



FY2021 HUD COC PROGRAM COMPETITION NEW/BONUS PROJECT SCORECARD

Applicant and Project Name: _____

Rater Name: _____ Date Reviewed: _____

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. Does the project meet all eligibility and quality threshold requirements? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Maximum Score Possible	162
	Total Project Score	
	Weighted Rating Score (Total Project Score / Maximum Score Possible x 100)	
Section I: Project Overview		Possible Points: 30
Section Score:		
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):		
The project serves a HUD-defined high priority population	3	
Understanding of the needs of the focus population to be served	3	
Type, scale, and location of housing fits the needs of those to be served	3	
Type and scale of supportive services, regardless of funding source	3	
How assistance in obtaining mainstream benefits is provided	3	
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	
1.c. Description of how participants will be assisted to obtain the benefits of mainstream health, social, and employment programs for which they are eligible to apply to maximize their ability to live independently. (5 pts = Extensive Plan; 3 pts = Adequate Plan; 1 pt = Poor Plan; 0 pts = No plan)	5	
2. Describe how the project aligns with the objectives and goals outlined in the CoC Compass . (5 pts = Thorough Alignment; 3 pts = Some Alignment; 1 pt = Little Alignment; 0 pts = No Details)	5	

Section II: Experience		Possible Points: 42	Section Score:
3. 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	
4. 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)			
Eligibility criteria		2	
Process for accepting new participants		2	
Process and criteria for exiting participants		2	
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	
How project addresses situations that may jeopardize housing or project assistance to ensure that project participation is terminated only in most severe cases		2	
5. 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	
6. 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)		3	
Use of the strength-based philosophy (2 = Complete description; 1 = Incomplete description; 0 = No description)		3	
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	
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	

Section III: Project Effectiveness		Possible Points: 30	Section 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	

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	
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.		
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	
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	
10. Describe the training applicant and sub-applicant staff have undergone or will undergo as well as agency policies or procedures related to diversity, equity, and inclusion as it pertains to service provision.		
Score according to the variety and range of training opportunities (5 pts = Numerous Opportunities; 3 pts = Some Varied Opportunities; 1 pt = Few Opportunities; 0 pts = No Details)	5	
Score according to how detailed the policies and procedures are (5 pts = Very Detailed Policies; 3 pts = Moderately Detailed Policies; 1 pt = Poorly Detailed Policies; 0 pts = No Details)	5	

Section IV: Organizational Capacity	Possible Points: 20	Section Score:
11. 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	
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	
12. 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	
Section V: Project Budget	Possible Points: 40	Section Score:
13. 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	
14. Audit		
a. Most recent audit found no exceptions to standard practices (Pass/Fail)	3/0	
b. Most recent audit identified agency as "low risk" (Pass/Fail)	3/0	
c. Most recent audit indicates no findings (Pass/Fail)	4/0	
15. Documented match amount (Pass/Fail)	5/0	

16. 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	
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	
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	

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



FY2021 HUD COC PROGRAM COMPETITION RENEWAL PROJECT SCORECARD

Applicant and Project Name: _____

Rater Name: _____

Date Reviewed: _____

Project Quality Requirements		
Renewal projects must ensure they continue to meet HUD thresholds for funding.	Maximum Score Possible	145
	Total Project Score	
	Weighted Rating Score (Total Project Score / Maximum Score Possible x 100)	

Please note at the numbered questions on the application correspond with the numbered scoring areas below.

Section I: Project Effectiveness	Possible Points: 90	Section Score:
3. How many beds are dedicated/prioritized for priority population(s)?		
Veterans		
Chronically Homeless		
Families		
Youth		
Domestic Violence		
4a. Does the project qualify as low barrier? (Must meet all criteria listed in application.)		
Yes	4	
No	0	
4b. Does the project meet all Housing First criteria? (Must meet all criteria listed in application.)		
Yes	6	
No	0	
5. Does the project provide supportive service activities?		
4 activities provided	5	
2-3 activities provided	3	
1 activity provided	1	
0 activities provided	0	
6. Describe how the project aligns with the objectives and goals outlined in the CoC Compass.		
Not scored	Not scored	Not scored
7. Did the project take 100% of all referrals from Coordinated Entry in the past grant year?		
Yes	5	
No	0	
8. Describe the training applicant and sub-applicant staff have undergone or will undergo as well as agency policies or procedures related to diversity, equity, and inclusion as it pertains to service provision.		
Score according to the variety and range of training opportunities (5 pts = Numerous Opportunities; 3 pts = Some Varied Opportunities; 1 pt = Few Opportunities; 0 pts = No Details)	5	
Score according to how detailed the policies and procedures are (5 pts = Very Detailed Policies; 3 pts = Moderately Detailed Policies; 1 pt = Poorly Detailed Policies; 0 pts = No Details)	5	

Efficient Use of Funding:			
9. What is the project's utilization rate?			
	95% or higher	5	
	80%-94%	0	
	79% or lower	-5	
10. Percent of funding recaptured in last completed grant year			
	7% or less	5	
	8% or more	0	
11. Were drawdowns made at least quarterly?			
	Yes	5	
	No	0	
HMIS Participation (or alternate database for domestic violence projects)			
12. Percentage of APR Data Quality Elements (6a.-6d.) with 5% or less null or missing values			
	85% or greater	5	
	Less than 84%	0	
HUD Monitoring Findings			
13. Does the recipient have any HUD monitoring findings in any of the agency's projects? If yes, findings must be resolved or explained to the satisfaction of Funding Review for the application to meet standards.		Standard Met:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Impact on Homelessness			
14. Is this project the only CoC funded project with dedicated beds to a particular target population? (Answered based on all applications submitted for this NOFO.)			
	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Scored, Taken into consideration in a tie score situation
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Serving High Need Populations			
15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined as having zero income at Start/entry? (APR 18)			
PSH			
	80% or more	10	
	70%-79%	8	
	50%-69%	5	
	Less than 50%	0	
RRH & TH			
	50% or more	10	
	40%-49%	8	
	30%-39%	5	
	Less than 30%	0	
16. What percentage of participants met "hard to serve" criteria defined as having two or more physical or mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2)			
PSH			
	More than 50%	10	
	30%-49%	8	
	10%-29%	5	
	Less than 10%	0	
RRH & TH			
	More than 10%	10	
	5%-10%	5	
	Less Than 5%	0	

17. What percentage of the households served were chronically homeless? (APR Q26a.)			
PSH			
80% or more	10		
70%-79%	8		
50%-69%	5		
Less than 50%	0		
RRH & TH			
15% or more	10		
10%-14%	8		
5%-9%	5		
1%-4%	2		
Less than 1%	0		
18. What percentage of the households served were families experiencing homelessness? (APR Q8a.)			
PSH			
15% or more	10		
10%-14%	8		
5%-9%	5		
1%-4%	0		
RRH & TH			
More than 50%	10		
30%-49%	8		
10%-29%	5		
Less than 10%	2		
More than 50%	0		
Section II: Project Performance		Possible Points: 55	Section Score:
Performance Data			
19. Length of Stay			
PSH—Percentage of leavers that remained in project more than 180 days (APR 22a.1)			
95% and more	20		
85%-94%	15		
75%-84%	10		
65%-74%	5		
55%-64%	0		
RRH—Percentage of participants that took 60 days or less from project entry to lease up (APR 22C)			
80%-100%	20		
60%-79%	15		
40%-59%	10		
20%-39%	5		
0%-19%	0		
TH – Average length of project stay in days (APR 22b)			
180 or less	20		
181-270	15		
271-390	10		
391-728	5		
More than 728 days	0		

20. Exits to Permanent Housing			
PSH - Percent who remain in PH or move to positive housing destinations $(\frac{[APR23c+APR5a9]}{[APR5a1-APR23c]})$			
95% or higher	25		
90%-94%	20		
85%-89%	15		
80%-84%	10		
75%-79%	5		
Less than 75%	0		
RRH & TH - Percent who exit to positive housing destinations (APR 23c)			
95% or higher	25		
90%-94%	20		
85%-89%	15		
80%-84%	10		
75%-79%	5		
Less than 75%	0		
21. New or Increased Income and Earned Income			
a. PSH Project Stayers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.1)			
8% and higher	2.5		
5%-7%	1.5		
Less than 5%	0		
b. PSH Project Stayers: New or increased other (non-employment) income (APR 19a.1)			
50% and higher	2.5		
25%-49%	1.5		
Less than 25%	0		
c. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.2)			
8% and higher	2.5		
5%-7%	1.5		
Less than 5%	0		
c. RRH and TH Project Leavers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.2)			
30% and higher	5		
20%-29%	2.5		
Less than 20%	0		
d. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2)			
50% and higher	2.5		
25%-49%	1.5		
Less than 25%	0		
d. RRH and TH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2)			
10% and higher	5		
5%-9%	2.5		
Less than 5%	0		
Section III: Completion of Application		Possible Points: 0 Deductions: -20 Minimum: -10	Section Score:
Is the application complete and accurate?			
Yes	0		
No	-5		
Are all required attachments provided?			
Yes	0		
No	-5		
Was the application submitted by the deadline?			
Yes	0		
No	-10		



FY2021 HUD COC PROGRAM COMPETITION RENEWAL PROJECT SCORECARD

Applicant and Project Name: _____

Rater Name: _____

Date Reviewed: _____

Project Quality Requirements		
Renewal projects must ensure they continue to meet HUD thresholds for funding.	Maximum Score Possible	145
	Total Project Score	
	Weighted Rating Score (Total Project Score / Maximum Score Possible x 100)	

Please note at the numbered questions on the application correspond with the numbered scoring areas below.

