

**Exhibit I, Evaluation Tool**  
**RFA No. HHS0013917**  
**Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet**

<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</b>			
<b>1.1</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's experience and qualifications in administering programs of similar scale and scope for Participant populations as required by this RFA.	20%		
<b>1.2</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's experience in promoting father-responsiveness in its community.	15%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>35%</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Program Delivery</b>			
<b>2.1</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed programming components and implementation, including each proposed Program Model, frequency of programming, location of programming, and goals of programming, as well as the overall comprehensiveness of Applicant's approach to programming.	15%		
<b>2.2</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's outreach, recruitment, and enrollment plans while considering the Fatherhood EFFECT Program's priorities.	10%		
<b>2.3</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's goals and objectives for the Community Coalition and systems-level father support requirements.	10%		
<b>2.4</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's plans to implement quality programming and operations.	5%		
<b>2.5</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's sufficiency of its staffing, hiring, supervision and training plans required under this RFA.	5%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>45%</b>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Project Cost</b>			
<b>3.1</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed expenses for allowability and necessity in consideration of the program requirements in this RFA.	10%		
<b>3.2</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's ability to fulfill the purpose of this program through its proposed uses of grant funds.	10%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>20%</b>		
<b>TOTAL (%)</b>		<b>100%</b>		

<b>Exhibit I, Evaluation Tool</b> <b>RFA No. HHS0013917</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 I, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0013917		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Applicant's Background and Experience	35%
2	Program Delivery	45%
3	Project Cost	20%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%