

Evaluation Service Rating Sheet Criteria

EXHIBIT #3

(Page 1 of 4)

Benton Harbor Housing Commission Evaluation Service Request for Proposal Rating Sheet		
Respondent:		
Reviewer:		
RATING CRITERIA	Possible Points	Points Awarded
<p>A. Prior Experience: This refers to the proposer’s background and experience to undertake the required task.</p> <p>Excellent = Technical proposal provides documentation demonstrating that the respondent has significant ability designing and implementing evaluation and monitoring services. The proposal details significant resources to design and implement a successful strategy. Staff resumes demonstrate significant ability and experience designing and implementing the required task. The Proposer provided documentation that it manages or has successfully managed similar projects on multiple occasions.</p>	21-30	
<p>Good = Technical proposal provides documentation demonstrating an adequate ability in designing and implementing evaluation and monitoring programs. The proposer adequately describes the resources at its disposal to make this initiative successful. Deficiencies in the information provided are minor. Staff resumes demonstrate adequate ability and experience to design and implement evaluation projects. Proposer provided documentation that it manages or has managed similar efforts.</p>	11-20	
<p>Poor = Technical proposal provides little documentation demonstrating an ability in designing and implementing a successful evaluation project. The proposal fails to detail adequate resources to design and implement the service tasks. Proposer fails to describe resources at their disposal to make the desired program successful. Staff resumes indicate little evidence of ability and experience to implement the project. Proposer has little or no management experience of similar portfolios.</p>	0-10	

EXHIBIT #3

(Page 2 of 4)

<p>B. Management and Work Plan: This refers to the evidence that the proposer has a methodology to successfully produce the desired outcomes.</p> <p>Excellent = Technical proposal provides a program description which demonstrates a clear strategy for achieving the requirements described in the RFP. Beginning and ending dates of the strategies and tactics are listed. The responsible parties are identified and relationships are illustrated. The submitted documentation demonstrates a clear understanding of how to meet the expectations in the RFP.</p> <p>Good = Technical proposal provides a program description which demonstrating an adequate understanding of how to achieve the requirements listed in the RFP. Technical proposal illustrates an adequate capability in planning an evaluation project. Deficiencies in the information proved are minor.</p> <p>Poor = Technical proposal provides little documentation demonstrating an ability to design and implement an evaluation and monitoring project. The proposal fails to adequately demonstrate an ability to implement the project as required in the RFP. The proposal does not describe in detail the process needed to make this desired program successful.</p>	21-30	
	11-20	
	0-10	

EXHIBIT #3

(Page 3 of 4)

<p>C. Cost</p> <p>Excellent = Proposer documents in <u>detail the reasonableness</u> of the cost associated with implementing evaluation and monitoring services. Details on the inkind donation amount should also be included</p> <p>Good = Proposer documents in <u>detail the costs</u> associated with implement evaluation and monitoring services.</p> <p>Poor = Proposer <u>fails to detail the costs</u> associated with implement evaluation and monitoring services.</p>	<p>15-20</p> <p>7-14</p> <p>0-6</p>	
<p>D. MBE/WBE/DBE/Section 3</p> <p>Excellent = Proposer provides <u>credible</u> plan to recruit and engage the targeted entities in the execution of this project.</p> <p>Good = Proposer provides <u>feasible</u> plan to recruit and engage the targeted entities in the execution of this project</p> <p>Poor = Proposer <u>does not provide a plan</u> with little expectation to recruit and engage the targeted entities.</p>	<p>8-10</p> <p>4-7</p> <p>0-3</p>	

EXHIBIT #3

(Page 4 of 4)

E. Cost		
Excellent = The proposer provides evidence of significantly improving the evaluation process through its ability to attract resources.	8-10	
Good = The proposer provides evidence of improving the evaluation process through its ability to attract resources.	4-7	
Poor = The proposer provides little or no additional resources.	0-3	
TOTAL	0-100	

COMMENTS: