

ADDENDUM #004 to the following Request for Applications (RFA):  
Criminal Justice, Mental Health, and Substance Abuse (CJMHTSA)

Reinvestment Grant

Advertisement Number: RFA06H16GS1

---

Section 4.3, page 22, is hereby amended to read:

**4.3 Review Criteria**

The Grant Review Committee will be classified into two teams, each of which will be assigned a specific type of grant to review: Planning or Implementation and Expansion. In addition, two teams will be assigned to review the Financial information for each type of grant.

Within each team, each member will independently evaluate the appropriate documentation submitted by each Applicant, according to the following criteria, using the manuals in **Appendix M-Planning Grant Evaluation Manual**, **Appendix N- Implementation or Expansion Grant Evaluation Manual** and **Appendix O-Financial Evaluation Manual**:

Criteria	Planning	Implementation or Expansion
<b>Programmatic</b>		
Statement of the Problem	56	72
Project Design and Implementation	84	168
Performance Measures	12	20
Capability and Experience	16	20
Sustainability	24	108
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>388</b>
<b>Financial</b>	96	96

The minimum programmatic score to be eligible for a Planning Grant award recommendation is 96 points.

The minimum programmatic score to be eligible for an Implementation or Expansion Grant award recommendation is 194 points.

---

FAILURE TO FILE A PROTEST WITHIN THE TIME PRESCRIBED IN SECTION 120.57(3), FLORIDA STATUTES, OR FAILURE TO POST THE BOND OR OTHER SECURITY REQUIRED BY LAW WITHIN THE TIME ALLOWED FOR FILING A BOND SHALL CONSTITUTE A WAIVER OF PROCEEDINGS UNDER CHAPTER 120, FLORIDA STATUTES.

**Appendix M**

**State of Florida  
Department of Children and Families**



**RFA# - RFA06H16GS1  
Criminal Justice, Mental Health, and Substance Abuse Reinvestment Grant  
Planning Grant Evaluation Manual**

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

## 1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- 1.1 Each Grant Review Committee member (evaluator) will evaluate the Criminal Justice, Mental Health, and Substance Abuse Reinvestment (CJMHSAs) Grant application for all applications that pass the mandatory criteria. Each evaluation criterion must be scored. Fractional values will not be accepted. If an evaluator score sheet(s) is missing scores, it will be returned for completion.
- 1.2 Each evaluator shall assign a score for each evaluation criterion based upon his or her assessment of the application. The assignment of an individual score must be based upon the following description of the point scores:

The application demonstrates or describes	Category	Points
...extensive competency, proven capabilities, an outstanding approach to the subject area, innovative, practical and effective solutions, a clear and complete understanding of inter-relationships, full responsiveness, a clear and comprehensive understanding of the requirements and planning for the unforeseen.	Superior	4
...clear competency, consistent capability, a reasoned approach to the subject area, feasible solutions, a generally clear and complete description of inter-relationships, extensive but incomplete responsiveness and a sound understanding of the requirements.	Good	3
...fundamental competency, adequate capability, a basic approach to the subject area, apparently feasible but somewhat unclear solutions, a weak description of inter-relationships in some areas, partial responsiveness, a fair understanding of the requirements and a lack of staff experience and skills in some areas.	Adequate	2
...little competency, minimal capability, an inadequate approach to the subject area, infeasible or ineffective solutions, somewhat unclear, incomplete or non-responsive, a lack of understanding of the requirements and a lack of demonstrated experience and skills.	Poor	1
...a significant or complete lack of understanding, an incomprehensible approach, a significant or complete lack of skill and experience and extensive non-responsiveness.	Insufficient	0

- 1.3 When completing score sheets evaluators should record references to the sections of the Request for Application (RFA) and the written application materials which most directly pertain to the criterion and upon which their scores were based. More than one section may be recorded. Evaluators should not attempt an exhaustive documentation of every bit of information considered but only key information. In general, the reference statements should be brief. If the application does not address an evaluation criterion, evaluators should indicate "not addressed" and score it accordingly.
- 1.4 Each evaluator has been provided a copy of the RFA, including its appendices, amendments, written inquiries and the replies provided by the Department. Each evaluator will be provided a copy of each Grant application which should be evaluated and scored according to the instructions provided in the solicitation and the evaluation manual.
- 1.5 Applications shall be independently scored by each member of the evaluation team. No collaboration is permitted during the scoring process. The same scoring principles must be applied to every application received, independent of other evaluators. Evaluators should work carefully to be as thorough as possible in order to ensure a fair and open competitive procurement. No attempt by Department personnel or other, evaluators or other persons to influence an evaluator's scoring shall be tolerated.

