

## CLIMATE AND ENERGY LEADERSHIP AWARDS

## JUDGING RUBRIC

			SED GILLES TREES, THE			
	SCORE	ENGAGEME (Weight 45%		CREATIVITY (Weight 20%)	MODEL (Weight 20%)	RESULTS (Weight 15%)
	5 = Excellent	Applicant actively engage populations and under-se communities to play an in and they were extremely i supportive, and positive t the process. Statements, or feedback from impacted or communities were proving the process.	erved ntegral role, involved, hroughout testimonials, ed person(s)	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 costeffectiveness have gone beyond expectations.
	4 = Good	Applicant effectively enga- vulnerable populations a underserved communitie were generally supportive throughout the process. A addressed issues that wi positive impact on these	nd is, and they e and positive Applicant Il have a	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 vulner populations and under-se communities, but there we opportunities to gain their involvement. This results focus on issues that affer populations. A more gendemographic census was responsive.	erved vere missed ir support and ed in limited ct these eral	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 fo needs of vulnerable popu under-served communitie actively engage these pop the process. A more broa partners, stakeholders ar were subjects of the prog	alations and es but did not pulations in id range of ind/or public	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 populations and under-se communities and did not issues that affect these partners and for pubsubjects of the program.	erved : address oopulations. ers,	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 initiatives lacks results, achievements and other measurable outcomes in a costeffective manner.