

Rural Revitalization Grant Scoring Rubric

SIGNIFICANCE

Resource/ Project Significance			
EXEMPLARY—3	ADEQUATE—2	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT—1	DEFICIENT/MISSING—0
Applicant clearly identifies the historical resource and presents a strong evidence-based argument why this historical resource has value to the people of Iowa. Applicant provides clear evidence to support their argument for historical significance. Reviewer has no questions about the significance of this historical resource.	Applicant identifies the historical resource and presents an adequate argument why this historical resource has value to the people of Iowa. Applicant provides some evidence to support their argument for historical significance. Reviewer has questions about the significance of this historical resource.	Applicant insufficiently identifies the historical resource and/or presents an inadequate argument or evidence to support the claim of historical significance.	Applicant fails to identify the historical resource and/or fails to present an argument or evidence to support the claim of historical significance.
Historical Significance			
EXEMPLARY—3	ADEQUATE—2	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT—1	DEFICIENT/MISSING—0
Applicant clearly explains and documents how the historical resource has national or international significance.	Applicant clearly explains and documents how the historical resource has state or local significance.	Applicant insufficiently explains or documents the historical resource's international, national, state, or local significance.	Applicant fails to identify the historical resource's level of significance.

Connection to Iowa's Rural Heritage			
EXEMPLARY—3	ADEQUATE—2	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT—1	DEFICIENT/MISSING—0
Applicant clearly describes how the resource is connected to and reflects Iowa's rural heritage.	Applicant provides an adequate description how the resource is connected to and reflects Iowa's rural heritage.	Applicant insufficiently describes how the resource is connected to or reflects Iowa's rural heritage.	Applicant fails to connect the resource to Iowa's rural heritage.

Size of Rural Community			
3	2	1	0
Property is located in a community with a population of less than 10,000.	Property is located in a community with a population of 10,001 to 20,000.	Property is located in a community with a population of 20,001 to 35,000.	Property is listed in a community with a population of 35,001 to 50,000 and/or is within a metropolitan statistical area

IMPLEMENTATION

Project Planning			
EXEMPLARY—3	ADEQUATE—2	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT—1	DEFICIENT/MISSING—0
Reviewer has confidence that the project is the highest priority for the historical resource and has been well-planned.	Applicant describes the planning process but the reviewer is left with questions about whether the work is a priority and whether sufficient planning has been done.	Applicant provides limited evidence of planning.	Applicant provides no discussion of project planning or the information provided is unclear.
Project Overview			
EXEMPLARY—3	ADEQUATE—2	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT—1	DEFICIENT/MISSING—0
Applicant clearly describes the proposed scope of work. Applicant references appropriate historic preservation standards and how they will be applied to this project. Reviewer has confidence that the project has been well-planned, will be done according to appropriate	Applicant describes the proposed scope of work, but leaves the reviewer with questions about some of the following: the project specifics, whether it is the right thing to do, or whether the applicant understands how to apply the appropriate historic preservation standards.	Applicant provides insufficient information about the proposed scope of work. and/or limited explanation about how historic preservation standards will be applied.	Applicant provides no explanation about what they will do or how it will be done, and/or the work proposed does not meet appropriate historic preservation standards. Reviewer does not have confidence that historic preservation standards will

historic preservation standards, and will be successfully implemented.			be followed, or that the project will be successfully implemented.
Project Timeline			
EXEMPLARY—3	ADEQUATE—2	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT—1	DEFICIENT/MISSING—0
The timeline is appropriate and realistic for all proposed work elements. The reviewer has no question that the project will be completed in the grant contract time period.	The timeline is appropriate for some proposed work elements, but reviewer questions if certain work elements can be completed in the proposed time frame.	The timeline is not appropriate for most of the work elements or reviewer questions if the entire project can be completed in the grant contract period.	The timeline is either not provided, not appropriate for all of the work elements, or the reviewer does not believe the project can be completed in the grant contract period.
Supporting Documents and Photos			
EXEMPLARY—3	ADEQUATE—2	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT—1	DEFICIENT/MISSING—0
The relevant supporting material, such as photographs of the resource, drawings, mortar analysis, rehabilitation studies, or letters of support provided*, clearly help the reviewer understand the need for all work items in the proposed scope of work. *Applicant does not need to provide all listed items, only those relevant to the project.	The applicant provides adequate supporting material to help the reviewer understand the need for most work items in the proposed scope of work.	The applicant provides some helpful supporting material but the body of material is incomplete for the reviewer to understand the need for the proposed scope of work.	The supporting material provided is unclear and does not help the reviewer understand the need for the proposed scope of work, or the supporting material is not provided.

