

2020 TQS Scoring Overview

CCOs will receive a score of 0–3 for each TQS component, based on the definitions and rubric below. Average scores from all 14 components will be combined to create a composite TQS score (42 total points possible).

If multiple projects/programs address the same component, scores will be averaged to get the component score. For example, if you submit two Behavioral Health Integration (BHI) projects that receive scores of 1 and 3, then the average BHI component score will be 2.

Criteria definitions

1. **Relevance** = The project/program addresses the applicable component definition in the guidance document.
2. **Detail** = The background/rationale and project/program are clearly described, as outlined in the guidance document.
3. **Feasibility** = The activities, monitoring activities and targets/benchmarks describe a plan or process that is likely to achieve the stated objectives.

Rubric

| <i>3 – Fully relevant, fully detailed, and feasible</i> | <i>2 – Somewhat relevant, somewhat to very limited detail and feasibility</i> | <i>1 – Very limited relevance, very limited to not detailed or feasible</i> | <i>0 – Does not address the component as defined in the guidance document</i> |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>Project/program fully addresses (relevance) the component definition.</p> <p>No additional details or clarity are needed in description, rationale and activities. There is a detailed prior year assessment of the component area and sufficient justification for the project/program selected.</p> <p>Activities, targets and benchmarks are mostly to fully feasible as described, even if there is room for improvement, and SMART objectives are utilized.</p> | <p>Project/program somewhat addresses (relevance) the component definition.</p> <p>Minor clarifying details are needed for the description, rationale, activities, targets and/or benchmarks. There is a somewhat detailed prior year assessment of the component area and some justification for the project/program selected.</p> <p>Activities, targets and benchmarks are somewhat feasible as described, and SMART objectives are somewhat utilized.</p> | <p>Project/program is very limited in how it addresses (relevance) the component definition.</p> <p>Major clarifying details are needed for the description, rationale, activities, targets and/or benchmarks. The prior year assessment of the component area is very limited in detail and includes insufficient justification for the project/program selected.</p> <p>Activities, targets and benchmarks have very limited feasibility as described, and SMART objectives are not utilized.</p> | |

Rationale

Reviewers will provide clear and actionable written feedback. They will include what was missing or needed clarification, areas of strength and opportunity, and component-specific recommendations or resources, if applicable.