

Tobacco Prevention and Control Coalitions
Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet
RFA No. HHS0012204

Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Qualifications/Experience			
1.1	Evaluate the respondent's key staffing profile, resumes for staff, and organization chart as to whether the Respondent has the necessary staff and experience to perform the services requested.	5%		
1.2	Evaluate the respondent's organizational capacity to undertake tobacco control and prevention activities.	5%		
1.3	Evaluate the respondent's organizational capacity to build a coalition or maintain an existing one.	5%		
	Subtotal	15%		
2	Performance Requirements/Deliverables			
2.1	Evaluate the respondent's work plan for how it will implement Goal 1 of the RFA.	12%		
2.2	Evaluate the respondent's work plan for how it will implement Goal 2 of the RFA.	12%		
2.3	Evaluate the respondent's work plan for how it will implement Goal 3 of the RFA.	12%		
2.4	Evaluate the respondent's work plan for how it will implement Goal 4 of the RFA.	12%		
2.5	Evaluate the respondent's work plan for how it will implement Goal 5 of the RFA.	12%		
	Subtotal	60%		
3	Budget Proposal			
3.1	Evaluate the Respondent's Requested Budget against the requirements within the RFA.	25%		
	Subtotal	25%		
	TOTAL (%)	100%		

Tobacco Prevention and Control Coalitions

RFA No. HHS0012204

No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Qualifications/Experience	15%
2	Performance Requirements/Deliverables	60%
3	Budget Proposal	25%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%

Tobacco Prevention and Control Coalitions RFA No. HHS0012204		
Evaluation Scoring Guide		
Score	Level	Description
Unacceptable	1	Response does not address requirement. Response is completely unacceptable.
Unacceptable	2	Response mentions requirement, but is not responsive to the elements of the requirement.
Unacceptable	3	Response addresses requirement, but response described does not allow the agency to fulfill mission.
Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.	4	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).
Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.	5	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).
Marginal. Fails to meet evaluation standards but failures are correctable.	6	Response meets fundamental requirements, however could not be implemented as described (implementation would require changes to be made by Respondent only).
Acceptable	7	Response clearly satisfies requirement but has some minor weaknesses.
Acceptable	8	Response clearly satisfies requirement.
Acceptable	9	Response satisfies requirements and has some benefits above requirement.
Exceptional	10	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.