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1.6 If any attempt is made to influence an evaluator, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Procurement Manager. If such an attempt is made by the Procurement Manager, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Inspector General.
- 1.7 Only the rating sheets provided should be used. No additional notes or marks should appear elsewhere in the evaluation manual.
- 1.8 Evaluators may request assistance in understanding evaluation criteria and applications only from the Procurement Manager.
- 1.9 Section 287.057(17)(a)1., Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires that each agency must avoid, neutralize, or mitigate significant potential organizational conflicts of interest before a contract is awarded. Accordingly, in compliance with Section 4.1 of the RFA, in the event any Applicant is a member of an association or organization represented on the Grant Review Committee in Section 4.4, the scores of the association or organization's representative will not be included in the total average score for any application.
- 1.10 All evaluators, scores, and notes; including any documentation excluded from scoring under section 1.9 above will be maintained for use by the Grant Review Committee acting as the CJMHSAs advisory body to the Department for future solicitations.
- 1.11 Questions related to the solicitation and evaluation of the applications should be directed only to:
 

Michele Staffieri, Procurement Manager  
 DCF, SAMH  
 1317 Winewood Blvd., Bldg. 6, Room 231, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0700  
 E-Mail Address: Michele.staffieri@myflfamilies.com
- 1.12 After each evaluator has completed the scoring of each CJMHSAs Reinvestment Grant application, the scores are then submitted to the Procurement Manager for compilation. The Procurement Manager will average the total CJMHSAs Reinvestment Grant point scores by each evaluator to calculate the points awarded for each section.
- 1.13 Following completion of the independent evaluations of the applications, the Procurement Manager will hold a meeting to validate evaluator scoring. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure that their individual evaluation scores were captured correctly when preparing the total CJMHSAs Reinvestment Grant scores.

## 2 QUALITATIVE CRITERIA

Evaluators shall assign scores to each of the applications received by the Department based on the following criteria:

- Applicant's articulation of their project approach and solution, and the ability of the approach and solution to meet the Department's needs and the requirements of the RFA
- The innovation of the approach and solution
- Applicant references and track record implementing similar solutions to the one specified in the RFA
- Experience and skills of proposed staff relative to the proposed approach and solution

## 3 APPLICATION PROGRAMMATIC POINT VALUES

- The maximum score for the Programmatic portion of the Application is 192 points.
- The minimum score to be eligible for award recommendation is 96 points.

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

	Programmatic Criteria: Planning	Points	Weighted Value	Maximum Points	Points Assigned
<b>Criteria 1: Statement of the Problem</b>					
1	Statement of the Problem	28	2	56	
	<b>Criteria 1 Subtotal</b>	<b>28</b>		<b>56</b>	
<b>Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation</b>					
2	Description of the Planning Council or Committee	8	3	24	
2	Timeline and Expected Milestones	20	3	60	
	<b>Criteria 2 Subtotal</b>	<b>28</b>		<b>84</b>	
<b>Criteria 3: Performance Measures</b>					
3	Performance Measures	12	1	12	
	<b>Criteria 3 Subtotal</b>	<b>12</b>		<b>12</b>	
<b>Criteria 4: Capability and Experience</b>					
4	Capability and Experience	16	1	16	
	<b>Criteria 4 Subtotal</b>	<b>16</b>		<b>16</b>	
<b>Criteria 5: Sustainability</b>					
5	Sustainability	8	3	24	
	<b>Criteria 5 Subtotal</b>	<b>8</b>		<b>24</b>	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>92</b>		<b>192</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criteria 1: Statement of the Problem</b>	
<b>Tab 4 - RFA References: Section 3.8; and Appendix A – Strategic Plan Format</b>	
<b>How well does the application describe the problem to be addressed?</b>	<b>Points (0-4 each)</b>
1. How well does the application document the extent of the problem with local and state data and appropriate trend analysis?  Notes:	
2. How well does the analysis describe the screening and assessment process used to identify the Target Population?  Notes:	
3. How well does the analysis of persons admitted with a mental illness, substance use disorder, or co-occurring disorders support the selection of the Target Population?  Notes:	
4. How well does the analysis identify and describe contributing factors that affect population trends in the county jail or juvenile detention center?  Notes:	
5. How well does the data and descriptive narrative provided delineate the specific factors that put the Target Population at-risk of entering or re-entering the criminal or juvenile justice systems?  Notes:	
6. How well does the application describe the project’s geographic environment and the socioeconomic factors impacting the selection of the Target Population?  Notes:	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 1: Statement of the Problem</u></b>	
Tab 4 - RFA References: Section 3.8; and Appendix A – Strategic Plan Format	
How well does the application describe the problem to be addressed?	Points (0-4 each)
7. How well does the application describe the project's priority as a community concern? Notes:	
Subtotal <i>(Max 28 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	2
<b>Total Points <i>(Max 56 Points)</i></b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation</b>	
Sub Criteria 2A: Description of the Planning Council or Committee	
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 1.2 and 1.6.1; Section 2.2.4.2, Section 3.8, and Appendix K - Criminal Justice, Mental Health &amp; Substance Abuse Reinvestment Grant Planning Council or Committee</i>	
How well does the application describe the planning council or committee?	Points (0-4 each)
1. How well does the description of the role of each member as stakeholder, consumer, etc. demonstrate compliance with s. 394.657(2)(a), F.S? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If the application is in <i>full compliance</i> with s. 395.657(2)(a), F.S., and fully identifies all positions in Appendix K, award <b>4 points</b>;</li> <li>b. If the application <i>reasonably complies</i> with s. 395.657(2)(a), F.S., identifies at least eighteen (18) of the positions in Appendix K, and provides a detailed explanation of how the Council intends to rectify the deficiency within the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter, award <b>3 points</b>;</li> <li>c. If the application is in <i>basic compliance</i> with s. 395.657(2)(a), F.S., identifies at least ten (10) of the positions in Appendix K, and provides a detailed explanation of how the Council intends to rectify the deficiency by the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter, award <b>2 points</b>;</li> <li>d. If the application does not adequately comply with s. 395.657(2)(a), F.S., identifies less than ten (10) of the positions in Appendix K, and provides a detailed explanation of how the Council intends to rectify the deficiency by the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter, award <b>1 point</b>; and</li> <li>e. If the application does not adequately comply with s. 395.657(2)(a), F.S., identifies less than ten (10) of the positions in Appendix K, and does not provide a sufficiently detailed explanation of how the Council intends to rectify the deficiency by the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter, award <b>0 points</b>.</li> </ul> Notes:	
2. How well does the application describe the Planning council's activities, including the frequency of meetings for the previous 12 months and future scheduling of meetings? Notes:	
Subtotal ( <i>Max 8 Points</i> )	
Weighted Value	3
<b>Total Points (<i>Max 24 Points</i>)</b>	



Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation</b>	
Sub Criteria 2B: Timeline and Expected Milestones	
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 1.6.14,</i> <i>Section 2.2.3;</i> <i>Section 3.8.5.2, and</i> <i>Appendix A- Strategic Plan Format</i>	
How well does the application describe the timeline for the proposed planning activities and expected milestones?	Points (0-4 each)
1. How well does the application describe the process for using needs assessments appropriate to the Target Population during planning?  Notes:	
2. How well does the application describe the proposed process used during planning for project design and implementation?  Notes:	
3. How well does the proposed planning address opportunities to coordinate funding, related resources, and recommended organizational or structural changes?  Notes:	
4. How well does the proposed strategy for coordination, communication and data sharing support strategic planning goals?  Notes:	
5. How well does the timeline outline anticipated start and completion dates for each milestone, benchmark, and goal?  Notes:	
<i>Subtotal (Max 20 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	3
<b>Total Points (Max 60 Points)</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Criteria 3: Performance Measures</u>	
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 2.4.1,</i> <i>Section 3.8.5.4, and</i> <i>Appendix A- Strategic Plan Format</i>	
How well does the application describe how performance under the grant will be measured?	Points (0-4 each)
1. How well does the project timeline ensure compliance with the specific measures outlined in Section 2.4.1?  Notes:	
2. How well do the proposed targets and methodologies address the measures specified in Section 2.4.1?  Notes:	
3. How well does the additional proposed performance measure, required in Section 2.4.1.5, align with the tasks outlined in the application?  Notes:	
Subtotal <i>(Max 12 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	1
Total Points <i>(Max 12 Points)</i>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 4: Capability and Experience</u></b>	
<b>Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 3.8.5.5</i></b>	
<b>How well does the application describe the Applicant’s capability and experience in providing similar services?</b>	<b>Points (0-4 each)</b>
1. How well do the capabilities and experience of the Applicant and other participating organizations, including law enforcement agencies, meet the objectives detailed in this RFA?  Notes:	
2. How well does the application demonstrate existing organizational capacity to implement the proposed project?  Notes:	
3. How well does the application outline the role of advocates, family members, responsible partners, and other community stakeholders represented on the Planning Council and how they will support the project’s objectives?  Notes:	
4. How well does the application address the necessary expertise and qualifications to carry out the Strategic Planning project?  Notes:	
<i>Subtotal (Max 16 Points)</i>	
<i>Weighted Value</i>	1
<b>Total Points (Max 16 Points)</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Criteria 5: Sustainability</u>	
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 1.6.16,</i> <i>Section 2.3, and</i> <i>Section 3.8.5.6.2</i>	
How well does the application address sustainability of the project?	Points (0-4 each)
1. How well does the application explain how strategic planning will support effective collaboration among stakeholders? Stakeholder collaboration should include government agencies, law enforcement, the criminal, juvenile, and civil justice systems, mental health and substance use service providers, transportation programs, housing assistance programs, and intervention programs.  Notes:	
2. How well does the application describe how collaborative partnerships and funding will be leveraged to build long-term support and resources to implement the strategic plan following grant completion?  Notes:	
Subtotal ( <i>Max 8 Points</i> )	
Weighted Value	3
Total Points ( <i>Max 24 Points</i> )	

Appendix N

State of Florida  
Department of Children and Families



RFA# - RFA06H16GS1  
Criminal Justice, Mental Health, and Substance Abuse Reinvestment Grant  
Implementation or Expansion Grant Evaluation Manual

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

## 1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- 1.1 Each Grant Review Committee member (evaluator) will evaluate the Criminal Justice, Mental Health, and Substance Abuse Reinvestment (CJMHS A) Grant application for all applications that pass the mandatory criteria. Each evaluation criterion must be scored. Fractional values will not be accepted. If an evaluator score sheet(s) is missing scores, it will be returned for completion.
- 1.2 Each evaluator shall assign a score for each evaluation criterion based upon his or her assessment of the application. The assignment of an individual score must be based upon the following description of the point scores:

The application demonstrates or describes	Category	Points
...extensive competency, proven capabilities, an outstanding approach to the subject area, innovative, practical and effective solutions, a clear and complete understanding of inter-relationships, full responsiveness, a clear and comprehensive understanding of the requirements and planning for the unforeseen.	Superior	4
...clear competency, consistent capability, a reasoned approach to the subject area, feasible solutions, a generally clear and complete description of inter-relationships, extensive but incomplete responsiveness and a sound understanding of the requirements.	Good	3
...fundamental competency, adequate capability, a basic approach to the subject area, apparently feasible but somewhat unclear solutions, a weak description of inter-relationships in some areas, partial responsiveness, a fair understanding of the requirements and a lack of staff experience and skills in some areas.	Adequate	2
...little competency, minimal capability, an inadequate approach to the subject area, infeasible or ineffective solutions, somewhat unclear, incomplete or non-responsive, a lack of understanding of the requirements and a lack of demonstrated experience and skills.	Poor	1
...a significant or complete lack of understanding, an incomprehensible approach, a significant or complete lack of skill and experience and extensive non-responsiveness.	Insufficient	0

- 1.3 When completing score sheets evaluators should record references to the sections of the Request for Application (RFA) and the written application materials which most directly pertain to the criterion and upon which their scores were based. More than one section may be recorded. Evaluators should not attempt an exhaustive documentation of every bit of information considered but only key information. In general, the reference statements should be brief. If the application does not address an evaluation criterion, evaluators should indicate "not addressed" and score it accordingly.
- 1.4 Each evaluator has been provided a copy of the RFA, including its appendices, amendments, written inquiries and the replies provided by the Department. Each evaluator will be provided a copy of each Grant application which should be evaluated and scored according to the instructions provided in the solicitation and the evaluation manual.
- 1.5 Applications shall be independently scored by each member of the evaluation team. No collaboration is permitted during the scoring process. The same scoring principles must be applied to every application received, independent of other evaluators. Evaluators should work carefully to be as thorough as possible in order to ensure a fair and open competitive procurement. No attempt by Department personnel or other, evaluators or other persons to influence an evaluator's scoring shall be tolerated.

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1.6 If any attempt is made to influence an evaluator, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Procurement Manager. If such an attempt is made by the Procurement Manager, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Inspector General.
- 1.7 Only the rating sheets provided should be used. No additional notes or marks should appear elsewhere in the evaluation manual.
- 1.8 Evaluators may request assistance in understanding evaluation criteria and applications only from the Procurement Manager.
- 1.9 Section 287.057(17)(a)1., Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires that each agency must avoid, neutralize, or mitigate significant potential organizational conflicts of interest before a contract is awarded. Accordingly, in compliance with Section 4.1 of the RFA, in the event any Applicant is a member of an association or organization represented on the Grant Review Committee in Section 4.4, the scores of the association or organization's representative will not be included in the total average score for any application.
- 1.10 All evaluators, scores, and notes; including any documentation excluded from scoring under section 1.9 above will be maintained for use by the Grant Review Committee acting as the CJMHS A advisory body to the Department for future solicitations.
- 1.11 Questions related to the solicitation and evaluation of the applications should be directed only to:
 

Michele Staffieri, Procurement Manager  
 DCF, SAMH  
 1317 Winewood Blvd., Bldg. 6, Room 231, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0700  
 E-Mail Address: Michele.staffieri@myflfamilies.com
- 1.12 After each evaluator has completed the scoring of each CJMHS A Reinvestment Grant application, the scores are then submitted to the Procurement Manager for compilation. The Procurement Manager will average the total CJMHS A Reinvestment Grant point scores by each evaluator to calculate the points awarded for each section.
- 1.13 Following completion of the independent evaluations of the applications, the Procurement Manager will hold a meeting to validate evaluator scoring. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure that their individual evaluation scores were captured correctly when preparing the total CJMHS A Reinvestment Grant scores.

## 2 QUALITATIVE CRITERIA

Evaluators shall assign scores to each of the applications received by the Department based on the following criteria:

- Applicant's articulation of their project approach and solution, and the ability of the approach and solution to meet the Department's needs and the requirements of the RFA
- The innovation of the approach and solution
- Applicant references and track record implementing similar solutions to the one specified in the RFA
- Experience and skills of proposed staff relative to the proposed approach and solution

## 3 APPLICATION PROGRAMMATIC POINT VALUES

- The maximum score for the Programmatic portion of the Application is 388 points.
- The minimum score to be eligible for award recommendation is 194 points.

