

Exhibit G, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0015202 Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet				
Evaluator Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
<b>1</b>	<b>Demonstration of Unmet Community Need (20%)</b>			
<b>1.1</b>	Evaluate Applicant's demonstrated ability to address a need for family violence services in the designated community.	10%		
<b>1.2</b>	Evaluate Applicant's visibility in the designated community and their demonstrated awareness of the services needed.	5%		
<b>1.3</b>	Evaluate Applicant's demonstrated support and partnership with other nonprofits and local systems in the designated community.	5%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>20%</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Program Requirements and Service Delivery (30%)</b>			
<b>2.1</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's ability to directly provide all required family violence services.	10%		
<b>2.2</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's ability to demonstrate the required service model.	10%		
<b>2.3</b>	Evaluate the Applicants ability to measure service delivery effectiveness.	10%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>30%</b>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Program Administration and Readiness (30%)</b>			
<b>3.1</b>	Evaluate the strength of the Applicant's experience, readiness, and staff capacity to work with survivors of family violence, domestic violence and dating violence.	15%		
<b>3.2</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's ability to comply with TAC 356 by the start of the grant award.	15%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>30%</b>		
<b>4</b>	<b>Organizational and Fiscal Stability (20%)</b>			
<b>4.1</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's current accounting systems and processes.	10%		
<b>4.2</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's ability to meet the maximum FVP funding level requirements.	5%		
<b>4.3</b>	Evaluate the degree of Applicant's community and board Support in applying for funding.	5%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>20%</b>		
<b>TOTAL (%)</b>		<b>100%</b>		

<b>Exhibit G, Evaluation Tool</b> <b>RFA No. HHS0015202</b>		
<b>Evaluation Scoring Guide</b>		
<b>Score</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>1</b>	Response does not address requirement. Response is completely unacceptable.
<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>2</b>	Response mentions requirement, but is not responsive to the elements of the requirement.
<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>3</b>	Response addresses requirement, but response described does not allow the agency to fulfill mission.
<b>Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.</b>	<b>4</b>	Response meets fundamental requirements, however could not be implemented as described (would require both the agency and Respondent to make significant changes not currently anticipated).
<b>Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.</b>	<b>5</b>	Response meets fundamental requirements, however could not be implemented as described (implementation would require both the agency and Respondent to make minor changes not currently anticipated).
<b>Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.</b>	<b>6</b>	Response meets fundamental requirements, however could not be implemented as described (implementation would require changes to be made by Respondent only).
<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>7</b>	Response clearly satisfies requirement but has some minor weaknesses.
<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>8</b>	Response clearly satisfies requirement.
<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>9</b>	Response satisfies requirements and has some benefits above requirement.
<b>Exceptional</b>	<b>10</b>	Response far exceeds all aspects of requirement.

For the purposes of this exhibit, "the agency" means the contracting state agency as specified in the solicitation.

Exhibit G, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0015202		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Demonstration of Unmet Community Need	20%
2	Program Requirements and Service Delivery	30%
3	Program Administration and Readiness	30%
4	Organizational and Fiscal Stability	20%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%