

Exhibit G, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016125 Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet				
Evaluator Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	LOCAL CRITICAL GAPS AND UNMET NEEDS			
1.1	Evaluate the Applicant's Proposed Project describing the unmet needs to be addressed and the supporting usage of community data to indicate data was used to prioritize the identified unmet need.	10%		
1.2	Evaluate the Applicant's Proposed Project describing the community or service area to be served and the data that supports the gap or unmet need.	5%		
	Subtotal	15%		
2	PROPOSED PROJECT DESIGN			
2.1	Evaluate the Applicant's goals of the Proposed Project services and activities and achieving those goals.	5%		
2.2	Evaluate the Applicant's Proposed Project integration with existing service systems and reaching individuals experiencing homelessness in hard-to-access or underserved geographic areas.	5%		
2.3	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed staffing details including proposed positions and plans for recruitment and retention.	5%		
2.4	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed plan for staff training and development to ensure competency and proficiency in addressing individuals' goals and carrying out evidence-based services.	5%		
2.5	Evaluate the Applicant's established or proposed partnerships providing supporting examples of projects showing results that would indicate success for this Proposed Project.	5%		
2.6	Evaluate the Applicant's collaboration with members/community partners prioritizing local needs and using a collaborative approach to maximize existing resources, avoiding duplication of effort.	5%		
2.7	Evaluate the Applicant's Proposed Project implementation of monitoring progress and providing oversight to the Proposed Project.	5%		
2.8	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed key milestones for the Proposed Project and successful implementation.	5%		
2.9	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed strategies that will be used to maintain or enhance community support and quality of services after the grant period ends.	5%		
	Subtotal	45%		
3	EXPERIENCE			
3.1	Evaluate the Applicant's experience in successfully implementing projects of similar scope and complexity.	10%		
3.2	Evaluate the Applicant's experience in administering federal or state-funded grant projects, cost reimbursement grants or contracts, or grant projects that require in-kind and private cash match.	10%		
3.3	Evaluate the Applicant's experience in collecting, analyzing, and reporting performance and outcome data.	10%		
	Subtotal	30%		
4	PROPOSED BUDGET			
4.1	Evaluate the Applicant's Proposed Budget proposal.	10%		
	Subtotal	10%		
	TOTAL (%)	100%		

Exhibit G, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016125		
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. HHS0016125		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	LOCAL CRITICAL GAPS AND UNMET NEEDS	15%
2	PROPOSED PROJECT DESIGN	45%
3	EXPERIENCE	30%
4	PROPOSED BUDGET	10%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%