

PROPOSAL REVIEW EVALUATION

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR SENIOR SERVICES

Aging Ahead

CONTRACT PERIOD JULY 1, 2026 - JUNE 30, 2027

PROPOSAL CHECK LIST

Failure to include any of the following items may result in the proposal being considered non-responsive.

- Accurate Budget
- Identification of non-federal match budget items with an asterisk (*)
- Identification of administrative costs with an "A"
- Signed assurances
- Copy of current insurance
- Demonstration of ability to meet requirements of the Americans With Disabilities Act
- Internal monitoring plan
- Provide a Certificate of Good Standing from the Missouri Secretary of State

PROPOSAL REVIEW EVALUATION

Name of Organization

Service to be Provided

Name of Reviewer

Date of Review

Total Score

SUMMARY

Maximum Points		Points Awarded
23	Criterion I Budget Summary and Detail	
23	Criterion II Provider Qualifications	
12	Criterion III Quality Assurance	
42	Criterion IV Service Delivery System	
	TOTAL POINTS AWARDED	

PROPOSAL REVIEW EVALUATION

Criterion I: Budget Summary and Detail 23 Points Maximum Score	Points Range	Points Awarded
<p>1. <u>Proposed <i>Aging Ahead</i> Unit Cost</u> (Requires comparison if more than one bid is submitted for this service)</p> <p>Maximum points of 19 are awarded to the lowest bidder. Remaining bidders are awarded points on a sliding scale determined as follows: (can be compared to <i>Aging Ahead</i> direct services)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">$\frac{\text{Lowest Bid} \div 19 = \text{Points Awarded}}{\text{Bid Price}}$</p>	0-19	
2. <u>Budget Detail and Preparation (Including)</u>		
Contributions 15%	Yes No	$\frac{1}{0}$
Other Cash	Yes No	$\frac{1}{0}$
Administration Cost 12% or less	Yes No	$\frac{1}{0}$
Non-Federal Match 15%	Yes No	$\frac{1}{0}$
TOTAL		

Please comment on the scores in this section:

PROPOSAL REVIEW EVALUATION

Criterion II: Provider Qualifications 23 Points Maximum		Points Range	Points Awarded
1.	Status Not for profit For Profit	<u>3</u> <u>0</u>	
2.	Years in Business More than 5 years 2 to 5 years Less than 2 years	<u>5</u> <u>3</u> <u>0</u>	
3.	Successful Contracts No major write-ups Maximum of one major write-up Two or more major write-ups	<u>5</u> <u>3</u> <u>0</u>	
4.	Positive References 3 positive references 1 or 2 positive references 0 positive references	<u>5</u> <u>3</u> <u>0</u>	
5.	Number of Funders More than 5 funders 2 to 5 funders Only 1 funder	<u>5</u> <u>3</u> <u>0</u>	

Please comment on the scores in this section.

PROPOSAL REVIEW EVALUATION

Criterion III: Quality Assurance 12 Points Maximum	Points Range	Points Awarded
1. Fiscal and program audit attached	<u>0-2</u>	
2. Internal monitoring form/plan attached	<u>0-10</u>	
TOTAL		

Please comment on the scores in this section.

PROPOSAL REVIEW EVALUATION

Criterion IV: Specifications for Service Delivery 42 Points Maximum Score	Points Range	Points Awarded
1. Plan to meet service specifications adequately (Please address the scoring of this item in your comments)	<u>0-18</u>	
2. Evaluation Plan for staff	<u>0-2</u>	
3. Staff Training	<u>0-4</u>	
4. Volunteer and Training Plans	<u>0-2</u>	
5. Secure Record Keeping/Confidentiality	<u>0-2</u>	
6. Contribution Opportunity & Written Method for collecting and recording contributions	<u>0-2</u>	
7. Grievance and Complaint Procedure	<u>0-2</u>	
8. Denial of Services	<u>0-2</u>	
9. Inclement Weather Policy	<u>0-2</u>	
10. Local Citizen Input & Outreach Plan	<u>0-2</u>	
11. Plan for reach low-income minority persons	<u>0-2</u>	
12. Drug Free Work Environment Policy	<u>0-2</u>	
TOTAL		

Please comment on the scores in this section.