Applicant and Project Name: Click or tap here to enter text.

Rater Name: Click or tap here to enter text. Date Reviewed: Click or tap to enter a date.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Quality Requirements** |  | | | |
| All new and bonus projects must pass threshold requirements before being considered for funding on the merit of the project. Threshold requirements are pass/fail rather than scored. | Maximum Score Possible | | 150 | |
| Total Project Score | | **ENTER TOTAL** | |
| Weighted Rating Score **(Total Project Score / Maximum Score Possible x 100)** | | **ENTER TOTAL** | |
| **Section I: Design of Housing and Supportive Services** | | Possible Points: **25** | | Section Score:  **ENTER TOTAL** |
| 1.a. Description of project: Does it meet the needs of the community and persons experiencing homelessness?  Score according to how well the project design demonstrates the following criteria (3 pts = Well-demonstrated, 2 pts = Fairly-demonstrated, 1 pt = Poorly-demonstrated; 0 pts = Not at all demonstrated): | | | | |
| Understanding of the needs of the target population to be served | | 3 | | Enter Score |
| Type, scale, and location of housing fits the needs of those  to be served | | 3 | | Enter Score |
| Type and scale of supportive services, regardless of funding source | | 3 | | Enter Score |
| How assistance in obtaining mainstream benefits is provided | | 3 | | Enter Score |
| Performance measures that meet or exceed HUD HEARTH or CoC benchmarks | | 3 | | Enter Score |
| 1.b. Description of the plan to assist participants in securing and maintaining PH that is safe, affordable, accessible, and acceptable to their needs.  (5 pts = Extensive Plan; 3 pts = Adequate Plan;  1 pt = Poor Plan; 0 pts = No plan) | | 5 | | Enter Score |
| 1.c. Description of how participants will be assisted to rapidly increase employment and/or income to maximize their ability to live independently.  (5 pts = Extensive Plan; 3 pts = Adequate Plan;  1 pt = Poor Plan; 0 pts = No plan) | | 5 | | Enter Score |
| **Section II: Experience** | | Possible Points: **40** | | Section Score:  **ENTER TOTAL** |
| 2. Experience of the applicant (and any sub-recipients) in working with the proposed population and in providing housing similar to that proposed in the application.  (15 pts = Extensive Experience; 10 pts = Moderate Experience; 5 pts = Limited Experience; 0 pts = No Experience) | | 15 | | Enter Score |
| 3. Description of experience with utilizing a Housing First approach.  Score given based on how project design incorporates a complete description of the following criteria (2 pts = Complete description; 1 pt = Incomplete description; 0 pts = No description) (**Options continue on next page**): | | | | |
| Eligibility criteria | | 2 | | Enter Score |
| Process for accepting new participants | | 2 | | Enter Score |
| Process and criteria for exiting participants | | 2 | | Enter Score |
| Demonstration that there are no preconditions to entry (substance use, income, criminal records, marital status, familial status, actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity) | | 2 | | Enter Score |
| How project addresses situations that may jeopardize housing or project assistance to ensure that project participation is terminated only in most severe cases | | 2 | | Enter Score |
| 4. Description of applicant experience in utilizing federal funds. | | | | |
| Score according to how well the applicant can demonstrate past proficiency in utilizing federal funds.  (5 pts = Extensive Past Proficiency; 3 pts = Moderate Past Proficiency;  1 pt = Limited Past Proficiency; 0 pts = No Past Proficiency) | | 5 | | Enter Score |
| 5. Description of the determination of type, amount, and duration of rental assistance for participants.  Score according to how well the response describes the use of the following philosophies and plans to prevent homelessness: | | | | |
| Use of the progressive engagement philosophy  (2 = Complete description; 1 = Incomplete description; 0 = No description) | | 2 | | Enter Score |
| Use of the strength-based philosophy  (2 = Complete description; 1 = Incomplete description; 0 = No description) | | 2 | | Enter Score |
| Plans to prevent persons from exiting into homelessness  (3 = Well-described plan; 2 = Fairly-described plan;  1 = Poorly-described plan; 0 = No plan described) | | 3 | | Enter Score |
| Plans to prevent persons from becoming homeless post-project exit  (3 = Well-described plan; 2 = Fairly-described plan;  1 = Poorly-described plan; 0 = No plan described) | | 3 | | Enter Score |
