



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

Ron DeSantis
Governor

Chad Poppell
Secretary

**Request for Applications RFA112818HSET1
ADDENDUM #003
Criminal Justice Mental Health and Substance Abuse
(CJMHTSA) Reinvestment Grant Program
Office of Substance Abuse and Mental Health**

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, a team 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- Implementation or Expansion Grant Evaluation Manual**, **Appendix N- Planning Grant Evaluation Manual** and **Appendix O-Financial Evaluation Manual**:

Criteria	Implementation or Expansion	Planning
Programmatic		
Statement of the Problem	64	48
Project Design and Implementation	160	84
Performance Measures	12	12
Capability and Experience	20	16
Evaluation and Sustainability	116	24
Subtotal	372	184
Financial	56	56

The minimum programmatic score to be eligible for an Implementation or Expansion Grant award recommendation is 298 points.

The minimum programmatic score to be eligible for a Planning Grant award recommendation is 147 points.

THIS IS A DEPARTMENT DECISION. FAILURE TO TIMELY CHALLENGE THIS DECISION IN THE MANNER DESCRIBED IN SECTION 4.8 OF RFA112818HSET1 WAIVES PROCEEDINGS UNDER CHAPTER 120, FLORIDA STATUTES.

1317 Winewood Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0700

Mission: Work in Partnership with Local Communities to Protect the Vulnerable, Promote Strong and Economically Self-Sufficient Families, and Advance Personal and Family Recovery and Resiliency

Appendix M

State of Florida
Department of Children and Families



RFA112811HSET1
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	Assign points within...
...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	81-100% of the maximum points
...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	61-80% of the maximum points
...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	41-60% of the maximum points
...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	21-40% of the maximum points
...a significant or complete lack of understanding, an incomprehensible approach, a significant or complete lack of skill and experience and extensive non-responsiveness.	Insufficient	0-20% of the maximum points

- 1.3 When completing score sheets, evaluators should record references to the sections of the RFA and the written application materials which most directly pertain to the criterion and upon which their scores were based. 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.
- 1.4 If the application does not address an evaluation criterion, evaluators should indicate "not addressed" and score it accordingly. Where information is not addressed in the appropriate section or is difficult to find, evaluators should indicate so on the score sheet and deduct points accordingly.
- 1.5 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.
- 1.6 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: _____

- 1.7 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.
- 1.8 Only the rating sheets provided should be used. No additional notes or marks should appear elsewhere in the evaluation manual.
- 1.9 Evaluators may request assistance in understanding evaluation criteria and applications only from the Procurement Manager.
- 1.10 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.
- 1.11 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.
- 1.12 Questions related to the solicitation and evaluation of the applications should be directed only to:

Michele Staffieri, Procurement Manager
E-Mail Address: Michele.staffieri@myflfamilies.com
- 1.13 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.
- 1.14 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; and
- 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 372 points.
- The minimum score to be eligible for award recommendation is 298 points.

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

SCORING SUMMARY SHEET

Programmatic Criteria		Maximum Points	Points Assigned
Criteria 1: Statement of the Problem			
1	Statement of the Problem	64	
Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation			
2A	Planning Council or Committee	24	
2B	Strategic Plan	108	
2C	Service Strategies	28	
Criteria 3: Performance Measures			
3	Performance Measures	12	
Criteria 4: Capability and Experience			
4	Capability and Experience	20	
Criteria 5: Evaluation and Sustainability			
5A	Evaluation	68	
5B	Sustainability	24	
5C	Complete Project Timeline	24	
Total		372	

