

Exhibit I, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0013385 Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet				
Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	
1	Applicant's Background and Experience			
1.1	Evaluate the Applicant's demonstrated experience with a similar Participant population and the ability to provide and coordinate the proposed services required by this RFA.	20%		
1.2	Evaluate the Applicant's organizational structure, key management, and community experience in addition to any experience in administering complex projects, grants or contracts.	15%		
	Subtotal	35%		
2	Project Delivery			
2.1	Evaluate the Applicant's Community Strengths, Needs Assessment, logic model and their overall comprehensive approach required by this RFA.	10%		
2.2	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed programming, including Program Models, frequency, location, goals, and overall comprehensive approach required by this RFA.	15%		
2.3	Evaluate the Applicant's goals and objectives for the community coalition including planned partners and the intent to build community connections and goals.	5%		
2.4	Evaluate the Applicant's outreach and recruitment strategies and how they align with community context and the intended population.	5%		
2.5	Evaluate the Applicant's described plan to implement quality programming and operations required by this RFA.	5%		
2.6	Evaluate the Applicant's understanding of organizational and staffing needs as well as sufficient staffing, hiring, supervision and training plans.	5%		
	Subtotal	45%		
3	Administrative and Financial Capacity			
3.1	Evaluate the Applicant's administrative and financial capabilities as well as their ability to administer and meet the requirements of the HOPES grant.	10%		
	Subtotal	10%		
4	Reasonable Project Cost			
4.1	Evaluate how the Application's Expenditure Proposal aligns with providing a reasonable, allocable and allowable cost methodology for the successful performance of the grant.	5%		
4.2	Evaluate how the Expenditure Proposal demonstrates appropriate use and understanding of funding and allocation of resources.	5%		
	Subtotal	10%		
	TOTAL (%)	100%		

Exhibit I, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0013385		
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.

Exhibit I, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0013385		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Applicant's Background and Experience	35%
2	Project Delivery	45%
3	Administrative and Financial Capacity	10%
4	Reasonable Project Cost	10%
GRAND TOTAL		100%