Exhibit G, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0015358
Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet

Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	**Criteria**	**Weight**	**Score**	**Comments**
1	**Applicant's Experience**			
1.1	Evaluate the Applicant's organizational structure, key management, and experience with similar Participant population, in addition to its experience in administering complex projects, grants, or contracts.	30%		
	Subtotal	**30%**		
2	**Community Engagement**			
2.1	Evaluate the Applicant's current community partnerships, support for the proposed programming and initiatives, planned efforts to enhance networks and service connections, and maintain partnerships to aid in outreach and recruitment for priority populations and seek Participant Referrals.	30%		
	Subtotal	**30%**		
3	**Project Design**			
3.1	Evaluate the Applicant's alignment of proposed services and initiatives with the community strengths and needs identified in the Community Strengths and Needs Assessment.	15%		
3.2	Evaluate the Applicant's logic model and Project Work Plan, including staffing, services, strategies to engage target populations, and the overall plan to achieve the desired outcomes of this RFA.	20%		
3.3	Evaluate the Applicant's alignment between Project Work Plan activities and objectives and planned spending.	5%		
	Subtotal	**40%**		
	TOTAL (%)	**100%**		

Exhibit G, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0015358		
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 G, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0015358		
No.	**Best Value Criteria**	**Weight**
1	**Applicant's Experience**	**30%**
2	**Community Engagement**	**30%**
3	**Project Design**	**40%**
	GRAND TOTAL	**100%**