

**Exhibit I, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS00015302
Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet**

Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Applicant Organization			
1.1	Evaluate the Applicant's ability to identify staff that will be responsible for providing the Services set forth in this RFA.	5%		
1.2	Evaluate the Applicant's organizational structure demonstrate the capacity of those who will provide Services directly.	5%		
1.3	Evaluate the Applicant's provided job description and primary responsibilities for staff.	10%		
1.4	Evaluate the Applicant's process for billing insurance and collecting from families when a Family Cost Share is assessed.	10%		
1.5	Evaluate the management and oversight system the Applicant has in place to meet the requirements of this RFA.	10%		
Subtotal		40%		
2	Technical Approach			
2.1	Evaluate the Applicant's level of preparedness to start providing services.	5%		
2.2	Evaluate how the Applicant will administer treatment protocols in accordance with the Autism Program rules and the requirements established in the Autism Program Policy Manual and ensure that all program personnel and Subcontractors are properly trained and adhere to this Contract requirement and compliance with Texas Family Code §261.101.	5%		
2.3	Evaluate how the Applicant will meet training requirements and staff development for all staff.	5%		
2.4	Evaluate the Applicant's process and information provided for evaluating children.	5%		
2.5	Evaluate how the Applicant will provide Focused Autism Services.	10%		
2.6	Evaluate the Applicant's process provided to ensure children receive the appropriate service intensity and duration based on assessed need.	10%		
2.7	Evaluate how the Applicant will track remaining eligibility for children receiving Focused Autism Services.	5%		
2.8	Evaluate the efficacy of the Applicant's plan for how data will be collected and maintained on operationally defined target behaviors.	5%		
Subtotal		50%		
3	Cost			
3.1	Evaluate the Applicant's Hourly Rate Workbook to determine if it clearly demonstrates a reasonable hourly rate, developed using reasonable and allowable costs and the number of Clients served.	10%		
Subtotal		10%		
TOTAL (%)		100%		

**Exhibit I, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS00015302**

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 I, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS00015302**

No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Application Organization	40%
2	Technical Approach	50%
3	Cost	10%
GRAND TOTAL		100%