**CoC PROGRAM NOFA APPLICATION EVALUATION SHEET – New Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Name** |  |
| **Agency** |  |
| **Proposed Services**  |  |
| **Total Participants Served:** |  |
| **Budget Summary:** | Grant Request:Documented Match:**Total Cost:** | $0,000.00$0,000.00**$0,000.00**  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS** | **RATING** | **COMMENTS** |
|  | **Max: 5** |  ● 🞉 ⊙ ○Excellent Good Fair Poor**5 points 4points 2.5 points 0 points** |
| *Outstanding audit findings: Successful applicants will not have any outstanding HUD, state and local government monitoring and/or audit findings.**CoC Participation: Successful applicants will be members in good standing of the Continuum of Care. (Section 1, question 11)**CoC Interim Rule Compliance:* Successful applicants will be in full compliance with all applicable requirements of the CoC Interim Rule (24 CFR part 578), including participation in (or willingness to participate in) the Coordinated Entry System. *(Section 1, question 12 )**House First/Reducing Barriers**The project has a housing first model.*1. *An applicant will be penalized if a program screens out program participants for:*
* *Having too little or no income*
* *Active or history of substance abuse*
* *Having a criminal record[[1]](#footnote-1)*
* *Having an eviction record*
* *Having a history of domestic violence*
1. *An applicant will be penalized if a project terminates program participants for:*
* *Failure to participate in program services*
* *Failure to make progress on a service plan*
* *Loss of, or failure to improve income*
* *Being a victim of domestic violence*
* *Activities not covered in a lease agreement*

 *(Section 4)* |  | *Requirement Satisfied?: ☐**Requirement Satisfied?:☐**Requirement Satisfied?:☐**Does the applicant screen program participants for:**• Having too little or no income ☐**• Active or history of substance abuse ☐**• Having a criminal record ☐**• Having an eviction record☐**• Having a history of domestic violence☐**Does the applicant terminate program participants for:* *• Failure to participate in program services ☐**• Failure to make progress on a service plan☐**• Loss of, or failure to improve income**• Being a victim of domestic violence☐**• Activities not covered in a lease agreement☐**Any checked boxes will results in 0 points for Housing First Model.* |
| ***-/5*** |

**Project Design**

The Continuum of Care will give preference to projects that are based on Housing First principles and focus on populations and needs that have been prioritized by the Continuum of Care.  Applicants will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well the application addresses each Design criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on information included in the project application and the Applicant Questionnaire.

**Responsiveness to Design Evaluation Criteria** ● 🞉 ⊙ ○

 Excellent Good Fair Poor

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DESIGN CRITERIA** | **RATING** | **COMMENTS** |
| 1. **Soundness of Program Design**
 | **Max: 25** | ● 🞉 ⊙ ○ Excellent Good Fair Poor **25 points 20 points 15points 10 points** |
| *The applicant’s proposal will be evaluated for overall feasibility and anticipated impact.* * *Is the project a logical extension of the agency’s mission and work?*
* *Does the agency have a landlord identification plan?*
* *Does the agency have staffing plan for the new project?*
* *Will the potential impact of this program assist the CoC in addressing the specific needs of the Continuum?*
* *Does the budget make sense? Is it cost-effective?*

*Criterion Scoring** *Excellent – all yes*
* *Good – four “yes” responses*
* *Fair – three “yes” responses*
* *Poor – two or less “yes” responses*
 |  |  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Agency Capacity and Expertise**

 | **Max: 25** |  ● 🞉 ⊙ ○ Excellent Good Fair Poor**25 points 20 points 15 points 10 points** |
| *The applicant’s past performance managing CoC awards (or other similar funding sources) will be considered. The applicant’s likely ability to administer CoC funding (in addition to its existing programming) will be considered.* * *Are key staff already in place and ready to begin work?*
* *Are staff well qualified and experienced in the type of services proposed?*
* *The organization has no recent history (last 5 years) of grant funds being recaptured.*
* *Is the agency experienced in effectively managing federal (or similarly sourced) funds?*
* *Is the agency ready to begin within 90 of their award?*

