

## Eastern PA CoC: 2024 New Project Scoring Sheet (DV Bonus RRH or TH-RRH)

Agency Name:

Project Type:

Expansion 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 |
|---|------------|----------------|
| <b>1 Geography to be covered (questions 8, 9, 26)</b><br>Multi-county, RHAB/CoC-wide = 2 points<br>Single County with strong explanation in project description why single county project needed = 2 points<br>Single County without strong explanation why single county project needed = 0 points | 2          |                |

| APPLICANT EXPERIENCE  | MAX POINTS | POINTS AWARDED |
|---|------------|----------------|
| <b>Organizational capacity to operate project (fiscal/grant management capacity, and capacity to operate regional project if applicable) = 2 points (questions 11-16)</b><br>0 points if organization does not describe sufficient capacity and/or experience to implement CoC project<br>1 point if capacity somewhat described and/or some concerns about capacity<br>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          |                |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>3 Experiencing serving and improving outcomes for communities that have been historically marginalized = 2 points (question 18)</b><br>0 points if not described<br>1 point if limited experience, or limited description provided<br>2 points if strong evidence of experience serving and improving outcomes for historically marginalized communities | 2 |  |
|---|---|--|

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>4 Experience providing housing to families/individuals fleeing domestic violence = 2 points (question 19)</b><br>0 points if not described<br>1 point if somewhat described<br><br>2 points if reviewer believes the applicant has needed experience | 2 |  |
|---|---|--|

**5 Experience with Housing First w/ DV survivors = 2 points (question 20)**

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**

**6 points (question 21)**

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 26)**

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 |  |
|---|--|

**Strong description of how project will assist participants to move quickly into permanent housing, including landlord engagement/housing search approach = 2 points (question 27 parts 1 and 5; question 28)**

0 points if not described  
1 point if somewhat described  
2 points if clear description of how project will assist participants to obtain housing. Clear description of landlord engagement and housing search assistance that will be provided.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 2 |  |
|---|--|

**Connecting survivors to supportive services, including mainstream benefits, health, and employment = 2 points (question 25 part 2, question 27 parts 3 and 4)**

0 points if not described  
1 point if somewhat described  
2 points if clear description of how organization connects survivors to supportive services, including specific examples

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 2 |  |
|---|--|

**10 How organization supports safety of survivors = 2 points (question 29)**

0 points if not described  
1 point if somewhat described  
2 points if clear description of how project supports safety of survivors

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 2 |  |
|---|--|

**Utilizing a trauma-informed, victim-centered approach = 2 points**

**11 (question 30)**

- 0 points if not described
- 1 point if somewhat described
- 2 points if clear description of experience providing a trauma-informed, victim-centered approach

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 2 |  |
|---|--|

**Survivor-centered services, strengths-based approach, cultural**

**12 responsiveness = 2 points (question 31)**

- 0 points if not described
- 1 point if somewhat described
- 2 points if clear description of how organization maximizes client choice and autonomy, implements strengths-based approach provides cultural responsive services

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 2 |  |
|---|--|

**Appropriateness of project. (The proposed project is responsive to the needs as identified in the project description.) = 4 points (question 25,**

**13 reviewer's overall impression, and 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 gaps, 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 (question 33)**

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  |  |
|--|--|

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 |  |
|---|--|

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

**16 (question 34)**

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 |  |
|---|--|

| NEED/DEMAND   | MAX POINTS | POINTS AWARDED                                |
|---|------------|---|
| <b>17 Need/demand for project = Up to 10 points</b>   |            |   |
| <p>10 points - project meeting high demand based on gaps analysis data and compared to other projects submitted</p> <p>5 points - project meeting medium demand based on gaps analysis data and compared to other projects submitted</p> <p>1 point - project meeting low demand based on gaps analysis data and compared to other projects submitted</p> | 10         | <b><i>DETERMINED BY FUNDING COMMITTEE</i></b> |

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