



Metropolitan Washington  
Council of Governments

## CLIMATE AND ENERGY LEADERSHIP AWARDS

### JUDGING RUBRIC

SCORE	ENGAGEMENT (Weight 40%)	RESULTS (Weight 20%)	CREATIVITY (Weight 20%)	MODEL (Weight 20%)
5 = Excellent	Applicant actively engaged underserved communities to play an integral role, and they were extremely involved, supportive, and positive throughout the process. Applicant effectively addressed issues that will have a prolonged positive impact on these populations.	The intended results, achievements, and measured outcomes, including cost-effectiveness have gone beyond expectations.	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.
4 = Good	Applicant effectively engaged 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 has achieved the intended results and measurable goals / outcomes in a cost-effective manner.	The initiative is innovative and interesting. It is beyond standard practice and creative.	The initiative is transferable to another jurisdiction/ organization.
3 = Adequate	Applicant engaged underserved 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 has had some successful results and measurable achievements, but thus far has not reached the main intended outcomes in a cost-effective manner.	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.
2 = Fair	Applicant attempted to focus on the needs of underserved communities but did not actively engage these populations in the process. A more broad range of partners, stakeholders or public were subjects of the program.	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.	The initiative is straight-forward with some unique aspects.	The initiative would be somewhat difficult to replicate in another jurisdiction/organization.
1 = Poor	Applicant did not engage underserved communities and did not address issues that affect these populations. A minimal array of partners, stakeholders or public were subjects of the program.	The initiatives lacks results, achievements and other measurable outcomes in a cost-effective manner.	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.