

## CoC New Projects Evaluation Criteria

2019 Scoring Tool for New/Expansion Supportive Services Only- Coordinated Entry Projects

*\*DV SSO-CE project are not eligible to receive component type prioritization bonus points*

### Score Breakdown

Summary of Factors	Points Possible	Points Assigned
Threshold Requirements	Pass/Fail	
Agency Experience	20	
Design of Supportive Services	30	
Timeliness	10	
Financial Efficiency and Management	20	
Project Ability to Enhance System Performance	20	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	

## Threshold Requirements

Threshold Requirements	Points
<b>HMIS Implementation</b> Projects are required to participate in HMIS, unless the applicant is a victim-service agency, serving survivors of domestic violence or a legal services agency.	Pass/Fail
<b>Coordinated Entry System</b> Projects are required to participate in the Coordinated Entry System (CES) when it is available for the project type.	Pass/Fail
<b>System for Award Management (SAM) Clearance</b> Applicant has a System for Award Management (SAM) clearance, meaning the applicant is not suspended or debarred from doing business with the federal government and/or receiving federal funds.	Pass/Fail
<b>Match Commitment</b> Match must equal 25% of the total grant request, including administrative costs but excluding leasing costs. Match contributions can be cash, in-kind, or a combination of both. If the source of match is third party in-kind, an MOU between the applicant and the third party will be required at the time of application submission	Pass/Fail
<b>HUD Requirements</b> All projects will be reviewed for compliance with the project eligibility and eligible cost requirements of the CoC Interim Rule and subsequent notices and must meet the threshold requirements outlined in the 2019 CoC Notice of Funding Availability	Pass/Fail

## 1. Agency Experience (20 points)

Criteria	Scale	Points
<b>Administrative Experience</b> Does the applicant have previous experience in utilizing federal funds?	<b>Highly Experienced</b>	<b>5</b>
	Experienced	3
	Little Experience	2-1
	No Experience	0
<b>Program Experience</b> Does the applicant have experience in administering the proposed program and performing the associated activities?	<b>Highly Experienced</b>	<b>5</b>
	Experienced	3
	Little Experience	2-1
	No Experience	0
<b>Experience with Leveraging Funds</b> Does the agency have experience in leveraging other federal, state, local, and private sector funds?	<b>Highly Experienced</b>	<b>3</b>
	Experienced	2
	Little Experience	1
	No Experience	0
<b>Management Structure</b> Does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all administrative requirements, such as record keeping, purchasing, financial/invoicing, and all other relevant CoC program requirements?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>7</b>
	Satisfactory	6-3
	Poor	2-0

## 2. Design of Supportive Services (30 points)

Criteria	Scale	Points
<b>Project Description and Need</b> Does the applicant provide a comprehensive explanation of what the project will look like and how it will operate? Are evidence-based best practices (i.e. trauma-informed, victim centered approaches) utilized/incorporated into the foundation of the project? Does the applicant provide sufficient data to convey the project's need?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>10</b>
	Good	9-7
	Satisfactory	6-4
	Poor	3-0
<b>Target Population</b> All projects must serve survivors of domestic violence, human trafficking, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking that meet HUD's definition of homelessness.	<b>Survivors of DV, dating violence &amp; stalking</b>	<b>2</b>
	Other Homeless Populations	0
<b>Severity of Needs and Vulnerability of Participants</b> Will the project serve and prioritize participants identified as having the most severe needs and highest vulnerabilities?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>3</b>
	Poor	2-0
<b>Improved Safety</b> Does the applicant demonstrate in the project description that the project will improve the safety of participants (i.e. at intake, during referrals, throughout housing navigation and placement)?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>5</b>
	Satisfactory	4-3
	Poor	2-0
<b>Advertisement Strategy</b> How well does the applicant describe the advertisement strategy for the coordinated entry process, and how it is designed to reach those with the highest barriers to accessing assistance?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>5</b>
	Satisfactory	4-3
	Poor	2-0
<b>Referral Process</b> How well does the applicant describe the referral process and how the coordinated entry process ensures that participants are directed to appropriate housing and/or services?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>5</b>
	Satisfactory	4-3
	Poor	2-0

### 3. Timeliness (10 points)

Criteria	Scale	Points
<b>Project Readiness</b> Does the applicant describe their plan for rapid implementation of the program in the project description?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>5</b>
	Satisfactory	4-3
	Poor	2-0
<b>Project Milestones</b> Does the agency demonstrate their ability to successfully meet all 4 project milestones? Is the agency's provided timeline realistic and feasible?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>5</b>
	Satisfactory	4-3
	Poor	2-0

### 4. Financial Efficiency & Management (20 points)

Criteria	Scale	Points
<b>Federal Debt</b> Is the applicant delinquent on any Federal debt?	<b>No</b>	<b>2</b>
	Yes	<b>0</b>
<b>Cost effectiveness</b> Are the relative costs compared to the relative outcomes of the project reasonable? Will other funds be leveraged to support CoC program funds during the implementation and operation of the project and will more people be served?	<b>Highly Cost Effective</b>	<b>6</b>
	Cost Effective	5-3
	Not Cost Effective	2-0
<b>Itemized Budget</b> Is a detailed proposed project budget and description provided? Is the budget inclusive of the necessary items for project success?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>5</b>
	Satisfactory	4-3
	Poor	2-0
<b>Total Budget</b> What is the feasibility, reasonableness, and accuracy of the budget?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>7</b>
	Satisfactory	6-4
	Poor	3-0

## 5. Project Ability to Enhance System Performance (20 points)

Criteria	Scale	Points
<b>Geographic Coverage</b> Does the applicant successfully demonstrate that the proposed program will cover the entire Pasadena CoC?	<b>Full Coverage</b>	<b>4</b>
	Partial Coverage	3-2
	Minimal Coverage	1-0
<b>Accessibility</b> Does the applicant successfully demonstrate that the proposed program will be easily accessible to people in need and to people least likely to request assistance?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>6</b>
	Satisfactory	5-3
	Poor	2-0
<b>Standardized Assessment</b> Is the standardized assessment process appropriate for the population being served? Is there sufficient detail provided that the assessment process will be able to successfully determine risk and prioritization when providing assistance?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>4</b>
	Satisfactory	3-2
	No Standardized Assessment	1-0
<b>Coordination with Mainstream Programs</b> Does the applicant provide a detailed plan that describes how the program will coordinate and integrate with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs that program participants may be eligible for?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>6</b>
	Satisfactory	5-3
	Poor	2-0