Sample Scoring Rubric with Weighting					
Application Question	**Guiding Question**	**Rating Scale**	**Description (Instructions)**	**Points Possible**	**Reviewed By**
Project Summary					
Executive Summary: Provide a brief, comprehensive summary of the overall project, the needs of the population to be served, how the project area was chosen and how the funding will contribute to a solution.	Does the summary clearly indicate the objective of the proposal? What area(s) will the project serve? How well does the summary describe the need?	0-5	0 = Unacceptable Response The narrative does not provide a clear objective for the project. 1-2 = Weak Response The narrative provides an objectives, but the connection between the actions of the project and that objective are not clear. OR the objective is clear but the service area is not. 3-4 = Average Response The objective and services are clear, but there is not a clear explanation of the need they are fulfilling. 5 = Strong Response The summary is comprehensive and detailed, the objective and need is clear and there is a clear connection to the project activities.	5	**Full Panel**
Connection to BDE Goal: Responses should explain how the project will further BDE's goal of closing the digital divide and ensuring covered populations have access to affordable, reliable, high-speed internet.	Does the project aim to close the digital divide in the catchment selected? Will the broadband provided be affordable, reliable and high-speed?	0-4	0 = Unacceptable Response The project summary does not connect the project to closing the digital divide or providing digital inclusion services. 1-2 = Weak Response The project summary outlines a plan for affordable, reliable, high-speed internet, but no connection is made to the need as caused by the digital divide.	4	**Full Panel**

			3 = Average Response A connection is made between the project and closing of the digital divide in that community. 4 = Strong Response The project summary connects the project to the overarching goals of the grant program with a clear definition of the need and how this project will address that.		
Statement of Experience					
Organization History: Provide a brief history of your organization.	How well does the narrative describe the organization's history and background?	0-3	Examples of what to look for: Ties to Baltimore, history of providing services to residents, established communication channels with community. 0 = Unacceptable Response No narrative is submitted or narrative does not reference the organization's history or background. 1 = Weak Response The narrative does not clearly describe the organization's history or background. Example: "To support the community, we have established programs throughout the years to support children in need." 2 = Average Response They provide limited history and/or background; narrative does not highlight key details Example: "For the past decade, our organization has supported children in south Baltimore through deployment of MiFi devices to over 200 families with children age 5-12."	3	Full Panel

			3 = Strong Response The narrative greatly details the organization's history and background historical impact, population served, need/reason for the establishment for organization) Example: "Our organization has worked over 12 years in the Cherry Hill, Brooklyn Park, and Curtis Bay neighborhoods. We were formed out a coalition of engineers, parents, and residents who were committed to ensure students had access to quality, affordable, high-speed broadband, as the options were limited at the time. To date, we have deployed fixed wireless connectivity at Cherry Hill Homes, Park Elementary, and Curtis Bay Elementary serving over 1,000 students and families."		
Capability & Experience: Provide a written narrative describing demonstrated capability & experience, as it relates to the proposed project.	Does the personnel identified for this project have the requisite capabilities and experience to reach success?	0-10	**0-3 = Unacceptable Response** The narrative does not reference the expertise of the implementation or project team. **4-5 = Weak Response** The narrative does not clearly describe the capabilities or experience of the organization nor project team. OR the project team does not have the required experience to reach success. **5-7 = Average Response** The narrative clearly explains the expertise of the organization in implementing these types of projects, but the specifics of the project team is not clear. OR the project team's experience is outlined but is not as much experience as a project of this scale would ideally have. **8-10 = Strong Response** The narrative greatly details the experience and capabilities of the organization and the project team in implementing projects like this one. It has clearly	10	

			outlined the years of experience and success. Project team has the required capabilities and experience to reach success.		
Past Network Deployments: Describe any past network deployments and successes.	How well does the narrative provide a detailed description of the organization's deployments, specifically its work in Baltimore City?	**0-15**	Examples of what to look for: History of successful broadband deployments in Baltimore communities. 0-3 = Unacceptable Response The narrative does not reference the any past network deployments or successes. 4-7 = Weak Response The narrative does not clearly describe the organization's past network deployments to allow for a project to be deemed successful. OR the experience was too recent to determine if the success threshold has been met. OR project team proposed did not work on any of the past deployments. 7-10 = Average Response The narrative clearly explains the organization's AND the project team's past network deployments and provides enough information to deem them successful. 10-15 = Strong Response The narrative greatly details the experience and success of the project team's previous network deployments. Those successes align with the proposed project scope and budget in this application.	15	Full Panel
Network Design					
Network Speed, Latency & Backhaul Requirements:	Does the applicant clearly communicate the speed, latency capabilities and backhaul requirements of the network?	**0-3**	0 = Unacceptable Response The narrative does not reference the network speed, latency or backhaul requirements. All must be referenced or 0 is the score. 1 = Weak Response All three are referenced, but two out of the three do not hit requirements. For	3	

