

Exhibit H, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016551 Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet				
Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Experience			
1.1	Evaluate the Applicant's organizational structure, key management, and experience in administering complex Projects, grants, or Contracts with similar Participant population.	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 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 proposed logic model, Project Work Plan, staffing, services, strategies to engage target populations.	20%		
3.3	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed Project Work Plan activities, objectives, and planned spending.	5%		
Subtotal		40%		
TOTAL (%)		100%		

Exhibit H, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016551		
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 H, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016551		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Experience	30%
2	Community Engagement	30%
3	Project Design	40%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%