

Eastern PA CoC: 2024 New Project Scoring Sheet (Annual CoC NOFO)

Agency Name:

Project Type:

Expansion project? (Yes or No)

Transition project? (Yes or No)

FUNDING COMMITTEE INSTRUCTIONS: For each project you are evaluating, enter your score for each criteria in the corresponding blue field. Score will automatically calculate. **NOTE:** Funding Committee members may award partial points for any criteria (e.g. 0.5 points, 1.5 points), even if not explicitly shown on scoring rubric.

Please enter any comments at the bottom of the sheet. Please use a separate tab for each project you are evaluating. See DMA summary spreadsheet for additional helpful information such as budget information, cost effectiveness, and CoC participation.

APPLICANT INFORMATION

MAX POINTS

POINTS AWARDED

1 Geography to be covered (questions 8, 9, 27)

Multi-county, RHAB/CoC-wide = 2 points
 Single County with strong explanation in project description why single county project needed = 2 points
 Single County without strong explanation why single county project needed = 0 points

2

APPLICANT EXPERIENCE

MAX POINTS

POINTS AWARDED

Organizational capacity to operate project (fiscal/grant management capacity, and capacity to operate regional project if applicable) = 2 points

2 (questions 14-17, 19)

0 points if organization does not describe sufficient capacity and/or experience to implement CoC project
 1 point if capacity somewhat described and/or some concerns about capacity
 2 points if it is clear that the organization has capacity to operate the project, based on HUD and CoC grant management and fiscal requirements. If proposing multi-county project, sufficient experience to operate

2

Experience with serving households experiencing homelessness and subpopulation (if applicable) = 2 points (question 18)

0 points if not described and/or little to no experience

1 point if somewhat described and/or some concerns about experience
 2 points if reviewer believes the applicant has needed experience. If targeting a specific subpopulation, demonstrates sufficient experience with the subpopulation

2

Experience serving and improving outcomes for communities that have historically been marginalized and experience delivering culturally responsive services = 2 points (question 20)

- 0 points if not described
- 1 point if somewhat described
- 2 points if clearly described and provides strong description of org's experience

2	
---	--

Organizational capacity to promote racial equity, and how project will promote equity = 2 points (question 21, question 20 part 3)

- 0 points if not described
- 1 point if somewhat described
- 2 points if clearly described and provides strong description of org's capacity to promote racial equity and how project will promote equity

2	
---	--

6 Experience with Housing First = 2 points (question 22)

- 0 points if not described and/or concerns about experience
- 1 point if somewhat described and/or description repeats definition of Housing First with few concrete examples
- 2 points if applicant indicates low/no barriers to entry and that reviewer believes the applicant has needed experience. Description should go beyond repeating definition of Housing first, and demonstrate HOW org implements Housing First principles.

2	
---	--

Experience partnering with people with lived experience and plan to incorporate persons with lived exp. in project design and delivery = 2 points (question 23)

- 0 points if not described
- 0.5 points if somewhat described
- 1 point if described and reviewer believes the applicant has needed experience and clear plan for incorporating persons w/ lived exp. in project design/delivery

2	
---	--

PROJECT DESIGN

MAX POINTS

POINTS AWARDED

Clear and compelling description of community/regional need = 2 points (question 27; expansions: question 11d)

- 0 points if need not described
- 1 point if narrative but no data, or data does not support the need for this project
- 2 points if applicant describes need and provides supporting data

2	
---	--

9 Projected outcomes = 2 points (question 26, part 3)

- 0 points if projected outcomes not described and/or outcomes do not align with CoC goals
- 1 point if projected outcomes somewhat described and/or outcomes somewhat aligned with CoC goals
- 2 points if projected outcomes clearly described and align with goals of CoC

2	
---	--

10 Approach to case management = 2 points (questions 31-32)

--	--

0 points if case management approach not described or description if vague/unclear

1 point if case management approach somewhat described and/or case management approach not clearly aligned with person-centered/housing-focused/trauma-informed care/etc. approach

2 points if case management approach clearly described and case management approach aligned with person-centered/housing-focused/trauma-informed case/etc. approach

2	
---	--

Strong description of how project will assist participants to obtain and retain permanent housing, including landlord engagement/housing

11 search approach (if scattered-site) = 2 points (questions 33-34)

0 points if not described

1 point if somewhat described

2 points if clear description of how project will assist participants to obtain housing. If scattered-site, clear description of landlord engagement and housing search assistance that will be provided.

