



500 Cities Data Challenge Review Guide

This document will guide you through the 500 Cities Data Challenge full proposal review materials and scoring process.

Familiarize Yourself with the Scoring Rubric

Upon receiving the application materials, it may help to familiarize yourself with the scoring rubric. Please note that each rubric has been designated for the corresponding application included in the same PDF. The first section of the rubric has been prepopulated with the Project Title, Applicant Organization, Application ID, and your name. Please do not alter the file extension. In the event that there is an error in the file name, please email 500citieschallenge@urban.org.

The scoring rubric, which you will use to evaluate and score each application, is broken out into the three categories of criteria listed below.

1. **Project Alignment with Data Challenge Goals** (Weight: 70%)
2. **Feasibility** (Weight: 30%)
3. **Bonus** (Additional, unweighted)

Review the Application

Keeping in mind the criteria above, please read and assess the following components of the application, which have been bookmarked in the PDF for your convenience.

1. **Application Form** – includes logistical information pertaining to applying organization and project
2. **Cover Letter**
3. **Proposal Narrative** – includes problem statement, approach, and project timeline
4. **Budget** - outlines proposed expenditures for the project
5. **Budget Narrative** – includes explanations and justifications for each line items

The Scoring Process

Within each rubric category, there are 3-5 specific criteria for which you will record a score. To record your score, please select one of the options from the drop down menu to the right of each criteria. The rating scale for each category is as follows:

- **Project Alignment with the Data Challenge Goals:** Please select a score of **(3)** Excellent, **(2)** Satisfactory, or **(1)** Unsatisfactory
- **Feasibility:** Please select a score of **(2)** Satisfactory or **(1)** Unsatisfactory
- **Bonus Criteria:** Please select a score of **(2)** Excellent, **(1)** Satisfactory or N/A

As you consider how to score your applications on each criteria, please refer to the descriptions within the table as a guide. In addition to your score, we welcome any comments you may have in the text box provided. However, please note that this is *optional*.

Lastly, page 3 contains the following sections:

- **Overall Recommendation:** Once you have entered all of your scores related to the criteria, we would like your overall recommendation of whether or not this applicant/project should receive grant funding. Please select “yes” or “no”.
- **Disclosures/Declarations:** We also ask you to identify any potential conflicts of interest that may exist between you and the applying organization, its partners, or the proposed project. If you do have any conflicts of interest, please provide an explanation in the space allotted.

Saving and Submitting Your Reviews

After you have filled in all required fields of the scoring rubric, please save the document with the *existing* file extension. Once you have scored and saved your applications, please submit your completed reviews in *one email with all PDFs* attached to 500citieschallenge@urban.org on or before **Monday, February 19th by COB**.

Additional Resources

Please feel free to access additional resources on the [500 Cities Data Challenge website](#), including the Request for Proposals and the [application guidelines](#).

500 Cities Data Challenge: Application Scoring Rubric

Project Title: _____

Applicant Organization: _____

Application ID: _____

Reviewer Name: _____

Project Alignment with Data Challenge Goals (Weight: 70%)					
Criteria	Excellent (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Score	Comments
Innovative Application of 500 Cities Data	Exceptionally outlines an unconventional approach or methodology and tests a novel application of the data.	Outlines an unconventional approach or methodology and tests a somewhat novel application of the data.	Fails to outline an unconventional approach and does not test a novel application of the data.		
Cross-Sector	Exceptionally addresses a question that strongly advances understanding at the intersection of health and other outcomes; offers a unique cross-sector intervention to improve healthy behaviors, health outcomes, health equity, and prevention.	Addresses a question that advances understanding at the intersection of health and other outcomes; offers a cross-sector intervention to improve healthy behaviors, health outcomes, health equity, and prevention.	Fails to address a question that advances understanding at the intersection of health and other outcomes; fails to offer a cross-sector intervention to improve healthy behaviors, health outcomes, health equity, and prevention.		
Replicable/ Open Approach	Exceptionally exemplifies how to use 500 Cities data through a transparent, replicable approach that can expand the knowledge base of the sector.	Outlines a transparent, replicable approach that can expand the knowledge base of the sector, but may not be clear on details.	Fails to outline a transparent, replicable approach that can expand the knowledge base of the sector.		
Methodology/ Instrumentation	Exceptionally outlines a clear and consistent methodology/ instrumentation that will answer the research question using the 500 Cities data as the central and essential component.	Outlines a reasonable methodology/ instrumentation that will answer the research question using the 500 Cities data as an important component.	Fails to outline a clear and consistent methodology/ instrumentation that will answer the research question using the 500 Cities data as an important component.		

Feasibility (Weight: 30%)

Criteria	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Score	Comments
Project Implementation	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.		
Budget/Budget Narrative	Aligns budget and narrative; both seem reasonable as it relates to the proposal.	Fails to align budget and narrative; either or both seem unreasonable as it relates to the proposal.		
Timeline	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.		
Organization's Background and Expertise	Demonstrates adequate knowledge of the community health issues to be addressed; organization seems well-equipped to complete the project.	Fails to demonstrate sufficient knowledge of the community health issues to be addressed and therefore does not seem well-equipped to complete the project.		
Staff Capacity	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
Organization's Experience in Serving Rural Communities	Demonstrates exceptional experience addressing critical needs and service gaps in rural communities; project aligns with organizational dedication to rural communities and expands current work in these areas.	Demonstrates some experience addressing critical needs and service gaps in rural communities; project aligns with some prior work focused on rural communities.	Does not demonstrate experience addressing critical needs and service gaps in rural communities; organization has not performed prior work focused on rural communities.		
Organization's Experience in Serving Underrepresented Communities	Demonstrates exceptional experience addressing critical needs and service gaps in underrepresented communities; project aligns with organizational dedication to underrepresented communities and expands current work in these areas.	Demonstrates some experience addressing critical needs and service gaps in underrepresented communities; project aligns with some prior work focused on underrepresented communities.	Does not demonstrate experience addressing critical needs and service gaps in underrepresented communities; organization has not performed prior work focused on underrepresented communities.		
General Professionalism and Proofreading	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?

General Comments (Optional)

Disclosures/Declarations

If you answer "No" above: 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.

If you answer "Yes" above: A conflict of interest, or certain factors that may contribute to the appearance or perception of a conflict of interest, exists 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.

Explanation of potential conflicts of interest (if applicable):