

Evaluation Tool, Exhibit F RFA No. HHS0015214 Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet				
Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Applicant Background			
1.1	Evaluate the Applicant's narrative description to include the legal name of the Applicant; any affiliations; its overall purpose or mission statement; and a brief history of its accomplishments.	5%		
1.2	Evaluate Applicant's plan to provide low or no cost sterilization of cats and dogs for the general public including Applicant's administration of the program and its financial management and budget strategy, procedures, or tools.	5%		
Subtotal		10%		
2	Target Area			
2.1	Evaluate the Applicant's described target area and client base population to be served, e.g. County(ies), city(ies), including average base income of all target areas to be served.	35%		
Subtotal		35%		
3	Strategy for Marketing			
3.1	Evaluate the Applicant's complete and detailed description of its outreach/marketing strategies for getting the word out about it's spay and neuter project, including any outreach to low-income pet owners if that is part of the strategy.	25%		
Subtotal		25%		
4	Coordination and Collaboration			
4.1	Evaluate the Applicant's description of its recent collaborative efforts, including successes or outcomes.	5%		
4.2	Evaluate the Applicant's description of how it will establish coordination and collaboration with community partners for low-cost spay/neuters of dogs and cats and its explanation of how coordination will be conducted.	5%		
Subtotal		10%		
5	Target Cost Estimate			
5.1	Evaluate the reasonableness of the Applicant's proposed costs.	20%		
Subtotal		20%		
TOTAL (%)		100%		

Evaluation Tool, Exhibit F RFA No. HHS0015214 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.

Evaluation Tool, Exhibit F RFA No. HHS0015214		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Applicant Background	10%
2	Target Area	35%
3	Strategy of Marketing	25%
4	Coordination and Collaboration	10%
5	Target Cost Estimate	20%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%