

**Exhibit I, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0015318
Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet**

Evaluator Respondent	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Community Needs 15%			
1.1	Evaluate Applicant's description of local unmet behavioral health needs that the Applicant aims to address.	5%		
1.2	Evaluate how Applicant works with community partners in developing and/or have agreed to implement Project goals for this application.	5%		
1.3	Evaluate how Applicant's proposed Project uses a collaborative approach within the community to maximize existing resources and avoid duplication of effort within a continuum of care.	5%		
	Subtotal	15%		
2	Applicant Background and Experience 15%			
2.1	Evaluate Applicant's experience implementing the Clubhouse International model	5%		
2.2	Evaluate Applicant's experience implementing a Clubhouse based on data provided (e.g.growth, usage patterns, community expansion).	5%		
2.3	Evaluate Applicant's experience administering grants of similar scope and size to the Solicitation over the past 5 years.	5%		
	Subtotal	15%		
3	Project Execution 60%			
3.1	Evaluate Applicant's proposed Project Activities to be implemented as part of this Project.	5%		
3.2	Evaluate how Applicant will ensure all services are implemented to reflect the cultural, racial, ethnic, and linguistic differences of the communities and individuals being served.	5%		
3.3	Evaluate Applicant's approach to be utilized to engage new participants including strategies that will be used to ensure engagement of underserved populations.	5%		
3.4	Evaluate Applicant's partnerships with community organizations and how community partners will actively participate in Project activities to provide employment, housing, and education support services to Clubhouse members including the nature of past and/or current collaborations as well as future plans.	10%		
3.5	Evaluate how Applicant will facilitate oversight, quality assurance, and customer satisfaction of the proposed Project.	5%		
3.6	Evaluate how Applicant will implement a Disaster Response Plan that provides a disaster response in the event of an emergency, incident, or disaster including plans to ensure the safety of staff and Project participants, and communication strategies for staff and participants to ensure the continuation of Services as feasible.	5%		
3.7	Evaluate Applicant's timeline including milestones and anticipated completion date associated with planning and implementing the proposed Project including an accreditation timeline if Applicant is not accredited. The time frame should cover the initial Project Period.	5%		
3.8	Evaluate Applicant's anticipated implementation barriers and how the Applicant will address them.	5%		
3.9	Evaluate Applicant's description of how peer support will be utilized.	5%		
3.10	Evaluate Applicant's proposal to train and certify all peer specialists to ensure their competency in the delivery of peer support.	5%		
3.11	Evaluate Applicant's sustainability plan beyond the grant term including plans to maintain accreditation, a service location, and diversify funding sources to support Clubhouse operations.	5%		
	Subtotal	60%		
4	Proposed Budget 10%			
4.1	Evaluate the extent to which Applicant's proposed Project cost and Cost Sharing meet the requirements of this RFA.	5%		
4.2	Evaluate Applicant's accounting system and accounting processes as described in Form D, Financial Controls.	5%		
	Subtotal	10%		
	TOTAL (%)	100%		

**Exhibit I, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0015318**

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. HHS0015318**

No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Community Needs	15%
2	Applicant Background and Experience	15%
3	Project Execution Sections	60%
4	Project Costs	10%
GRAND TOTAL		100%