Applicant and Project Name: Click here to enter text.

Rater Name: Click here to enter text. Date Reviewed: Click or tap to enter a date.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Quality Requirements** |  |
| Renewal projects must ensure they continue to meet HUD thresholds for funding.  | Maximum Score Possible | PSH – 135RRH - 105 |
| Total Project Score |  |

*Please note at the numbered questions on the application correspond with the numbered scoring areas below.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section I: Project Effectiveness** | Possible Points: **PSH – 80****RRH – 50** Possible Deductions:-10 | Section Score: |
| 5. Does the project qualify as low barrier? |
| Answered “None of the Above” | 4 |  |
| Checked any other boxes | 0 |
| 6. Does the project meet all Housing First criteria?  |
| Answered “None of the Above” | 6 |  |
| Checked any other boxes | 0 |
| 7a. Did the project take 100% of all referrals from Coordinated Entry in the past grant year?  |
| Yes | 2 |  |
| No | 0 |
| 7b. Percentage of referrals refused by applicant |
| 10% or less | 3 |  |
| 11% to 25% | 1 |
| “Don’t Know” or higher than 25% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| 8. Prioritization and Referral Process |
| Proof of Prioritization and Referral Process | 5 |  |
| No Information Provided | 0 |
| Efficient Use of Funding:  |
| 9. What is the project’s utilization rate? |
| 90% or higher | 5 |  |
| 80%-89% | 0 |
| 79% or lower | -5 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| 10. Anticipated recapture |
| Yes |  | *Not scored* |
| No |  |
|  |  |  |
| 11. History of recapture (three years) |
| No history of recapture | 5 |  |
| Recapture for each grant listed is less than 10% | 0 |
| Recapture on any grant is greater than 10% | -5 |
| 12. Percent of funding recaptured in last completed grant year |
|  a. Amount authorized in most recent completed HUD grant year |
|  b. Remaining balance in eLOCCS |
| Less than 10% | 5 |  |
| More than 10%  | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| 13. Were drawdowns made at least quarterly? |
| Yes | 5 |  |
| No | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| 14. Voluntary reallocation *(answered if project was not fully expended)* |
| Yes, the applicant wishes to voluntarily reallocate |  | *Not Scored* |
| No, the applicant does not wish to voluntarily reallocate |  |
| N/A |  |
| HMIS Participation |
| 15. Percentage of APR Data Quality Elements (6a.-6d.) with 5% or less null or missing values |
| 85% or greater | 5 |  |
| Less than 84% | 0 |
| HUD Monitoring Findings |
| 16. Does the recipient have any HUD monitoring findings in any of the agency’s projects? If yes, findings must be resolved or explained to the satisfaction of the Funding Review Panel for the application to meet standards.  | Standard Met:Yes/No |  |
| Impact on Homelessness |
| 17. Is this project the only CoC funded project with dedicated beds to a particular target population? *(Answered by Project Evaluation based on all applications submitted for this NOFA.)* |
| Yes |  | *Not Scored**Taken into consideration in a tie score situation* |
| No |
| 18. Would additional funds be accepted? |
| Yes |  | *Not Scored* |
| No |
| 19. LPB membership acknowledgement |
| Yes | 5 |  |
| No | 0 |
| Serving High Need Populations **– PSH ONLY** |
| 20. What percentage of the households met “hard to serve” criteria defined as having zero income at Start/entry? (APR 23) |
| 80% or more | 10 |  |
| 70-%79%  | 8 |
| 50%-69% | 5 |
| Less than 50% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| 21. What percentage of participants met “hard to serve” criteria defined as having two or more physical or mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2) |
| More than 50%  | 10 |  |
| 30%-49% | 8 |
| 10%-29% | 5 |
| Less than 10% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| 22. What percentage of the households served were chronically homeless? (APR Q26a.) |
| 80% or more | 10 |  |
| 70-%79%  | 8 |
| 50%-69% | 5 |
| Less than 50% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section II: Project Performance** | Possible Points: 55  | Section Score: |
| Performance Data |
| **Permanent Supportive Housing** |
| 23. Length of Stay |
| Percentage of leavers that remained in project more than 180 days (APR 22a.1) |
| 95% and more  | 20 |  |
| 85%-94% | 15 |
| 75%-84% | 10 |
| 65%-74% | 5 |
| 55%-64% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| 24. Exits to Permanent Housing  |
| Percent who remain in or move to PH |
| 95% or higher | 25 |  |
| 90%-94% | 20 |
| 85%-89% | 15 |
| 80%-84% | 10 |
| 75%-79% | 5 |
| Less than 75% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| 25. New or Increased Income and Earned Income |
| a. Project Stayers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.1) |
| 8% and higher | 2.5 |  |
| 5%-7% | 1.5 |
| Less than 5% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
|  |  |
| b. Project Stayers: New or increased other (non-employment) income (APR 19a.1) |
| 50% and higher | 2.5 |  |
| 25%-49% | 1.5 |
| Less than 25% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| c. Project Leavers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.2) |
| 8% and higher | 2.5 |  |
| 5%-7% | 1.5 |
| Less than 5% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| d. Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2) |
| 50% and higher | 2.5 |  |
| 25%-49% | 1.5 |
| Less than 25% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| **Rapid Re-Housing** |
| 23. Length of Stay |
| Percentage of participants that took 30 days or less from project entry to lease up (CAPER 22C) |
| 80%-100% | 20 |  |
| 60%-79% | 15 |
| 40%-59% | 10 |
| 20%-39% | 5 |
| 0%-19% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| 24. Exits to Permanent Housing  |
| Percent who exit to PH |
| 95% or higher | 25 |  |
| 90%-94% | 20 |
| 85%-89% | 15 |
| 80%-84% | 10 |
| 75%-79% | 5 |
| Less than 75% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| 25. New or Increased Income and Earned Income |
| a. Project Leavers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.2) |
| 30% and higher | 5 |  |
| 20%-29% | 2.5 |
| Less than 20% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |
| b. Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2) |
| 10% and higher | 5 |  |
| 5%-9% | 2.5 |
| Less than 5% | 0 |
| *Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?* |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section III: Completion of Application** | Possible Points: 0 Deductions: -5 | Section Score: |
| 26. Is the application complete and accurate?  |
| Yes | 0 |  |
| No | -5 |