| **Section III: Project Effectiveness** | | Possible Points: **25** | | Section Score:  **ENTER TOTAL** |
| 6. Does the project commit to taking all referrals through the community’s Coordinated Entry process? **(Pass/Fail)** | | 5/0 | | Enter Score |
| 7. What would be the prioritization process for households referred to this project? How will it be determined who is most vulnerable and the best fit for any referrals to this project? Provide detail from policy established by the CoC. | | | | |
| Score according to how well the applicant can demonstrate understanding of prioritization and pairing households based on project eligibility.  (5 pts = Extensive Process; 3 pts = Adequate Process;  1 pt = Poor Process; 0 pts = No Process) | | 5 | | Enter Score |
| 8. Will all participating households served in this project be recorded in HMIS or an equivalent database for domestic violence, in accordance with the community’s Data Quality Standards? **(Pass/Fail)** | | 5/0 | | Enter Score |
| 9. Description of a plan for rapid implementation of the project, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing the first participant. Provide a detailed schedule of proposed activities for 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days after grant award. **(CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE!)** | | | | |
| Score according to how extensive the project plan is  (5 pts = Extensive Plan; 3 pts = Adequate Plan;  1 pt = Poor Plan; 0 pts = No Plan) | | 5 | | Enter Score |
| Score according to how detailed the schedules for proposed activities are  (5 pts = Very Detailed; 3 pts = Moderately Detailed;  1 pt = Poorly Detailed; 0 pts = No Details) | | 5 | | Enter Score |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section IV: Organizational Capacity** | Possible Points: **20** | Section Score:  **ENTER TOTAL** |
| 10. Describe agency key staff positions and qualifications of individuals who will carry out the project | | |
| Score according to how detailed key staff descriptions are  (5 pts = Very Detailed; 3 pts = Moderately Detailed;  1 pt = Poorly Detailed; 0 pts = No Details) | 5 | Enter Score |
| Score according to how qualified staff are to executive project  (5 pts = Very Qualified; 3 pts = Moderately Qualified;  1 pt = Poorly Qualified; 0 pts = Not at all qualified) | 5 | Enter Score |
| 11. Describe the agency’s financial management system, including financial reporting, record keeping, accounting systems, payment procedures, procurement processes, and audit requirements. | | |
| Score based on completeness of financial management system with respect to each identified component  (10 pts = Complete System; 5 pts = Partially-Complete System; 0 pts = None of financial management system components are described) | 10 | Enter Score |
| **Section V: Financial Information** | Possible Points: **40** | Section Score:  **ENTER TOTAL** |
| 12. Do project costs appear reasonable when compared to project costs of similar project types?  (5 pts = Very Reasonable; 3 pts = Somewhat Reasonable; 1 pt = Not Reasonable; 0 pts = Completely Unreasonable) | 5 | Enter Score |
| 13. Audit | | |
| a. Most recent audit found no exceptions to standard practices **(Pass/Fail)** | 3/0 | Enter Score |
| b. Most recent audit identified agency as “low risk” **(Pass/Fail)** | 3/0 | Enter Score |
| c. Most recent audit indicates no findings **(Pass/Fail)** | 4/0 | Enter Score |
| 14. Documented match amount **(Pass/Fail)** | 5/0 | Enter Score |
| 15. Budgeted costs are reasonable, allocable, and allowable. | | |
| Reasonable (6 pts = Very Reasonable; 3 pts = Somewhat Reasonable; 1 pt = Not Reasonable; 0 pts = Completely Unreasonable) | 6 | Enter Score |
| Allocable (6 pts= All costs are allocable; 3 pts = Costs are 50/50 allocable and not allocable; 0 pts = Costs are not at all allocable) | 6 | Enter Score |
| Allowable (8 pts = All costs are allowable; 4 pts = Costs are 50/50 allowable and not-allowable; 0 pts = Costs are not at all allowable) | 8 | Enter Score |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Completion of Application** | Possible Points: **0**  Deductions: **-15** | Section Score:  **ENTER TOTAL** |
| Are all required attachments provided? | | |
| Yes | 0 | Enter Score |
| No | -5 |
| Is the application complete and accurate? | | |
| Yes | 0 | Enter Score |
| No | -5 |
| Was the application submitted by the deadline? | | |
| Yes | 0 | Enter Score |
| No | -5 |