



## Powering Healthy Lives: Narrowing the Life Expectancy Gap Through People, Place & Power

### Application Scoring Rubric

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Application ID: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant's Self-Identified Priority Area:  People  Place  Power

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Disclosures/Declarations

**No conflicts of interest exist between myself and this application/proposal.**

*By checking this box, you hereby certify that no conflict of interest, nor any factor that may contribute to the appearance or perception of a conflict of interest, exists between yourself and the parties associated with this proposal, which include the organization listed as the primary applicant as well as any organizations or individuals either contributing resources to the proposed project or receiving any benefits, financial or otherwise, from the requested grant funds.*

**Yes, potential conflicts of interest may exist between myself and this application/proposal.**

*By checking this box, you are indicating that a conflict of interest, or certain factors that may contribute to the appearance or perception of a conflict of interest, may exist between yourself and the parties involved in this proposal, which include the organization listed as the primary applicant as well as any organizations or individuals either contributing resources to the proposed project or receiving any benefits, financial or otherwise, from the requested grant funds. Please provide an explanation of the potential conflict of interest in the space provided below.*

### Project Alignment with Challenge Goals (Weight: 70%)

Criteria	Excellent (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Score	Comments (Optional)
<b>Centrality of USALEEP Data</b>	Proposed project uses USALEEP data as a central and core component of the project proposal, both if the proposed project is new or if it builds on existing work; Serves as a viable and exceptional case study for the field to use the USALEEP data in an innovative and impactful way.	Proposed project uses USALEEP data as a component of the project proposal, however the core objective of the project focus does not centrally showcase the USALEEP data. The proposed project may be a viable case study for the field to use the USALEEP data but not in an exceptionally innovative or impactful way.	Proposed project does not use the USALEEP data as a central component of the project proposal or the project has clear objectives and outputs that are mostly unrelated to USALEEP data. The proposed project is unable to serve as a viable case study for the field to use the USALEEP data in an innovative and impactful way.		
<b>Innovative and Open Application of USALEEP Data</b>	Proposal exceptionally outlines an unconventional approach or methodology and tests a novel application of the USALEEP data.	Proposal outlines a somewhat unconventional approach or methodology and tests a somewhat novel application of the USALEEP data.	Proposal fails to outline an unconventional approach and does not test a novel application of the USALEEP data.		
<b>Cross-Sector Approach</b>	Proposed project exceptionally addresses a question/issue that strongly advances understanding at the intersection of health and other factors/outcomes; offers innovative solutions which promote health equity and better life outcomes across people, place and power.	Proposed project addresses a question/issue that advances understanding at the intersection of health and other factors/outcomes; offers solutions which promote health equity and better life outcomes across people, place and power.	Proposed project fails to address a question/issue that advances understanding at the intersection of health and other factors/outcomes; fails to offer solutions which promote health equity and better life outcomes across people, place and power.		
<b>Replicable/ Open Approach</b>	Proposed project exceptionally exemplifies how to use the USALEEP data through a transparent, replicable approach and has considered how the deliverables listed can expand the knowledge base of the sector.	Proposed project outlines how to use the USALEEP data through a transparent, replicable approach that can expand the knowledge base of the sector but may not specifically explain how the deliverables listed can expand the knowledge base of the sector.	Proposed project fails to outline a transparent, replicable approach that can expand the knowledge base of the sector.		

Please use **ONE** of the criteria sections below to evaluate the applicant's self-identified priority area only (either **people**, **place** or **power**).

Criteria	Excellent (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Score	Comments (Optional)
<b>People</b>	<b>Leadership</b>	Proposed project is led and/or informed by the expertise of individuals who have lived experience, or have significant credibility and longstanding relationships, with communities who have systematically experienced social or economic barriers to health (including but not limited to the list of communities provided).	Proposed project is led by individuals who have demonstrated commitment to communities who have systematically experienced social or economic barriers to health (including but not limited to the list of communities provided) but is not led by or incorporates people with lived experience.	Proposed project is not led by individuals who have lived experience, or have significant credibility and longstanding relationships, with communities who have systematically experienced social or economic barriers to health (including but not limited to the list of communities provided).	

