

OAA TITLE III-C(1) CONGREGATE MEALS – REVIEWER SCORE SHEET

Bidder Name: _____

Reviewer Name: _____

Date: _____

Reviewers shall assign a raw score from 0–5 for each evaluation category. The raw score will be converted to a weighted score by dividing the raw score by 5 and multiplying by the maximum points available for that category. The final proposal score is the sum of all weighted category scores.

SCORING SCALE

- 0 = Not addressed / Non-responsive
- 1 = Poor – Significant deficiencies
- 2 = Fair – Partially meets requirements
- 3 = Acceptable – Meets minimum requirements
- 4 = Good – Exceeds requirements
- 5 = Excellent – Fully exceeds requirements

Reviewers must score each criterion independently.

Comments are required for any score of 0–2 and strongly encouraged for all scores.

ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (15 POINTS)

The criteria listed below are provided to guide the reviewer's assessment and comments.

Reviewers shall consider all required elements together and assign a single raw score (0–5) for the section as a whole based on the overall strength of the response.

Criterion	Reviewer Comments
Legal name, address, and contact information provided	
Experience providing Congregate Meals or comparable services	

Organizational qualifications and service standards	
Qualifications of key personnel	
Staffing structure and organizational capacity	
Authorized signers clearly identified	

Section Raw Score (0-5): _____ Section Weighted Score (Max 15): _____ (raw score divided by 5 then multiplied by max points)

SERVICE DELIVERY PLAN (20 POINTS)

The criteria listed below are provided to guide the reviewer's assessment and comments.

Reviewers shall consider all required elements together and assign a single raw score (0-5) for the section as a whole based on the overall strength of the response.

Criterion	Reviewer Comments
Meal service operations and service days	
Ability to operate all JAAA-designated meal sites	
Food preparation method and logistics	
Menu planning, dietitian involvement, and participant input	
Participant management and service continuity	

Identification and reporting of unserved/underserved demand	
Holiday schedules and service interruption procedures	

Section Raw Score (0–5): _____ Section Weighted Score (Max 20): _____ (raw score divided by 5 then multiplied by max points)

ELIGIBILITY, REGISTRATION, AND CLIENT RIGHTS (15 POINTS)

The criteria listed below are provided to guide the reviewer's assessment and comments.

Reviewers shall consider all required elements together and assign a single raw score (0–5) for the section as a whole based on the overall strength of the response.

Criterion	Reviewer Comments
Uniform Program Registration (UPR) compliance	
UPR timeliness, renewal, and accuracy	
Grievance procedures and staff training	
Protection of client rights	

Section Raw Score (0–5): _____ Section Weighted Score (Max 15): _____ (raw score divided by 5 then multiplied by max points)

OUTREACH AND NUTRITION EDUCATION (10 POINTS)

The criteria listed below are provided to guide the reviewer's assessment and comments.

Reviewers shall consider all required elements together and assign a single raw score (0–5) for the section as a whole based on the overall strength of the response.

Criterion	Reviewer Comments
Outreach to populations with greatest economic and social need	

Nutrition education activities and documentation	
--	--

Section Raw Score (0-5): _____ Section Weighted Score (Max 10): _____ (raw score divided by 5 then multiplied by max points)

DATA MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING (10 POINTS)

The criteria listed below are provided to guide the reviewer's assessment and comments.

Reviewers shall consider all required elements together and assign a single raw score (0-5) for the section as a whole based on the overall strength of the response.

Criterion	Reviewer Comments
KAMIS data entry accuracy and timeliness	
Monthly program and financial reporting	
Tracking and reporting Congregate Meal units	
Internal data quality controls	

Section Raw Score (0-5): _____ Section Weighted Score (Max 10): _____ (raw score divided by 5 then multiplied by max points)

COORDINATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE (10 POINTS)

The criteria listed below are provided to guide the reviewer's assessment and comments.

Reviewers shall consider all required elements together and assign a single raw score (0-5) for the section as a whole based on the overall strength of the response.

Criterion	Reviewer Comments
Coordination with JAAA and community partners	
Quality assurance and monitoring processes	
Customer satisfaction survey process and use of results	

Congregate Nutrition Advisory Group structure and use	
--	--

Section Raw Score (0-5): _____ Section Weighted Score (Max 10): _____ (raw score divided by 5 then multiplied by max points)

BUDGET AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT (20 POINTS)

The criteria listed below are provided to guide the reviewer's assessment and comments.

Reviewers shall consider all required elements together and assign a single raw score (0-5) for the section as a whole based on the overall strength of the response.

Criterion	Reviewer Comments
Financial attachments complete and accurate	
Cost per unit calculation	
Non-federal match sources and documentation	
Program income procedures	
Financial stability and internal controls	

Section Raw Score (0-5): _____ Section Weighted Score (Max 20): _____ (raw score divided by 5 then multiplied by max points)

TOTAL SCORE

Category	Points
Organizational Capacity	_____ / 15
Service Delivery Plan	_____ / 20
Eligibility, Registration & Client Rights	_____ / 15
Outreach and Nutrition Education	_____ / 10
Data Management & Reporting	_____ / 10

Category	Points
Coordination and Quality Assurance	____ / 10
Budget & Financial Management	____ / 20
TOTAL SCORE	____ / 100

ADDITIONAL REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer Recommendation

Recommend for Award Recommend with Conditions Do Not Recommend

Summary Comments / Conditions (if any):

REVIEWER CERTIFICATION

By signing below, I certify that I have reviewed and scored this proposal independently, objectively, and in accordance with the evaluation criteria and scoring methodology published in the Request for Proposal. I affirm that I have no actual, perceived, or potential conflict of interest with the proposer and that my scoring reflects my independent judgment.

Reviewer Name (Printed): _____

Reviewer Signature: _____

Date: _____

OAA TITLE III-C(1) CONGREGATE MEALS

REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROPOSAL SCORING

Purpose

These instructions guide reviewers in evaluating proposals submitted in response to the OAA Title III-C(1) Congregate Meals RFP. Scores must be based solely on the content provided in each proposal and must align with the evaluation criteria and point values established in the RFP.

1. General Scoring Guidance

- Reviewers must read the entire proposal before assigning scores.
 - Scores must reflect:
 - Responsiveness to Section 6 – Proposal Submission Requirements
 - Alignment with Section 3 – Scope of Services
 - Demonstrated capacity to meet KDADS Field Support Manual (FSM) and Older Americans Act (OAA) requirements.
 - Do not assume compliance or capacity if it is not clearly described.
 - All scoring must be supported by written reviewer comments.
-

2. Scoring Scale

Each criterion is scored using the following 0–5 scale, then multiplied by the assigned weight for that section:

Score Description

- | | |
|----------|---|
| 5 | Excellent – Fully addresses all requirements with strong detail and clarity |
| 4 | Good – Addresses requirements with minor gaps or limited detail |
| 3 | Adequate – Addresses requirements at a basic level |
| 2 | Limited – Partially addresses requirements; notable gaps |
| 1 | Poor – Minimally addresses requirements |
| 0 | Non-responsive – Does not address the requirement |
-

3. Using the Score Sheet Tables

- Each section of the score sheet contains:
 - Required elements to be reviewed
 - Maximum points available
 - Score entry
 - Reviewer comments field
- Reviewers must:

- Enter a numeric score for each section
 - Provide comments explaining the score
 - Comments should reference specific strengths or deficiencies in the proposal.
 - Reviewers shall assign a raw score from 0–5 for each evaluation category. The raw score will be converted to a weighted score by dividing the raw score by 5 and multiplying by the maximum points available for that category. The final proposal score is the sum of all weighted category scores.
-

4. Key Evaluation Notes by Section

Organizational Capacity

Evaluate staffing, volunteer support, organizational structure, and experience delivering congregate nutrition services.

Service Delivery Plan

Evaluate:

- Meal service operations
- Site management staffing
- Menu planning and nutrition standards
- Service continuity and fiscal year coverage
- Identification and reporting of unserved/underserved demand (not a home-delivered waitlist)

Eligibility, Registration, and Client Rights

Evaluate procedures for:

- Uniform Program Registration (UPR)
- Client rights notification
- Grievance handling and documentation

Outreach and Nutrition Education

Evaluate outreach to individuals with greatest economic and social need and the quality of nutrition education activities.

Data Management and Reporting

Evaluate KAMIS data entry practices, reporting timeliness, and internal data quality controls.

Coordination and Quality Assurance

Evaluate coordination with JAAA, customer satisfaction surveys, corrective action processes, and the Congregate Nutrition Advisory Group.

Budget and Financial Management

Evaluate:

- Financial stability and controls
 - Funding sources and sustainability
 - Fund management practices ensuring full-year service
 - Match documentation and program income handling
-

5. Weighted Scoring and Totals

- Reviewers shall assign a raw score from 0–5 for each evaluation category. The raw score will be converted to a weighted score by dividing the raw score by 5 and multiplying by the maximum points available for that category. The final proposal score is the sum of all weighted category scores.
- Each section has a maximum weighted point value.
- Section scores are totaled to determine the final proposal score.
- Reviewers must verify:
 - All sections are scored
 - Totals are calculated correctly

6. Reviewer Certification

Each reviewer must complete the Reviewer Certification and Signature section attesting that:

- The proposal was reviewed objectively
- Scores were based solely on proposal content
- No conflict of interest exists

Unsigned score sheets may be considered incomplete.

7. Important Reminders

- Do not compare proposals to each other — score each independently.
 - Do not adjust scoring criteria or point values.
 - Do not request or consider information not included in the proposal.
 - All score sheets are subject to audit and open records review.
-

Worked Scoring Example — OAA Title III-C(1) Congregate Meals

Example Section: Service Delivery Plan (20 Points Maximum)

Scenario:

The proposer clearly describes how congregate meals will be provided five days per week at all JAAA-designated sites, including food preparation methods, transportation logistics, menu planning with a registered dietitian, and holiday closures. The proposal also explains how meal service levels and funding will be managed to ensure OAA-funded meals are available for the full contract period.

However:

- The description of how unserved or underserved demand (e.g., transportation barriers or communities without an operating congregate site) will be identified and reported is brief.
- Procedures for unplanned service interruptions are mentioned but lack detail.

Step 1: Assign Raw Score (0–5 Scale)

Score Consideration	Assessment
Meal service operations	Fully addressed
Site operations & staffing	Adequately addressed
Menu planning & certification	Fully addressed
Service continuity (full fiscal year)	Addressed
Unserved/underserved demand reporting	Limited detail
Service interruption procedures	Limited detail

Raw Score Assigned: 4 out of 5

Step 2: Apply Section Weight

- Section Weight: 20 points
- Raw Score: 4 / 5

Calculated Score:

$$(4 \div 5) \times 20 = 16 \text{ points}$$

Step 3: Document Reviewer Comments

Example Reviewer Comments:

The proposal provides a clear and feasible plan for delivering Congregate Meals at all designated sites, including menu planning, food preparation, and service continuity. The proposer demonstrates the ability to manage OAA-funded meals for the full contract period. Additional detail is needed regarding procedures for identifying and reporting unserved or underserved demand and for managing unplanned service interruptions.

Final Score for This Section:

16 / 20 points

Reviewer Tip

When scoring Congregate Meals proposals:

- Focus on service continuity, site operations, and fiscal year coverage.
- Do not score congregate waitlist reporting as a home-delivered meals waitlist.
- Look for clear identification of access barriers and unmet demand, consistent with KDADS Area Plan expectations.