

Appendix O

Financial Evaluation Manual

State of Florida
Department of Children and Families



DCF RFA 2021 001
Criminal Justice, Mental Health, and Substance Abuse Reinvestment Grant

Applicant: _____

Evaluator: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- 1.1 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 application submitted to the Department. which should be evaluated and scored according to the instructions provided in the solicitation and the evaluation manual.
- 1.2 Each financial evaluator will evaluate only Criteria 6 for all applications that pass the mandatory criteria. Each criterion must be scored.
- 1.3 Each evaluator shall assign a score based upon his or her assessment of the application. Scoring must reflect the evaluator's independent evaluation of the application to each criterion. Fractional values or missing scores will not be accepted. If an evaluator's score sheet is not complete, it will be returned for completion.
- 1.4 When completing score sheets, evaluators should record references to the sections of Request for Applications (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.
- 1.5 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 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 Officer. If such an attempt is made by the Procurement Officer, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Inspector General.
- 1.7 Only the score 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 Officer/Procurement Advisors.
- 1.9 Questions related to the solicitation and the evaluations of the application should be directed only to:
Michele Staffieri, Procurement Officer
E-Mail Address: Michele.staffieri@myflfamilies.com
- 1.10 After the evaluator has completed scoring each application, submit scores to the Procurement Office using Qualtrics for compilation. The Procurement Officer will average the total point scores by each evaluator to calculate the points awarded for each criterion.
- 1.11 Following completion of the independent evaluations of the applications, the Procurement Officer 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 scores.

2 QUALITATIVE CRITERIA

- 2.1 Evaluators shall assign scores to each of the applications received by the Department based on the considerations detailed for each criterion.
- 2.2 The assignment of an individual score must be based upon the following description of the point scores, unless otherwise noted for a specific criterion:

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

3 CRITERION 6 POINT VALUES

The maximum score for Criterion 6 is 56 points.

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

SCORING SUMMARY SHEET

Criterion 6		Maximum Points	Points Assigned
1	Budget Summary and Narrative	28	
2	Line Item Budget	28	
Total		56	

Applicant: _____ Evaluator: _____

Criteria 1: Budget Summary and Narrative**Tab 7; RFA References:** *Section 3.7.9 and Appendix G – 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 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 budget demonstrates reasonable proposed costs associated with the provision of services for each state fiscal year.	8		
3. The budget demonstrates allowable proposed costs associated with the provision of services that are for each state fiscal year.	8		
4. The 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 3.7.9 and Appendix G – 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 budget demonstrates a reasonable percentage of the total cost for salaries .	8		
2. The budget demonstrates a reasonable percentage of the total cost for fringe benefits .	8		
3. The budget demonstrates a reasonable percentage of the total cost for all other direct service costs .	8		
4. The 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			