

Exhibit K, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016733 Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet				
Evaluator Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Narrative, Personnel, and Organization			
1.1	Evaluate the Applicant's Narrative Proposal and how it demonstrates an understanding of the purpose and goals of this RFA.	10%		
1.2	Evaluate the Applicant's organizational capacity and experience and how it demonstrates the qualifications, experience, organization, and methodologies to meet the requirements and timelines of the this RFA.	15%		
Subtotal		25%		
2	Project Work Plan and Performance Requirements			
2.1	Evaluate the Applicant's Project Work Plan and how it demonstrates a clear understanding of the proposed services, processes, timeframes, and methodologies for meeting the requirements of this RFA.	20%		
2.2	Evaluate the Applicant's staffing and organizational capacity required to successfully implement the proposed Projects required by this RFA.	10%		
Subtotal		30%		
3	Management Requirements			
3.1	Evaluate the Applicant's ability to establish and maintain administrative oversight and support for the programmatic discussions and decisions in coordination with HHSC.	5%		
Subtotal		5%		
4	Program Requirements			
4.1	Evaluate the Applicant's ability to develop comprehensive plans addressing the required elements for each plan and supports successful implementation, project performance, and reporting for the Nutrition Incentive Program proposed Project(s).	10%		
Subtotal		10%		
5	Proposed Budget			
5.1	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed Budget detailed line item descriptions and justifications to support the requirements of this RFA.	30%		
Subtotal		30%		
TOTAL (%)		100%		

Exhibit K, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016733		
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 K, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016733		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Narrative, Personnel, and Organization	25%
2	Project Work Plan and Performance Requirements	30%
3	Management Requirements	5%
4	Program Requirements	10%
5	Proposed Budget	30%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%