Description of the network to be constructed should provide the network speed, latency capabilities and backhaul requirements. Description should discuss pole attached vs. underground for wired networks and tower type and equipment expectations for a wireless network.			example, the latency does not exceed 50 milliseconds and the backhaul requirements are clear and reasonable, but the speed does not meet 100 symmetrical. 2 = Average Response All three are referenced, but one out of the three is not sufficient. For example, speed and latency meet minimum requirements, but the backhaul requirements do not appear to support the project scale or are deemed unreasonable. 3 = Strong Response All requirements are clearly met and the proposed network design will meet the scope requirements reasonably. The proposed technological solution demonstrates resilience.		
Operations: Description should identify whether the network build-out will be performed by the applicant, or if contracted services will be utilized, or a combination of the two. While it is anticipated that the applicant will ultimately own and operate the network constructed, please confirm the operations and any restrictions to be placed on the future use of any	Does the proposal include industry standards for "Fundamental Network Designs": Scalability, Availability, Security and Manageability?	0-15	0-3 = Unacceptable Response The narrative does not include details on the operations of the proposed network. The response is unacceptable if any of the four fundamentals are missing or insufficient. 4-6 = Weak Response All four fundamentals are discussed, but detail is not sufficient to get a clear understanding of how the network will be operated. For example, the applicant indicates they will contract out network management, but the contractor's scope is not provided. 7-10 = Average Response All four fundamentals are discussed, but scalability is not clearly outlined. 11-15 = Strong Response All four fundamentals are discussed in detail, with the inclusion of any contractor scopes and a robust plan is outlined for scalability of the network.	15	

equipment and network constructed as part of the project.					
			Project Summary, Operations and Design Subtotal	**55**	

Community To be Served

Description of Community: Provides a description of the community including geographic location, referenced through addresses, longitude/latitude, and neighborhoods. Description should also include available demographic information of residents and households to be served.	Does the applicant provide geographic location of the service area? Does the applicant provide the number of households or residents their project will serve? Does the applicant provide demographic information of the served residents?	0-3	0 = Unacceptable Response The narrative does not include details of the community the project will serve. 1 = Weak Response The narrative has limited details of the community the project will serve. For example, the name of the apartment complex in provided with no address or with no number of households. 2 = Average Response The narrative includes sufficient details to clearly outline the geographic location of the community to be served. The number of residents or households to be served in included, but no demographics are provided. 3 = Strong Response All geographic indicators of the community location is provided, the number of residents/households the project will serve is clear and the applicant provided basic demographic information on those households.	3	
Existing Internet Service: Describes the currently available internet service at	Does the applicant provide information on the currently available services in the proposed geographic service area? Is evidence	0-3	0 = Unacceptable Response The narrative does not include details of the existing internet services available in the community.	3	

the location, including speeds and costs.	provided to support that information?		1 = Weak Response The narrative has limited details of the existing internet services available. For example, the response includes one line referencing that Comcast services are available to some households in the community. 2 = Average Response The narrative includes sufficient details to clearly understand the current availability of internet services in the community, including the available providers and the number of households in that community it is available to. 3 = Strong Response The narrative includes sufficient details on the existing internet services available, including speeds and costs for households. The number of households utilizing those services currently is made available. Evidence is provided to support the claims.		
Subscriber Cost: Provides a listing of subscriber service options for the project, their costs, and any limitations of service such as data caps.	Does the applicant clearly outline the pricing structure of internet service plans? Does the applicant outline the limitations of their offerings?	0-5	0-1 = Unacceptable Response The narrative references a potential cost for subscribers, but the cost is not provided. OR costs are far too high for the community to afford. 2 = Weak Response The narrative indicates there will be a cost to subscribers but only a wide range of costs and speeds is provided without clear description of what this community will be paying. OR the costs are clear, but they are high. 3-4 = Average Response The narrative outlines a clear pricing structure aligned with available speeds and indicates how that cost will be communicated to residents. The costs are affordable. 5 = Strong Response There is no cost to subscribers.	5	

