Organization Name	Score
Children's Home Society of Florida	86.45
UF Health	75.35
Little People Preparatory Preschool	69.95

Organization Name	Criteria	Weight	Reviewer's Rating and Total Numerical Rating			Average	Weighted Average
			Jones	Goldberg	Knopf		
UF Health	Project Plan						
	Services	5	65	65	65	65.00	3.25
	Population and Outreach	5	60	60	75	65.00	3.25
	Partners and Service Linkage	5	65	65	65	65.00	3.25
	Staffing	5	65	65	70	66.67	3.33
	Continuous Learning and Quality Supports	5	65	65	65	65.00	3.25
	Organization Capacity	5	75	70	100	81.67	4.08
	Total Project Plan	**30**					**20.42**
	Subcontracting						
	Risk associated with subcontracting outside the United States	4	100	100	100	100.00	4.00
	Subcontractor qualifications	3	100	100	100	100.00	3.00
	Over reliance on subcontracting	3	100	100	100	100.00	3.00
	Total Subcontracting	**10**					**10.00**
	Record of Past Experience						
	Experience with similar projects	10	70	65	89	74.67	7.47
	Feedback from references	10	60	60	69	63.00	6.30
	Total Record of Past Experience	**20**					**13.77**
	Risk						
	Identification of risk to the CTAC	5	70	70	89	76.33	3.82
	Contractor's approach to reducing, mitigating, or eliminating risk	5	70	70	89	76.33	3.82
	Total Risk	**10**					**7.63**
	Financial Stability						
	Analysis of the contractor's most recent financial statements or similar evidence	10	69	70	69	69.33	6.93
	Total Financial Stability	**10**					**6.93**
	Budget and Narrative (Form 2)						
	Budget and Narrative	20	80	80	89	83.00	16.60
	Total Budget and Narrative	**20**					**16.60**
	Total	**100**					**75.35**

Organization Name	Criteria	Weight	Reviewer's Rating and Total Numerical Rating			Average	Weighted Average
			Jones	Goldberg	Knopf		
Little People Preschool	Project Plan						
	Services	5	69	60	69	66.00	3.30
	Population and Outreach	5	69	65	69	67.67	3.38
	Partners and Service Linkage	5	69	65	69	67.67	3.38
	Staffing	5	69	65	69	67.67	3.38
	Continuous Learning and Quality Supports	5	60	65	69	64.67	3.23
	Organization Capacity	5	60	60	69	63.00	3.15
	Total Project Plan	**30**					**19.83**
	Subcontracting						
	Risk associated with subcontracting outside the United States	4	100	100	100	100.00	4.00
	Subcontractor qualifications	3	100	100	100	100.00	3.00
	Over reliance on subcontracting	3	100	100	100	100.00	3.00
	Total Subcontracting	**10**					**10.00**
	Record of Past Experience						
	Experience with similar projects	10	60	60	69	63.00	6.30
	Feedback from references	10	60	60	69	63.00	6.30
	Total Record of Past Experience	**20**					**12.60**
	Risk						
	Identification of risk to the CTAC	5	69	70	69	69.33	3.47
	Contractor's approach to reducing, mitigating, or eliminating risk	5	60	60	69	63.00	3.15
	Total Risk	**10**					**6.62**
	Financial Stability						
	Analysis of the contractor's most recent financial statements or similar evidence	10	70	70	69	69.67	6.97
	Total Financial Stability	**10**					**6.97**
	Budget and Narrative (Form 2)						
	Budget and Narrative	20	70	70	69	69.67	13.93
	Total Budget and Narrative	**20**					**13.93**
	Total	**100**					**69.95**

