

**Exhibit H, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0014507
Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet**

Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Qualifications and Experience (20%)			
1.1	Evaluate the Respondent's capacity to provide ADRC core services as required by this RFA.	5%		
1.2	Evaluate the Respondent's problem statement and how it aligns with the purpose and goals of ADRC services.	5%		
1.3	Evaluate the Respondent's prior experience and organizational capacity to provide services and manage projects.	5%		
1.4	Evaluate the Respondent's understanding of the RFA requirements, goals, and focus of the Project.	5%		
	Subtotal	20%		
2	Project Work Plan (50%)			
2.1	Evaluate the Respondent's Project Work Plan to determine if it includes a clear understanding of the Project while addressing the Eligible Population while providing ADRC services in all counties identified within the ADRC PSA Region.	10%		
2.2	Evaluate the Respondent's Project Work Plan to determine if it includes a clear understanding of the Project while addressing the ADRC service requirements in the proposed ADRC PSA Region. Those services include: Specialized Information, Referral, and Assistance (IR&A); Referral to Respite Care services; Local Contact Agency services; Housing Navigator activities; Outreach and Education activities under the Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act (MIPPA); Pilot programs and local initiatives that target underserved populations; as well as Collaborative Efforts.	25%		
2.3	Evaluate the Respondent's Project Work Plan to determine if it includes a clear understanding of the Project while addressing the Plan of Operation, Cultural Competence Plan, Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity Plan, Transition Plan, Community Collaboration Plan, Client Feedback Plan, Staffing Plan, Turnover Plan as well as Quality Monitoring Plan requirements.	15%		
	Subtotal	50%		
3	Requested Budget Cost (30%)			
3.1	Evaluate the Respondent's Requested Budget to determine if it clearly demonstrates a reasonableness, allowability, allocability, and is developed in accordance with applicable State and federal grant requirements.	30%		
	Subtotal	30%		
	TOTAL (%)	100%		

**Exhibit H, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0014507**

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. HHS0014507**

No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Qualifications and Experience	20%
2	Project Work Plan	50%
3	Requested Budget Cost	30%
GRAND TOTAL		100%