



WORKING DRAFT

Alaska Rural Health Transformation Program

Project Application Evaluation Framework Implementation Pathway - Fall 2026

This evaluation framework is designed to support a consistent assessment of each implementation pathway project application submitted for funding under Alaska's Rural Health Transformation Program (RHTP). Applications will be first 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.

A separate framework will be used to evaluate project applications submitted through the planning pathway.

The project application evaluation framework is designed to assess the strength of each project on its own merits. Projects meeting quality and merit criteria will be further considered in the context of the full portfolio of fundable projects as per the Portfolio Analysis Framework. Because requests are anticipated to exceed available funding, 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).

In order to be considered for funding, projects must meet minimum administrative requirements as outlined in the federal RHTP Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) and the State of Alaska Rural Health Transformation program, including permissible uses of funds and administrative cost limits. Projects that do not meet these requirements will not be considered for funding. Additionally, projects will be reviewed for budget justification, expenditure rationale, and compliance with federal cost principles.

How Applications are Scored

Applications are scored by a Department of Health review panel made up of subject matter experts from across the Department. Three reviewers from that panel are assigned to each application, and each assigned reviewer scores every criterion independently.

Each criterion score is the average of the assigned reviewers' scores for that criterion. The overall score is the weighted average of the criterion scores, using the weights shown in the framework.

Advancing to Portfolio Review

To advance to portfolio-level review, a project must meet both of the following:

- An overall weighted average score of 3.0 or higher; and

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.



WORKING DRAFT

- An average score of 2.5 or higher in every criterion.

Because each criterion score is based on the average of three reviewers, the 2.5 threshold allows the combined assessment of the review team to account for reasonable differences in reviewer judgment. Every criterion must still meet a minimum threshold for the project to advance.

	Description	1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
Alignment with State & Federal RHTP Goals and Alaska RHTP initiatives (15%)	Alignment with Federal CMS RHTP goals and initiatives and State of Alaska's approved RHTP initiatives . Applicants are expected to propose activities and uses of funds that are consistent with CMS requirements. Evaluation will consider both the project's overall alignment and the significance of any allowability concerns. Limited issues that can be resolved without materially changing the project may be addressed through clarification, while concerns affecting the project's core purpose or a substantial portion of the proposed work will be reflected in the score.	The project is not aligned with State and federal RHTP goals and initiatives or Alaska's RHTP initiatives; and/or the project's core purpose is not a permissible use of funds under CMS requirements.	Alignment with State and federal RHTP goals and Alaska RHTP initiatives is weak or superficial and/or a substantial portion of the proposed work would not be a permissible use of funds and could not be removed without changing what the project is.	The project broadly aligns with State and federal RHTP goals and Alaska RHTP initiatives, however, the proposal may not meaningfully or sufficiently drive impact. Requested uses of funds appear permissible or impermissible costs are minimal and not central to the project and could be removed.	The project shows clear alignment 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 advances Alaska's intended purpose for the program.	The project demonstrates strong, explicit alignment with State and federal RHTP goals and initiatives, clearly advances one or more 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.
Demonstrated Need Aligned with Intervention (10%)	Alignment of proposed activities with need and the strength of supporting documentation or justification. Need may be described and demonstrated through multiple forms of information, including local data,	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	Need is reasonably described and supported by some evidence or justification (e.g., limited data, local context, or stakeholder input), but the	Need is clearly demonstrated using strong justification which may include community or Tribal input, with linkage between identified needs, target	Need is compellingly demonstrated through a well-rounded picture that may draw on multiple sources such as data trends and documented



