



## Rural Changemaker Scoring Rubric - 2026

### Guidance for Using This Scoring Rubric

This rubric is designed to support consistent decision-making, but it is **only a directional tool**. It should **not** be the sole factor guiding your final decision. Please use it as a structured starting point and pair it with your professional judgment, relevant context, organizational priorities, and external partner input, as appropriate.

If your RFP requires you to make significant changes to the rubric questions, please **consult with your supervisor and Data & Learning before proceeding**.

### Scoring Rubric

---

#### Title

*Character Limit: 100*

#### Focuses on Priority Populations\*

Intentionally engages communities who are:

- Black
- Hispanic
- Children and families with low incomes (200% Federal Poverty Level)
- People who identify as LGBTQ+

Scale:

0 = No Evidence (There is no intentional effort to prioritize or focus on the priority populations.)

1 = Poor

2 = Average

3 = Good

4 = Strong (An intentional focus on the priority populations is clearly demonstrated.)

**Scoring Options:** 0 - 4

#### Advances Health Equity\*

Scale:

0 = No Evidence (There is no mention of health equity or reducing disparities as fundamental reasons for this proposal.)

1 = Poor

2 = Average

3 = Good

4 = Strong (A clear focus on improving health outcomes by reducing disparities and advancing health equity.)

**Scoring Options:** 0 - 4

## **Addresses one of the Vital Conditions of for Health and Well-being**

0 = (Shows no connection to seven vital conditions, or baseline understanding of conditions.)

1 = (Shows loose connection to at least 1 vital condition, and some understanding of conditions.)

2 = (Shows connection to at least 1 vital condition, and baseline understanding of conditions.)

3 = (Shows strong connection to at least 1 vital condition, and strong understanding of conditions.)

4 = (Makes strong connection to 1 or multiple vital conditions and very strong understanding of conditions.)

**Scoring Options:** 0 - 4

## **Authentic Engagement\***

Scale:

0 = No Evidence (There is no effort to engage people and communities in the project beyond providing services. Community voice not included.)

1 = Poor

2 = Average

3 = Good

4 = Strong (People and communities are authentically centered in the project, including through leadership and decision-making power.)

**Scoring Options:** 0 - 4

## **Defining Success\***

Scale:

0 = No Evidence (The organization's goals and processes are unclear and/or unfeasible given the grant term and funding and/or do not align with the goals of the RFP.)

1 = Poor

2 = Average

3 = Good

4 = Strong (The goals to be accomplished during the grant term are clear, feasible and aligned with the goals of the RFP.)

**Scoring Options:** 0 - 4

## **Budget, Timeline and Staff Capacity\***

Scale:

0 = No Evidence (The project budget, timeline and/or staff capacity indicate that there could be significant challenges to achieving the organization's goals.)

1 = Poor

2 = Average

3 = Good

4 = Strong (The project budget, timeline and staff capacity indicate that this organization

could achieve its goals.)

**Scoring Options:** 0 - 4

### **Grassroots Effort (Short Answer)**

*“Grassroots efforts” include local, regional, national, or international efforts and organizations led by everyday people who are closest to an issue. Grassroots Organizations take a “bottom-up” approach and begin with community-based initiatives that grow outwardly to include other strategic partners.*

Would you call this a “Grassroots Effort”, according to our provided definition? Why or why not?

### **Overall Rating\***

Scale:

0 = No Evidence (There is no clear focus on priority populations, project doesn't clearly describe how it advances health equity, no ties to vital conditions, goals are not clear.)

1 = Poor

2 = Average

3 = Good

4 = Strong (There is a clear focus on priority populations, project works to advance health equity, clear ties to vital conditions, goals are clear.)

**Scoring Options:** 0 - 4

## Community-led Organization\*

Scale:

0 = No Evidence (The community (priority population) holds no leadership and decision-making role, and the community did not identify the issue or challenge.)

2 = Average (The community (priority population) identified the issue or challenge but holds no leadership and decision-making role.)

4 = Strong (The community (priority population) holds leadership and decision-making role, and the community identified the issue or challenge.)

### Choices

0

2

4

## Rural-led Organization\*

Scale:

0 = No Evidence (Be from organizations that are based in urban or suburban communities.)

2 = Average (Be from organizations that are based in urban or suburban communities, but with physical locations in rural communities.)

4 = Strong (Be from organizations that are based in rural communities.)

### Choices

0

2

4

## Reviewer Comments or Feedback

*Character Limit: 2000*

## Suggested questions or areas for further exploration during the site visit

*Character Limit: 2000*

## Do you recommend that we site visit this organization?\*

### Choices

Yes

No