

Scoring Rubric Criteria and Weighting

Criteria	Weighting
A. Alignment with Joint Committee Goals and Working Group Priorities	10
B. One-Time or Recurring Funding Required	10
C. Availability of alternative, non-SLRF Federal or State Funding (i.e. ARPA funds appropriated to State agencies or Infrastructure funds)	10
D. Use of Matching Funds (i.e. county, metro city, NEU SLRF funds; private, philanthropy)	15
E. Project Feasibility & Plan	15
F. State & Community Impact	10
G. Disproportionately Impacted/Vulnerable Populations	15
H. Identification of Evidence Based Practices and Project Metrics	10
I. Return on Investment and Outcomes	10
J. Potential for Transformational Impact	10
	115

Scoring Rubric Abbreviations Key:
 JC – Joint Committee WG – Working Group SLRF – State and Local Recovery Funds DI – Disproportionately Impacted QCTs – Qualified Census Tracts

Proposed Scoring Rubric for Working Group Scoring

Criteria	Not Demonstrated	Below Expectation	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Score
A. Alignment with Joint Committee Goals and Working Group Priorities	Project does not align with any of the three goals set by JC	Project can be related to one JC goal and WG priority, but alignment is not clear	Project aligns closely with two JC goals and WG priority	Project aligns closely with all three JC goals and one WG priority	
	0 points	3 points	7 points	10 points	
B. One-Time or Recurring Funding Required	Yes, needs recurring state general fund appropriations	N/A	N/A	No, needs only one-time funding and no recurring state general fund appropriation	
	0 points			10 points	
C. Availability of alternative, non-SLRF Federal or State Funding (i.e. ARPA funds appropriated to State agencies or Infrastructure funds)	Significant non-SLRF federal or state funding source is available	Non-SLRF federal or state funding source is available	Some non-SLRF federal or state funding source may be available	No other non-SLRF federal or state funding source has been identified	
	0 points	3 points	7 points	10 points	
D. Use of Matching Funds (i.e. county, metro city, NEU SLRF funds; private, philanthropy)	No evidence of public, private, philanthropic partnerships	Actual or potential public, private, or philanthropic partnerships identified	Actual or potential public, private, or philanthropic partnerships with actual or potential funding identified	One or more actual public, private, or philanthropic partnerships identified with letter of support or funding commitment	
	0 points	5 points	10 points	15 points	
E. Project Feasibility & Plan	No clear plan for use of funds or feasibility of project	Project plan for use of funds and feasibility are unclear and/or ambiguous	Project plan and use of funds are clear and project feasibility is presented with some details	Project plan and use of funds and feasibility are clear and presented with significant detail	
	0 points	5 points	10 points	15 points	
F. State & Community Impact	No identification of project impact, including populations to benefit	Some identification of project impact, but lack of clarity on populations to be benefited	State and community impacts of project clearly identified and described with populations to benefit	State & Community impacts of project clearly identified with multiple populations to benefit	
	0 points	3 points	7 points	10 points	
G. Disproportionately Impacted/Vulnerable Populations	No DI/vulnerable populations to benefit from the project	Project intends to benefit DI and vulnerable populations but not clearly identified	Project description clearly identifies DI/vulnerable populations that will be benefited	Project description clearly identifies multiple DI/vulnerable populations to be benefited and describes in detail how	
	0 points	5 points	10 points	15 points	
H. Identification of Evidence Based Practices and Project Metrics	No mention off evidence based-practices or metrics to be utilized or furthered in the project	Intent expressed in application for use of evidence-based practices and project metrics but not clearly identified	Identification of anticipated evidence-based practices and project metrics	Detailed description of all anticipated evidence-based practices and project metrics	
	0 points	3 points	7 points	10 points	
I. Return on Investment and Outcomes	No mention of project outcomes or ROI	Recognition within project description of project outcomes and ROI but not specified	Identification of anticipated project outcomes and ROI	Detailed description of all expected project outcomes and positive ROI	
	0 points	3 points	7 points	10 points	
J. Potential for Transformational Impact	No opportunity for transformational impact for Oklahoma citizens.	Project may have transformational impact on citizens and state capabilities over the next 2-5 years	Project may have transformational impact on citizens and state capabilities over the next 5-10 years	Project is a once in a generation opportunity for the state	
	0 points	3 points	7 points	10 points	
				TOTAL	