

**Exhibit F, Evaluation Tool**  
**Rural Initiative Grant Program**  
**Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet**  
**HHS0014211**

Evaluator Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
<b>1</b>	<b>Community Need (25%)</b>			
<b>1.1</b>	Evaluate the applicant's description of local unmet behavioral health needs that the proposed project aims to address.	10%		
<b>1.2</b>	Evaluate how community partners have participated in developing and/or have agreed to implement proposed project goals and intervention strategies.	8%		
<b>1.3</b>	Evaluate how the proposed project uses a collaborative approach within the community to maximize existing resources and avoid duplication of effort within a continuum of care.	7%		
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>25%</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Project Design (50%)</b>			
<b>2.1</b>	Evaluate activities that meet local unmet behavioral health needs to be implemented as part of this project.	10%		
<b>2.2</b>	Evaluate how the proposed project will be delivered using trauma-informed and person-centered approaches.	10%		
<b>2.3</b>	Evaluate how the proposed project will ensure all services are implemented to reflect the cultural, racial, ethnic, and linguistic differences of the communities and individuals being served.	5%		
<b>2.4</b>	Evaluate how the applicant proposes partnerships with community organizations (outside of local mental or behavioral health authority(ies) and how community partners will actively participate in project activities.	5%		
<b>2.5</b>	Evaluate how the applicant will facilitate oversight, quality assurance, and customer satisfaction of the proposed project, and how the applicant plans to adhere to statute and TAC requirements based on program design.	5%		
<b>2.6</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's disaster-response plan.	5%		
<b>2.7</b>	Evaluate the proposed timeline including milestones and anticipated completion date associated with planning and implementing the proposed project.	5%		
<b>2.8</b>	Evaluate the staffing plan for the proposed project and plans for staff training and development to ensure their competency in addressing the identified goals or carrying out evidence-based service activities.	5%		
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>50%</b>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Applicant Ability to Execute (15%)</b>			
<b>3.1</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's experience in implementing projects similar in scope and complexity to the Proposed Project, experience implementing projects serving children with serious emotional disturbance and adults with mental illness, and experience implementing projects in coordination with community partners.	5%		
<b>3.2</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's experience implementing state and/or federally-funded grants.	5%		
<b>3.3</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's experience in collecting, analyzing, and reporting performance and outcome data, and the Applicant's experience in managing and reporting expenditures and match, and if applicable, in coordination with community partners, and the Applicant's key agency personnel's experience to implement the proposed project.	5%		
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>15%</b>		
<b>4</b>	<b>Project Costs (10%)</b>			
<b>4.1</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's cost proposal and match plans.	5%		
<b>4.2</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's Financial Controls questionnaire and supporting documentation.	5%		
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>10%</b>		
	<b>TOTAL (%)</b>	<b>100%</b>		

Rural Initiative Grant Program HHS0014211		
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.

Rural Initiative Grant Program HHS0014211		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Community Needs	25%
2	Project Design	50%
3	Applicant Ability to Execute	15%
4	Project Costs	10%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%