Policy and Sustainability Review Tool

APPLICANT NAME: _______________________________  DATE____________________

The review framework does not necessarily correspond to the order of application materials. Reviewers should consider the entire application prior to completing this document. Please score all items or request staff guidance. Leaving items blank or marking N/A will handicap the applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Areas for Review</th>
<th>See Section IV of RFQ</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Question IV.A.2a</strong>: Assessment - Degree to which response includes strong justification for choosing the policy opportunities and activities in their response <em>(up to 10 points- 10: Strong justification/relevance; 5: Moderate justification/relevance; 0: unclear/weak justification/relevance)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Question IV.A.2a</strong>: Political/Economic Environment – Accurately assesses the current political/economic environment; proposed strategy and activities feasible within current environment. <em>(up to 10 points – 10: Clear assessment/highly feasible; 5 Moderate assessment/reasonably feasible; 0 Weak assessment with questionable feasibility)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Question IV.A.2a</strong>: Applicability to First 5 LA - Degree to which response reflects First 5 LA’s priorities, resources and limitations. <em>(up to 5 points- 5: Clearly applicable 3: applicable with reservations; 0: not applicable)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Question IV.A.2b</strong>: Degree to which summaries reflect experience relevant to First 5 LA Policy Agenda Goals and target population <em>(up to 15 points- 15: Highly relevant; 7 Moderately relevant; 0 Not relevant)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Question IV.A.2b</strong>: Degree to which summaries reflect the specific role the consultant played in the project and how it led to the outcomes described. <em>(up to 5 points – 5: Applicant clearly contributed to outcomes; 2: Applicant moderately contributed to outcomes; 0 Unclear how applicant contributed to outcomes)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Policy and Sustainability Review Tool

| 6. **Scope of Work:** Degree to which SOW clearly describes objectives and activities over a 12 month period, beginning March 15, 2013. Activities are presented in logical order.  
(up to 10 points – 10 Applicant clearly describes activities/order is logical; 5 Applicant somewhat clear; 0 unclear) |
|---|
| 7. **Budget/Budget Narrative:** Degree to which budget reflects the activities in the SOW; Are the appropriate staff assigned to the activities at the right amount of time? Are costs reasonable?  
(up to 10 points – 10 Costs are appropriate, appropriate staff assigned; 5 Some costs or staffing not aligned; 0 unclear) |
| 8. **Resumes:** Degree to which applicant resume(s) reflect the experience and relevant projects to support the First 5 LA Policy Department.  
(up to 15 points – 15: Exceptional experience and relevance; 7 Modest experience and relevance; 0 no relevant experience or relevance) |
| 9. **Work Samples:** Degree to which work samples are relevant and are of high quality.  
   a. Relevance - 5 Highly relevant; 2 Moderately relevant; 0 Not relevant  
   b. Quality – 10 Exceptional quality; 8 Average quality; 0 Poor quality  
(up to 15 points) |
| 10. **Overall Quality of Application:** Applicant presented clear, concise, well written and structured responses; answered questions clearly and provided clear examples, timelines and detailed responses.  
(up to 15 points- 15: Exceptional writing and presentation; 8 adequate writing and presentation; 0 poor, unacceptable writing and presentation) |

**TOTAL POINTS**  
(Max 110 points)

Reviewer #_____