APPLICANT NAME:

REVIEWER ID:

### SUMMARY SCORES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Understanding of the Scope of Work</th>
<th>Score (max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Technical Approach</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Qualifications</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Organizational Capacity</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Budget</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE:**

(100)
I. UNDERSTANDING OF THE SCOPE OF WORK 20 points

This criterion reflects the extent to which the applicant’s proposal demonstrates a solid understanding of the various conceptual, methodological, and logistical issues related to conducting the proposed implementation evaluation. It also reflects the extent to which the applicant’s proposal demonstrates a solid understanding of First 5 LA’s efforts as communicated in the Strategic Plan, particularly as it relates to implementation in the Best Start communities.

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

Score: (maximum score = 20)
II. TECHNICAL APPROACH 30 points

The applicant will be evaluated on the extent to which the proposed technical approach is succinct and logical in format, demonstrating clear conceptual design and methods consistent with the various tasks to be accomplished and an approach that meets all the requirements outlined in the RFQ, including:

a. A description of how the Place-Based Implementation Evaluation might be designed including a proposed sampling plan, proposed data collection and data analyses; and strategies for working with First 5 LA staff and establishing an appropriate partnership relationship;

b. Examples of the problems that might occur in the proposed approach, particularly problems related to collecting data from a wide range of people and contexts, providing formative, timely feedback for the purposes of informing First 5 LA decision-making, as well as a sufficiently-detailed description of how each problem might be prevented and/or addressed.

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

Score: (maximum score = 30)
III. QUALIFICATIONS

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

a. Qualitative evaluation methods, including expertise in observational note-taking, one-on-one interviews, focus groups, and document analysis;

b. Experience working closely with client and providing formative feedback in a timely and politically and culturally sensitive manner;

c. Experience collecting and analyzing qualitative data from a large number of people and different contexts. The applicant should demonstrate an understanding of qualitative data analysis including organization and management of large volumes of narrative text;

d. Ability to communicate complex concepts, stimulate creative thinking, and negotiate differences within a diverse stakeholder group;

e. Bilingual in Spanish and English;

f. Inclusion of full résumés of proposed staff in the proposal which clearly reflect the range and depth of the requirements outlined above;

Preferred qualifications: (One point for each preferred item)

g. Knowledge working in Los Angeles County;

h. Experience conducting implementation evaluations in the past;

i. Experience conducting evaluations of place-based initiatives/efforts;

j. Ability to communicate in multiple languages.

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

Score: (maximum score = 30)
IV. **ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY** 10 points

The applicant’s organizational capacity to conduct in-depth qualitative evaluations including providing resources and support for the recruitment, training and management of a team of field staff, with particular experience conducting observations and interviews, and quality control activities associated with multi-site studies. This criterion reflects the need to have adequate capacity – both human and financial – to do this kind of study. Financial capacity will be determined through a review of the applicant’s proposed budget, statement of financial position and other relevant documents if required.

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

**Score:** (maximum score = 10)
V. **BUDGET**  

Applicants submitting proposals must develop budgets that are in line with common business practices. 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, number 9);

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

d. An awareness of the realities of fixed-price budgeting reflected in an appropriate financial accommodation of risk, particularly related to protracted revisions and delayed start dates;

e. A total annual budget that does not exceed $750,000. It is expected that applicants’ budgets will be clearly justified in the budget narrative and will be appropriate to the work proposed.

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

**Score:**  \( \text{(maximum score} = 10) \)