



APPENDIX 2 – EVALUATION AND SCORING RUBRIC

Community-Driven Behavioral Health Initiative (CDBHI) Grant Program

No.	Evaluation Criterion	Application Priorities	Max Points
1	Alignment with RFA Purpose, BHSA Population-Based Prevention, and Allowable Prevention Approach	Project remains within population-based prevention; meets one or more statutory prevention requirements; uses a CDEP, EBP, or other allowable prevention approach and applicable strategies; advances statewide goals; and excludes Early Intervention, diagnosis, and treatment. This criterion assesses alignment; Criterion 3 assesses design and feasibility.	15
2	Community Need, Service Area, and Populations of Focus	Credible data, community knowledge, lived experience, and local context demonstrate strengths, need, disparities, risk and protective factors, barriers, geography, existing prevention resources, remaining gaps or limitations, the prevention investment gap, relevance to selected population(s), and nonduplication.	15
3	Project Design, Prevention Pathway, and Implementation Plan	Activities and the prevention pathway are clear, feasible, culturally grounded, population-focused, and measurable. SMARTIE objectives, responsible staff, timelines, milestones, deliverables, risks, and dependencies credibly connect activities to outputs, outcomes, stigma and discrimination reduction, and statewide goals.	15
4	Health Equity, Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness, Lived Experience, and Community Engagement	Project addresses structural barriers and disparities; reflects culture and language; ensures accessibility; uses representative staffing and trusted messengers; and meaningfully engages community members and people	15

No.	Evaluation Criterion	Application Priorities	Max Points
		with lived or living experience through ongoing feedback and documented responses in planning, implementation, and evaluation.	
5	Organizational Experience and Capacity	Applicant demonstrates community trust; relevant and comparable experience; implementation readiness; adequate staffing; fiscal systems and internal controls; experience managing public funding; and capacity to manage the proposed award and funded third parties.	10
6	Management, Regional and Local Coordination, Partnerships, and Oversight	Management and oversight are feasible; partners and funded third parties are defined; procurement and subaward requirements are addressed; monitoring, underperformance, corrective action, compliance, quality assurance, and issue management are sound; and coordination reduces duplication and strengthens complementary investment.	10
7	Data, Evaluation, Community-Defined Measures, Quality Improvement, and Reporting	Applicant demonstrates feasible data management, evaluation, quality assurance, and reporting capacity; recognizes community-defined evidence and measures; protects confidentiality; consults communities; uses continuous quality improvement; and can participate in required statewide evaluation and reporting.	10
8	Budget Reasonableness, Allowability, Investment Gap, and Sustainability	Budget is complete, reasonable, allowable, cost effective, nonduplicative, and aligned with activities and Appendix 4; identifies major assumptions and the prevention investment gap CDBHI funding will fill; and includes realistic sustainability and scalability approaches.	10
Maximum Points			100

Minimum Score: An application should receive an overall technical and budget review score of at least 70 out of 100 possible points to advance to statewide portfolio consideration. Applications scoring below the minimum score may not be recommended for funding. Meeting or exceeding the minimum qualifying score allows an application to advance to statewide portfolio consideration but does not guarantee selection or funding. No separate minimum score applies to an individual evaluation section unless expressly stated in the RFA or Evaluation and Scoring Rubric.