

**Exhibit E, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0015344
Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet**

Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Local Unmet Needs			
1.1	Evaluate Applicant's description of local need for breast and cervical cancer services. Evaluate Applicant's use of qualitative and quantitative data, including use of rankings from the County Health Ranking and Roadmap.	15%		
	Subtotal	15%		
2	Narrative Proposal			
2.1	Evaluate Applicant's description of BCCS service provision. Evaluate Applicant's description of facilities and partnerships to ensure eligible clients are able to access all required services.	15%		
2.2	Evaluate Applicant's description of BCCS eligibility determination. Evaluate Applicant's proposed strategies to navigate ineligible individuals to other programs and strategies to avoid dual program eligibility.	15%		
	Subtotal	30%		
3	Outreach to Eligible Service Areas			
3.1	Evaluate Applicant's description of promotion and outreach plans for BCCS services in counties selected on Form D. Evaluate Applicant's specific plans for counties where the Applicant does not operate a physical or mobile clinic.	20%		
	Subtotal	20%		
4	Performance Indicators			
4.1	Evaluate Applicant's plan to identify and prioritize women 30 and older who have never or rarely been screened. Evaluate Applicant's description of service navigation and connections with other local providers.	20%		
4.2	Evaluate Applicant's description of complete and timely data entry, including additional processes or resources proposed and considering most Applicants have existing electronic health records, making data entry into Med-It dual entry.	15%		
	Subtotal	35%		
	TOTAL (%)	100%		

**Exhibit E, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0015344**

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 E, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0015344**

No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Local Unmet Needs	15%
2	Narrative Proposal	30%
3	Outreach to Eligible Service Areas	20%
4	Performance Indicators	35%
GRAND TOTAL		100%