Potential Barriers: Describes potential barriers/challenges the project may encounter and measures to address.	Does the narrative clearly describe potential challenges the implementation team may face? If barriers are identified, does the applicant clearly outline how those will be addressed?	**0-3**	0 = Unacceptable Response The narrative does not include details of any barriers/challenges the project will face. OR the barriers do not have a clear path to being overcome. 1 = Weak Response The narrative has limited details of the barriers/challenges the project will face and no solutions/mitigating factors are identified. 2 = Average Response The narrative includes sufficient details to clearly understand the potential barriers/challenges the project could face. The applicant indicates potential measures/strategies to overcome those barriers. 3 = Strong Response The narrative includes sufficient details to clearly understand the potential barriers/challenges the project could face and the applicant outlines a clear plan to address each barrier.	**3**	
Partners: Includes a list of community partners and describes their involvement in the building and deployment of networks.	Does the applicant have partners to complete this work? Is the clear role of each partner outlined?	**0-3**	0 = Unacceptable Response The narrative does not include details of any partnerships. 1 = Weak Response The narrative has limited details of partnerships. For example a list of potential partners is included with no context. 2 = Average Response The narrative includes sufficient details to clearly understand the role of each potential partner in the implementation of the project. Clear scopes are	**3**	

			outlined for each partner and background information on their capacity is provided. 3 = Strong Response The narrative includes sufficient details to clearly understand the role of each potential partner in the implementation of the project. Clear scopes are outlined for each partner and background information on their capacity is provided AND letters of commitment are provided to support those scopes.		
Community Engagement Plan: Describes a plan for community engagement of the community impacted by the project.	Does the applicant have a plan to engage the community in the project rollout? Has the community been involved in the planning stages?	0-5	0-1 = Unacceptable Response The narrative does not describe how the community will be engaged in the project. 2 = Weak Response The narrative indicates there will be involvement by the community in the project but the clear role/plan to bring them to the table is not outlined. 3-4 = Average Response The narrative outlines a clear role for the community in the project, including proposed events/workshops the applicant plans to hold for the community during the project. 5 = Strong Response The narrative outlines a clear role for the community in the project, including proposed events/workshops the applicant plans to hold for the community during the project AND it clearly outlines how that feedback will be integrated into the existing project plan.	**5**	
Sustainability					

Intended Outcomes: Describes the proposed performance metrics (through both outputs and outcomes) of the project.	Does the applicant include performance metrics/measures for the project? Does the applicant define success?	**0-3**	<u>0 = Unacceptable Response</u> The narrative does not include performance metrics/measures. <u>1 = Weak Response</u> The narrative has limited performance metrics/measures for the project. For example, a couple of output metrics such as number of households served. <u>2 = Average Response</u> The narrative includes a number of performance metrics/measures that includes both outputs and outcomes. For example, a measurement focused on the adoption of internet by households served. <u>3 = Strong Response</u> The narrative includes multiple quantitative and qualitative metrics/measures that include both outputs and outcomes.	**3**	
Sustainability Plan: Discusses the sustainability plan for the project for the next five years.	How will this project be sustained over the next five years? Does the sustainability plan require ongoing support from the City or other grant funding? Does the applicant include the impact of other sources of revenue?	**0-10**	<u>0-3 = Unacceptable Response</u> The applicant does not have a clear plan to sustain the project beyond the performance period of the grant. Either operationally or funding does not have a feasible life after the grant period. <u>4-5 = Weak Response</u> The applicant lays out a sustainability plan, but it is entirely dependent upon additional funds from the City or another grant source that is not guaranteed at the time. OR the sustainability plan has an absolute clear stop plan upon the 5 year mark. <u>5-7 = Average Response</u> The applicant has a sustainability plan that leverage revenue sources that are more secure such as through fees collected or a grant that has already been awarded.	**10**	