WORKING DRAFT

	Description	1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
	documented community or Tribal input, practitioner experience, planning documents and emerging or other evidence.		project is a priority for the community/region.	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 weak or unclear.	population(s), and the proposed intervention.	community/regional planning input) where applicable and accessible. The proposal clearly articulates why the proposed approach is the right solution for this community or region, and reflects alignment with local and regional priorities.
Outcomes (10%)	Alignment of outcomes with project and population served. Impact should be considered in proportion to community size, baseline conditions, and project scope. Outcomes may include direct clinical outcomes, access improvements, avoided emergency utilization, workforce or system capacity gains, continuity improvements, or other measurable changes that advance RHTP goals.	No concrete project outcomes are identified.	Project outcomes are unclear or not measurable. Outcomes are not appropriate for the project or population served and may not clearly advance RHTP goals.	Project outcomes are reasonable and specific, and measurable using feasible methods, and reflect meaningful changes for the population or community served, and are related to State RHTP goals, targeted outcomes, or metrics.	Project outcomes are clear, specific and measurable using feasible and reliable methods. Outcomes are well-aligned and appropriate for the project and population served and drive progress towards State RHTP goals.	Project outcomes are ambitious, clear, specific and measurable using feasible and reliable methods. Outcomes clearly advance State RHTP goals, targeted outcomes or metrics, and are well matched to the project and population served.
Rural Impact (15%)	Rural impact will be assessed in proportion to the applicant’s service environment, baseline capacity, and the significance of	Unclear how the project and outcomes impact rural residents.	Impact of projects and outcomes for rural residents is limited or indirect.	Impact of projects and outcomes for rural residents is moderate. The explanation of impact may lack	Impact of projects and outcomes for rural residents is meaningful relative to the community or	Impact of projects and outcomes for rural residents is significant relative to the community or population



WORKING DRAFT

	Description	1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
	the change for the affected community or region. For the purposes of RHTP, all areas outside of Anchorage are considered rural. Organizations located across the state are eligible for RHTP funding if projects can demonstrate impact on rural health care delivery systems.			sufficient evidence, clarity, or connection to the community served.	population served. The explanation is clear.	served. The explanation of impact is clear and compelling.
Transformation Potential (10%)	Transformation is considered in terms of context-specific change relative to the starting point of the community, region or system improvements. In some communities, establishing access where none existed, reducing patient travel, stabilizing and developing workforce pipelines, improving referral coordination, or building core infrastructure may constitute meaningful transformation relative to the local baseline.	Proposed activities would not lead to change or are at risk of resulting in harmful changes to existing health care system and facilities.	Proposed activities would lead to small, incremental changes to the community or existing health care system, with limited reach or durability of impact.	Proposed activities would modestly support measurable changes to the community or existing health care system, but are limited in scope, reach, or degree of system-level change.	Proposed activities demonstrate significant transformative potential for the community or health care delivery system, demonstrating clear improvements within the applicant's service area or target population, relative to the community's baseline.	The proposed activities represent a well-designed plan to meaningfully transform rural health care delivery, relative to the community or regional baseline, with impact that extends beyond the applicant organization and may align with or amplify other awarded projects.
Community Alignment and Partnerships (10%)	Projects should show an understanding of who else serves the same patients or communities and demonstrate awareness and support from the people, communities, and organizations affected by the work. The proposal should describe any engagement	The proposal does not identify other organizations serving the same patients or communities, does not recognize partnerships or coordination necessary for project success, and	The proposal identifies few relevant organizations, does not fully identify coordination or partnerships that appear necessary for project success, describes	The proposal identifies relevant organizations and describes outreach to them or to the people served that has been initiated, with evidence of support that is present but limited ; or	The proposal clearly identifies who else serves the patients or communities, describes substantive outreach to them or to the people served and what came of it, and provides	The proposal demonstrates a thorough understanding of the local and regional landscape , documented engagement with the organizations and people relevant to this work, and