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

	Programmatic Criteria: Planning	Points	Weighted Value	Maximum Points	Points Assigned
<b>Criteria 1: Statement of the Problem</b>					
1	Statement of the Problem	36	2	72	
	<b>Criteria 1 Subtotal</b>	<b>36</b>		<b>72</b>	
<b>Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation</b>					
2	Description of the Planning Council or Committee	8	3	24	
2	Strategic Plan	8	3	24	
2	Description of Project Design and Implementation	32	3	96	
2	Service Strategies	8	3	24	
	<b>Criteria 2 Subtotal</b>	<b>56</b>		<b>168</b>	
<b>Criteria 3: Performance Measures</b>					
3	Performance Measures	20	1	20	
	<b>Criteria 3 Subtotal</b>	<b>20</b>		<b>20</b>	
<b>Criteria 4: Capability and Experience</b>					
4	Capability and Experience	20	1	20	
	<b>Criteria 4 Subtotal</b>	<b>20</b>		<b>20</b>	
<b>Criteria 5: Evaluation and Sustainability</b>					
5	Evaluation	20	3	60	
5	Sustainability	8	3	24	
5	Complete Project Timeline	8	3	24	
	<b>Criteria 5 Subtotal</b>	<b>36</b>		<b>108</b>	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>168</b>		<b>388</b>	



Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 1: Statement of the Problem</u></b>	
<b>Tab 4 - RFA References: Section 3.8.4.1 and Appendix A – Strategic Plan Format</b>	
<b>How well does the application describe the problem to be addressed?</b>	<b>Points (0-4 each)</b>
1. How well does the application document the extent of the problem with local and state data and appropriate trend analysis?  Notes:	
2. How well does the application describe the project’s geographic environment and the socioeconomic factors impacting the selection of the Target Population?  Notes:	
3. How well does the application describe the project’s priority as a community concern?  Notes:	
4. How well does the analysis describe the screening and assessment process used to identify the Target Population?  Notes:	
5. How well does the analysis of persons admitted with a mental illness, substance use disorder, or co-occurring disorders support the selection of the Target Population?  Notes:	
6. How well does the analysis identify and describe contributing factors that affect population trends in the county jail or juvenile detention center?  Notes:	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 1: Statement of the Problem</u></b>	
<b>Tab 4 - RFA References: Section 3.8.4.1 and Appendix A – Strategic Plan Format</b>	
<b>How well does the application describe the problem to be addressed?</b>	<b>Points (0-4 each)</b>
7. How well does the data and descriptive narrative provided delineate the specific factors that put the Target Population at-risk of entering or re-entering the criminal or juvenile justice systems?  Notes:	
8. How well does the analysis support the projected number of individuals to be served?  Notes:	
9. How well does the analysis demonstrate how the identified needs of the Target Population are consistent with the priorities of the Strategic Plan?  Notes:	
<i>Subtotal (Max 36 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	2
<b>Total Points (Max 72 Points)</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation</b>	
Sub Criteria 2A: Description of the Planning Council or Committee	
<b>Tab 5; RFA References:</b> <i>Section 1.2 and 1.6.1;</i> <i>Section 2.2.4.2,</i> <i>Section 3.8, and</i> <i>Appendix K - Criminal Justice, Mental Health &amp; Substance Abuse Reinvestment Grant Planning Council or Committee</i>	
How well does the application describe the planning council or committee?	Points (0-4 each)
<p>1. How well does the description of the role of each member as stakeholder, consumer, etc. demonstrate compliance with s. 394.657(2)(a), F.S?</p> <p>a. If the application is in <i>full compliance</i> with s. 395.657(2)(a), F.S., and fully identifies all positions in Appendix K, award <b>4 points</b>;</p> <p>b. If the application <i>reasonably complies</i> with s. 395.657(2)(a), F.S., identifies at least eighteen (18) of the positions in Appendix K, and provides a detailed explanation of how the Council intends to rectify the deficiency within the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter, award <b>3 points</b>;</p> <p>c. If the application is in <i>basic compliance</i> with s. 395.657(2)(a), F.S., identifies at least ten (10) of the positions in Appendix K, and provides a detailed explanation of how the Council intends to rectify the deficiency by the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter, award <b>2 points</b>;</p> <p>d. If the application does not adequately comply with s. 395.657(2)(a), F.S., identifies less than ten (10) of the positions in Appendix K, and provides a detailed explanation of how the Council intends to rectify the deficiency by the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter, award <b>1 point</b>; and</p> <p>e. If the application does not adequately comply with s. 395.657(2)(a), F.S., identifies less than ten (10) of the positions in Appendix K, and does not provide a sufficiently detailed explanation of how the Council intends to rectify the deficiency by the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter, award <b>0 points</b>.</p> <p>Notes:</p>	
<p>2. How well does the application describe the Planning council's activities, including the frequency of meetings for the previous 12 months and future scheduling of meetings?</p> <p>Notes:</p>	
Subtotal ( <i>Max 8 Points</i> )	
Weighted Value	3
<b>Total Points (<i>Max 24 Points</i>)</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation</b>	
Sub Criteria 2B: Strategic Plan	
<p><b>Tab 5; RFA References:</b> <i>Section 1.6.14,</i>  <i>Section 2.1.4.1 and 2.2.3;</i>  <i>Section 3.8, and</i>  <i>Appendix A– Strategic Plan Format</i></p>	
How well does the application describe the Strategic Plan?	Points (0-4 each)
<p>1. How well does the existing Strategic Plan reflect the elements of Appendix A? Each goal should identify objectives and tasks associated with it. Each task should identify performance measure(s), a responsible lead person or organization, and a projected completion date.</p> <p>Notes:</p>	
<p>2. How well does the application describe progress to date in implementing, reviewing, and updating the Strategic Plan and addressing challenges or barriers to implementation?</p> <p>Notes:</p>	
<i>Subtotal (Max 8 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	3
<b>Total Points (Max 24 Points)</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation</u></b>	
Sub Criteria 2C: Description of Project Design and Implementation	
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 2.2,</i> <i>Section 3.8, and</i> <i>Appendix A– Strategic Plan Format</i>	
How well does the application describe the Project Design and implementation?	Points (0-4 each)
1. How well do project goals, strategies, milestones, and key activities meet the objectives outlined in Section 2.2?  Notes:	
2. How well do the proposed additional objectives and tasks relate to implementing the specific program, services, and policies for the Target Population?  Notes:	
3. How qualified and experienced is the organization and key stakeholder responsible for each task or key activity necessary to accomplish the project?  Notes:	
4. How well does the application address active participation by the Planning Council or Committee in project implementation or expansion?  Notes:	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation</b>	
Sub Criteria 2C: Description of Project Design and Implementation (continued)	
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 2.2, Section 3.8, and Appendix A- Strategic Plan Format</i>	
How well does the application describe the Project Design and implementation?	Points (0-4 each)
5. How well does the application address interagency communication during the lifetime of the project? The application should address the frequency of planned meetings, and the decision making process. If the applicant is a consortium of counties it should also address collaboration and the relationship between the partner counties.  Notes:	
6. How well is the screening and assessment approach designed to address the needs of the Target Population? The application should discuss how potential participants will receive tailored needs-based assessments, the criteria to be used, the specific screening tool(s) and the validity of the tool for the selected Target Population. If specific tool(s) have not yet been selected, the application should address the process by which tool(s) will be selected.  Notes:	
7. How well does the application address coordinated care to increase access to services? The application should address access to mental health, substance use and co-occurring services, and access to support and ancillary social services (i.e., housing, primary care; benefits, etc.) to intercept individuals at the earliest point possible and divert to community-based service programs.  Notes:	
8. How well does the application address law enforcement processes? The application should address current intercept points, capacity, and diversion initiatives (e.g., processes, training, etc.) designed to prevent further involvement or reentry into the criminal or juvenile justice system.  Notes:	
<i>Subtotal (Max 32 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	3
<b>Total Points (Max 96 Points)</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation</u></b>	
Sub Criteria 2D: Service Strategies	
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 2.2,</i> <i>Section 3.8, and</i> <i>Appendix A- Strategic Plan Format</i>	
How well are the strategies the Applicant intends to use to serve the Target Population described?	Points (0-4 each)
1. How well are the services and supervision methods described and how well do they address diverting the Target Population from arrest, prosecution, or incarceration to treatment and support services?  Notes:	
2. How well do the proposed interventions address the Project objectives for the Target Population and the goals of the Strategic Plan?  Notes:	
Subtotal <i>(Max 8 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	3
<b>Total Points <i>(Max 24 Points)</i></b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 3: Performance Measures</u></b>	
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 2.4,</i> <i>Section 3.8, and</i> <i>Appendix A- Strategic Plan Format</i>	
How well does the application describe how performance under the grant will be measured?	Points (0-4 each)
1. How well does the application address the applicant's use of output and outcome data to measure project effectiveness as defined by the specific performance measures outlined in Section 2.4.2? The application should address standards for data collection, analysis, distribution and quality assurance.  Notes:	
2. How well do proposed targets and methodologies address the measures specified in Section 2.4.2?  Notes	
3. How well does the additional proposed performance measure, required in Section 2.4.2.9, align with the tasks outlined in the application?  Notes:	
4. How well does the application address the applicant's use of output and outcome data to measure project effectiveness as defined the additional proposed performance measure required in Section 2.4.2.9? The application should address standards for data collection, analysis, distribution and quality assurance.  Notes:	
5. How well do proposed targets and methodologies address the additional proposed performance measure required in Section 2.4.2.9?  Notes:	
Subtotal <i>(Max 20 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	1
Total Points <i>(Max 20 Points)</i>	



Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 4: Capability and Experience</u></b>	
<b>Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 3.8</i></b>	
<b>How well does the application describe the Applicant’s capability and experience in providing similar services?</b>	<b>Points (0-4 each)</b>
1. How well do the capabilities and experience of the Applicant and other participating organizations, including law enforcement agencies, meet the objectives detailed in this RFA?  Notes:	
2. How well does the application demonstrate existing organizational capacity to implement the proposed project?  Notes:	
3. How well does the application outline the role of advocates, family members, responsible partners, and other community stakeholders represented on the Planning Council and how they will support the project’s objectives?  Notes:	
4. How well does the application detail the proposed staff, including Project Director, key personnel, and subcontractors who will participate in the project, including the role of each and their level of effort and qualification?  Notes:	
5. How well does the application explain the responsibilities of each participating organization and how the Applicant proposes to fill staff positions and select subcontractors?  Notes:	
<i>Subtotal (Max 20 Points)</i>	
<i>Weighted Value</i>	1
<b>Total Points (Max 20 Points)</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 5: Evaluation and Sustainability</u></b>	
Sub Criteria 5A: Evaluation	
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 1.6.16, Section 2.3, and Section 3.8</i>	
How well does the application describe the Evaluation process?	Points (0-4 each)
1. How well does the application describe how the project's effectiveness will be demonstrated, including assessments of planning or implementation outcomes?  Notes:	
2. How well does the application describe the process for defining and measuring variables like stakeholder support and service coordination outlined?  Notes:	
3. How well does the application describe the process for measuring project effectiveness in promoting public safety, reduction of recidivism and access to services and supports?  Notes:	
4. How well does the application describe the process for measuring project effectiveness in reducing expenditures associated with the incarceration of the Target Population? The application should address a methodology to measure the service outcomes and corresponding savings or averted costs.  Notes:	
5. How well does the application explain how the county's proposed initiative will reduce the number of individuals judicially committed to a state mental health treatment facility?  Notes:	
<i>Subtotal (Max 20 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	3
<b>Total Points (Max 60 Points)</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 5: Evaluation and Sustainability</u></b>	
Sub Criteria 5B: Sustainability	
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 1.6.16,</i> <i>Section 2.3, and</i> <i>Section 3.8</i>	
How well does the application address sustainability of the project?	Points (0-4 each)
1. How well does the application describe strategies to preserve and enhance the project services, systems and collaborations after the end of the requested grant award?  Notes:	
2. How well does the application describe the collaborative partnerships and funding that will be leveraged to build long-term support and resources to sustain the project when the state grant ends.  Notes:	
Subtotal ( <i>Max 8 Points</i> )	
Weighted Value	3
<b>Total Points (<i>Max 24 Points</i>)</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 5: Evaluation and Sustainability</u></b>	
Sub Criteria 5C: Complete Project Timeline	
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 2.2.4.2.1, and Section 3.8</i>	
How well does the application provide a realistic and detailed timeline for each funding year proposed?	Points (0-4 each)
1. How clearly does the application establish goals, objectives, key activities, milestones, start dates, completion dates and responsible partners for each proposed funding year?  Notes:	
2. How effectively does the application timeline support the Strategic Plan and project goals for the Target Population?  Notes:	
Subtotal ( <i>Max 8 Points</i> )	
Weighted Value	3
Total Points ( <i>Max 24 Points</i> )	