Section I: Project Effectiveness	Possible Points: 90	Section Score:
3. How many beds are dedicated/prioritized for priority population(s)?		
Veterans		
Chronically Homeless		
Families		
Youth		
Domestic Violence		
4a. Does the project qualify as low barrier? (Must meet all criteria listed in application.)		
Yes	4	
No	0	
4b. Does the project meet all Housing First criteria? (Must meet all criteria listed in application.)		
Yes	6	
No	0	
5. Does the project provide supportive service activities?		
4 activities provided	5	
2-3 activities provided	3	
1 activity provided	1	
0 activities provided	0	
6. Describe how the project aligns with the objectives and goals outlined in the CoC Compass.		
Not scored	Not scored	Not scored
7. Did the project take 100% of all referrals from Coordinated Entry in the past grant year?		
Yes	5	
No	0	
8. Describe the training applicant and sub-applicant staff have undergone or will undergo as well as agency policies or procedures related to diversity, equity, and inclusion as it pertains to service provision.		
Score according to the variety and range of training opportunities (5 pts = Numerous Opportunities; 3 pts = Some Varied Opportunities; 1 pt = Few Opportunities; 0 pts = No Details)	5	
Score according to how detailed the policies and procedures are (5 pts = Very Detailed Policies; 3 pts = Moderately Detailed Policies; 1 pt = Poorly Detailed Policies; 0 pts = No Details)	5	

Efficient Use of Funding:			
9. What is the project's utilization rate?			
	95% or higher	5	
	80%-94%	0	
	79% or lower	-5	
10. Percent of funding recaptured in last completed grant year			
	7% or less	5	
	8% or more	0	
11. Were drawdowns made at least quarterly?			
	Yes	5	
	No	0	
HMIS Participation (or alternate database for domestic violence projects)			
12. Percentage of APR Data Quality Elements (6a.-6d.) with 5% or less null or missing values			
	85% or greater	5	
	Less than 84%	0	
HUD Monitoring Findings			
13. Does the recipient have any HUD monitoring findings in any of the agency's projects? If yes, findings must be resolved or explained to the satisfaction of Funding Review for the application to meet standards.		Standard Met:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Impact on Homelessness			
14. Is this project the only CoC funded project with dedicated beds to a particular target population? (Answered based on all applications submitted for this NOFO.)			
	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Scored, Taken into consideration in a tie score situation
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Serving High Need Populations			
15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined as having zero income at Start/entry? (APR 18)			
PSH			
	80% or more	10	
	70%-79%	8	
	50%-69%	5	
	Less than 50%	0	
RRH & TH			
	50% or more	10	
	40%-49%	8	
	30%-39%	5	
	Less than 30%	0	
16. What percentage of participants met "hard to serve" criteria defined as having two or more physical or mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2)			
PSH			
	More than 50%	10	
	30%-49%	8	
	10%-29%	5	
	Less than 10%	0	
RRH & TH			
	More than 10%	10	
	5%-10%	5	
	Less Than 5%	0	

17. What percentage of the households served were chronically homeless? (APR Q26a.)			
PSH			
80% or more	10		
70%-79%	8		
50%-69%	5		
Less than 50%	0		
RRH & TH			
15% or more	10		
10%-14%	8		
5%-9%	5		
1%-4%	2		
Less than 1%	0		
18. What percentage of the households served were families experiencing homelessness? (APR Q8a.)			
PSH			
15% or more	10		
10%-14%	8		
5%-9%	5		
1%-4%	0		
RRH & TH			
More than 50%	10		
30%-49%	8		
10%-29%	5		
Less than 10%	2		
More than 50%	0		
Section II: Project Performance		Possible Points: 55	Section Score:
Performance Data			
19. Length of Stay			
PSH—Percentage of leavers that remained in project more than 180 days (APR 22a.1)			
95% and more	20		
85%-94%	15		
75%-84%	10		
65%-74%	5		
55%-64%	0		
RRH—Percentage of participants that took 60 days or less from project entry to lease up (APR 22C)			
80%-100%	20		
60%-79%	15		
40%-59%	10		
20%-39%	5		
0%-19%	0		
TH – Average length of project stay in days (APR 22b)			
180 or less	20		
181-270	15		
271-390	10		
391-728	5		
More than 728 days	0		

