

**Exhibit E, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0015867
Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet**

| Evaluator Respondent | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---------------|--------------|-----------------|
| # | Criteria | Weight | Score | Comments |
| 1 | Experience/Personnel Qualifications | | | |
| 1.1 | Evaluate the Applicant's ability to serve and reach the target population of youth. | 15% | | |
| 1.2 | Evaluate the Applicant's experience working with the children identified as the target population. | 15% | | |
| Subtotal | | 30% | | |
| 2 | Methodology and Approach | | | |
| 2.1 | Evaluate the Applicant's strategies for outreach and engagement for families during treatment of youth by the organization. | 20% | | |
| 2.2 | Evaluate the Applicant's current or intended trauma informed model, and related interventions. | 20% | | |
| 2.3 | Evaluate the Applicant's current system or plans to build a provider network for aftercare services for youth and their families post-discharge. | 10% | | |
| Subtotal | | 50% | | |
| 3 | Administration and Management | | | |
| 3.1 | Evaluate the experience and qualifications of the individual(s) who will oversee the application, administration, and supervision of the Applicant's organization before, during and after Accreditation certification. | 10% | | |
| 3.2 | Evaluate the Applicant's short and long-term goals the organization has achieved, or desires to achieve through Accreditation. | 10% | | |
| Subtotal | | 20% | | |
| TOTAL (%) | | 100% | | |

| Exhibit E, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0015867 | | |
|--|-------|---|
| 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. HHS0015867**

| No. | Best Value Criteria | Weight |
|--------------------|--|---------------|
| 1 | Experience/Personnel Qualifications | 30% |
| 2 | Methodology and Approach | 50% |
| 3 | Administration and Management | 20% |
| GRAND TOTAL | | 100% |