Exhibit G HHS0007346 Evaluation Score Tool

HHSC Women's Health Family Planning
Criteria, Subcriteria Sheet
RFA #HHS0007346

Evaluator				
Respondent				
#	**Criteria**	**Weight**	**Score**	**Comments**
1	**Local Need and Access to Care (15%)**			
1.1	Evaluate the details regarding the service needs to be addressed; data supporting the unmet need as critical; the community/service area to be served, including geographic/demographic information and any special populations impacted by the unmet need. SCORING GUIDANCE: An ideal response describes unmet needs to be addressed, uses community data to clearly support the unmet needs to be addressed and indicates that the Applicant used data to prioritize the identified unmet need. Any special populations identified makes sense in conjunction with the data provided and there are no special populations indicated by the data that are omitted. Policies and procedures are included that demonstrate requirement compliance.	10%		
1.2	Evaluate strategies to serve individuals in proposed service areas including any remote or underserved areas. SCORING GUIDANCE: An ideal response references any special populations to be served as described in the Application in describing a hard-to-reach area and/or population. An ideal response includes a strategic approach to reach individuals in remote or underserved areas. The proposed approach would likely increase access to services in those hard-to-reach areas.	5%		
	Subtotal	**15%**		
2	**Program Design (55%)**			
2.1	Evaluate the reasonableness and appropriateness of the estimated number of unduplicated individuals to be served on an annual and monthly basis, as detailed by the respondent. SCORING GUIDANCE: An ideal response would demonstrate that the proposed number of unduplicated individuals to be served appears feasible given project design, budget and staffing. The unduplicated number to be served appears to align with industry standards based upon funds being requested (e.g. reasonable cost per person).	10%		
2.2	Evaluate how the program will deliver services, supports, and activities. SCORING GUIDANCE: An ideal response demonstrates that the Collaborative members or community partners proposed are relevant to the work being proposed and populations being served. There is no significant omission of a partner that should reasonably be included. Collaborative or community partners increase access to services and work to remove barriers to access. Will demonstrate how the Collaborative or community partners coordinate services for individuals with unmet behavioral health needs. There is a plan to ensure adherence to fidelity to any evidence-based model or research which may include: completion of required trainings/certifications, fidelity checks, implementation of oversight practices, relationships/technical assistance from a program developer, quality assurance reviews, the use of program implementation manuals, etc.)	10%		
2.3	Evaluate the goals and expected outcomes and include evaluation on: 1. eligibility process; and 2. administrative oversight of complex health service programs. SCORING GUIDANCE: An ideal response would demonstrate that the proposed goals and outcomes would likely meet the community need described in the Application. The outcomes that are proposed are in alignment with the stated goals. The goals and outcomes proposed appear attainable, relevant, and measurable. An ideal response includes a clear description of each service/activity proposed by the Project. The proposed work is reflective of the Scope of Work outlined in the RFA. The proposed work is aligned with the goals and expected outcomes described in the Application, and would likely meet the community unmet need described in the Application.	15%		
2.4	Evaluate how the program uses a client- focused approach within the community to maximize existing resources and avoid duplication of effort. SCORING GUIDANCE: An ideal response demonstrates how the Applicant utilizes and implements services and outreach measures and how the provider will ensure non-duplication of effort (ex. coordinated case management, clear eligibility guidelines, releases, care coordination, etc.). The response provides a reasonable explanation of how the provider works to maximize existing resources and/or leverage resources. The strategies detailed would likely maximize resources and avoid duplication, demonstrate how the Proposed Project is building on existing partnerships, and how partnerships intersect within a service delivery structure.	10%		
2.5	Evaluate how the provider will oversee the program and the extent providers participated in prioritizing gaps and developed strategies to address the identified need and if the locations and partnerships support the program. SCORING GUIDANCE: An ideal response indicates that the Applicant actively engaged clients and community in prioritizing local needs as opposed to identifying the need as an agency in isolation. Response should indicate how feedback/engagement was sought from partners (ex. surveys, focus groups. existing community agendas, collaborative planning efforts, cross-agency meetings, etc.). Response should indicate how Applicant and partners worked together to develop strategies and/or activities to be proposed as part of this application.	10%		
	Subtotal	**55%**		
3	**Applicant Ability to Execute (20%)**			
3.1	Evaluate how the Applicant will monitor implementation progress and provide oversight including: meeting goals and expected outcomes; quality and effectiveness of services and activities; satisfaction of individuals receiving services; and participating in activities. SCORING GUIDANCE: An ideal response includes a clear, detailed explanation of how the applicant will monitor/oversee the project regarding: meeting goals and expected outcomes; the quality and effectiveness of services provided; and the level of satisfaction of individuals who received services/participated in activities.	10%		
3.2	Evaluate experience in successfully implementing programs: of similar scope and complexity as Proposed Project; serving target population; and with grants and contracts related to: state and/or federal grants; cost reimbursement funded grants; and matching grants. SCORING GUIDANCE: An ideal response includes a detailed narrative that shows the applicant has success in implementing projects that: are similar in scope and complexity to the proposed project; involved serving individuals; and involved substantial coordination/partnership with various types of organizations. An ideal response also includes a completed table showing multiple grant projects that: relate directly to the goals and objectives of this RFA. Ideally, the applicant can show a full three-five year history administering government grants with matching requirements with award amounts similar to what is requested in the applicants Expenditure Proposal.	10%		
	Subtotal	**20%**		
4	**Project Costs (10%)**			
4.1	Evaluate the financial stability, fiscal controls and management systems, previous audit reports, contract and litigation history to determine ability to provide service delivery. SCORING GUIDANCE: Ideally, documentation provided by Applicant would demonstrate that the grant request is no more than 25% of last year's operational budget; there is cash flow that would support cost reimbursement payment method; all necessary fiscal controls are in place; no significant audit concerns; and there is no significant contract or litigation history.	5%		
4.2	Budget Review: Evaluate the strategies and budget to determine if the program will be successful, costs are justifiable and clearly cost compliant, and is a value to the state. SCORING GUIDANCE: An ideal response would include sufficient detail and information to demonstrate the proposed budget matches the proposed strategies (i.e. the right amount of staff and appropriate cost is assigned to various project components). There are no substantial missing costs in relation to what is proposed.	5%		
	Subtotal	**10%**		
	TOTAL (%)	**100%**		