PHASE 1 - CRITERIA AND THEIR WEIGHTS								
	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	1
Α	Α	C	Α	Е				
А	1	2	3	3				
	В	С	С	Е				
	В	1	2	3				
		С	D	Е				
		С	3	3				
			D	D				
			D	3				
				Е				
				Е				

 Relative weight assigned to each criterion is based on our comparison of each criterion against all others using the following values.

Examples using a 7- and 8-meml

1 = Disagreement among committee 4-3 4-4

2 = Majority of committee in agreement 5-2 5-3 or 6-2 3 = Unanimous or almost unanimous agreement 6-1 or 7-0 7-1 or 8-0

A point value of one is included as the initial basic weight for all Evaluation Criteria prior to beginning the analysis. In addition, each criterion's total points are added.

Evaluation Criteria are listed in no particular order. The weighting process will provide relative val

Evaluation Criteria

Actual Criteria are developed by Owner for the specific project to I

- A. Agency has demonstrated successful outcomes with past service delivery
- B. Reasonable cost per unit of service
- C. Staff/Agency well-qualified to deliver service
- D. Quality of measures being used to track effectiveness
- E. Is it a collaborative effort? (reward collaborative effort)

EVALUATION MATRIX FOR NONPROFIT RFP

			PHASE 2 - APPLICATIONS					
	WEIGHT		Application 1		Application 2		Application 3	
J	Base weight of "1"		RAW	FINAL	RAW	FINAL	RAW	FINAL
	plus actu	ual points						
	A =	5		0		0		0
	B =	1		0		0		0
	C =	6		0		0		0
	D =	7		0		0		0
	E =	10		0		0		0
	Totals			0		0		0

2.	Needs/Interests are rated by evaluating each need against the Eva
	Raw score resulting from this evaluation based on the following s

ber committee

0=No

1=Maybe/Somewhat

2=Yes

۱.	_	_	
ш	л		

be evaluated.	
---------------	--

Applic	ation 4	Application 5			
RAW	RAW FINAL		FINAL		
	0		0		
	0		0		
	0		0		
	0		0		
	0		0		
	0		0		

luation Criteria. cale.