

2024 CoC NOFO New Project Ranking Tool—Written Application

Adopted by NIHC 9/5/2024

Applying Agency: _____

Project Name: _____

Project Type:

- CoC Bonus: Coordinated Entry-SSO
- CoC Bonus: Permanent Supportive Housing
- CoC Bonus: Rapid Rehousing
- CoC Bonus: Joint TH/RRH
- DV Bonus: Joint TH/RRH

1. Project Readiness and Capacity to Implement Project		
Performance Standard	Point Description	Points Awarded
(A) Agency demonstrates strong fiscal capacity in proportion to project budget (HUD request is reasonable proportion to agency budget or other programs agency has been operating)	High capacity: 5 points Probable capacity: 3 points Low capacity: 0 points	/5
(B) Project has experience and a plan to implement a new grant in a timely way and onboard, support, and retain staff members	Excellent Plan: 5 points Good plan: 3 points Inadequate plan: 0 points	/5
Section 1: Maximum 10 points		/10
Review panel: Please provide any necessary feedback regarding why the group decided this score.		

Section 1. Project Readiness and Capacity to Implement Project-Panel Guidance

1A. Financial capacity refers to:

Ability of an organization to successfully manage a federal grant based on past experience managing government funding and/or a strong plan to do so.

- Requested amount is reasonable compared to other grants managed by the organization and compared to the agency’s overall budget
- There are no major concerns from the audit that indicate the organization might not be able to manage the project.
- No recent HUD findings or the agency has a clear outline to address those findings
- If they agency has a renewal grant, the recapture average will be shared

2024 CoC NOFO New Project Ranking Tool—Written Application

1B. Experience implementing the grant in a timely way and onboarding and supporting staff refers to:

- A clear plan with timeframes to get the new project up and running once the grant starts
- A plan to onboard, support, and retain staff members from the beginning of the grant going forward.

2. Project Services and Support		
Performance Standard	Point Description	Points Awarded
Agency has the experience and plan to work with this population and the internal capacity and/or external partnerships to reach desired outcomes for the target population including housing stability.	Excellent experience/plan: 5 pts Good experience/plan: 3 pts Inadequate experience/plan: 0 pts	/5
Projected staffing resources are appropriate for project.	Excellent staffing plan: 5 points Good staffing plan: 3 pts Inadequate staffing plan: 0 pts	/5
They type, frequency and duration of the supportive services proposed fit the needs of the population to be served.	Meets needs well: 5 pts Meets needs satisfactorily: 3 pts Does not meet needs: 0 pts	/5
This project outlines how it will assist client to successfully locate, obtain and maintain housing.	Good plan: 5 pts Adequate plan: 3 pts Weak plan: 0 pts	/5
Project is equipped to support people with high levels of services of service needs (ie. mental health, substance use, barriers to housing & employment, etc)	Highly supportive: 5 pts Some support: 3 pts Little support: 0 pts	/5
Project has experience and a plan to successfully connect clients to mainstream resources (SSI, SSDI, Medicaid, Link)	Yes: 3 pts No: 0 pts.	/3
This project outlines a plan that will increase client income	Good plan: 5 pts Satisfactory plan: 3 pts No plan: 0 pts	/5
Section 2: Maximum 33 points		/33
Review panel: Please provide any necessary feedback regarding why the group decided this score.		

2024 CoC NOFO New Project Ranking Tool—Written Application

3. Data Collection		
DV agencies will be scored based on their HMIS-comparable database plan. Full participation in HMIS-comparable database means ability to meet federal HMIS requirements by submitting an Annual Performance report (APR) generated from a HMIS-comparable database with aggregate client counts for data elements.		
Performance Standard	Point Description	Points Awarded
Agencies currently using HMIS/Comparable database	Currently using well-5 pts Currently using some-3 pts Currently using inadequately-0pts	/5
Agencies not currently using HMIS/comparable system for more than 1 project	Not using but has a strong plan—5 pts Not using but has an adequate plan-3 pts Not using but have no plan—0 pts	/5
Section 3: Maximum 5 points		/5
Review panel: Please provide any necessary feedback regarding why the group decided this score.		

4. Evaluation and Outcomes		
Performance Standard	Point Description	Points Awarded
Agency has an evaluation and quality improvement process for this specific project.	Good plan- 5 pts Adequate plan-3 pts Weak/no plan-0 pts	/5
Agency demonstrates practices to implement evaluation plan, ensure client level outcomes are met, and process for improving project based findings.	Good plan- 5 pts Adequate plan-3 pts Weak/no plan-0 pts	/5
Section 4: Maximum 10 points		/10
Review panel: Please provide any necessary feedback regarding why the group decided this score.		

