2018 OR-505 BOS CoC Review and Ranking
Scoring Criteria
New DV Bonus Projects

Project**:**   Score**:**

Reviewer**:**

Project application must include partnership with local/regional DV provider or indicate clear expertise with providing services to DV victims and survivors.

Project applicant must confirm ability to sub-contract, potentially across multiple jurisdictions.

Summary of Factors	2018 Points
Threshold Requirements	
1. Project's Work Consistent with Community Needs	**15**
2. Project Quality, Appropriateness, and Readiness	**35**
3. Agency/Collaborative Capacity	**45**
4. HMIS Participation	**10**
Total	**105**

I.   Threshold Requirements

Threshold Criteria • These factors are required, but not scored. If the project indicates "no" for any threshold criteria, it is ineligible for CoC funding.	**2018 Points**
HMIS Implementation: Projects are required to participate in HMIS, unless the project is a victim-service agency, serving survivors of domestic violence, or a legal services agency.	**N/A**
Coordinated Entry: Projects are required to participate in Coordinated Entry, when it is available for the project type.	**N/A**
Eligible Applicant: Applicants and sub-recipients (if any) are eligible to receive CoC funding, including: non-profit organizations, States, local governments, and instrumentalities of state and local governments.	**N/A**

Eligible New Project Type: each of the following types of projects are limited to a 1-year funding request and must follow the Housing First approach: • Rapid Re-housing (PH-RRH) projects. • Joint TH and PH-RRH component projects as defined in Section II.C.3.m of this NOFA. • SSO Projects for Coordinated Entry (SSO-CE) to implement policies, procedures, and practices that equip the CoC's coordinated entry to better meet the needs of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (e.g., to implement policies and procedures that are trauma-informed, client-centered or to better coordinate referrals between the CoC's coordinated entry and the victim service providers coordinated entry system where they are different). • CoC may apply to expand an existing renewal project in accordance with Section III.C.3.i of the NOFA, that is not dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that meet the definition of homeless in paragraph (4) of 24 CFR 578.3 to dedicate additional units, beds, persons served, or services provided to existing program participants to this population.	**N/A**

II.   Detail

1. **Project's Work Consistent with Community Needs: _15_ Points**

Factors:

1A: Renewable Activities	2018 Points
Extent to which the project utilizes grant funds for renewable activities (e.g., leasing rental subsidies, and housing operations) as opposed to non-renewable funds (e.g., acquisition, construction, and rehabilitation).	**5**

1B: Unmet Need	2018 Points

Extent to which the project addresses an unmet need by utilizing CoC/regional priorities as determined by data analyses and local input. *Top 5 identified gaps/needs as determined by local community; CAAs use CSBG '17-'19 MGA. PIT, other data-supported reporting.*	**10**

2. **Project Quality, Appropriateness, Readiness: 35 Points**

Consider overall design of the project in light of its outcome objectives and the CoC's goal that permanent housing programs for homeless people result in stable housing and increased income (through benefits or employment).

2A: Population Served	**2018 Points**
Population to be served is well-defined and eligible and will prioritize serving project participants with the highest need.	**5**

2B: Program Design	**2018 Points**
Program design includes provision of comprehensive/intensive case management and appropriate supportive services of the appropriate type, scale, and location to meet the needs of program participants (as well as transportation if necessary), using a Housing First model. Consider: • Is the project staffed appropriately to provide the services? • Is the staff trained to meet the needs of the target population? • Does the program include involvement of clients in designing and operating the program? • Is the program design intentionally inclusive of and accessible to all eligible clients? • Are links to other services described?	**10**

2C: Program Outcomes	**2018 Points**

Program outcomes are realistic but sufficiently challenging given project scale. Outcomes are measurable and appropriate to the population being served. Minimal project outcomes should include: • Percentage of formerly homeless individuals who remain housed in PH at the end of the operating year or exited to another PH is at least 90%. • Percentage of leavers that increase employment income from entry to exit is at least 20% for PSH and 38% for RRH. • Percentage of leavers that increase non-employment income from entry to exit is at least 54%. • The percent of adult leavers and stayers in all CoC-funded projects that have non-cash mainstream benefits is at least 80% for PSH and 51% for RRH.	**5**
2D: Housing	**2018 Points**
Housing where participants will reside is fully described and appropriate to the program design proposed. Consider: • Is the project staffed appropriately to operate the housing? • Is the staff trained to meet the needs of the population to be served? • Will the program be physically accessible to persons with disabilities?	**5**
2E: Policies and Procedures	**2018 Points**
Do the agencies (especially the lead agency)/does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all administrative requirements? Consider: • Does the agency have HEARTH-required policies/procedures in place? (Agencies to complete checklist as part of materials)	**5**
2F: Project Readiness	**2018 Points**

The project will be ready to start by HUD's statutory deadlines. Consider: • Regulatory obstacles such as tenant displacement or relocation, environmental or zoning issues anticipated.	**5**

3. Agency/Collaborative Capacity: 45 Points

3A: Past Performance	**2018 Points**
Have the agencies/has the agency submitting this application demonstrated – through past performance – the ability to successfully carry out the proposed work and have they/has it successfully served homeless people as a group? Consider: • The experience of the agency in handling a similar project (e.g., if the project will involve relocation of tenants, what experience does the agency have with relocation?). • If the agency has other CoC programs, has the agency left CoC project grant funds unspent in the past 3 years? Consider if the program is running at capacity and if the program receives leasing or rental assistance funding.	**15**

3B: Agency Experience	**2018 Points**
Do the agencies (especially the lead agency)/does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all grant audit, administrative, and reporting requirements? Consider: • Have they/has it successfully handled federal or other major grants of similar size without difficulty or problems in the past 5 years? • Any outstanding HUD findings or concerns and/or financial audit findings? • Has HUD instituted any sanctions on agency CoC grants, including – but not limited to – suspending disbursements (e.g., freezing LOCCS), requiring repayment of grant funds, or de- obligating grant funds due to performance issues? • To what extent has the program advised the Collaborative Applicant of outstanding HUD findings or concerns?	**10**

3C: Alignment with CoC Priorities This will be scored on the overall application, but programs can submit an essay answer demonstrating their CoC alignment.	2018 Points
Does the project and agency align and support CoC priorities including: • Performance goals • CoC participation	10

3D: Alignment with Housing First Principles Programs may submit an essay response for consideration if fidelity of Housing First principles is less than 100%.	2018 Points
Does the project incorporate Housing First principles into its operations including prioritization of most vulnerable participants; low or no entry barriers; voluntary participation in support services. • Has the project received HUD's approval during monitoring (vs. finding showing not full HF)? • Is the project moving toward HF but not quite there? • Is the project NOT operating HF?	5 3 0

3E: Alignment with Coordinated Entry Standards? Programs may submit an essay response if fidelity to Coordinated Entry standards is less than 100%. No Coordinated Entry=No Score.	2018 Points
Does the project incorporate Coordinated Entry standards into its operations, including: • Is the project fully integrating CE and ready for next steps? • Is the project moving toward CE but not quite there? • Is the project NOT operating CE?	5 3 0

4. **HMIS Participation: 10 Points**

- Does the application indicate clearly that the agency intends to participate in HMIS in the event the project is funded?
- If the agency has other programs, do they demonstrate HMIS participation? Consider:
  - Percentage of null/missing, "don't know," or "refused" data
  - The percentage of clients with known income and benefits