

RFA HHS0015357 Exhibit N, Evaluation Tool Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet				
Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
<b>1</b>	<b>Narrative, Personnel, and Organization</b>			
<b>1.1</b>	Evaluate the Respondent's narrative overview and how it demonstrates an understanding of the program purpose and goals of this RFA.	5%		
<b>1.2</b>	Evaluate the experience and capacity the Applicant has in providing Services, managing similar projects to the SNAP Outreach and Application Assistance Project and how the proposed approach meets the specific project requirements outlined in this RFA.	10%		
<b>1.3</b>	Evaluate the Respondent's Key Personnel and Organizational Requirements, qualifications, experience, organizational structure, and methodologies necessary to meet the project's requirements and deadlines.	5%		
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>20%</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Performance Requirements and Project Work Plans</b>			
<b>2.1</b>	Evaluate the Respondent's Project Work Plan and how it establishes and maintains a formal network of subrecipients equipped to provide outreach application assistance, education, and limited case management services to populations potentially eligible for SNAP benefits.	10%		
<b>2.2</b>	Evaluate the effectiveness and strategies of the Respondent's proposed plan to conduct informational activities aimed at educating individuals, families, and communities about the SNAP application process, benefits availability, eligibility criteria, documentation requirements, and accessible self-service resources and tools.	20%		
<b>2.3</b>	Evaluate the Respondent's proposed initiatives and how it effectively leverages partnerships with local stakeholders such as community leaders, nonprofits, and SNAP clients to identify and address the specific challenges of food insecurity in their communities.	5%		
<b>2.4</b>	Evaluate how the Applicant's collaborative efforts foster creativity and adaptability, enabling tailored solutions that enhance SNAP outreach and client resilience and the potential impact of the proposed projects to determine if they meet the unique needs of the community effectively and foster a greater understanding of the SNAP process.	5%		
<b>2.5</b>	Evaluate the projected reach of the targeted population, ensuring that the initiatives can efficiently address food insecurity challenges while maximizing their impact within the community.	5%		
<b>2.6</b>	Evaluate the Respondent's capacity to fulfill all other Outreach Contract Requirements, and Project Sustainability to ensure the Grantee has the operational infrastructure necessary to implement this project and meet contractual requirements effectively.	5%		
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>50%</b>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Expenditure Proposal and Justification (Cost effectiveness)</b>			
<b>3.1</b>	Evaluate the reasonableness of the Respondent's proposed Expenditure Proposal and how it meets all the requirements outlined in this RFA.	30%		
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>30%</b>		
	<b>TOTAL (%)</b>	<b>100%</b>		

RFA HHS0015357 Exhibit N, Evaluation Tool		
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.

RFA HHS0015357 Exhibit N, Evaluation Tool		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Narrative, Personnel, and Organization	20%
2	Performance Requirements and Project Work Plans	50%
3	Expenditure Proposal and Justification (Cost effectiveness)	30%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%