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

Criteria 1: Statement of the Problem			
Tab 4 - RFA References: Section 3.8.5.1 and Appendix A – Strategic Plan Format			Max Score: 64
How well does the application describe the problem to be addressed by the proposed project?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The application demonstrates the extent of the problem the project will address, including local and state data and appropriate trend analysis.	8		
2. The application demonstrates the project's geographic environment socioeconomic factors and community concerns, sufficient to support selection of the Target Population.	8		
3. The application demonstrates an analysis of the current population of the jail or juvenile detention center, including the screening and assessment process used to identify the Target Population.	8		
4. The application demonstrates an analysis of the current population of the jail or juvenile detention center, including the percentage of persons admitted with a mental illness, substance use disorder, or co-occurring disorders that supports the selection of the Target Population.	8		
5. The application demonstrates an analysis of the current population of the jail or juvenile detention center, including identification of describe contributing factors that affect population trends in the county jail or juvenile detention center.	8		
6. The application demonstrates an analysis of the current population of the jail or juvenile detention center, including data and a descriptive narrative that delineates the specific factors that put the Target Population at-risk of entering or re-entering the criminal or juvenile justice systems.	8		
7. The application demonstrates a reasonable projected number of individuals to be served.	8		
8. The application demonstrates how the needs identified are consistent with the priorities of the Strategic Plan.	8		
Total Assigned Score			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation			
Sub Criteria 2A: Planning Council or Committee			
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 1.2 and 1.6.1, 2.2.4.2, Section 3.8, and Appendix K - Criminal Justice, Mental Health & Substance Abuse Reinvestment Grant Planning Council or Committee</i>			Max Score: 24
How well does the application describe the planning council or committee?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The applications demonstrates compliance with s. 394.657(2)(a), F.S. and clearly identifies the role of each member as stakeholder, consumer, etc.	12		
2. The applications demonstrates the activity of the Planning council, including the frequency of meetings for the previous 12 months and future scheduling of meetings.	12		
Total Assigned Score			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation			
Sub Criteria 2B: Strategic Plan			
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 1.6.14, 2.1.6, 2.2, 3.8, and Appendix A– Strategic Plan Format</i>			Max Score: 64
How well does the application describe the Strategic Plan?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The application demonstrates a current Strategic Plan identifying project goals, strategies, milestones and key activities and at least one objective specified in section 2.2.	12		
2. The application demonstrates a current Strategic Plan identifying an organization or key stakeholder responsible for each task or key activity and a proposed completion date for each.	12		
3. The application demonstrates a current Strategic Plan addressing participation of the planning council or committee.	12		
4. The application demonstrates a current Strategic Plan addressing communication amongst agencies and organizations involved throughout the lifetime of the project, detailing the frequency of planned meetings, and the decision-making process to ensure successful implementation.	16		
5. The application demonstrates a current Strategic Plan addressing screening of potential participants and tailored, validated needs-based assessments, including criteria to be used and specific screening tool(s) specific to the Target Population or the process by which tool(s) will be selected.	16		
6. The application demonstrates a current Strategic Plan addressing care coordination to increase access to behavioral health treatment and support services and ancillary social services (i.e., housing, primary care; benefits, etc.);	16		

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

<p>7. The application demonstrates a current Strategic Plan addressing law enforcement assessment of their current process at intercept points, capacity, and how the proposed project will implement or expand diversion initiatives.</p>	<p>12</p>		
<p>8. The application demonstrates the status of the Strategic Plan, including implementation, sequential Intercept Mapping, date of last review or update for the proposed Target Population, and identifying challenges or barriers to implementation.</p>	<p>12</p>		
<p>Total Assigned Score</p>			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation			
Sub Criteria 2C: Service Strategies			
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 2.2, 3.8, and Appendix A– Strategic Plan Format</i>			Max Score: 28
How well are the strategies the Applicant intends to use to serve the Target Population described?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The application demonstrates services and supervision methods to be applied in addressing diversion of the Target Population from arrest, prosecution, or incarceration to treatment and support services.	16		
2. The application demonstrates interventions addressing the proposed Project objectives for the Target Population and the goals of the Strategic Plan.	12		
Total Assigned Score			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

