



Metropolitan Washington
Council of Governments

CLIMATE AND ENERGY LEADERSHIP AWARDS

JUDGING RUBRIC

SCORE	ENGAGEMENT (Weight 40%)	CREATIVITY (Weight 20%)	MODEL (Weight 20%)	RESULTS (Weight 20%)
5 = Excellent	Applicant actively engaged vulnerable populations and under-served communities to play an integral role, and they were extremely involved, supportive, and positive throughout the process. Statements, testimonials, or feedback from impacted person(s) or communities were provided.	Overall the initiative is extremely innovative and unique. This presents a new practice/new way of thinking.	The initiative is easily transferable to another jurisdiction/organization.	The intended results, achievements, and measured outcomes, including cost-effectiveness have gone beyond expectations.
4 = Good	Applicant effectively engaged vulnerable populations and underserved communities, and they were generally supportive and positive throughout the process. Applicant addressed issues that will have a positive impact on these populations.	The initiative is innovative and interesting. It is beyond standard practice and creative.	The initiative is transferable to another jurisdiction/organization.	The initiative has achieved the intended results and measurable goals/outcomes in a cost-effective manner.
3 = Adequate	Applicant engaged vulnerable populations and under-served communities, but there were missed opportunities to gain their support and involvement. This resulted in limited focus on issues that affect these populations. A more general demographic census was highly responsive.	The initiative shows some creative thought and has unique aspects.	It is possible to replicate the initiative in another jurisdiction/organization; however, there are some unique conditions that may limit its replication.	The initiative has had some successful results and measurable achievements, but thus far has not reached the main intended outcomes in a cost-effective manner.
2 = Fair	Applicant attempted to focus on the needs of vulnerable populations and under-served communities but did not actively engage these populations in the process. A more broad range of partners, stakeholders and/or public were subjects of the program.	The initiative is straight-forward with some unique aspects.	The initiative would be somewhat difficult to replicate in another jurisdiction/organization.	The initiative showed some promise but has not yet delivered many of the intended results, achievements and other measured outcomes in a cost-effective manner.
1 = Poor	Applicant did not engage vulnerable populations and under-served communities and did not address issues that affect these populations. A minimal array of partners, stakeholders and/or public were subjects of the program.	The initiative seems to be very standard practice with very little or no creativity.	The initiative would be extremely difficult to replicate in another jurisdiction/organization.	The initiative lacks results, achievements and other measurable outcomes in a cost-effective manner.