

**Exhibit N, Evaluation Tool**  
**RFA No. HHS0016124**  
**Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet**

Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
<b>1</b>	<b>LOCAL UNMET NEED AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (15%)</b>			
<b>1.1</b>	Evaluate how the Applicant's proposal identifies and prioritizes unmet needs using supporting community data.	10%		
<b>1.2</b>	Evaluate how the Applicant's proposed service area supports community need.	5%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>15%</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>PROPOSED PROJECT DESIGN (45%)</b>			
<b>2.1</b>	Evaluate Applicant's plan to meet the program requirements, including the services and activities that will be provided to achieve those requirements. Evaluate how these services and activities are supported by evidence or research and how they will be implemented with fidelity.	10%		
<b>2.2</b>	Evaluate Applicant's plan to provide coordinated and comprehensive services to eligible clients, including requirement to target street outreach and case management as priority services and serving the most vulnerable adults who are literally and chronically homeless.	10%		
<b>2.3</b>	Evaluate how the Applicant's proposal to collaborate with HUD Continuum of Care (CoC) goal to end homelessness. Evaluate how proposal addresses participation in HUD Continuum of Care (CoC) initiatives such as coordinated entry and assessment activities.	5%		
<b>2.4</b>	Evaluate how Applicant's proposal plans for staffing, including proposed positions and plans for recruitment and retention.	5%		
<b>2.5</b>	Evaluate how the Applicant's proposal for staff training and development ensure competency and proficiency. Evaluate how Applicant's proposal includes addressing individuals' goals and carrying out evidence-based services.	5%		
<b>2.6</b>	Evaluate how the Applicant's proposal monitors implementation and oversight to meet program requirements and outcomes.	5%		
<b>2.7</b>	Evaluate how the Applicant's proposal identifies key milestones relevant to successful implementation.	5%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>45%</b>		
<b>3</b>	<b>APPLICANT ABILITY TO EXECUTE (30%)</b>			
<b>3.1</b>	Evaluate Applicant's experience in successfully implementing projects of similar scope and complexity as Proposed Project; serving individuals with mental illness; and in coordination with community partners.	10%		
<b>3.2</b>	Evaluate Applicant's experience in administering: federal- or state-funded grant projects; cost reimbursement grants or contracts; and grant projects that require in-kind and private cash match.	10%		
<b>3.3</b>	Evaluate Applicant's experience in collecting, analyzing, and reporting performance and outcome data including managing and reporting expenditures and match in coordination with community partners.	10%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>30%</b>		
<b>4</b>	<b>PROJECT COST (10%)</b>			
<b>4.1</b>	Evaluate the proposed budget.	10%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>10%</b>		
<b>TOTAL (%)</b>		<b>100%</b>		

Exhibit N, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016124		
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 N, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016124		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	LOCAL UNMET NEED AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION	15%
45	PROPOSED PROJECT DESIGN	45%
4	APPLICANT ABILITY TO EXECUTE	30%
5	PROJECT COST	10%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%