			8-10 = Strong Response The applicant has a sustainability plan that leverage revenue sources that are more secure such as through fees collected or a grant that has already been awarded AND the project has a reasonably reliable path forward even beyond the 5 year mark.		
35			**Partnerships, Community and Metrics Subtotal**		
Schedule					
Timeline: Describe the proposed schedule for implementing the Project, assuming a Summer 2024 start. Provide a timeline with key milestones, including permitting review timelines. Projects must be completed by **June 30, 2026.**	Does the applicant provide a complete schedule for the project implementation? Is the timeline aligned with the performance period of the grant?	**0-10**	0-3 = Unacceptable Response No timeline is provided OR the timeline does not align at all with the performance period of the grant. 4-5 = Weak Response A minimal timeline is provided, but there is not sufficient details to understand the feasibility of the timeline OR the timeline is unreasonable/unrealistic. 5-7 = Average Response A detailed timeline is provided with key milestones that have sufficient detail to determine their feasibility. The timeline seem realistic. 8-10 = Strong Response A clear timeline is provided with extensive detail into milestones. It includes contingency plans for potential changes to the timeline and it appears pretty clear the project will be complete prior to June 30, 2026.	**10**	
Budget					
Grant Request Budget	Do all expenses appear to relate to the organization's project/program proposal?	Y/N/Unsure If No or Unsure, explain	Instruction List any expenses that do not appear to relate to the organization's activities in furtherance of the project proposal (i.e. supporting digital inclusion activities). You may also list any expenses that you are unsure if they relate.	N/A	Full Panel

			Please explain why it appears it does not relate to their response or why you are unsure whether it does.		
Grant Request Budget	Of all eligible expenses, are expense dates between July 1, 2024 and June 30, 2026?	Y/N/Unsure If No or Unsure, explain	Instruction List any expenses that do not fall in between the period of July 1, 2024, and June 30,2026. Please list the date of the expense.	N/A	Full Panel
Grant Request Budget + Narrative	Of all eligible expenses, **between the narrative description and the individual expense descriptions in the budget**, did the organization provide the level of detail necessary for understanding the expenses?	**0-15** + Narrative Field*	0 = Unacceptable Response No budget nor budget narrative was submitted or neither the narrative nor the budget description outlines eligible expenses for the proposed project. 1 = Weak Response Neither the narrative nor the budget description provides enough detail to understand the specific expenses the organization seeks to be reimbursed for. 2 = Average Response The narrative and/or the individual expense descriptions in the budget provides limited details. It provides enough information for a general understanding of the expenses the organization seeks to be reimbursed for but does not give specifics on the expenses. (Example, listing a broad category rather than a specific expense.) 3= Strong Response The narrative and the individual expense descriptions in the budget provide ample details on specific expenses.	**15**	Full Panel
Grant Request Budget + Narrative	Of all eligible expenses, **between the narrative description and the individual expense descriptions in the budget**, how well do the expenses align to the organization's project activities?	**0-10** +	Examples of what to look for: 0 = Unacceptable Response 1 = Weak Response Neither the narrative nor the budget descriptions provide clarity as to how the expenses connect to the organization's project activities.	**10**	Full Panel

		Narrative Field*	2 = Average Response The narrative and/or the budget provides a limited connection to how the expenses relate to the organization's project activities. 3 = Strong Response The narrative and/or the budget clearly state how those expenses connect to the organization's project activities, and the connection of their expenses to their activities is explicit/strong.		
35			**Timeline & Budget Subtotal**	**35**	
Priority Areas (Up to 15 Points)					
Partnerships with trusted, community-based, grassroots organizations: Does the applicant identify any partnerships with grassroots organizations to further their project proposal?	The applicant has **uploaded at least 1 letter of commitment from a partner grassroots organization.**	Y/N		Y:5 N: 0	
Target Populations: Has the applicant identified a target population their project plans to engage?	The applicant has identified at least one (1) target population that their project will engage (demographic information).	Y/N		Y: 3 N: 0	
Language Access Plan/Services: Has the applicant provided a comprehensive language plan? Is there a plan to	The applicant plans to provide community engagement or project materials in multiple languages for the community.	Y/N		Y: 2 N: 0	

provide oral language services?					
MDUs: Has the applicant proposed to serve MDUs (multi-family dwellings) through their project?	The applicant plans to provide services in MDUs.	Y/N		Y:5 N:0	
			Total Possible Priority Area Points	15	
			Total Possible Points (Application Responses + Priority Areas)	140	

Highest overall average scores will be recommended for funding by the panel, with final determinations made by the Office of Broadband and Digital Equity based on geographic diversity/need and funding availability.