COMMUNITY IMPACT

Importance to Local Community			
EXEMPLARY—3	ADEQUATE—2	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT—1	DEFICIENT/MISSING—0
Applicant clearly identifies the local community or audience and makes an evidence-based argument for how this project will have an impact on its rural community or audience. The applicant clearly describes how they will measure the project's impact.	Applicant adequately identifies the rural community or audience and makes an evidence-based argument for how this project will have an impact on the rural community or audience. The applicant adequately describes how they will measure the project's impact.	Applicant insufficiently identifies the rural community or audience and/or makes an unconvincing argument for how this project will impact the rural community or audience. Reviewer has questions about the potential for impact or how the project's impact will be measured.	Applicant does not identify the rural community or audience and does not make an argument for this project's impact. Alternatively, this project has no impact on the rural community or audience.
Project Accessibility and Promotion			
EXEMPLARY—3	ADEQUATE—2	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT—1	DEFICIENT/MISSING—0
The historical resource is or will be regularly accessible to the public. The applicant identifies a strong plan for how the resource will be shared on site and across multiple platforms including web sites, and social and traditional media.	The historical resource is accessible to the public, but the reviewer has questions about the applicant's plan for facilitating access and communication. Alternatively, the applicant identifies a strong plan for facilitating access and communication, but public access to the historical resource will be on a limited basis.	The historical resource is accessible to the public on a limited basis. The applicant describes a weak plan for facilitating access and communication.	The historical resource is not accessible to the public. The applicant does not identify a plan for how the resource will be shared on site or across multiple platforms including web sites, and social and traditional media.
Sustainability			
EXEMPLARY—3	ADEQUATE—2	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT—1	DEFICIENT/MISSING—0
Applicant clearly explains how the resource and the benefits of the project will be sustained into the future. The applicant makes a compelling case that there is a critical need for the project.	Applicant adequately explains how the resource and the benefits of the project will be sustained into the future. The applicant makes an adequate case that there is a critical need for the project. The reviewer has some questions	Applicant provides a weak explanation for how the resource and the benefits of the project will be sustained into the future. The applicant makes a weak case that there is a critical need for the project.	Applicant does not explain how the resource and the benefits of the project will be sustained into the future. The applicant does not make a case that there is a critical need for the project.

about either sustainability or critical need.

BUDGET

Budget Clarity and Match			
EXEMPLARY—3	ADEQUATE—2	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT—1	DEFICIENT/MISSING—0
Project budget and intended use of requested funds are clear. Applicant identifies source of cash and all of the cash match has been secured.	Project budget and intended use of funds are adequately explained. The applicant identifies the source of cash match and some of the cash match has been secured.	Project budget or intended use of requested funds is unclear or applicant identifies the sources of cash match but the cash match required has not been secured.	Project budget is incomplete or inaccurate. The applicant identifies the sources of cash match but the cash match required has not been secured.
Budget Propriety			
EXEMPLARY—3	ADEQUATE—2	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT—1	DEFICIENT/MISSING—0
Budget is appropriate for the type of work proposed and there is a clear connection between the scope of work and the budget items. Applicant provides strong documentation that budget numbers are reliable.	Budget is appropriate for most work items and budget is adequately itemized according to the scope of proposed work. Applicant provides adequate evidence that budget numbers are reliable for most work items.	Budget is not appropriate for most work items and/or there is a weak connection between the scope of work and budget items. Applicant provides insufficient evidence that budget numbers are reliable for most or all of the work items.	Budget is not appropriate for work items and/or there is no connection between the scope of work and budget items.

APPLICANT CAPACITY

EXEMPLARY—3	ADEQUATE—2	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT—1	DEFICIENT/MISSING—0
Applicant clearly demonstrates that it has the capacity to manage a federal grant. Local project manager has the experience, tools and capacity to ensure that the project will be successfully completed.	Applicant adequately demonstrates that it has the capacity to manage a federal grant but the reviewer has questions whether the project will be completed on schedule.	Applicant provides a weak explanation of its capacity to manage a federal grant.	Applicant fails to demonstrate its capacity to manage the grant.

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT STATUS

3
The CLG is in good standing and has met the program requirements as documented in their 2019 CLG annual report.