WORKING DRAFT

	Description	1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
	that has been initiated or occurred and what came of it. If successful implementation depends on participation or coordination with other organizations, the proposal should identify those organizations and explain how they will be involved. Where partnerships are proposed and/or necessary for project success, applications should clearly substantiate them through letters of support or other documentation, and describe partner roles, demonstrated contributions and how the partnership strengthens implementation, integration, or sustainability. A project carried out by a single organization can fully meet this criterion.	describes no outreach to them or to the people served, coordination, evidence of support, or does not explain why coordination and partnership would not be needed. Partnerships, if proposed, are not documented.	outreach to them or to the people served that is minimal, undocumented, or unclear, or gives an insufficient explanation of why coordination and partnership would not be needed. Partnerships, if proposed, lack documentation or clear roles.	provides a reasonable explanation for why coordination and partnership are not needed. Partnerships, if proposed, are documented, but roles or contributions are not fully defined.	documented evidence of support, and the project does not duplicate existing efforts ; or clearly explains why coordination and partnership are not needed and shows the project is connected to the people and community it serves. Partnerships, if proposed, are documented with defined roles and contributions.	clear evidence of support, with coordination that meaningfully strengthens the project or the broader local or regional system; or the project operates as a strong standalone model that is clearly shaped by the people it serves and connected to the systems around it. Partnerships, if proposed, are well documented, defined and accountable.
Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Justification (10%)	Cost-effectiveness is assessed in terms of whether the requested amount is reasonable for the work proposed within the performance period in the setting where the project will operate. Proposals should show how costs were determined, connect them to specific activities, and explain significant or unusual costs. Cost is	The budget provides insufficient information to understand how costs were determined or connected to project activities. There is not enough information to assess whether the requested amount is reasonable for the work proposed.	The budget is explained only in general terms. One or more significant costs are not adequately supported, or the requested amount raises concerns about reasonableness that are not explained by the	The budget is explained and connected to activities, and the requested amount appears reasonable and appropriate for the work proposed and the setting served. Significant costs are explained, although	The budget is clearly explained and connected to project activities and outcomes. Significant costs have a clear basis, and the requested amount is well supported and proportionate to the	The budget is clearly explained and well supported. Significant costs have a documented basis, and the proposal demonstrates strong value for the work proposed within its operating environment,



WORKING DRAFT

	Description	1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
	considered in proportion to the operating environment. Projects serving small, remote, or high-cost communities are not expected to achieve the same cost per person served as projects closer to population centers, and one-time investments that create durable capacity are considered differently from recurring operating costs.		project scope or operating environment.	some supporting detail may be limited.	scope of work and operating environment.	including thoughtful consideration of how resources will be used efficiently and sustainably. This may include durable investments, shared resources, leveraged funding, or other efficiencies, where applicable.
Sustainability (10%)	Sustainability beyond the RHTP project period may be financial, operational, workforce-based, reimbursement-based, or system-based. Examples include reimbursement pathways, operational integration, workforce retention strategies, federal match opportunities, cost and/or utilization avoidance, braided funding, or other realistic approaches suited to the project type and setting.	Sustainability is not sufficiently supported or plausible.	Sustainability is somewhat plausible, but without a plan.	Sustainability is plausible, based on reasonable assumptions, with a basic plan.	Sustainability is planned in detail or clearly justified as not necessary given the nature and time-limited purpose of the initiative.	Sustainability is robustly demonstrated, with a clear plan and justification; and meaningfully supports the sustainability of other projects, organizations, or system-level efforts.
Project Approach, Workplan and Monitoring (10%)	Project approach and workplan must include clear activities or milestones, reasonable monitoring, identified risks, and a practical plan for adjustment over time, but may	Workplan, activities, and milestones lack clarity or feasibility, making it difficult to determine whether the project can be successfully implemented as described.	Workplan, activities, and milestones are generally clear, but present material risks to timely implementation; limited consideration of how	Workplan, activities, and milestones reflect serious thought about obstacles and potential delays and are clearly relevant to target	Workplan, activities, and milestones reflect a considered, thoughtful operating and strategic framework with clear and feasible timelines	Workplan, activities, and milestones include clear and effective approaches to efficient implementation and tangible impact within



WORKING DRAFT

	Description	1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
	be phased or scaled to fit rural implementation realities.		challenges would be addressed; and/or have questionable relevance to the desired outcomes.	outcomes, but mitigation strategies and monitoring approaches are limited or not fully developed.	and milestones, including defined approaches to risk management, progress tracking, and course correction.	the RHTP timeframe, with strong monitoring, learning, and adaptive management practices.