

Exhibit H, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0014111 Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet				
Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
<b>1</b>	<b>Qualifications and Experience</b>			
<b>1.1</b>	Evaluate the proposed staffing plan presented in the Applicant's Executive Summary, including staff resume(s) and roles and responsibilities in performing the activities set forth in the RFA.	10%		
<b>1.2</b>	Evaluate how well the Applicant's current services relate to the activities set forth in the RFA.	15%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>25%</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Strength of Proposed Project Approach</b>			
<b>2.1</b>	Evaluate the extent the Applicant's Work Plan provided a proficient understanding of the requirements set forth in Section II of the RFA.	5%		
<b>2.2</b>	Evaluate the extent the Applicant's Work Plan provided a reasoned and effective approach to meeting the requirements set forth in Section II of the RFA.	15%		
<b>2.3</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's method for ensuring technical assistance related to creating nutrition policies and initiatives is provided to food bank stakeholders and staff.	10%		
<b>2.4</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's ability to network with food banks across the state.	10%		
<b>2.5</b>	Evaluate Applicant's plan to disseminate lessons learned and best practices that will be implemented as a result of this grant project.	5%		
<b>2.6</b>	Evaluate Applicant's capacity to provide technical assistance for policies that affect internal processes and stakeholders of a food bank.	20%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>65%</b>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Proposed Budget and Justification (Cost Effectiveness)</b>			
<b>3.1</b>	Evaluate the extent the Applicant's budget aligns with the activities set forth in Section II of the RFA and represents their ability to identify costs necessary to carry out the activities described in their Application.	10%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>10%</b>		
<b>TOTAL (%)</b>		<b>100%</b>		

Exhibit H, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0014111		
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 H, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0014111		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Qualifications and Experience	25%
2	Strength of Proposed Project Approach	65%
3	Proposed Budget and Justification (Cost Effectiveness)	10%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%