20. Exits to Permanent Housing			
PSH - Percent who remain in PH or move to positive housing destinations $\left(\frac{[APR23c+APR5a9]}{[APR5a1-APR23c]}\right)$			
95% or higher	25		
90%-94%	20		
85%-89%	15		
80%-84%	10		
75%-79%	5		
Less than 75%	0		
RRH & TH - Percent who exit to positive housing destinations (APR 23c)			
95% or higher	25		
90%-94%	20		
85%-89%	15		
80%-84%	10		
75%-79%	5		
Less than 75%	0		
21. New or Increased Income and Earned Income			
a. PSH Project Stayers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.1)			
8% and higher	2.5		
5%-7%	1.5		
Less than 5%	0		
b. PSH Project Stayers: New or increased other (non-employment) income (APR 19a.1)			
50% and higher	2.5		
25%-49%	1.5		
Less than 25%	0		
c. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.2)			
8% and higher	2.5		
5%-7%	1.5		
Less than 5%	0		
c. RRH and TH Project Leavers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.2)			
30% and higher	5		
20%-29%	2.5		
Less than 20%	0		
d. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2)			
50% and higher	2.5		
25%-49%	1.5		
Less than 25%	0		
d. RRH and TH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2)			
10% and higher	5		
5%-9%	2.5		
Less than 5%	0		
Section III: Completion of Application		Possible Points: 0 Deductions: -20 Minimum: -10	Section Score:
Is the application complete and accurate?			
Yes	0		
No	-5		
Are all required attachments provided?			
Yes	0		
No	-5		
Was the application submitted by the deadline?			
Yes	0		
No	-10		

Project Priority Listing

Rank	Agency	Project	Project Type	App Type	Budget	Running Total	Score
	Tier 1						
1	The Salvation Army	Coordinated Entry	SSO	Renewal	\$210,139	\$210,139	NA
2	The Salvation Army	Housing Assessment Program	SSO	Renewal	\$228,488	\$438,627	NA
3	The Salvation Army	HMIS	HMIS	Renewal	\$100,000	\$538,627	NA
4	The Salvation Army	Coordinated Entry	SSO	Renewal	\$65,950	\$604,577	NA
5	Heartside Nonprofit Housing Corporation	Verne Barry Place	PSH	Renewal	\$157,720	\$762,297	86.9
6	Community Rebuilders	Housing Solutions	PSH	Renewal	\$601,943	\$1,364,240	85.4
7	Community Rebuilders	Keys First	RRH	Renewal	\$918,834	\$2,283,074	85.4
8	Community Rebuilders	First Step Housing	Joint TH & RRH	Renewal	\$887,487	\$3,170,561	80.7
9	Heartside Nonprofit Housing Corporation	Ferguson Apartments	PSH	Renewal	\$63,000	\$3,233,561	80
10	County of Kent	Shelter Plus Care SRA	PSH	Renewal	\$548,385	\$3,781,946	77.9
11	Community Rebuilders	LOFT Combined	PSH	Renewal	\$416,082	\$4,198,028	77.6
12	County of Kent	Shelter Plus Care TRA	PSH	Renewal	\$1,121,511	\$5,319,539	77.2
13	Heartside Nonprofit Housing Corporation	Commerce Apartments	PSH	Renewal	\$269,241	\$5,588,780	71.9
14	Grand Rapids Housing Commission	Hope Community	RRH	Renewal	\$159,663	\$5,748,443	71.5
15	YWCA West Central Michigan	Project HEAL	TH	Renewal	\$399,368	\$6,147,811	71.3
16	Community Rebuilders	HEROES	PSH	Renewal	\$160,964	\$6,308,775	66.7
17	YWCA West Central Michigan	Project HEAL TH-RRH	Joint TH & RRH	Renewal	\$454,490	\$6,763,265	64.3
18	Community Rebuilders	PACT (Partners Achieving Change Together)	Joint TH & RRH	Renewal	\$443,700	\$7,206,965	62.7
19	Inner City Christian Federation	ICCF PSH	PSH	Renewal	\$38,304	\$7,245,269	56.9
	Tier 2						
20	AYA Youth Collective	Housed As You Are	Joint TH & RRH	General Bonus	\$362,263	\$7,607,532	96
21	Safe Haven	Comprehensive Housing and Supportive Services for Victims of Domestic Violence	Joint TH & RRH	DV Bonus	\$480,609	\$8,088,141	89.9
22	Community Rebuilders	First Step Housing Expansion	Joint TH & RRH	DV Bonus	\$259,767	\$8,347,908	81.9
	Not Ranked						
NA	Heart of West Michigan United Way	CoC Planning Grant	Planning	Planning	\$217,358	\$8,565,266	