### RECO Evaluation RFP
### APPLICANT REVIEW TOOL

**APPLICANT NAME:**

**REVIEWER ID:**

#### SUMMARY SCORES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score (max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Understanding Scope of Work</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Technical Approach</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Organizational Experience &amp; Proposed Personnel</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Budget</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Project Management</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE:** (100)
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I. UNDERSTANDING SCOPE OF WORK

The applicant’s understanding of the scope of work as reflected in the proposal must demonstrate the following:

a. Appropriate approach to the project tasks, including explanations and rationales for any suggested modifications

b. Demonstrated understanding of key characteristics of the early childhood obesity prevention interventions in general, as well as issues specific to various segments of the population

c. Demonstrated understanding of the collective impact evaluation approach

d. Demonstrated understanding of the existing evidence base in collective impact evaluations

e. Identification of anticipated logistical challenges and a sufficiently-detailed description of how challenges will be addressed or minimized.

f. Ability to partner with resourceful entities who are doing or have done collective impact and simulation modeling work before

Score:  (maximum score = 20)
II. **TECHNICAL APPROACH**

The applicant will be evaluated by the extent to which the proposal meets all the requirements outlined in the RFP, including:

a. Logical and clear conceptual framework that address the comprehensive nature of the project.

b. Evaluation design and approach to sampling participants

c. Approach to data collection and measurement

d. Analytic approach and proposed use of external sources of data

e. Identification of potential contextual and methodological challenges and approach to addressing or minimizing them.

f. Strategies for working with First 5 LA staff, LACDPH staff, program evaluators, and other identified stakeholders

**Note:** Any notes and/or questions should be included on a separate piece of paper

**Score:** (maximum score = 30)
RECO Evaluation RFP
APPLICANT REVIEW TOOL

III. ORGANIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE & PROPOSED PERSONNEL 30 points

The applicant will be evaluated by the extent to which their staff qualifications demonstrate the relevant background, training and experience in the following areas:

a. Adequate staff to effectively complete all proposed tasks.

b. Adequate computer/statistical resources and the institutional capability to process and analyze all data, both quantitative and qualitative

c. Adequate financial capacity as determined by the applicant’s proposed budget, statement of financial position, and other relevant documents

d. Knowledge of early childhood obesity prevention programs in LA County

e. Experience conducting longitudinal studies

f. Experience in working with culturally and linguistically diverse groups, in particular, parents of young children and community-based programs

g. Experience in building connections across agencies for the purposes of evaluation.

h. Experience in GIS Mapping techniques

i. Experience describing the connections of systems and networks of county agencies.

j. Experience collecting shared measurement across a variety of programs

k. Experience building and analyzing large, complex quantitative data sets

l. Experience developing relevant simulation models

m. Experience in collecting, cleaning and processing quantitative data

n. Experience in analyzing and summarizing qualitative and quantitative data.

o. Inclusion of full résumés of proposed staff in the proposal which clearly reflect the range and depth of the requirements outlined above, including any publications in professional refereed journals, as relevant to the current project. This includes sub-contractors and partners as well.

p. Experience in and knowledge of working in Southern California, preferably in Los Angeles

Name of Applicant:
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County.

q. Experience in delivering presentations to various audiences

Note: Any notes and/or questions should be included on a separate piece of paper

Score: (maximum score = 30)

Name of Applicant:
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**BUDGET**

The applicant’s budget and budget narrative should reflect the following:

a. A reasonable price per task, based on the reviewers’ experience;

b. A composite hourly rate for all personnel that does not exceed $150/hour (see detail in Contracting Considerations section below);

c. Tasks assigned to appropriate personnel as to minimize the cost per deliverable while also maximizing the quality of the output;

d. An overall budget that does not exceed $3,000,000. It is expected that applicants’ budgets will be lower than this, however.

**Name of Applicant:**
IV. PROJECT MANAGEMENT 10 points

The applicant will be evaluated by the extent to which the proposal meets all the requirements outlined in the RFP, including:

a. A logical timeline that demonstrates how the project (with all associated deliverables) will be completed within the project period (5 years).

b. Evidence of the ability to have a sufficient number of the staff available to accomplish the work including a list of all current and projected, outside commitments (listed separately by percent time for each ongoing or proposed project and presented by year) for key staff and consultants who are proposed less than full time to this project.

c. Procedures for maintaining quality control and timeliness and conducting regular reviews of the quality of data collected

Note: Any notes and/or questions should be included on a separate piece of paper

Score: (maximum score = 10)