# 2015 Scorecard for CoC Funds: New Projects

This scorecard will be used by the Balance of State Project Review Committee to score applications for new projects. This scorecard has four goals:

- Fund organizations that have the capacity to run effective programs (can manage and administer the program, can operate on reimbursement basis, have experience serving this population or a similar one)
- Fund projects that reflect the Balance of State Continuum of Care & HUD's priorities: permanent supportive housing and serving the chronically homeless and veterans
- Incentivize agencies to be good partners (participating in community efforts to end homelessness, on HMIS, helping create infrastructure for their community's homeless service system to operate effectively throughout the year)
- Ensure that funded projects are being good stewards of BoS CoC funding and performing to BoS CoC standards

The BoS Project Review Committee may ask applicant agencies to provide additional information to determine agency capacity to: implement projects in a timely manner with successful outcomes, score well on the HUD Annual Performance Report (APR), and avoid jeopardizing overall agency stability or future funding for the NC BoS CoC.

*[References in brackets indicate the section of the application that will be used to score each question.]*

| Reviewer: | |
|---|---|
| Applicant: | |
| Project Name: | |
| Project Type (circle one) | PH:PSH          PH:RRH          SSO |
| Reviewer Signature: | Date: |

| PROJECT QUALITY REQUIREMENTS | | |
|---|---|---|
| New projects must receive at least the minimum score in each section. If a minimum is unmet, further review will be triggered. After further review, the Project Review Committee will determine potential consequences, including whether the project is ineligible for inclusion in final BoS CoC | **Maximum Score Possible:** | **PSH: 186** <br> **RRH: 171** <br> **SSO: 136** |

| | Project Score: | |
|---|---|---|
| application. | | |

# Combined Scoring

This section is scored by two reviewers, a member of the NC BoS Project Review Committee and an NCCEH staff person, and these two scores are averaged for each question. Find more information on the Project Review Committee in the NC BoS CoC Governance Charter: www.ncceh.org/bos

## Section I: Organizational Capacity

| Possible Points | Minimum | Project Score | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | Standard Met | | |
| Consistency with Mission | | Possible Score | Project Score |
| Does the project fit within the mission of the agency? Does the agency currently serve homeless households in their community? [] | | Standard met, unmet | |
| | | | |

## Section II: Accuracy

| Possible Points | Minimum | Project Score | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | 10 | | |
| Accuracy and Appropriateness of Response | | Possible Score | Project Score |
| Is the project description completed and accurate? [] | | 2 | |
| Does the application describe prior experience serving homeless persons that has prepared the agency for administering this grant? [] | | 2 | |
| Are questions regarding services completed and accurate? | | 2 | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *[]* | | |
| Are questions regarding outreach completed and accurate?<br><br>*[]* | 2 | |
| Are questions regarding housing for participants completed and accurate?<br><br>*[]* | 2 | |
| Are the standard performance measures completed?  Are the goals appropriate for the project and are the descriptions complete?  (Score includes both required Standard Performance Measures and any optional Additional Performance Measures)<br> *[]* | 4 | |
| Is the overall application complete, accurate, and error-free? | 1 | |

## Section III: BoS & HUD Priorities

| Possible Points | Minimum | Project Score | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **PSH: 110**<br><br>**RRH: 95**<br><br>**SSO: 60** | **PSH: 38**<br><br>**RRH: 15**<br><br>**SSO: Standards Met** | | |
| **Targeting People with Disabilities** | | | |
| What percentage of the **adults** served by the project are expected to be people with disabilities?<br><br>*[]* | | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| | Less than 100% | 0 | |
| | 100% | 8 | |
| **Targeting Veterans** | | | |
| What percentage of the **adults** served by the project are expected to be veterans?<br><br>*[]* | | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| | Less than 25% | 0 | |

| | Between 25% and 49% | 4 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Between 50% and 74% | 8 | |
| | Between 75% and 99% | 12 | |
| | 100% | 16 | |

| **Targeting People Who Are Chronically Homeless** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| What percentage of the people **(adults and children)** served by the project are expected to be chronically homeless?<br><br>*[]* | **Possible Score** | | **Project Score** |
| | Less than 25% | 0 | |
| | Between 25% and 49% | 4 | |
| | Between 50% and 74% | 8 | |
| | Between 75% and 99% | 12 | |
| | 100% | 16 | |

| **Permanent Housing Projects (PSH and RRH)** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Is this a permanent supportive housing (PSH) project requesting any funds for housing?<br><br>*[]* | **Possible Score** | | **Project Score** |
| | Yes | 20 | |
| | No | 0 | |
| Is this a rapid re-housing (RRH) project that is requesting any funds for housing?<br>*[]* | | | |
| | Yes | 5 | |
| | No | 0 | |
| Rental assistance projects are preferred to leasing projects as rental assistance projects adjust to FMR and provide tenants with a lease in their name. Projects that wish to provide leasing must submit a written statement that explains why the project is not applying as a rental assistance project. | Standard<br><br>met, unmet, n/a | | |
| For rapid re-housing projects:  Applicants must be currently receiving | Standard | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) RRH funds and in good standing with the ESG office. | met, unmet, n/a | |
| **Supportive Services Only (SSO) Projects** | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| **For SSO projects:** Applicants must submit a statement demonstrating that the region has developed sufficient permanent supportive housing resources. The statement must clarify what elements of the SSO project make it preferable to a permanent supportive housing project. | Standard met, unmet, n/a | |
| **Housing Over Services** | | |
| Total $ request for housing activities (acquisition, rehab, construction, rental assistance, & leasing): [] | | |
| Total $ budget request: [] | | |
| Percentage of total budget devoted to housing activities (housing activities request ÷ total request x 100): | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| Less than 35% | 0 | |
| Between 35% and 54.9% | 5 | |
| Between 55% and 74.9% | 10 | |
| Between 75% and 84.9% | 20 | |
| Between 85% and 100% | 30 | |
| While services are an important component of supporting households in maintaining their housing, HUD prioritizes using CoC program funds for housing and using other sources of available funding to provide services. Projects requesting HUD funding to provide supportive services  must  provide a plan on how these services will be funded in the future from alternate sources. Please include these elements:<br>• Other potential sources of funding that the project is working to secure to fund supportive services.<br>• A plan for when the project will reduce its use of CoC funds for services. | Standard met, unmet, n/a | |

| Housing First | | |
|---|---|---|
| Is this a Housing First project?<br><br>[e-snaps application] | 20 | |
| **Key Elements of Permanent Supportive Housing** | | |
| If this project is a Permanent Supportive Housing project, does it include the following key elements of Permanent Supportive Housing as defined by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)[1]? *[eligibility requirements, sample lease, program rules, house rules (if any), NCCEH will make a form for applicants to list services and indicate if they are required, optional, etc] If the standards are unmet, the applicant will have six months from the date of the CoC Application submission to comply with the all of the standards to the satisfaction of the BoS Steering Committee or its appointed subcommittee.* | | |
| Leases or rental agreements do not have any provisions that would not be found in leases held by someone who does not have a disability. | Standard met, unmet, n/a | |
| Participation in services is voluntary and tenants cannot be evicted for rejecting services. | Standard met, unmet, n/a | |
| House rules, if any, are similar to those found in housing for people who do not have disabilities and do not restrict visitors or otherwise interfere with a life in the community. | Standard met, unmet, n/a | |
| Housing is not time-limited, and the lease is renewable at tenants' and owners' option. | Standard met, unmet, n/a | |
| Tenants have choices in the support services that they receive. They are asked about their choices and can choose from a range of services, and different tenants receive different types of services based on their needs and preferences. | Standard met, unmet, n/a | |
| As needs change over time, tenants can receive more intensive or less intensive support services without losing their homes. | Standard met, unmet, n/a | |

## Section IV: Scope of Services

| Possible Points | Minimum | Project Score |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

---

[1] US Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Center for Mental Health Services. (2010) Permanent Supportive Housing: Building Your Program (Evidence- Based Practices KIT). Retrieved from http://store.samhsa.gov/shin/content//SMA10-4510/SMA10-4510-06-BuildingYourProgram-PSH.pdf

| 8 | 6 | |
|---|---|---|

| Service Needs | Possible Score | Project Score |
|---|---|---|
| Do services adequately and appropriately meet anticipated service needs?<br><br>[] | 4 | |
| **Employment Services** | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| Does the project provide or link participants to employment services? Does the program have employment goals?<br><br>[] | 2 | |
| **Access to Mainstream Benefits** | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| Does the project include services to help participants access mainstream benefits, including but not limited to using SOAR trained caseworkers?<br><br>[] | 2 | |

# Staff Scoring

The following section is scored by NCCEH. Staff use standardized scoring methods to ensure fairness.

## Section V: Organizational Capacity

| Possible Points | Minimum | Project Score |
|---|---|---|
| 17 | 8 | |
| **Completed Similar Projects** | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| Has the agency successfully implemented a **CoC-funded** project of the same project type (PSH, RRH or SSO)?<br><br>[] | | |
| Has successfully implemented the same project type | 8 | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Has not implemented the same project type | 0 | |
| **If not**, has the agency successfully implemented this same type of project (permanent supportive housing, rapid rehousing, coordinated assessment) using another funding source?<br><br>*[]* | 4 | |
| If the answer to either above question is yes, are the same staff that were operating the program at that time going to be operating the proposed project?<br><br>*[]* | 2 | |
| If none of the above, has the agency successfully implemented a different HUD-funded project (ESG, Section 8, HPRP, etc)? | 2 | |
| **Agency Stability** | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| Has the agency been in operation for at least 3 years?<br><br>*[]* | Standard<br><br>met, unmet | |
| **Non-profits only:** Did the applicant submit a signed audit letter and a copy of their budget from the most recent fiscal year?  (Financial statements will be used to assess fiscal stability of the applicant agency.  Financial statements that demonstrate instability may result in the agency not meeting requirements.)<br><br>*[]* | Standard<br><br>met, unmet, n/a | |
| **Non-profits only:** Does the agency have the financial capacity to operate this project on a reimbursement basis?<br><br>*[]* | Standard<br><br>met, unmet, n/a | |
| **Non-profits only:** Has the agency submitted a list of their board of directors and a copy of the minutes from their three most recent board meetings?  Does the agency have an active and engaged board of directors? *[]* | Standard<br><br>met, unmet, n/a | |
| **Capacity to Provide Needed Services** | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| Does the agency have the capacity to provide the services that will be needed?  a) Do the services described seem adequate and appropriate | | |