Organization Name	Criteria	Weight	Reviewer's Rating and Total Numerical Rating			Average	Weighted Average
			Jones	Goldberg	Knopf		
Children's Home Society of Florida	Project Plan						
	Services	5	90	95	90	91.67	4.58
	Population and Outreach	5	90	95	85	90.00	4.50
	Partners and Service Linkage	5	90	90	80	86.67	4.33
	Staffing	5	90	90	75	85.00	4.25
	Continuous Learning and Quality Supports	5	85	90	75	83.33	4.17
	Organization Capacity	5	85	90	75	83.33	4.17
	Total Project Plan	**30**					**26.00**
	Subcontracting						
	Risk associated with subcontracting outside the United States	4	100	100	100	100.00	4.00
	Subcontractor qualifications	3	100	100	100	100.00	3.00
	Over reliance on subcontracting	3	100	100	100	100.00	3.00
	Total Subcontracting	**10**					**10.00**
	Record of Past Experience						
	Experience with similar projects	10	85	90	85	86.67	8.67
	Feedback from references	10	69	70	69	69.33	6.93
	Total Record of Past Experience	**20**					**15.60**
	Risk						
	Identification of risk to the CTAC	5	90	90	90	90.00	4.50
	Contractor's approach to reducing, mitigating, or eliminating risk	5	90	90	85	88.33	4.42
	Total Risk	**10**					**8.92**
	Financial Stability						
	Analysis of the contractor's most recent financial statements or similar evidence	10	90	90	100	93.33	9.33
	Total Financial Stability	**10**					**9.33**
	Budget and Narrative (Form 2)						
	Budget and Narrative	20	80	80	89	83.00	16.60
	Total Budget and Narrative	**20**					**16.60**
	Total	**100**					**86.45**

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** Date: 11/28/21

Name of Bidder: Children's Home Society of Florida

Reviewer: Mia Jones

Does Bidder meet minimum requirements to bid? ☑ **Y** ☐ **N**

Proposals will be reviewed against the criteria below:

Place a check in the box if bidder meets qualifications:

CRITERIA	WEIGHT	Score
Project Plan		
■ *Services: 1. Introduction/Executive Summary 2. Project Activities*	*5*	90
Comments:		
■ *Population and Outreah: 1. Target Population 2. Population Needs and Challenges 3. Outreach and Marketing Strategy.*	*5*	90
Comments:		
■ *Partners and Service Linkage*	*5*	90
Comments:		
■ *Staffing*	*5*	90
Comments:		
■ *Continuous Learning and Quality Supports*	*5*	85
Comments:		
■ *Organizational Capacity*	*5*	85
Comments:		
Subcontracting *(if no subcontracting, the contractor will receive maximum 10 points)*		
■ *Based on risk associated with subcontracting outside the United States*	*4*	100
Comments: No subcontracting		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** Date: 11/28/21

Name of Bidder: Children's Home Society of Florida

Reviewer: Mia Jones

■ *Based on subcontractor qualifications*	*3*	100
Comments: No Subcontracting		
■ *Based on over reliance on subcontracting*	*3*	100
Comments: No subcontracting		
Record of Past Experience		
■ *Based on experience with similar projects*	*10*	85
Comments:		
☐ *Based on feedback from references*	*10*	69
Comments: None provided.		
Risk		
■ *Based on identification of risk to the CTAC*	*5*	90
Comments:		
■ *Based on contractor's approach to reducing, mitigating, or eliminating risk*	*5*	90
Comments:		
Financial Stability		
■ *Based on an analysis of the contractor's most recent financial statements or similar evidence*	*10*	90
Comments:		
Budget and Narrative (Form 2)	*20*	80
Comments:		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:** 11/28/21

Name of Bidder: Children's Home Society of Florida

Reviewer: Mia Jones

TOTAL	**100**	

SCORING DESCRIPTION	SCORING RANGE
Exceptional: Meets or significantly exceeds all of CTAC's requirements	90-100
Good: Meets all and exceeds several of CTAC's requirements	80-89
Satisfactory: Meets CTAC's minimum requirements	70-79
Unsatisfactory: Does not meet minimum requirements	60-69
Evaluation Team Member's Numerical Rating for this Criterion	

Reviewer's Signature

11/28/21

Date

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:** 11/30/2021

Name of Bidder: Children's Home Society

Reviewer: Alexandra Goldberg

Does Bidder meet minimum requirements to bid? ☑ **Y** ☐ **N**

Proposals will be reviewed against the criteria below:

Place a check in the box if bidder meets qualifications:

CRITERIA	WEIGHT	Score
Project Plan		
☑ *Services: 1. Introduction/Executive Summary 2. Project Activities*	5	95
Comments: Project Activities successfully describe a plan for all 4 core components- a CTAP/partnership with 2-1-1, family/community outreach, health care provider outreach, & data collection. Plan also describes plan for developmental screenings, proposed feedback loop strategies, resource directory, diversity/inclusion,& sustainability.		
☑ *Population and Outreah: 1. Target Population 2. Population Needs and Challenges 3. Outreach and Marketing Strategy.*	5	95
Comments: Successfully recognizes target outreach as birth-8 population, supported by Alachua family data. Proposes specific plan for conducting outreach to recruit families, promote CTAP, and connect with community providers.		
☑ *Partners and Service Linkage*	5	90
Comments: Letters of support demonstrate solid partnerships with community agencies and providers with detail as to what partnership/activities will look like.		
☑ *Staffing*	5	90
Comments: Staffing plan successfully includes positions for HMG program manager, care coordinators, and outreach coordinator, along with roles/responsibilities and percentages of time for each. Also includes supervision/management plan and staffing chart. Positions and responsibilities are all adequate and appropriate for successful HMG implementation.		
☑ *Continuous Learning and Quality Supports*	5	90
Comments: Successfully describes plan to measure serves & collect data, including through the use of STAR. Describes strategies to improve program quality and ensure model fidelity, along with staff training activities and supervision practices.		
☑ *Organizational Capacity*	5	90
Comments: Described Organizational Capacity provides support for history of success engaging in similar activities & target populations, including providing recruiting, enrolling, screening, and linkage for children, along with outcomes.		
Subcontracting *(if no subcontracting, the contractor will receive maximum 10 points)*		
☐ *Based on risk associated with subcontracting outside the United States*	4	
Comments: No subcontracting.		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** Date: 11/30/02021

Name of Bidder: Children's Home Society

Reviewer: Alexandra Goldberg

☐ *Based on subcontractor qualifications*	*3*	
Comments: No subcontracting.		
☐ *Based on over reliance on subcontracting*	*3*	
Comments: No subcontracting.		
Record of Past Experience		
■ *Based on experience with similar projects*	*10*	90
Comments: Describes experience working on projects and administering programs related to early intervention.		
☐ *Based on feedback from references*	*10*	
Comments:		
Risk		
■ *Based on identification of risk to the CTAC*	*5*	90
Comments: 3 risk areas identified and described.		
■ *Based on contractor's approach to reducing, mitigating, or eliminating risk*	*5*	90
Comments: Describes strategies to mitigate and reduce risk.		
Financial Stability		
■ *Based on an analysis of the contractor's most recent financial statements or similar evidence*	*10*	90
Comments: Provided most recent financial audit to provide evidence of financial stability. Funding history outlined.		
Budget and Narrative (Form 2)	*20*	90
Comments: Proposed budget allocates funds for appropriate HMG staff positions (program manager, care coordinator, outreach coordinator, etc.) and activities (screenings, activity stations at events, ASQ Enterprise account) to support adequate and appropriate HMG implementation and services.		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:** 11/30/2021

Name of Bidder: Children's Home Society

Reviewer: Alexandra Goldberg

TOTAL	**100**	

SCORING DESCRIPTION	SCORING RANGE
Exceptional: Meets or significantly exceeds all of CTAC's requirements	90-100
Good: Meets all and exceeds several of CTAC's requirements	80-89
Satisfactory: Meets CTAC's minimum requirements	70-79
Unsatisfactory: Does not meet minimum requirements	60-69
Evaluation Team Member's Numerical Rating for this Criterion	

Alexandra Goldberg 11/30/2021

Reviewer's Signature Date

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:**_____

Name of Bidder: Children's Home Society of

Reviewer: Knopf

Does Bidder meet minimum requirements to bid? Y N YES

Proposals will be reviewed against the criteria below:

Place a check in the box if bidder meets qualifications:

CRITERIA	WEIGHT	Score
Project Plan		
■ *Services: 1. Introduction/Executive Summary 2. Project Activities*	*5*	90
Comments:		
■ *Population and Outreah: 1. Target Population 2. Population Needs and Challenges 3. Outreach and Marketing Strategy.*	*5*	85
Comments:		
■ *Partners and Service Linkage*	*5*	80
Comments:		
■ *Staffing*	*5*	75
Comments:		
■ *Continuous Learning and Quality Supports*	*5*	75
Comments:		
■ *Organizational Capacity*	*5*	75
Comments:		
Subcontracting *(if no subcontracting, the contractor will receive maximum 10 points)*		
■ *Based on risk associated with subcontracting outside the United States*	*4*	100
Comments:		
■ *Based on subcontractor qualifications*	*3*	100
Comments:		
■ *Based on over reliance on subcontracting*	*3*	100
Comments:		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:**_____

