

Exhibit M, Evaluation Tool
RFA No. HHS0016842
Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet

Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	Criteria	Weight	Score	Comments
1	Service Objectives and Quality Indicators			
1.1	Evaluate the Applicant's Programmatic Proposal components and description of goals to achieve Service Objectives and Quality Indicators.	15%		
	Subtotal	15%		
2	Delivery Model			
2.1	Evaluate the Applicant's Management Plan, Administrative Management Plan, and Community Engagement Plan (CEP).	15%		
	Subtotal	15%		
3	Compliance and General Requirements			
3.1	Evaluate the Applicant's described plan of Compliance and General Requirements.	10%		
	Subtotal	10%		
4	Placement Services and Services to Children			
4.1	Evaluate the Applicant's plan to provide Placement Services and Services to Children.	15%		
	Subtotal	15%		
5	Case Management			
5.1	Evaluate the Applicant's described Case Management Plan.	15%		
	Subtotal	15%		
6	History and Experience			
6.1	Evaluate the Applicant's description of their organizational experience, structure and relationship between their organization and other community-based services to be provided.	10%		
6.2	Evaluate the Applicant's described success which demonstrates the ability to provide the requirements of this RFA.	10%		
	Subtotal	20%		
7	Financial Process, Systems, and Structure			
7.1	Evaluate the Applicant's detailed Financial System and Structure supporting management and oversight of the service network, and the validation of services required of this RFA.	10%		
	Subtotal	10%		
	TOTAL (%)	100%		

Exhibit M, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016842		
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 M, Evaluation Tool RFA No. HHS0016842		
No.	Best Value Criteria	Weight
1	Service Objectives and Quality Indictors	15%
2	Delivery Model	15%
3	Compliance and General Requirements	10%
4	Placement Services and Services to Children	15%
5	Case Management	15%
6	History and Experience	20%
7	Financial Process, Systems, and Structure	10%
	GRAND TOTAL	100%