*Criterion Scoring** *Excellent – all “yes” responses*
* *Good – four “yes” responses*
* *Fair – three “yes” responses*
* *Poor – two or less “yes” responses*
 |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DESIGN CRITERIA** | **RATING** | **COMMENTS** |
| 1. **Severity of Needs**

 | **Max: 15** | ● 🞉 ⊙ ○ Excellent Good Fair Poor **15 points 10 points 5 points 0 points** |
| *The project serves people who have experienced:** *Chronically homeless persons*
* *LGBTQ+ persons*
* *Youth*
* *Veterans*
* *Low or no income persons*
* *Current substance abuse, significant health or behavioral health challenges, or functional impairments*
* *Coming from the streets*
* *Criminal history*
* *Abuse/victimization or a history of victimization/abuse, Domestic Violence, sexual assault, childhood  abuse, sex trafficking*
* *High utilization of crisis or emergency services to meet basic needs*
* *Length of time homeless*
* *Risk of continued homelessness*
* *Risk of illness or death*
* *Only project of its kind in the CoC geography*
* *None*

*Criterion scoring:** *Excellent – all these groups*
* *Good – 10+*
* *Fair – 5+*
* *Poor – 4 or less*
 |  | * *Chronically homeless persons*[ ]
* *LGBTQ+ persons*[ ]
* *Youth*[ ]
* *Veterans*[ ]
* *Low or no income persons*[ ]
* *Current substance abuse, significant health or behavioral health challenges, or functional impairments*[ ]
* *Coming from the streets*[ ]
* *Criminal history*[ ]
* *Abuse/victimization or a history of victimization/abuse, Domestic Violence, sexual assault, childhood  abuse, sex trafficking*[ ]
* *High utilization of crisis or emergency services to meet basic needs*[ ]
* *Length of time homeless*[ ]
* *Risk of continued homelessness*[ ]
* *Risk of illness or death*[ ]
* *Only project of its kind in the CoC geography*[ ]
* *None*[ ]
 |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Local Priorities / Special Populations (5pts) Racial Equity (5pts)**

 | **Max: 10** |  ● ⊙ ○ Excellent Fair Poor **10 points 5points 0 points** |
| *Preference will be given to projects that serve one or more of the following special populations/local priorities:** *Chronically homeless*
* *Members of households with children*
* *Veterans*
* *Rapid Rehousing*
* *DV Bonus Project*

*Does the project propose to promote racial equity and identify and address any racial disparities? (Yes/No)* |  |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Mainstream Benefits**

 | **Max: 10** |  ● 🞉 ⊙ ○ Excellent Good Fair Poor **10 points 8 points 5points 0 points** |
| *The project:** *Provides transportation assistance to enable clients to attend mainstream benefit appointments and/or employment training, or to travel to work*
* *Follows up with participants at least annually to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed*
* *Provides program participants with access to SSI/SSDI technical assistance, either by the applicant, a subrecipient, or partner agency*

*Criterion Scoring** *Excellent – provides all three of the services above*
* *Good – provides only two of the above services*
* *Fair – provides only one of the above services*
* *Poor – provides none of the services listed above*
 |  |  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Equal Access/Gender Identity/Anti-discrimination** | **Max: 10** |  ● 🞉 ⊙ ○ Excellent Good Fair Poor **10 points 8 points 5points 0 points** |
| *The agency is compliant with CoC policies to implement the Equal Access and Gender Identity Final Rules AND Anti-discrimination policies.**.**Scoring criteria:** *Excellent – all policies were provided and are compliant.*
* *Good – all policies were provided and mostly compliant.*
* *Fair – some policies were provided and mostly compliant.*
* *Poor – no policies were provided or policies were out of compliance.*
 |  |  |  |  |
| **\_ /10** |

**Evaluation Outcome**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Max.****Score** | **Proposer****Score** | **Total Score:****XX/100** |
| Design Criteria | 100 | XX |

1. *With exceptions for state mandated restrictions* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)