Name of Bidder: Children's Home Society of

Reviewer: Knopf

Record of Past Experience		
☐ *Based on experience with similar projects*	*10*	85
Comments:		
☐ *Based on feedback from references*	*10*	69
Comments: References listed but no feedback provided		
Risk		
☐ *Based on identification of risk to the CTAC*	*5*	90
Comments:		
☐ *Based on contractor's approach to reducing, mitigating, or eliminating risk*	*5*	85
Comments:		
Financial Stability		
☐ *Based on an analysis of the contractor's most recent financial statements or similar evidence*	*10*	100
Comments:		
Budget and Narrative (Form 2)	*20*	
Comments: I didn't find narrative for the budget		
TOTAL	**100**	

SCORING DESCRIPTION	SCORING RANGE
Exceptional: Meets or significantly exceeds all of CTAC's requirements	90-100
Good: Meets all and exceeds several of CTAC's requirements	80-89
Satisfactory: Meets CTAC's minimum requirements	70-79
Evaluation Team Member's Numerical Rating for this Criterion	

Herman Knopf 12/02/2021

Reviwer's Signature Date

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:** 11/28/21

Name of Bidder: UF Health

Reviewer: Mia Jones

Does Bidder meet minimum requirements to bid? ☑ **Y** ☐ **N**

Proposals will be reviewed against the criteria below:

Place a check in the box if bidder meets qualifications:

CRITERIA	WEIGHT	Score
Project Plan		
☐ *Services: 1. Introduction/Executive Summary 2. Project Activities*	*5*	65
Comments:		
☐ *Population and Outreah: 1. Target Population 2. Population Needs and Challenges 3. Outreach and Marketing Strategy.*	*5*	60
Comments: Targeted population does not match RFP. Appears to only be providing services to current clients. Focus is limited		
☐ *Partners and Service Linkage*	*5*	65
Comments: Mentions some partnerships. Does not include partnership with 211 which is critical.		
☐ *Staffing*	*5*	65
Comments: Not applicable to HMG.		
☐ *Continuous Learning and Quality Supports*	*5*	65
Comments: Proposes evaluations that are not apart of HMG		
☐ *Organizational Capacity*	*5*	75
Comments: Bidder has experience with early childhood and early intervention services. But does not mention experience working with the entire Birth to 8 population.		
Subcontracting *(if no subcontracting, the contractor will receive maximum 10 points)*		
■ *Based on risk associated with subcontracting outside the United States*	*4*	100
Comments: No subcontracting		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** Date: 11/28/21

Name of Bidder: UF Health

Reviewer: Mia Jones

■ *Based on subcontractor qualifications*	*3*	100
Comments: No Subcontracting		
■ *Based on over reliance on subcontracting*	*3*	100
Comments: No subcontracting		
Record of Past Experience		
☐ *Based on experience with similar projects*	*10*	70
Comments:		
☐ *Based on feedback from references*	*10*	60
Comments: Listed but no feedback provided.		
Risk		
☐ *Based on identification of risk to the CTAC*	*5*	70
Comments:		
☐ *Based on contractor's approach to reducing, mitigating, or eliminating risk*	*5*	70
Comments:		
Financial Stability		
☐ *Based on an analysis of the contractor's most recent financial statements or similar evidence*	*10*	69
Comments: Not adequately described.		
Budget and Narrative (Form 2)	*20*	80
Comments: Budget does not provide funds for HMG positions which doe snot adequately support HMG implementation.		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:** 11/28/21

Name of Bidder: UF Health

Reviewer: Mia Jones

TOTAL	**100**	

SCORING DESCRIPTION	SCORING RANGE
Exceptional: Meets or significantly exceeds all of CTAC's requirements	90-100
Good: Meets all and exceeds several of CTAC's requirements	80-89
Satisfactory: Meets CTAC's minimum requirements	70-79
Unsatisfactory: Does not meet minimum requirements	60-69
Evaluation Team Member's Numerical Rating for this Criterion	

Reviewer's Signature

11/28/21

Date

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:** 11/30/2021

Name of Bidder: UF Health

Reviewer: Alexandra Goldberg

Does Bidder meet minimum requirements to bid? ☐ **Y** ☑ **N**

Proposals will be reviewed against the criteria below:

Place a check in the box if bidder meets qualifications:

CRITERIA	WEIGHT	Score
Project Plan		
☐ *Services: 1. Introduction/Executive Summary 2. Project Activities*	5	65
Comments: Project Activities described do not include implementation of 2 of the 4 core components [centralized telephone access point (2-1-1) & family/community outreach]. No partnership with 2-1-1 described. No 24/7 access to families plan described. No staffing for program manager, care coordinator, or outreach specialist. Proposed project activities do not include 4 required developmental screening tools, outreach activities, or data collection through STAR.		
☐ *Population and Outreah: 1. Target Population 2. Population Needs and Challenges 3. Outreach and Marketing Strategy.*	5	60
Comments: While HMG serves children birth-8, the proposed target population is elementary students and children 6-8. Proposed project focus is on children with dyslexia or other language-based disorders, whereas HMG services are not limited to a specific developmental domain. Outreach & marketing strategies description of sharing information on what HMG is, what services HMG can offer (free developmental screenings, information, & referrals), or sharing HMG materials.		
☐ *Partners and Service Linkage*	5	65
Comments: Noted appropriate partnerships with some local early childhood agencies/programs (i.e. FDLRS, Early Steps, etc.), but lack of partnership with local 211 does not allow the HMGF affiliate to provide appropriate service linkage for families. No 24/7 access to families described.		
☐ *Staffing*	5	65
Comments: Provided staffing plan with roles/responsibilities and percentages of time, but positions are not applicable to HMG services. Physician champion included, but description does not include appropriate Physician Champion activities. SLP and pediatric mental health specialists are not required or best practice for HMG affiliate implementation. No program manager, care coordinator, or family/community outreach staff position proposed in budget. Does not include staffing chart.		
☐ *Continuous Learning and Quality Supports*	5	65
Comments: Project proposes evaluation of "impact on adolescent anxiety, depression, and suicidally", which is not related to HMG affiliate services. No mention of measuring services or HMG common indicators via STAR database. Successfully mentions tracking of encounters/education of health care providers, but through their medical record system, not through STAR.		
☐ *Organizational Capacity*	5	70
Comments: Applicant has experience working with neurodevelopmentally diverse populations, early childhood populations, and early intervention services. Does not mention experience related to HMG Programming Activities, including working with HMG target population (children birth-8) or required developmental screening tools.		
Subcontracting *(if no subcontracting, the contractor will receive maximum 10 points)*		
☐ *Based on risk associated with subcontracting outside the United States*	4	
Comments: No subcontracting.		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:** 11/30/2021

Name of Bidder: UF Health

Reviewer: Alexandra Goldberg

☐ *Based on subcontractor qualifications*	*3*	
Comments: No subcontracting.		
☐ *Based on over reliance on subcontracting*	*3*	
Comments: No subcontracting.		
Record of Past Experience		
☐ *Based on experience with similar projects*	*10*	65
Comments: Applicant has experience working with neurodevelopmentally diverse populations and experience in a pilot project focused on autism evaluations. Does not mention experience related to HMG Programming Activities, including working with HMG target population (children birth-8) or required developmental screening tools.		
☐ *Based on feedback from references*	*10*	
Comments:		
Risk		
☐ *Based on identification of risk to the CTAC*	*5*	70
Comments: No risks noted.		
☐ *Based on contractor's approach to reducing, mitigating, or eliminating risk*	*5*	70
Comments: No listed measures that will be taken to mitigate risks.		
Financial Stability		
■ *Based on an analysis of the contractor's most recent financial statements or similar evidence*	*10*	70
Comments: Provided most recent financial statements to prove financial stability. Funding history outlined.		
Budget and Narrative (Form 2)	*20*	80
Comments: Proposed budget does not allocate funds for appropriate HMG staff positions and majority of costs cover SLP & mental health specialist, which does not support adequate and appropriate HMG implementation and services.		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:** 11/30/2021

Name of Bidder: UF Health

Reviewer: Alexandra Goldberg

TOTAL	**100**	

SCORING DESCRIPTION	SCORING RANGE
Exceptional: Meets or significantly exceeds all of CTAC's requirements	90-100
Good: Meets all and exceeds several of CTAC's requirements	80-89
Satisfactory: Meets CTAC's minimum requirements	70-79
Unsatisfactory: Does not meet minimum requirements	60-69
Evaluation Team Member's Numerical Rating for this Criterion	

Alexandra Goldberg 11/30/2021

Reviewer's Signature Date

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:**_____

Name of Bidder: UF Health

Reviewer: Knopf

Does Bidder meet minimum requirements to bid? **Y** **N** Not Validated in CFNCF Ph

Proposals will be reviewed against the criteria below:

Place a check in the box if bidder meets qualifications:

CRITERIA	WEIGHT	Score
Project Plan		
■ *Services: 1. Introduction/Executive Summary 2. Project Activities*	*5*	65
Comments: Bidder did not describe comprehensive developmental screening and broad connection to the birth to age 8 early childhood community. Bidder described a sole focus on dyslexia screening. Bidder did not indicate plans to connect with 211 helpline		
☐ *Population and Outreah: 1. Target Population 2. Population Needs and Challenges 3. Outreach and Marketing Strategy.*	*5*	75
Comments: The target population was clearly described, but does not match the target population described in the RFP. Bidder is focused on PreK-3rd Grade, recruitment is primarily through CMS, Early Learning Centers and Local Elementary Schools		
☐ *Partners and Service Linkage*	*5*	65
Comments: Response does not include partnership with 211		
☐ *Staffing*	*5*	80
Comments: Staffing plan is appropriate for the services described in the proposal		
☐ *Continuous Learning and Quality Supports*	*5*	65
Comments: No mention of HMGF common indicators		
☐ *Organizational Capacity*	*5*	100
Comments: Bidder has long history of conducting similar work.		
Subcontracting *(if no subcontracting, the contractor will receive maximum 10 points)*		
☐ *Based on risk associated with subcontracting outside the United States*	*4*	100
Comments: N/A		
☐ *Based on subcontractor qualifications*	*3*	100
Comments: N/A		
☐ *Based on over reliance on subcontracting*	*3*	100
Comments:	10	

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:**_____

Name of Bidder: UF Health

Reviewer: Knopf

Record of Past Experience		
☐ *Based on experience with similar projects*	*10*	89
Comments:		
☐ *Based on feedback from references*	*10*	69
Comments: References listed, but no feedback provided		
Risk		
☐ *Based on identification of risk to the CTAC*	*5*	89
Comments:		
☐ *Based on contractor's approach to reducing, mitigating, or eliminating risk*	*5*	89
Comments:		
Financial Stability		
☐ *Based on an analysis of the contractor's most recent financial statements or similar evidence*	*10*	69
Comments: Financial stability of the organization is not described		
Budget and Narrative (Form 2)	*20*	89
Comments: The proposed costs are reasonable and relate to the services proposed.		
TOTAL	**100**	

SCORING DESCRIPTION	SCORING RANGE
Exceptional: Meets or significantly exceeds all of CTAC's requirements	90-100
Good: Meets all and exceeds several of CTAC's requirements	80-89
Satisfactory: Meets CTAC's minimum requirements	70-79
Evaluation Team Member's Numerical Rating for this Criterion	

Herman Knopf 11/30/2021

Reviwer's Signature Date

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:** 11/28/21

Name of Bidder: Little People Preparatory Preschool

Reviewer: Mia Jones

Does Bidder meet minimum requirements to bid? ☑ **Y** ☐ **N**

Proposals will be reviewed against the criteria below:

Place a check in the box if bidder meets qualifications:

CRITERIA	WEIGHT	Score
Project Plan		
☐ *Services: 1. Introduction/Executive Summary 2. Project Activities*	5	69
Comments: Although each question was answered, it did not describe the required program activities that are listed on page 36 under "B" on the scope of services. Not clear if bidder is focusing on all of Alachua county.		
☐ *Population and Outreah: 1. Target Population 2. Population Needs and Challenges 3. Outreach and Marketing Strategy.*	5	69
Comments: The RFP is for age 0-8. The proposal limits the targeted population to 0-5.		
☐ *Partners and Service Linkage*	5	69
Comments: Although the proposal mentions partners, it does not describe their role in implementing HMGA. The plan to secure a partnership with 211 is not mentioned only completing an application. Does not indicate what the application is for.		
☐ *Staffing*	5	69
Comments: Does not clearly describe the HMGA duties for the Program Coor, Care Coor. and the Outreach Coor. Not clear if the social worker is functioning as the Outreach Coordinator. Assessment not mentioned in duties.		
☐ *Continuous Learning and Quality Supports*	5	60
Comments: Not clearly addressed by the Bidder as it relates to HMG.		
☐ *Organizational Capacity*	5	60
Comments: Not clearly addressed by the Bidder. Does not describe experience related to HMG including administering developmental screenings, hosting events, outreach to healthcare providers.		
Subcontracting *(if no subcontracting, the contractor will receive maximum 10 points)*		
☐ *Based on risk associated with subcontracting outside the United States*	4	100
Comments: N/A. NO subcontracting		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** Date: 11/28/21