- A good example of an evaluation plan: outlines what will be measured, when, how, and by whom.

2024 CoC NOFO New Project Ranking Tool—Written Application

- An adequate example contains elements of a great plan but lacks specificity on what, how, etc.
- A weak example has little to no specificity about what, when, how, etc outcomes will be measured.

5. Meaningful Engagement of People with Lived Experience of Homelessness in policy design, policy making and decision making.		
Performance Standard	Point Description	Points Awarded
Project demonstrates experience and plan to incorporate people with lived experience of homelessness in decision-making, feedback and operation of the program or past projects. Plan includes agency’s commitment to the time and resources needed for mentoring and coaching.	High engagement-5 pts Some engagement-3 pts Little/no engagement- 0 pts	/5
Section 5: Maximum 5 points		/5
Review panel: Please provide any necessary feedback regarding why the group decided this score.		

- Meaningful engagement could include participation of people with lived experience on agency board or other decision-making body, opportunities for feedback and involvement in continuous quality improvement, or other concrete examples of how participants are meaningfully engaged in program design and agency level decision making.

6. Racial Equity		
Performance Standard	Point Description	Points Awarded
Agency approach to recruiting and retaining diverse board members, senior staff, an staff that reflects community served	Multiple strategies- 3 pts Some strategies-2 pt No strategies-0 pts	/3
Agency approach to equity as it relates to program design and services	Multiple strategies- 3 pts Some strategies-2 pt No strategies-0 pts	/3
Agency approach to evaluate internal policies and program outcomes to identify programmatic changes needed to make program participant outcomes more equitable.	Multiple strategies- 3 pts Some strategies-2 pt No strategies-0 pts	/3
Section 6: Maximum 9 points		/9
Review panel: Please provide any necessary feedback regarding why the group decided this score.		

2024 CoC NOFO New Project Ranking Tool—Written Application

7. Active participation in Continuum of Care		
Performance Standard	Point Description	Points Awarded
Attendance at full membership meetings	70% or more-2 pt <70%- 0 pts	/2
Involvement in a CoC committee or workgroup	Yes: 2 pts No: 0 pts	/2
Section 7: Maximum 3 points		/4

- The NIHC will score this section based on the attendance records.

8. New CoC Partnerships		
Performance Standard	Point Description	Points Awarded
Applicant not currently funded by HUD CoC funds (either directly or indirectly)	Yes: 6 pts No: 0 pts	/6
Section 8: Maximum 6 points		/6

COC BONUS: COORDINATED ENTRY		
Performance Standard	Point Description	Points Awarded
Applicant is requesting funds to run a CoC-wide CES project.	Yes: 10 pts No: 0 pts	/10
CES Project: Maximum 10 points		/10

- HUD mandates that all CoC's have a Coordinated Entry System. Currently there are no HUD funded CoC projects in this service area.

DV BONUS PROJECTS ONLY		
Performance Standard	Point Description	Points Awarded
Percentage of DV survivors that exited emergency shelter or TH program to a permanent destination in the last fiscal year	75%-100--3 pts 50-74--2 pts 25-49--1 pt <25--0 pts	/3
Project is able to describe how they quickly move DV survivors experiencing homelessness into permanent housing and address barriers to housing	Multiple strategies- 2 pts Some strategies-1 pt No strategies-0 pts	/2
Project is able to demonstrate how they prioritize the safety of DV survivors experiencing homelessness	Excellent ability—2 pts Adequate ability—1 pt	/2

2024 CoC NOFO New Project Ranking Tool—Written Application

	Inadequate ability—0 pts	
Project is able to demonstrate how they will evaluate ability to ensure the safety of DV survivors	Excellent ability—2 pts Adequate ability—1 pt Inadequate ability—0 pts	/2
Project understand the trauma-informed, victim-centered approaches to meet the service needs of DV survivors experiencing homelessness and has a plan to meet those needs by providing a wide variety of services and support.	Excellent understanding—2 pts Adequate understanding—1 pt Inadequate understanding—0 pts	/2
DV Projects ONLY: Maximum 11 points		/11
Review panel: Please provide any necessary feedback regarding why the group decided this score.		

Written Scoring Summary	Points Awarded
1. Project Readiness and Capacity to Implement Project	/10 max
2. Project Services and Support	/33 max
3. Data Collection	/5 max
4. Evaluation and Outcomes	/10 max
5. Meaningful Engagement of People with Lived Experience	/5 max
6. Racial Equity	/9 max
7. Active participation in Continuum of Care	/4 max
8. New CoC Partnerships	/6 max
CES Project Question	/10 max
DV Bonus Question	/11 max
Written Total: CoC Bonus Project	/92 max pts
Written Total: DV Bonus Projects	/93 max pts