2	
---	--

Coordination with community partners and plan for connecting

12 participants to services = 2 points (question 35, question 26 part 2)

0 points if not described

1 point if somewhat described

2 points if clear description of community partnerships (by name) and clear plan for connecting participants to services

2	
---	--

Appropriateness of project. (The proposed project is responsive to the needs as identified in the project description.) = 4 points (question 26,

13 reviewer's overall impression, and project budget)

0 points if reviewer has concerns about project design and/or appropriateness of project to meet community needs

2 point if proposed project somewhat matches needs, but there are outstanding questions or concerns

4 points if project scale, project type, and service plan seem appropriate based on needs identified

4	
---	--

SYSTEM PERFORMANCE

MAX POINTS

POINTS AWARDED

14 Current CoC funded projects: System Performance Measures (Quintiles)

--	--

Current CoC funded agencies will be evaluated on their performance in the FY24 local renewal scoring process related to system performance criteria (housing stability, returns to homelessness or DV safety for DV dedicated projects, LOT between project start date and housing move in, income growth, connecting participants to non-cash/mainstream benefits, connecting participants to health insurance, high quality data entry, timeliness of HMIS data entry). Agencies will be evaluated in quintiles. DMA will take average performance score for any agency that has multiple CoC funded projects. Agencies that do not currently receive CoC funding will not be evaluated on this criteria. *However, the Funding Committee may also consider performance as an additional factor for consideration if an applicant was a former CoC grantee or is a current or former ESG grantee.*

1st quintile - Top 20% ranked CoC funded agencies related to system performance: 10 points

2nd quintile: 21-40% ranked: 8 points

3rd quintile: 41-60% ranked: 6 points

4th quintile: 61-80%: 4 points

5th quintile: 81-100%: 0 points

TO BE ENTERED BY DMA	TO BE ENTERED BY DMA
-----------------------------	-----------------------------

Leveraging	MAX POINTS	POINTS AWARDED
------------	------------	----------------

15 Non-CoC Resources to cover housing costs = 5 points (questions 37-38)

5 points if PSH or RRH project will leverage housing subsidies or subsidized housing units for at least 25% of units/participants in the project.

2 points if leveraging, but less than 25%

5	POINTS AWARDED
----------	-----------------------

Non-CoC Resources to cover healthcare/service costs = 5 points

16 (questions 39-40)

5 points if project will leverage 25% or more of the project's healthcare needs through community partnerships.

2 points if leveraging, but less than 25%

5	POINTS AWARDED
----------	-----------------------

NEED/DEMAND	MAX POINTS	POINTS AWARDED
-------------	------------	----------------

17 Overall need/demand for project = Up to 10 points

10 points - project meeting high demand based on gaps analysis data and compared to other projects submitted

5 points - project meeting medium demand based on gaps analysis data and compared to other projects submitted

0 points - project meeting low demand based on gaps analysis data and compared to other projects submitted

10	DETERMINED BY FUNDING COMMITTEE
-----------	--

TOTAL	TOTAL MAX BASE POINTS	TOTAL POINTS AWARDED
Total Points, Not Including System Performance (38 Points)	38	0
System Performance Points (10 if CoC-funded; 0 N/A)	TO BE ENTERED BY DMA	TO BE ENTERED BY DMA
Overall Need/Demand for Project Points (10 points)	10	DETERMINED BY FUNDING COMMITTEE
TOTAL SCORE (Total Points Awarded/Total Max Base Points)	#VALUE!	

NOTE: OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Additional consideration will be given to agencies that have not previously received CoC funding

Past Performance:

- A: Current ESG Grantees - Previous performance related outcomes are strong
- B: Applicants who are not current/former CoC/ESG grantees/ no data in HMIS - Strong performance outcomes from other projects (if

Cost Effectiveness & Budget

Is the project cost effective? Compare project's service budget to CoC average. How does supportive services + admin cost compare to CoC average? (DMA to provide) Any concerns about project budget?

CoC Participation:

- Participates in CoC/RHAB (DMA to provide)
- Participates in HMIS or HMIS-comparable database (DMA to provide)
- Participates in Coordinated Entry process (DMA to provide)

Do you recommend this project? (Yes/No)

Do you recommend any changes to the project design/scale/budget/etc.?

Funding Committee Comments: