

RFP #2026-045: Peer Advocate and Peer Supervision Training

Proposal Rating Worksheet

Proposer: Second Chance Opportunities

	Weight	Reviewer 1		Reviewer 2		Reviewer 3		Reviewer 4	
		Rate	Score	Rate	Score	Rate	Score	Rate	Score
Criterion #1	20%	4	0.8	5	1	4.5	0.9	5	1
Criterion #2	60%	4	2.4	5	3	4.5	2.7	5	3
Criterion #3	10%	5	0.5	4	0.4	4	0.4	5	0.5
Criterion #4	10%	3	0.3	4	0.4	3	0.3	4	0.4
TOTALS:			4		4.8		4.3		4.9

SCO

Criterion 1 scored 4 it appears lacks experience with scholarships for individuals needing financial support; Highlighted most of individuals they prepare for work readiness.

Very thorough, good local connections.

Criterion 2: Able to start immediately. The plan has identified strict guidelines SCO doesn't train individuals who are not workforce-ready. Appears limit population as some individuals might be ready to train and at the time of training aren't working etc.

Experience is appropriate, plan is well organized, cost is appropriate. SCO seems to not have a consistante training delivery.

NOTES:

SCO

Criterion 3: Excellent budget breakdown

Criterion 4: I didn't see much identified in the plan about performance measures. It appears the overall plan proposed lacks this identified section.

Reviewer 5	
Rate	Score
5	1
3	1.8
5	0.5
2	0.2
	3.5

4.3

SCO

I found this proposal to be lacking in one of the most important areas- recruitment strategies for marginalized communities. The main purpose of the program is to help diversify the peer recovery workforce, and I found that to be lacking here. This proposal sounds similar to standard peer recovery programs. It did not read as if this was targeted for marginalized communities, and that is why the plan description got a lower score.

Performance measures are poorly outlined. The proposer states the bare minimum for what they will be tracking, but includes no plan on how they will.

**RFP #2026-045: Peer Advocate and Peer Supervision Training
 Proposal Rating Worksheet**

Proposer: Healthy Capital District

	Weight	Reviewer 1		Reviewer 2		Revie
		Rate	Score	Rate	Score	Rate
Criterion #1	20%	4	0.8	5	1	4.5
Criterion #2	60%	4	2.4	5	3	5
Criterion #3	10%	5	0.5	4	0.4	5
Criterion #4	10%	5	0.5	5	0.5	4.5
TOTALS:			4.2		4.9	

NOTES: _____

Criterion 1: Strong experience although comparing has minimal staffing; covers all four required areas

Very thorough, good experience. Would be a solid partner

Criterion 2: Proposal extensive and addresses most areas; However unlike other proposal it doesn't offer a full time virtual program which can connect all individuals regardless of work, home care, health care needs population

Criterion 3: Budget very
detailed and specific

Criterion 4:
Performance indicators
where concise, precise

Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4		Reviewer 5	
Score	Rate	Score	Rate	Score
0.9	5	1	5	1
3	5	3	5	3
0.5	5	0.5	5	0.5
0.45	5	0.5	5	0.5
4.85		5		5

4.79

HCD is very experienced, the plan is very well thought of, cost is appropriate, and there history shows excelt performance.

I love this organizations' focus on lived experience being at the center of their program. There is a unique type of expertise individuals who've lived through recovery bring to the table. I particularly like their specialized certification in Criminal Justice Support Recovery.

Has a robust outreach plan. Going into low-income housing sites and working with faith-based organizations are great recruitment strategies.

The budget was very detailed, but I would have liked for it to be broken down by each year instead of the total costs for the full two years.

**RFP #2026-045: Peer Advocate and Peer Supervision Training
 Proposal Rating Worksheet**

Proposer: Recovery Coach University

	Weight	Reviewer 1		Reviewer 2		Review
		Rate	Score	Rate	Score	Rate
Criterion #1	20%	5	1	3	0.6	4.5
Criterion #2	60%	5	3	4	2.4	5
Criterion #3	10%	5	0.5	5	0.5	4.5
Criterion #4	10%	5	0.5	4	0.4	4.5
TOTALS:			5		3.9	

NOTES: _____

Criterion 1: Extensive staffing patterns; Has numerous staff with tons of experience; able to train and reach individuals who are unable to participate in person
 virtual model instead of in person. Some of the plan description sounds vague/general. I have questions about local recruitment

Criterion 2: Has a detailed proposal with a concrete plan that address all require activities; able to implement immediately

Criterion 3: The budget is detailed and appear appropriate

Criterion 4: Has a clear specific and measurable performance indicators.

wer 3	Reviewer 4		Reviewer 5	
Score	Rate	Score	Rate	Score
0.9	5	1	5	1
3	3	1.8	4	2.4
0.45	5	0.5	5	0.5
0.45	5	0.5	5	0.5
4.8		3.8		4.4

4.38

Experience is good,
 Plan is well thoughtof,
 but local seems to be a
 better option for this
 kind of training so it can
 be done in person.

There are clear bennifits
 of in person training,
 such as more interactive
 activities that keep
 studentrs invoved and
 intrested in class. Cost
 is appropriate. The
 history of performance
 is appropriate.

I would have loved to
 see a better
 recruitment/outreach
 strategy to target
 marginalized
 individuals.