

**Exhibit D, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0015167
Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet**

Evaluator Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Program Design (45%)			
1.1	Evaluate the proposed program design, its ability to provide the Services, and the likelihood of producing selected outcome(s).	30%		
1.2	Evaluate the Applicant's goals and outcomes support, and the ability to quantify, measure, track, and report on the impact of the Project on the proposed outcome(s).	15%		
Subtotal		45%		
2	Applicant Background (35%)			
2.1	Evaluate the Applicant's experience, knowledge, and expertise in either providing or managing a network of Service Providers with experience providing direct Client Services for pregnant women and families.	10%		
2.2	Evaluate the Applicant's vision, mission, and values statements with the stated goals and outcomes of Thriving Texas Families.	10%		
2.3	Evaluate the Applicant's plans to ensure quality Service delivery and the plan to monitor Subrecipient Service Providers.	15%		
Subtotal		35%		
3	Project Details (20%)			
3.1	Evaluate the Applicant's ability to ensure a Local Approach in selected Service area(s).	10%		
3.2	Evaluate the Applicant's ability to make target population(s) and the general public aware of the program, Services provided, and how Services are accessed.	10%		
Subtotal		20%		
TOTAL (%)		100%		

Exhibit D, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0015167		
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 D, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0015167**

No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Program Design	45%
2	Applicant Background	35%
3	Project Details	20%
GRAND TOTAL		100%