

**City of Winston-Salem
HUD Continuum of Care Program
2016 New Project SCORECARD**

Agency or Agencies: _____

Program or Project Name: _____

NOTE TO PANEL: ONLY THE NEW PROJECTS ARE TO BE SCORED THIS YEAR. THE RENEWAL PROJECTS WILL NOT BE SCORED BY THE PANEL, BUT WILL HAVE PERFORMANCE SCORES CALCULATED BY STAFF. PLEASE BE SURE TO COMPLETE ONE OF THESE SCORECARDS FOR EACH OF THE NEW PROJECTS.

Section numbers below refer to sections of the application form. The point system below is a guide to panel scoring. Panel members have discretion to use “in-between” numbers, including decimals, to indicate gradations of scoring.

SCORING CHART			
Total Possible Points = 100			
Section 3: ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY			27 Points Maximum
<i>Scoring Criteria</i>			Points Available
			Points Awarded
A	Mission—Does the project support the mission of the organization? 3 points—clearly defined connection to mission 1 point—the project may have potential to support the mission 0 points—this project does not support the agency’s mission		3
B	Experience—Will the experience of the organization contribute to the project success? 6 points—clearly states relevant experiences and length of time 3 points—agency can do it, with training and assistance 0 points—it isn’t clear there’s a way for them to do this project successfully		6
C	Structure—Are organizational structure and human resources appropriate to support the project? 6 points—clearly describes strong structure 5 points—agency is making slight adjustments to make it possible 3 points—agency needs to make a major change in structure/staff 1 point—agency probably would need outside help; questionable 0 points—it isn’t clear they can get organized to do it		6

D	<p>Capacity and timing—Does the organization have what is needed to start and finish the project in a timely and effective manner?</p> <p>6 points—clearly has the capacity to succeed & in a timely manner 4 points—agency can do it & do it on time, but could use a more clearly stated plan 2 points—need more information to tell if they can do it 1 point—agency would need to hire new/different staff or consultants to do it; timing not clear 0 point—it isn't clear there's a way for them to do this project successfully & on time</p>	6	
E	<p>Collaboration—Will collaboration contribute to project success?</p> <p>6 points—clearly states project is part of a collaborative initiative 4 points—references being part of a collaborative initiative, but not clear the degree they're invested in the collaborative effort 2 points—describes working with some other organizations, but not clear it is part of a collaborative effort 1 point—just describes referrals between agencies and/or homeless council meeting attendance 0 points—not part of a collaboration and referrals not even clear</p>	6	
TOTAL CAPACITY POINTS			

Section 4: STRATEGIC PRIORITY —Does the project help the community meet strategic objectives? (see Appendix 1 of application)		29 Points Maximum	
	<i>Scoring Criteria</i>	Points Available	Points Awarded
A	<p>Need—Does the proposal establish the need and potential benefits?</p> <p>6 points—describes the population and needs clearly, and the populations include chronically homeless persons 4 points—describes the population; need not clearly described and/or does not include chronically homeless persons 0 points—no clear statement of population or need</p>	6	

B	<p>Strategies—Is the proposal consistent with the strategies listed in Exhibit 1 of the application? Applicants are to organize their response using the 4 Roman numerals in Exhibit 1 to make it easy to score.</p> <p>6 points—used all 4 strategic elements from Exhibit 1 4 points—used 3 elements from Exhibit 1 2 points—used 2 elements from Exhibit 1 1 points—used 1 element from Exhibit 1 0 points—used no elements from Exhibit 1</p>	6	
C	<p>Performance Measures</p> <p>6 points—indicated 2 measures with target # and % 4 points—indicated measures but targets incomplete 0 points—failure to describe measures or goals not relevant</p>	6	
D	<p>Performance Results</p> <p>6 points—had successful performance on 2 goals 4 points—had success on at least 1 goal 1 point—described goals, but appears not to know results 0 points—no clearly measured goals</p>	6	
	<p>Supplemental Questionnaire—</p> <p>5 points—applicant completed Supplemental Questionnaire in Exhibit 2 of the application</p> <p>3 points—Supplemental Questionnaire partially completed</p> <p>0 points—applicant did not complete Supplemental Questionnaire at all</p>	5	
TOTAL STRATEGIC POINTS			

Section 5: PROJECT APPROACH AND DESIGN		21 Points Maximum	
<i>Scoring Criteria</i>		Points Available	Points Awarded
A	<p>Coordinated Intake and Assessment</p> <p>6 points—project will serve households who are assessed through the Community Intake Center (coordinated Intake and Assessment)</p> <p>0 points—no participation indicated</p>	6	

B	<p>Services—Are services appropriate to help participants meet the objectives of the funding program?</p> <p>6 points—describes type, frequency and duration of services, as well as a follow-up plan and all appear to be appropriate and sufficient to meet needs and to succeed on performance measures; services are available but housing is not conditioned on participation; housing is not conditioned on sobriety</p> <p>4 points—type, frequency or duration not clearly described or appear to be insufficient to meet needs of the participants</p> <p>0 points—services not clearly described or not tied to needs</p>	6	
C	<p>Housing First—Is the project based on Housing First or other best practices?</p> <p>6 points—Housing First fully implemented, and there is full, relevant response to all parts of the questions</p> <p>0 points—does not use Housing First or unresponsive to question</p>	6	
D	<p>Duplication—Does the proposed project duplicate services?</p> <p>3 points—clearly not a duplication or if a duplication, service is provided as part of a team/collaborative effort</p> <p>2 points—some duplication, but focuses on a specific subpopulation that other agencies don't serve</p> <p>1 point—good case made for the service, but it is clearly a duplication of services</p> <p>0 points—duplication of services and no case made to support it</p>	3	
TOTAL QUALITY POINTS			

Section 6: COST EFFECTIVENESS		23 Points Maximum	
<i>Scoring Criteria</i>		Points Available	Points Awarded
A	<p>CoC Proposed Project Budget/Funds Requested</p> <p>6 points—lists all the activities and the funds requested and the budget is attached</p> <p>0 points—does not list all the activities or funds requested and/or the budget is not attached</p>	6	
B	<p>Matching & Other Funds Status—Does the project meet or exceed the 25% match requirement?</p> <p>6 points—fills out all information and match is at least 25%</p> <p>0 points—information missing and/or match less than 25%</p>	6	
C	<p>Leverage</p> <p>4 points—Leverage is at least 150% of HUD request</p> <p>3 points—Leverage is at least 100% of HUD request</p> <p>1 points—Leverage is at least 75% of HUD request</p> <p>0 points—Leverage is less than 75 % of HUD request</p>	4	
D	<p>Average Cost</p> <p>4 points—all information is provided</p> <p>0 points—all information is not provided</p>	4	
E	<p>Sustainability—is a sustainability plan described?</p> <p>3 points—a plan is described and appears to be reasonable</p> <p>0 points—a reasonable plan is not described</p>	3	
TOTAL COST EFFECTIVENESS POINTS			
TOTAL POINTS			
Additional Comments:			
THIS PROPOSAL HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND SCORED BY:			
Name		Date	