Name of Bidder: Little People Preparatory Preschool

Reviewer: Mia Jones

☐ *Based on subcontractor qualifications*	*3*	100
Comments: No subcontracting.		
☐ *Based on over reliance on subcontracting*	*3*	100
Comments: No subcontracting		
Record of Past Experience		
☐ *Based on experience with similar projects*	*10*	60
Comments: Not clearly addressed by the Bidder.		
☐ *Based on feedback from references*	*10*	60
Comments: No reference letters provided.		
Risk		
☐ *Based on identification of risk to the CTAC*	*5*	69
Comments: Not addressed by the Bidder.		
☐ *Based on contractor's approach to reducing, mitigating, or eliminating risk*	*5*	60
Comments: Not addressed by the Bidder.		
Financial Stability		
☐ *Based on an analysis of the contractor's most recent financial statements or similar evidence*	*10*	70
Comments: Provided financial statement. Unable to determine if financially stable from information provided.		
Budget and Narrative (Form 2)	*20*	70
Comments: Completed form 2 but does not state what percentage of time would be dedicated to HMG.		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:** 11/28/21

Name of Bidder: Little People Preparatory Preschool

Reviewer: Mia Jones

TOTAL	**100**	

SCORING DESCRIPTION	SCORING RANGE
Exceptional: Meets or significantly exceeds all of CTAC's requirements	90-100
Good: Meets all and exceeds several of CTAC's requirements	80-89
Satisfactory: Meets CTAC's minimum requirements	70-79
Unsatisfactory: Does not meet minimum requirements	60-69
Evaluation Team Member's Numerical Rating for this Criterion	

11/28/21

Reviewer's Signature Date

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** Date: 11/30/2021

Name of Bidder: Little People Preparatory Preschool

Reviewer: Alexandra Goldberg

Does Bidder meet minimum requirements to bid? ☐ Y ☑ N

Proposals will be reviewed against the criteria below:

Place a check in the box if bidder meets qualifications:

CRITERIA	WEIGHT	Score
Project Plan		
☐ *Services: 1. Introduction/Executive Summary 2. Project Activities*	5	60
Comments: Proposed CTAP does not meet CTAC or HMG requirements. No 24/7 access to families through 2-1-1 described. No described plan to offer required developmental screenings. Does not discuss data collection through use of STAR. Does not describe plans to work with health care providers.		
☐ *Population and Outreah: 1. Target Population 2. Population Needs and Challenges 3. Outreach and Marketing Strategy.*	5	65
Comments: Target population listed as b-5, but HMG serves b-8. Proposed HMG services for one zip code as opposed to entire county. Does not discuss cultural differences. Outreach strategies successfully list communication methods.		
☐ *Partners and Service Linkage*	5	65
Comments: Noted appropriate partnerships with some local early childhood agencies/programs (i.e. ELC, FDLRS, Early Steps, etc.), but lack of local 211 as CTAP does not allow the HMGF affiliate to provide appropriate service linkage for families or 24/7 access.		
☐ *Staffing*	5	65
Comments: Provided staffing plan with roles/responsibilities but no percentages of time. Program manager and care coordinator included, no outreach coordinator. Listed roles/responsibilities for care coordinator and additional staff positions (teachers and floaters) are not appropriate or best practice for HMG implementation. Does not include staffing chart.		
☐ *Continuous Learning and Quality Supports*	5	65
Comments: Discusses how they will collect data and measure services, but does not discuss data collection through use of STAR. Does not discuss staff training and supervision practices or strategies for ensuring quality and fidelity to the model.		
☐ *Organizational Capacity*	5	60
Comments: Does not mention experience related to HMG Programming Activities, including working with HMG target population (children birth-8), required developmental screening tools, developmental screening events, centralized telephone access point, healthcare provider outreach, successful fundraising and grant writing experience, etc.		
Subcontracting *(if no subcontracting, the contractor will receive maximum 10 points)*		
☐ *Based on risk associated with subcontracting outside the United States*	4	
Comments: No subcontracting.		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:** 11/30/02021