| and b) is the staffing pattern or subcontract plan adequate and appropriate? Do program staff have sufficient experience and knowledge to effectively run the type of program being applied for?*[]* | Standard<br><br>met, unmet, n/a | |
|---|---|---|
| **Administrative Capacity** | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| Is the administrative staff separate from the services staff?<br><br>*[]* | 3 | |
| Is funding for the administrative staff stable? Is there adequate administrative staff to ensure agency stability throughout program implementation?<br><br>*[]* | 3 | |
| **Energy Star** | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| Does the project use Energy Star appliances?<br><br>*[]* | 1 | |

## Section VI: Match & Leverage

| **Possible Points** | **Minimum** | **Project Score** |
|---|---|---|
| **8** | **Standards met** | |
| **Documentation of Match** | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| Do match letters sufficiently document the required match for the project type? | Standard<br><br>met, unmet, n/a | |
| **Leverage** | | |
| Total leverage:<br><br>*[]* | | |
| Total $ request from HUD:<br><br>*[]* | | |

| Ratio of leverage to request (leverage ÷ request): | Possible Score | Project Score |
|---|---|---|
| Ratio at least 1.5:1 | Standard<br><br>met, unmet, n/a | |
| Ratio 1.5 to 1.99:1 | 4 | |
| Ratio 2:1 or more | 8 | |

## Section VII: Performance

| Possible Points | Minimum | Project Score |
|---|---|---|
| **28** | **Standards met** | |
| **APR Scores** | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| Does the agency have any additional projects that are meeting HUD's APR goals? | 8 | |
| **HMIS Participation (Per federal law, domestic violence programs are prohibited from using HMIS. Use of a comparable database may be substituted.)** | | |
| If the agency has additional beds (not a part of this project application), are those beds also being entered into the system?<br><br>*[HMIS report; HIC]* | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| Yes | 5 | |
| No | 0 | |
| Does the agency commit to enter 100% of the beds into HMIS (with client consent)?<br><br>*[Interview with agency]* | Standard<br><br>met, unmet, n/a | |
| **HUD Monitoring Findings** | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| If the agency has other existing projects, are there any HUD monitoring findings currently associated with any of these projects? If so, findings must be resolved or explained to the satisfaction of the Review Committee for the application to meet the standard.. *[Interview with agency]* | Standard<br><br>met, unmet, n/a | |
| **Previous Project Spending Rates**<br>These questions are for projects that have been operating for at least one year at the time of the NOFA release. | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| Amount awarded<br>Amount spent (percentage rounded to the nearest percent) | | |
| Percentage 90+% | 0 | |
| 70-89% | -10 | |
| 69% and less | -25 | |
| How many grant extensions from HUD were given in for a reason other than merging grants? *[Interview with agency or information from HUD]* | | |
| 0 | 15 | |
| 1 | 0 | |
| 2+ | further review | |

## Section VIII: Agency's Relationship to Community

| **Possible Points** | **Minimum** | **Project Score** |
|---|---|---|
| **0** | **Standards met** | |
| **Participation in Regional Committee Activities**<br>**The following participation questions will be scored based on the project participation in all Regional Committees within their grant coverage area.** | | |
| Does the applicant actively participate in Regional Committee(s)? *[Conversation with RC lead; RC minutes]* | Standard<br><br>met, unmet | |
| Actively participate in Regional Committee meetings<br>(75% of meetings July 2014 - June 2015) | Standard<br><br>met, unmet | |

| Application has been presented to Regional Committee and has been approved for consideration by the BoS Project Review Committee | Standard<br><br>met, unmet | |
|---|---|---|
| Participated in regional ESG application process | Standard<br><br>met, unmet | |
| Recipient agrees to participate in the local Coordinated Assessment process as designed by the Regional Committee | Standard<br><br>met, unmet | |

## Section IX:  Deductions

| Possible Points - | Minimum | Project Score | |
|---|---|---|---|
| -25 | Not more than loss of -15 | | |
| **Budget** | | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| If questions regarding the budget are not complete and accurate, subtract up to 5 points. | | -5 | |
| **Deadlines** | | **Possible Score** | **Project Score** |
| If the online application was NOT completed correctly, subtract up to 10 points.  (Specific dates for deadlines will be clarified as the NOFA timeline is discerned or published. Late applications will not be accepted.) | | -10 | |
| If required accompanying documents are NOT turned in on time, subtract up to 10 points. | | -10 | |