Appendix O

State of Florida  
Department of Children and Families



RFA# - RFA06H16GS1  
Criminal Justice, Mental Health, and Substance Abuse Reinvestment Grant

Financial Evaluation Manual

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## 1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- 1.1 Each evaluator will evaluate the Financial Reply for all applicant replies that pass the mandatory criteria. Each evaluation criterion must be scored. Fractional values will not be accepted. If an evaluator score sheet(s) is missing scores, it will be returned for completion. Scoring must reflect the evaluator's independent evaluation of the reply to each evaluation criterion.
- 1.2 Each evaluator shall assign a score for each evaluation criterion based upon his/her assessment of the reply. The assignment of an individual score must be based upon the following description of the point scores, unless otherwise noted for the criteria:

IF, in your judgment the reply demonstrates and/or describes...	Category	Points
...extensive competency, proven capabilities, an outstanding approach to the subject area, innovative, practical and effective solutions, a clear and complete understanding of inter-relationships, full responsiveness, a clear and comprehensive understanding of the requirements and planning for the unforeseen.	Superior	4
...clear competency, consistent capability, a reasoned approach to the subject area, feasible solutions, a generally clear and complete description of inter-relationships, extensive but incomplete responsiveness and a sound understanding of the requirements.	Good	3
...fundamental competency, adequate capability, a basic approach to the subject area, apparently feasible but somewhat unclear solutions, a weak description of inter-relationships in some areas, partial responsiveness, a fair understanding of the requirements and a lack of staff experience and skills in some areas.	Adequate	2
...little competency, minimal capability, an inadequate approach to the subject area, infeasible and/or ineffective solutions, somewhat unclear, incomplete and /or non-responsive, a lack of understanding of the requirements and a lack of demonstrated experience and skills.	Poor	1
...a significant or complete lack of understanding, an incomprehensible approach, a significant or complete lack of skill and experience and extensive non-responsiveness.	Insufficient	0

- 1.3 When completing score sheets evaluators should record references to the sections of Request for Applications (RFA) and the written reply materials which most directly pertain to the criterion and upon which their scores were based. More than one section may be recorded. Evaluators should not attempt an exhaustive documentation of every bit of information considered but only key information. In general, the reference statements should be brief. If the reply does not address an evaluation criterion, evaluators should indicate "not addressed" and score it accordingly.
- 1.4 Each evaluator has been provided a copy of the RFA, including its appendices, any RFA addenda, and applicant written inquiries and the written responses provided by the Department. Each evaluator will also be provided with a copy of each Financial Stability reply which should be evaluated and scored according to the instructions provided in the solicitation and the evaluation manual.
- 1.5 Replies shall be independently scored by each member of the evaluation team. No collaboration is permitted during the scoring process. The same scoring principles must be applied to every reply received, independent

of other evaluators. Evaluators should work carefully to be as thorough as possible in order to ensure a fair and open competitive procurement. No attempt by Department personnel or others, including other evaluators, to influence an evaluator's scoring shall be tolerated.

- 1.6 If any attempt is made to influence an evaluator, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Procurement Manager. If such an attempt is made by the Procurement Manager, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Inspector General.
- 1.7 Only the rating sheets provided should be used. No additional notes or marks should appear elsewhere in the evaluation manual.
- 1.8 Evaluators may request assistance in understanding evaluation criteria and replies only from the Procurement Manager/Procurement Advisors.
- 1.9 Questions related to the solicitation and the evaluations of the reply should be directed only to:  
Michele Staffieri, Procurement Manager  
Florida Department of Children and Families  
Office of Substance Abuse and Mental Health  
1317 Winewood Blvd., Bldg 6, Room 231  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0700  
E-Mail Address: Michele.staffieri@myflfamilies.com
- 1.10 After each evaluator has completed the scoring of each Financial Reply, the scores are then submitted to the Procurement Manager for compilation. The Procurement Manager will average the total Financial Reply point scores by each evaluator to calculate the points awarded for each section.
- 1.11 Following completion of the independent evaluations of the replies, the Procurement Manager will hold a meeting to validate evaluator scoring. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure that their individual evaluation scores were captured correctly when preparing the total Financial Reply scores.

## 2 QUALITATIVE CRITERIA

Evaluators shall assign scores to each of the replies received by the Department based on the criteria detailed for each subcriteria.

## 3 FINANCIAL REPLY POINT VALUES

The maximum score for the Financial Reply is 96 points.

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

	Financial Reply Criteria	Points	Weighted Value	Maximum Points	Points Assigned
<b>Criteria 1: Budget</b>					
1A	Budget Summary and Narrative	4	2	8	
1B	Budget Narrative	12	2	24	
1C	Line Item Budget	32	2	64	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>		<b>96</b>	



Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criteria 1: Budget</b>	
Sub Criteria 1A: Budget Summary and Narrative	
Tab 7 - RFA References: Sections 3.3 and 4.4 <i>Appendix IX – Budget Summary and Narrative</i>	
Does the proposed budget demonstrate the applicant’s ability to provide services within the allocated funding for each state fiscal year?	Points (0-4 each)
1. Does the proposed budget summary outline the costs associated with the provision of services for each of the three state fiscal years of the potential contract? If there are any changes in cost from one fiscal year to the next, are the changes explained and justified?  Notes:	
Subtotal <i>(Max 4 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	2
<b>Total Points <i>(Max 8 Points)</i></b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criteria 1: Budget</b>	
Sub Criteria 1B: Budget Narrative	
Tab 7 - RFA References: Sections 3.3 and 4.4 <i>Appendix IX – Budget Summary and Narrative</i>	
Does the proposed budget demonstrate reasonable, allowable, and necessary costs for each state fiscal year?	Points (0-4 each)
1. Does the budget and narrative demonstrate that the total proposed costs associated with the provision of services are <b>reasonable</b> for each state fiscal year? Notes:	
2. Does the budget narrative demonstrate that the total proposed costs associated with the provision of services are <b>allowable</b> for each state fiscal year? Notes:	
3. Does the budget narrative demonstrate that the total proposed costs associated with the provision of services are <b>necessary</b> for each state fiscal year? Notes:	
Subtotal <i>(Max 12 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	2
<b>Total Points <i>(Max 24 Points)</i></b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criteria 1: Budget</b>	
Sub Criteria 1C: Line Item Budget	
Tab 7 - RFA References: Sections 3.3 and 4.4 <i>Appendix IX – Budget Summary and Narrative</i>	
Do the proposed budget line items demonstrate a reasonable approach to funding the provision of services outlined in the RFA?	Points (0-4 each)
1. Does the total of <b>direct service personnel</b> costs represent a reasonable percentage of the total budget? Notes:	
2. Does the total of <b>fringe benefit</b> costs represent a reasonable percentage of the total budget? Notes:	
3. Does the total of <b>building occupancy</b> costs represent a reasonable percentage of the total budget? Notes:	
4. Does the total of <b>travel</b> costs represent a reasonable percentage of the total budget? Notes:	
5. Does the total of <b>equipment and operating supplies and expenses</b> costs represent a reasonable percentage of the total budget? Notes:	
6. Does the total of <b>subcontracted services</b> costs represent a reasonable percentage of the total budget? Notes:	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criteria 1: Budget</b>	
Sub Criteria 1C: Line Item Budget	
<b>Tab 7 - RFA References:</b> Sections 3.3 and 4.4 <i>Appendix IX – Budget Summary and Narrative</i>	
Do the proposed budget line items demonstrate a reasonable approach to funding the provision of services outlined in the RFA?	Points (0-4 each)
7. Does the total of <b>all other direct costs</b> represent a reasonable percentage of the total budget? Notes:	
8. Does the total of <b>distributed indirect costs</b> represent a reasonable percentage of the total budget? Notes:	
Subtotal <i>(Max 32 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	2
<b>Total Points <i>(Max 64 Points)</i></b>	