	<b>Community Expertise &amp; Partnership</b>	The expertise of communities who have endured historical and ongoing marginalization is reflected in the design, delivery, impact and evaluation of the project outcomes. Proposed project plans to utilize community partners to share key insights regarding enriched programs, services, resources, etc. with community stakeholders.	The expertise of communities who have endured historical and ongoing marginalization is incorporated but not central in the design, delivery, impact and evaluation. Proposed project shows some connection with community partners but does not propose a specific plan to share key insights gleaned from the proposed project.	The expertise of communities who have endured historical and ongoing marginalization is not central in the design, delivery, impact and evaluation. Proposed project does not propose a plan to utilize community partners in sharing key insights regarding enriched programs, services, resources, etc. with community stakeholders.		
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Criteria		Excellent (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Score	Comments (Optional)
Place	<b>Leadership</b>	Proposed project is led by organizations both located in and serving communities in regions facing some of the worst health disparities including (but not limited to): Appalachia, Mississippi Delta, Southeast, Southwest, Plains Region ( <i>Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming</i> ), Native American and Indigenous Territories, or a rural/underserved region not explicitly specified.	Proposed project is led by organizations serving communities in regions facing some of the worst health disparities including (but not limited to): Appalachia, Mississippi Delta, Southeast, Southwest, Plains Region ( <i>Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming</i> ), Native American and Indigenous Territories, or a rural/underserved region not explicitly specified.	Proposed project is led by organizations neither located in nor serving communities in regions facing some of the worst health disparities including (but not limited to): Appalachia, Mississippi Delta, Southeast, Southwest, Plains Region ( <i>Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming</i> ), Native American and Indigenous Territories, or a rural/underserved region not explicitly specified.		
	<b>Community Expertise</b>	The local assets and challenges are acknowledged and reflected in the design, delivery, impact and evaluation of the project outcomes; the project demonstrates a community place-based expertise	The local assets and challenges are acknowledged but place-based expertise is not necessarily reflected in the design, delivery, impact and evaluation of the project outcomes.	The local assets and challenges are neither acknowledged nor reflected in the design, delivery, impact and evaluation of the project outcomes, and the project demonstrates little to no place-based expertise.		

Criteria		Excellent (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Score	Comments (Optional)
Power	<b>Stakeholder Empowerment</b>	The proposed project outlines a clear plan that leverages the USALEEP data to increase the capacity of community stakeholders, leaders and organizations to advance health equity through power-building activities to address inequities that impact health outcomes.	The proposed project informs leaders and organizations in the proposed target community, but using the USALEEP data to build the capacity of community stakeholders to advance health equity is not a direct goal of the project.	The proposed project neither empowers nor informs organizations that reflect the target community.		
	<b>Strategies to Build Power</b>	Proposed project uses USALEEP data within building power strategies including but not limited to: advocacy and capacity-building efforts, community organizing, coalition building and collaboration, narrative change and media advocacy campaigns, policy innovation and systems change.	Proposed project utilizes some building power strategies including but not limited to: advocacy and capacity-building efforts, community organizing, coalition building and collaboration, narrative change and media advocacy campaigns, policy innovation and systems change.	Proposed project does not utilize key building power strategies including but not limited to: advocacy and capacity-building efforts, community organizing, coalition building and collaboration, narrative change and media advocacy campaigns, policy innovation and systems change.		

**Feasibility (Weight: 30%)**

Criteria	Satisfactory (1)	Unsatisfactory (0)	Score	Comments (Optional)
<b>Project Implementation</b>	Presents a detailed and thorough plan that effectively addresses the issues described in problem statement through stated activities and/or products.	Fails to present a detailed and thorough plan that addresses the issues described in problem statement through stated activities and/or products.		
<b>Budget/Budget Narrative</b>	Aligns budget and narrative; both seem reasonable as it relates to the proposal, including project timeline and activities.	Fails to align budget and narrative; either or both seem unreasonable as it relates to the proposal.		
<b>Timeline</b>	Provides a timeline of activities and/or products that can be reasonably achieved within the one-year grant period.	Timeline of activities and/or products cannot be reasonably achieved within the one-year grant period.		
<b>Organization's Background and Expertise</b>	Demonstrates adequate knowledge of the community's health equity issues to be addressed; organization seems well-equipped to complete the project.	Fails to demonstrate sufficient knowledge of the community's health equity issues to be addressed and therefore does not seem well-equipped to complete the project.		
<b>Staff Capacity</b>	Demonstrates adequate staff capacity to successfully complete the project.	Staff capacity appears insufficient to successfully complete the project.		

**Bonus Criteria (Unweighted)**

Criteria	Excellent (2)	Satisfactory (1)	N/A	Score	Comments (Optional)
<b>General Professionalism and Proofreading</b>	Proposal and documentation is presented in a clear and organized manner with no grammatical errors.	Proposal and documentation is presented in a clear and organized manner with minimal grammatical errors that do not impact readability.	Proposal and documentation is unclear and/or not well organized. Grammatical errors negatively impact readability.		

**Overall Recommendation**

After considering your scores for each of the above criteria and your overall impression of the entire application, would you recommend that this applicant receive the requested grant funding?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
	<input type="checkbox"/> No

**Overall Comments to Urban Institute (Required):** *In the space below, please summarize why you do or do not recommend this applicant for funding.*

**Overall Comments to Applicant (Optional):** *We encourage you to use the space below to provide any overall feedback that you would like to communicate directly to the applicant that can help inform and improve their future proposals.*