

**WIOA AND CCMEP YOUTH SERVICES PRT SCORE SHEET**

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Vendor Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Program Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Program Service Type: \_\_\_\_\_

Target Population(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Rate the responses to each of the following categories using this scale:  
 5= Excellent; 4 = Good; 3 = Average; 2 = Below Average; 1 = Poor; 0 = Non-Responsive;  
 Select "Yes" or "No" and assign point value as indicated.

Proposer Experience and Qualifications (25 points)	Comments	Score	Adj. Score
a. Rate the vendor’s qualifications that they bring to this project. Do they differentiate their services from others?			<b>0</b>
b. Rate the vendor's capacity to undertake the scope of work based on a demonstrated history of successfully completing similar or related work with the targeted service population.			<b>0</b>
c. Rate the vendor's capacity to undertake the scope of work based on an organizational structure with adequate facilities, fiscal controls, staff, equipment, research tools, administrative and other resources.			<b>0</b>

d. Rate the vendor's explanation of how it meets the additional prior experience requirements for the specific program listed in Section 2.2.			0
e. Rate the vendor's position description for key positions.			0
f. Rate the vendor's key project personnel. Do the employees listed have adequate experience and appropriate education or licensing?			0
			0
<b>Administrative Structures and Scope of Work (40 points)</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Adj. Score</b>
a. Rate the vendor's program description.			0

<p>b. Rate the vendor's statement of how the proposed program is specifically designed to meet the needs of the target population it will serve.</p>			<b>0</b>
<p>c. Rate the methods and procedures vendor will use to ensure coordination and collaboration of services with Department.</p>			<b>0</b>
<p>d. Rate the vendor's description of its service delivery model and the specific services it will provide in delivering one or more of the 14 WIOA elements described in the RFP.</p>			<b>0</b>
<p>e. Rate the vendor's experience with former WIA services, federal regulations and performance measures related to the target population served.</p>			<b>0</b>
<p>f. Rate the vendor's workforce development system partnerships in Clark County including OhioMeansJobs partners, community colleges, community organizations, economic development agencies and other service providers to leverage funds and integrate services.</p>			<b>0</b>

<p>g. Rate the vendor's description of their five deliverables. Are they well-defined, specific, achievable, and measurable? Do they make sense within the scope of the target population?</p>			<b>0</b>
<p>h. Rate the vendor's description of their three outcomes. Are they well-defined, specific, achievable, and measurable? Do they make sense within the scope of the target population?</p>			<b>0</b>
<p>i. Rate the vendor's plan to achieve the WIOA Performance Outcomes applicable to its proposed program.</p>			<b>0</b>
<p>j. Rate the vendor's method to measure its performance against the stated outcomes.</p>			<b>0</b>
<p>k. Rate the vendor's methodology used to carry out this project and the reason for selecting this methodology. Did the vendor detail the tasks to be undertaken?</p>			<b>0</b>

l. Rate the vendor's plan to assess the progress of the project.			0
m. Rate the vendor's plan to adjust its program if the assessment of progress yields less-than-favorable results.			0
n. Rate the vendor's plan to maintain constant contact with Department case managers for CCMEP participants. Does vendor ensure that it will respond to requests for updated information within one business day?			0
o. Rate the vendor's tracking or scheduling mechanism it will use to ensure status of participants is reported to the CCMEP case manager every 14 or 30 days.			0
p. Rate the vendor's management approach and project management organizational structure including reporting levels and lines of authority.			0

<p>q. Rate the vendor's approach to project control including details of the methods used in controlling project activities.</p>			0
<p>r. Rate the vendor's identification of the pertinent issues as well as the potential risks and problems, which may occur on projects of this type.</p>			0
<p>s. Rate the vendor's plan to avoid or mitigate any problems and steps to be taken should the problem occur. Did the vendor incorporate activities in the project plan to reduce the occurrence, severity, and impact of events or situations that can compromise the attainment of any project objective?</p>			0
			0
<p><b>Attachments (10 points)</b></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>	<p><b>Score</b></p>	<p><b>Adjusted Score</b></p>
<p>a. Rate the vendor's proposed subcontractors. <i>If no subcontractors are proposed, comment N/A and do not score.</i></p>			0

<p>b. Did the vendor include three letters of reference for similar projects it has completed? (If Yes- 5 Pts., If No- 0 Pts.)</p>			0
<p>c. Rate the vendor's experience based on the letters of reference.</p>			0
<p>d. Did the vendor include a chart which outlines the project schedule including all project activities and deliverables and the timeframes for completion of each? (If Yes- 5 Pts., If No- 0 Pts.)</p>			0
<p>e. Rate the vendor's project schedule. Are the timeframes reasonable? Are all project activities and deliverables included?</p>			0
<p>Include comments here about any additional information submitted in the attachments section. Do not assign a score to this section.</p>			
			0

<b>Did the proposal contain any of the following:</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>
a. Introduction Elements <b>(deduct one point for each element that is missing)</b> Cover Page- 5 elements Cover Letter- 5 elements Table of Contents- 1 element Conflict of Interest- 1 element Mandatory Disclosures- 2 elements Financial Statement- 5 elements Exec. Summary- 9 elements Required Forms- 5 elements			<b>0</b>
b. Assumptions <b>(If Yes- -2 Pts., If No- 0 Pts.)</b>			<b>0</b>
c. Lack of sufficient detail <b>(If Yes- -2 Pts., If No- 0 Pts.)</b>			<b>0</b>
d. Poor organization <b>(If Yes- -2 Pts., If No- 0 Pts.)</b>			<b>0</b>
e. Lack of proofreading <b>(If Yes- -2 Pts., If No- 0 Pts.)</b>			<b>0</b>
f. Unnecessary use of self-promotional claims <b>(If Yes- -2 Pts., If No- 0 Pts.)</b>			<b>0</b>
			<b>0.00</b>

<b>Overall Proposal Scoring</b>			<b>Score</b>
Proposer Experience and Qualifications			<b>0</b>
Administrative Structures and Scope of Work			<b>0</b>
Attachments			<b>0</b>
Deductions			<b>0</b>
			<b>0</b>