<u>Criteria 3: Performance Measures</u>			
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 2.4, 3.8, and Appendix A- Strategic Plan Format</i>			Max Score: 12
How well does the application describe how performance under the grant will be measured?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The application demonstrates monitoring of grant activities to determine achievement of performance measures specified in Section 2.4.2, including the process and standards for data collection, analysis, distribution and quality assurance.	4		
2. The application demonstrates targets and methodologies addressing the performance measures specified in Section 2.4.2.	4		
3. The application demonstrates at least one additional performance measure unique to the tasks outlined in the application, including proposed targets and methodologies.	4		
Total Assigned Score			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

<u>Criteria 4: Capability and Experience</u>			
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 3.8</i>			Max Score: 20
How well does the application describe the Applicant's capability and experience in providing similar services?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The application demonstrates the capabilities and experience of the Applicant and other participating organizations, including law enforcement agencies, sufficient to meet the objectives detailed in this RFA.	4		
2. The application demonstrates the organization's capacity to implement the proposed project.	4		
3. The application demonstrates 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.	4		
4. The application outlines proposed staffing, including the Project Director, key personnel, and subcontractors who will participate in the project, including the role of each and their level of effort and qualifications.	4		
5. The application explains the responsibilities of each participating organization and how the Applicant proposes to fill staff positions and select subcontractors.	4		
Total Assigned Score			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

<u>Criteria 5: Evaluation and Sustainability</u>			
Sub Criteria 5A: Evaluation			
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 2.3 and Section 3.8</i>			Max Score: 68
How well does the application describe the Evaluation process?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The application demonstrates how the project's effectiveness will be validated, including assessments of planning or implementation outcomes.	16		
2. The application demonstrates the process for defining and measuring variables like stakeholder support and service coordination outlined.	16		
3. The application demonstrates the process for measuring project effectiveness in promoting public safety, reduction of recidivism and access to services and supports.	12		
4. The application demonstrates the process for measuring project effectiveness in reducing expenditures associated with the incarceration of the Target Population, including a methodology to measure the service outcomes and corresponding savings or averted costs.	12		
5. The application demonstrates how the proposed initiative will reduce the number of individuals judicially committed to a state mental health treatment facility.	12		
Total Assigned Score			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

<u>Criteria 5: Evaluation and Sustainability</u>			
Sub Criteria 5B: Sustainability			
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 2.3, and Section 3.8</i>			Max Score: 24
How well does the application address sustainability of the project?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The application demonstrates strategies to preserve and enhance the project services, systems and collaborations after the end of the requested grant award.	12		
2. The application demonstrates collaborative partnerships and funding that will be leveraged to build long-term support and resources to sustain the project when the state grant ends.	12		
Total Assigned Score			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

<u>Criteria 5: Evaluation and Sustainability</u>			
Sub Criteria 5C: Complete Project Timeline			
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 2.2, and Section 3.8</i>			Max Score: 24
How well does the application provide a realistic and detailed timeline for each funding year proposed?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The application demonstrates goals, objectives, key activities, milestones, start dates, completion dates and responsible partners for each proposed funding year.	12		
2. The application demonstrates a timeline supporting the Strategic Plan and project goals for the Target Population.	12		
Total Assigned Score			

Appendix N

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



**RFA112818HSET1
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 (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	Assign points within...
...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	81-100% of the maximum points
...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	61-80% of the maximum points
...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	41-60% of the maximum points
...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	21-40% of the maximum points
...a significant or complete lack of understanding, an incomprehensible approach, a significant or complete lack of skill and experience and extensive non-responsiveness.	Insufficient	0-20% of the maximum points

- 1.3 When completing score sheets, evaluators should record references to the sections of the RFA and the written application materials which most directly pertain to the criterion and upon which their scores were based. 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.
- 1.4 If the application does not address an evaluation criterion, evaluators should indicate "not addressed" and score it accordingly. Where information is not addressed in the appropriate section or is difficult to find, evaluators should indicate so on the score sheet and deduct points accordingly.
- 1.5 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.
- 1.6 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: _____

- 1.7 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.
- 1.8 Only the rating sheets provided should be used. No additional notes or marks should appear elsewhere in the evaluation manual.
- 1.9 Evaluators may request assistance in understanding evaluation criteria and applications only from the Procurement Manager.
- 1.10 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.
- 1.11 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 CJMHSa advisory body to the Department for future solicitations.
- 1.12 Questions related to the solicitation and evaluation of the applications should be directed only to:
Michele Staffieri, Procurement Manager
E-Mail Address: Michele.staffieri@myflfamilies.com
- 1.13 After each evaluator has completed the scoring of each CJMHSa Reinvestment Grant application, the scores are then submitted to the Procurement Manager for compilation. The Procurement Manager will average the total CJMHSa Reinvestment Grant point scores by each evaluator to calculate the points awarded for each section.
- 1.14 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 CJMHSa 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 184 points.
- The minimum score to be eligible for award recommendation is 147 points.

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

SCORING SUMMARY SHEET

Programmatic Criteria: Planning		Maximum Points	Points Assigned
Criteria 1: Statement of the Problem			
1	Statement of the Problem	48	
Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation			
2	Description of the Planning Council or Committee	24	
2	Timeline and Expected Milestones	60	
Criteria 3: Performance Measures			
3	Performance Measures	12	
Criteria 4: Capability and Experience			
4	Capability and Experience	16	
Criteria 5: Sustainability			
5	Sustainability	24	
Total		184	

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

Criteria 1: Statement of the Problem			
Tab 4 - RFA References: Section 3.8 and Appendix A – Strategic Plan Format			Max Score: 48
How well does the application describe the problem to be addressed by the proposed project?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The application demonstrates the extent of the problem the project will address, including local and state data and appropriate trend analysis.	8		
2. The application demonstrates the project's geographic environment socioeconomic factors and community concerns, sufficient to support selection of the Target Population.	8		
3. The application demonstrates an analysis of the current population of the jail or juvenile detention center, including the screening and assessment process used to identify the Target Population.	8		
4. The application demonstrates an analysis of the current population of the jail or juvenile detention center, including the percentage of persons admitted with a mental illness, substance use disorder, or co-occurring disorders that supports the selection of the Target Population.	8		
5. The application demonstrates an analysis of the current population of the jail or juvenile detention center, including identification of describe contributing factors that affect population trends in the county jail or juvenile detention center.	8		
6. The application demonstrates an analysis of the current population of the jail or juvenile detention center, including data and a descriptive narrative that delineates the specific factors that put the Target Population at-risk of entering or re-entering the criminal or juvenile justice systems.	8		
Total Assigned Score			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation			
Sub Criteria 2A: Planning Council or Committee			
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 1.2 and 1.6.1, 2.2.4.2, Section 3.8, and Appendix K - Criminal Justice, Mental Health & Substance Abuse Reinvestment Grant Planning Council or Committee</i>			Max Score: 24
How well does the application describe the planning council or committee?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The applications demonstrates compliance with s. 394.657(2)(a), F.S. and clearly identifies the role of each member as stakeholder, consumer, etc.	12		
2. The applications demonstrates the activity of the Planning council, including the frequency of meetings for the previous 12 months and future scheduling of meetings.	12		
Total Assigned Score			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

Criteria 2: Project Design and Implementation			
Sub Criteria 2B: Timeline and Expected Milestones			
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 1.6.14, 2.2, 3.8, and Appendix A– Strategic Plan Format</i>			Max Score: 60
How well does the application describe the timeline for the proposed planning activities and expected milestones?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The applications demonstrates the process for using needs assessment appropriate to the Target Population during planning.	12		
2. The applications demonstrates the process to be used for project design and implementation.	12		
3. The applications demonstrates opportunities to coordinate funding, related resourced and recommended organizational or structural changes.	12		
4. The applications demonstrates strategies for coordination, communication and data sharing supporting strategic planning goals.	12		
5. The applications demonstrates anticipated start and completion dates for each milestone, benchmark and goal.	12		
Total Assigned Score			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

<u>Criteria 3: Performance Measures</u>			
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 2.4, 3.8, and Appendix A– Strategic Plan Format</i>			Max Score: 12
How well does the application describe how performance under the grant will be measured?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The applications demonstrates the manner in which the proposed timeline ensures compliance with the performance measures specified in Section 2.4.1.	4		
2. The applications demonstrates targets and methodologies address the measures specified in Section 2.4.1.	4		
3. The application demonstrates at least one additional performance measure unique to the tasks outlined in the application, including proposed targets and methodologies.	4		
Total Assigned Score			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

<u>Criteria 4: Capability and Experience</u>			
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 3.8</i>			Max Score: 16
How well does the application describe the Applicant’s capability and experience in providing similar services?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The application demonstrates the capabilities and experience of the Applicant and other participating organizations, including law enforcement agencies, sufficient to meet the objectives detailed in this RFA.	4		
2. The application demonstrates the organization’s capacity to implement the proposed project.	4		
3. The application demonstrates 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.	4		
4. The application demonstrates the organization’s expertise and qualifications necessary to carry out the Strategic Planning project	4		
Total Assigned Score			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

<u>Criteria 5: Sustainability</u>			
Tab 5; RFA References: <i>Section 2.3 and 3.8</i>			Max Score: 24
How well does the application address sustainability of the project?			
Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The application demonstrates how the strategic planning will support effective collaboration among stakeholders, including 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..	12		
2. The application demonstrates how collaborative partnerships and funding will be leveraged to build long-term support and resources to implement the strategic plan following grant completion.	12		
Total Assigned Score			

Appendix O

State of Florida
Department of Children and Families



RFA112818HSET1
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:

The application demonstrates or describes	Category	Assign points within...
...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	81-100% of the maximum points
...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	61-80% of the maximum points
...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	41-60% of the maximum points
...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	21-40% of the maximum points
...a significant or complete lack of understanding, an incomprehensible approach, a significant or complete lack of skill and experience and extensive non-responsiveness.	Insufficient	0-20% of the maximum points

- 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
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 criteria.

3 FINANCIAL REPLY POINT VALUES

The maximum score for the Financial Reply is 56 points.

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

SCORING SUMMARY SHEET

Financial Reply Criteria		Maximum Points	Points Assigned
1	Budget Summary and Narrative	28	
2	Line Item Budget	28	
Total		56	

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

Criteria 1: Budget Summary and NarrativeTab 7; RFA References: *Section 3.3 and 4.4 and Appendix IX – Budget Summary and Narrative*

Max Score: 28

Does the proposed budget demonstrate the applicant's ability to provide services within the allocated funding for each state fiscal year and are costs reasonable, allowable and necessary?

Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The application budget demonstrates a summary of the costs associated with the provision of services for the state fiscal year(s) of the potential contract (one state fiscal year for planning, three state fiscal years for implementation). For implementation grants, the application explains and justifies any changes in cost from one fiscal year to the next.	4		
2. The application budget demonstrates reasonable proposed costs associated with the provision of services for each state fiscal year.	8		
3. The application budget demonstrates allowable proposed costs associated with the provision of services that are for each state fiscal year.	8		
4. The application budget demonstrates necessary proposed costs associated with the provision of services are for each state fiscal year.	8		
Total Assigned Score			

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

Criteria 2: Line Item Budget

Tab 7; RFA References: *Section 3.3 and 4.4 and Appendix IX – Budget Summary and Narrative*

Max Score: 28

Do the proposed budget line items demonstrate a reasonable approach to funding the provision of services outlined in the RFA?

Consideration	Max Score	Assigned Score	Notes/Comments
1. The application budget demonstrates a reasonable percentage of the total cost for salaries .	8		
2. The application budget demonstrates a reasonable percentage of the total cost for fringe benefits .	8		
3. The application budget demonstrates a reasonable percentage of the total cost for all other direct service costs .	8		
4. The application budget includes a line item budget for each proposed subcontracted service that includes reasonable costs for the services to be subcontracted.	4		
Total Assigned Score			