

Exhibit F, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016838 Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet				
Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Proposed Work			
1.1	Evaluate Applicant's existing MHO program and how it reduces SOCs.	20%		
1.2	Evaluate Applicant's program funding and its plan to use the grant funds to enhance, expand, or modify its existing program.	20%		
1.3	Evaluate Applicant's plan to sustain the program beyond the Grant period.	10%		
	Subtotal	50%		
2	Unmet Needs			
2.1	Evaluate Applicant's proposed target population, including geographic areas or specific groups affected by SOCs, that are most likely to benefit from its program enhancements, expansion, or modification.	10%		
2.2	Evaluate Applicant's data collection approach and methodology including its reporting method, tracked measures, target for each measure, criteria used to assess or define program success, and how its performance measures will be used to improve Client outcomes.	30%		
	Subtotal	40%		
3	Partnerships			
3.1	Evaluate Applicant's program partnerships and how they will assist Applicant's proposed enhancement, expansion, or modification.	10%		
	Subtotal	10%		
	TOTAL (%)	100%		

Exhibit F, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016838		
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 No. HHS0016838		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Proposed Work	50%
2	Unmet Needs	40%
3	Partnerships	10%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%