Name of Bidder: Little People Preparatory Preschool

Reviewer: Alexandra Goldberg

☐ *Based on subcontractor qualifications*	*3*	
Comments: No subcontracting.		
☐ *Based on over reliance on subcontracting*	*3*	
Comments: No subcontracting.		
Record of Past Experience		
☐ *Based on experience with similar projects*	*10*	60
Comments: Does not describe experience with similar projects (such as providing developmental screenings, providing a centralized telephone access point, partnerships with health care providers, hosting outreach events in the community, collecting data through database, etc.) or large grants.		
☐ *Based on feedback from references*	*10*	
Comments:		
Risk		
☐ *Based on identification of risk to the CTAC*	*5*	70
Comments: No risks identified.		
☐ *Based on contractor's approach to reducing, mitigating, or eliminating risk*	*5*	60
Comments: No listed measures that will be taken to mitigate risks.		
Financial Stability		
☐ *Based on an analysis of the contractor's most recent financial statements or similar evidence*	*10*	70
Comments: Provided most recent financial statements to prove financial stability. Funding history outlined.		
Budget and Narrative (Form 2)	*20*	70
Comments: Included budget and budget narrative. Included staff positions with rate of pay, but no percentages of time.		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:** 11/30/2021

Name of Bidder: Little People Preparatory Prechools

Reviewer: Alexandra Goldberg

TOTAL	**100**	

SCORING DESCRIPTION	SCORING RANGE
Exceptional: Meets or significantly exceeds all of CTAC's requirements	90-100
Good: Meets all and exceeds several of CTAC's requirements	80-89
Satisfactory: Meets CTAC's minimum requirements	70-79
Unsatisfactory: Does not meet minimum requirements	60-69
Evaluation Team Member's Numerical Rating for this Criterion	

Alexandra Goldberg 11/30/2021

Reviewer's Signature Date

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:**_____

Name of Bidder: Little people preparatory Pre

Reviewer: Knopf

Does Bidder meet minimum requirements to bid? Y N Yes

Proposals will be reviewed against the criteria below:

Place a check in the box if bidder meets qualifications:

CRITERIA	WEIGHT	Score
Project Plan		
☐ *Services: 1. Introduction/Executive Summary 2. Project Activities*	*5*	69
Comments: Bidder doesn't connect to 211 or to HMG service model standards , not clear that the bidder is focused on serving all Alachua County or just 32609 zip code		
☐ *Population and Outreah: 1. Target Population 2. Population Needs and Challenges 3. Outreach and Marketing Strategy.*	*5*	69
Comments: Bidder doesn't cover the entire age range stated in RFP. Marketing strategy doesn't reference HMG resources available form HMGF, Bidder doesn't comment on collaboration with child health care providers.		
☐ *Partners and Service Linkage*	*5*	69
Comments: Applicant states that they will collaborate with many relevant agencies, but does not describe how these partnerships will be established.		
☐ *Staffing*	*5*	69
Comments: The job descriptions provided do not match the personnel needs of implementing HMG programming		
☐ *Continuous Learning and Quality Supports*	*5*	69
Comments: Not addressed by the bidder		
☐ *Organizational Capacity*	*5*	69
Comments: Not addressed by the bidder		
Subcontracting *(if no subcontracting, the contractor will receive maximum 10 points)*		
☐ *Based on risk associated with subcontracting outside the United States*	*4*	100
Comments: NA		
☐ *Based on subcontractor qualifications*	*3*	100
Comments: NA		
☐ *Based on over reliance on subcontracting*	*3*	100
Comments:		

RFP 2021-07 **Score Sheet** **Date:**_____

Name of Bidder:

Reviewer:

Record of Past Experience		
☐ *Based on experience with similar projects*	*10*	
Comments: This is bidder's first submission for a RFP/Grant		
☐ *Based on feedback from references*	*10*	69
Comments: No references provided		
Risk		
☐ *Based on identification of risk to the CTAC*	*5*	69
Comments: Not addressed by bidder		
☐ *Based on contractor's approach to reducing, mitigating, or eliminating risk*	*5*	69
Comments: Not addressed by bidder		
Financial Stability		
☐ *Based on an analysis of the contractor's most recent financial statements or similar evidence*	*10*	69
Comments: Insufficient information provided to make a determination		
Budget and Narrative (Form 2)	*20*	69
Comments: Funding request is higher than available funds, but resources seem to be focused on managing existing operations. It is not clear how this funding would support the scope of services requested in this RFP		
TOTAL	**100**	

SCORING DESCRIPTION	SCORING RANGE
Exceptional: Meets or significantly exceeds all of CTAC's requirements	90-100
Good: Meets all and exceeds several of CTAC's requirements	80-89
Satisfactory: Meets CTAC's minimum requirements	70-79
Evaluation Team Member's Numerical Rating for this Criterion	

Herman Knopf 12/02/2021

Reviwer's Signature Date