p>9–0 points: Strategies and activities are unclear and/or lack a clear evidence base or fail to relate to the project goals. Outcome measures are either missing or misaligned with the intended results. Does not address key elements identified by CMS’s Notice of Funding Opportunity. No clear sustainability plan or documentation.</p>	30	

Reviewer Comments:



NORTH DAKOTA

RURAL HEALTH TRANSFORMATION

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
<p>Action Plan – Timeline and Milestones (10 Points)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>6–3 points: Action plan is vague or incomplete, with limited detail on milestones or timing. Weak alignment with RHTP timelines.</p> <p>2–0 points: Action plan is unclear, unrealistic, or missing key components. Does not support implementation or align with RHTP timelines.</p>	10	

Reviewer Comments:



NORTH DAKOTA

RURAL HEALTH TRANSFORMATION

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
<p>Action Plan – Metrics (10 Points)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>6–3 points: Metrics are vague, limited, or weakly tied to outcomes. Data collection and reporting plan is unclear or incomplete.</p> <p>2–0 points: Metrics are missing, not measurable, or not relevant. No clear plan for data collection or reporting.</p>	10	

Reviewer Comments:



NORTH DAKOTA

RURAL HEALTH TRANSFORMATION

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
<p>Key Personnel (10 Points)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>6–3 points: Limited or unclear description of personnel and partners. Gaps in expertise, roles, or capacity to manage activities and funds.</p> <p>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.</p>	10	

Reviewer Comments:



Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
<p>Preference (10 Points)</p> <p>10–9 points: The proposal explicitly incorporates core activities from Parents Lead or specific recommendations from the ND Suicide Fatality Review Commission (SFRC). The project demonstrates a deep understanding of these resources and integrates them as a primary component of the project's impact.</p> <p>8–7 points: The proposal clearly references and addresses the identified state priorities (Parents Lead or SFRC recommendations). The connection is logical and well-detailed, though perhaps less integrated into the core project design than the top tier.</p> <p>6–3 points: The proposal makes a passing or superficial reference to Parents Lead or SFRC recommendations. The connection to state-identified needs is present but lacks specific detail, actionable activities, or a clear strategy for implementation.</p> <p>2–0 points: The proposal fails to address the identified state priorities or does not mention the Parents Lead program or SFRC recommendations. There is no demonstrable connection to these specific North Dakota needs.</p>	10	

Reviewer Comments:



Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
<p>Budget and Funding Details (10 Points)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>8–7 points: Budget is generally appropriate but may lack some detail or clear justification for certain costs. Mostly aligns with RHTP allowable uses.</p> <p>6–3 points: Budget is incomplete, unclear, or weakly justified. Limited alignment with project activities or RHTP allowable uses.</p> <p>2–0 points: Budget is missing, inadequate, or not aligned with project activities or RHTP requirements.</p>	10	

Reviewer Comments:

TOTAL	Points Possible: 100	Points Awarded:
--------------	-----------------------------	------------------------