



DRAFT

Alaska Rural Health Transformation Program

Project Evaluation Framework

This evaluation framework is designed to support a consistent assessment of each project application submitted for funding under Alaska’s Rural Health Transformation Program (RHTP). Applications will be evaluated based on the below weighted criteria, which reflect the State’s goal to invest in projects that help make health care work better for Alaskans by improving access and prevention, expanding workforce, leveraging technology, and creating long-lasting changes that help people stay healthy.

The scoring rubric is designed to assess the strength of each project on its own merits. Because funding is limited and demand is expected to be high, final decisions will also consider the full set of projects to make sure RHTP investments help all Alaskans, support all of the State’s RHTP initiatives, maximize impact, and stay within federal funding limits. All projects must support [Alaska’s RHTP initiatives](#) and are subject to review and approval by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS).

| | 1 (Poor) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 (Excellent) |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| Alignment with State & Federal RHTP Goals and Alaska RHTP initiatives (20%) | The project is not aligned with State and federal RHTP goals and Alaska RHTP initiatives and/or predominantly includes activities or requested uses of funds that are impermissible under CMS requirements. | Alignment with State and federal RHTP goals and Alaska RHTP initiatives is weak or superficial and predominantly includes activities for which there is limited or unclear justification of permissibility under CMS requirements. | The project broadly aligns with State and federal RHTP goals and Alaska RHTP initiatives and requested uses of funds appear permissible; however, the proposal may not meaningfully or sufficiently drive impact in alignment with State RHTP priorities. | The project is clearly aligned with State and federal RHTP goals and Alaska RHTP initiatives, with well-supported justification that proposed activities and requested uses of funds are permissible under CMS requirements and advance Alaska’s intended purpose for the program. | The project demonstrates strong, explicit alignment with State and federal RHTP goals and Alaska RHTP initiatives, clearly advances one or more State RHTP initiatives, and includes a well-substantiated and compliant use of funds that reflects a strong understanding of CMS requirements and Alaska’s intended purpose for the program. |

This project is supported by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) as part of a financial assistance award totaling \$272,174,855.72, with 100 percent funded by CMS/HHS. The contents are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official views of, nor an endorsement, by CMS/HHS, or the U.S. Government.



DRAFT

| | 1 (Poor) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 (Excellent) |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| Demonstrated Need Aligned with Intervention (10%) | Need is not demonstrated. The proposal does not describe the problem to be addressed or why it matters for the intended community/region. | Need is minimally described but not supported with data, community input, or credible rationale, and it is unclear why this project is a priority for the community/region. | Need is reasonably described and supported by some evidence (e.g., limited data, local context, or stakeholder input), but the magnitude, root causes, or target population are not fully clear or compelling. The intervention proposed to address the need appears appropriate, but the connection is not supported by evidence. | Need is clearly demonstrated using credible evidence and/or documented community/regional input, with a clear linkage between identified needs, target population(s), and the proposed intervention. | Need is strongly demonstrated through multiple sources (e.g., data trends and documented community/regional planning input), shows clear urgency, and the proposal convincingly explains why the project offers a compelling solution for the community/region. |
| Outcomes (15%) | No concrete project outcomes are identified. | Project outcomes are vague, cannot be readily measured, and/or do not support improvement of patient outcomes, access to care, and/or reduction of healthcare costs. | Project outcomes are reasonable and specific, can be reliably measured, and support improvement of patient outcomes, access to care, and/or reduction of healthcare costs, but are not clearly tied to State RHTP targeted outcomes or metrics. | Project outcomes are well-supported by credible literature, are specific, and can be reliably measured. They directly relate to State RHTP goals, targeted outcomes, and metrics. | Outcomes are ambitious, well-supported by credible literature, and specific. They can be reliably measured and clearly advance State RHTP goals, targeted outcomes, and metrics at a meaningful scale. |
| Rural Impact (15%) | Unclear how the project and outcomes impact rural residents. | Impact of project and outcomes for rural residents is limited or indirect. | Impact of project and outcomes for rural residents is fair. The explanation of impact may lack sufficient evidence, clarity, or scale. | Impact of project and outcomes for rural residents is moderate. The explanation is clear. | Impact of project and outcomes for rural residents is significant. The explanation of impact is clear and compelling. |



DRAFT

| | 1 (Poor) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 (Excellent) |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Transformation Potential (10%) | Investments would not lead to change or are at risk of resulting in harmful changes to existing rural health care delivery system and facilities. | Investments would lead to small, incremental changes to existing rural health care delivery system, with limited scale or durability of impact. | Investments would modestly support measurable changes to rural health care delivery system, but are limited in scope, reach, or degree of system-level change. | Major investments with significant transformative potential for rural health care delivery, demonstrating clear improvements within the applicant’s service area or target population. | Robust investment plan to structurally transform rural health care delivery, with impact that extends beyond the applicant organization and may align with or amplify other awarded projects. |
| Strength of Partnerships and Coordination (10%) | The proposal does not describe meaningful coordination with relevant partners, systems, or the community, and does not explain why coordination would not be needed. | Some partners or coordination activities are mentioned, but roles, relationships, or community connections are unclear, informal, or weakly described. | The proposal demonstrates appropriate coordination with partners, systems, or the community, with some defined roles or integration strategies, or provides a reasonable explanation for why the project can succeed without formal partners. Coordination approaches may still be underdeveloped. | The proposal shows intentional coordination with partners, existing systems, and/or the community to avoid duplication and strengthen local or regional impact, or clearly explains why formal partnerships are not necessary and demonstrates a strong coordination approach with relevant systems, stakeholders, or communities. | The proposal demonstrates robust, well-integrated coordination that meaningfully strengthens the broader local or regional system. Partnerships (if used) are well-defined and accountable, or the project clearly operates as a strong standalone model that is deeply connected to community needs, systems, and outcomes. |
| Sustainability (10%) | Sustainability is not sufficiently supported or plausible. | Sustainability is somewhat plausible, but without a detailed plan. | Sustainability is clearly plausible, with reasonable assumptions, but without a detailed plan. | Sustainability is planned in detail or clearly justified as not necessary given the nature and time-limited purpose of the initiative. | Project is not only sustainable in and of itself, but meaningfully supports the sustainability of other projects, organizations, or system-level efforts. |



DRAFT

| | 1 (Poor) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 (Excellent) |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| Workplan and Monitoring (10%) | Timeline and milestones are not clear, feasible, or directly linked to the proposed initiative, and there is little evidence that the project can be implemented as described. | Timeline and milestones are clear and well thought out but present material risks to timely implementation, with limited consideration of how challenges would be addressed. | Detailed workplan that reflects serious thought about obstacles and potential delays, but mitigation strategies and monitoring approaches are limited or not fully developed. | Workplan reflects a considered, thoughtful operating and strategic framework with clear and feasible timelines and milestones, including defined approaches to risk management, progress tracking, and course correction. | In addition to prior point categories, the workplan includes clear and effective approaches to accelerating early implementation and maximizing impact within the RHTP timeframe, with strong monitoring, learning, and adaptive management practices. |

DRAFT