

**Exhibit F, Evaluation Tool**  
**RFA HHS0016783**  
**Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet**

<b>Evaluator</b>				
<b>Respondent</b>				
<b>#</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Local Unmet Needs (50%)</b>			
<b>1.1</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's local unmet needs to be addressed, and the supporting usage of quantitative and qualitative data required by this RFA.	15%		
<b>1.2</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's proposal to offer preventive health services and how the services will meet the unique local needs of the community, ensuring Clients are referred to local providers for ongoing service provision.	15%		
<b>1.3</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's ability to meet the local unmet needs based on the Applicant's described years of experience providing the service and key personnel.	10%		
<b>1.4</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed Mobile Health Unit vehicle's ability to meet unmet local needs and provide the proposed services.	10%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>50%</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Mitigation of Barriers and Outcomes (20%)</b>			
<b>2.1</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's proposed Mobile Health Unit plans to mitigate scheduling, operational barriers, and challenges to increase access to care for eligible clients.	10%		
<b>2.2</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's proposal plan to collect, measure, quantify, and report on performance measures that will improve Mobile Health Unit services.	10%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>20%</b>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Community Engagement (30%)</b>			
<b>3.1</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's plan for collaborations with community partners in the service delivery area(s).	15%		
<b>3.2</b>	Evaluate the Applicant's plan to promote Mobile Health Unit services and prioritize outreach to women who have never received preventive health care services or have not been screened in the last ten (10) years within the proposed service area(s).	15%		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>30%</b>		
<b>TOTAL (%)</b>		<b>100%</b>		

Exhibit F, Evaluation Tool RFA HHS0016783		
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 F, Evaluation Tool RFA HHS0016783		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Local Unmet Needs	50%
2	Mitigation of Barriers and Outcomes	20%
3	Community Engagement	30%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%