

<b>TEXAS HOME VISITING PROGRAM</b> <b>Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet</b> <b>HHS0013406</b>				
<b>Evaluator</b>				
<b>Respondent</b>				
<b>#</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Applicant's Background and Experience (40%)</b>			
<b>1.1</b>	Evaluate how well the Application uses information and recommendations from the CSNA to identify and support the use of proposed services and activities that address needs and priorities of the eligible service population and the community.	10%		
<b>1.2</b>	Evaluate how well the Applicant's experience demonstrates the ability to provide and coordinate the proposed services.	10%		
<b>1.3</b>	Evaluate how well the Application demonstrates an understanding of and experience in incorporating or advancing Trauma-Informed approaches and practices as well as addressing social determinants of health and/or health equity.	10%		
<b>1.4</b>	Evaluate how well the Application demonstrates experience in connecting with other agencies and supporters, as well as leveraging community partnerships to benefit Families and to advance public awareness.	10%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>40%</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Program Delivery (40%)</b>			
<b>2.1</b>	Evaluate how well the Application demonstrates appropriate implementation plans for selected Program Models and initiatives.	8%		
<b>2.2</b>	Evaluate how well the Application demonstrates understanding of organizational and staffing needs as well as sufficient staffing, hiring, supervision and training plans.	8%		
<b>2.3</b>	Evaluate how well the Application demonstrates understanding of Family priorities and community context as well as appropriate outreach, recruitment, and enrollment plans.	8%		

<b>2.4</b>	Evaluate how well the Application demonstrates understanding of critical components of service delivery and sufficient plans to implement quality services and operations.	8%		
<b>2.5</b>	Evaluate how well the Application demonstrates understanding of and includes sufficient plans to address program support and oversight, to include data use, reporting, administration, and coordination of any subawards.	8%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>40%</b>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Administrative and Financial Capacity (10%)</b>			
<b>3.1</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's administrative and financial capabilities, including the ability to oversee a complex Grant.	5%		
<b>3.2</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's financial stability.	5%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>10%</b>		
<b>4</b>	<b>Reasonable Project Cost (10%)</b>			
<b>4.1</b>	Evaluate the proposed expenditures, including how reasonable, allowable, and necessary proposed costs are for the successful performance of the Grant.	5%		
<b>4.2</b>	Evaluate the proposed costs for how well the Applicant understands the intent of the THV Program.	5%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>10%</b>		
<b>TOTAL (%)</b>		<b>100%</b>		

**TEXAS HOME VISITING PROGRAM  
HHS0013406**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Best Value Criteria</b>	<b>Weight</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Applicant's Background and Experience</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Program Delivery</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Administrative and Financial Capacity</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Reasonable Project Cost</b>	<b>10%</b>
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>

TEXAS HOME VISITING PROGRAM HHS0013406		
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.