



KANSAS STATEWIDE HOMELESS COALITION
Kansas Balance of State Continuum of Care
2009 Project Scoring Sheet

Project Name _____

Reviewer Name _____

Criteria		
Capacity	(Maximum 20 points)	
Does the applicant have access to the staffing and administrative resources necessary to successfully implement the planned activities and manage the grant properly?	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely Likely. Has been successful with a similar project in the past.
	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very likely. Hasn't done it before, but is well staffed and should be able to be successful.
	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Probably. Doesn't have the resources now, but has a plan for getting them that should work.
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Likely. Hasn't managed a project of this scope before, doesn't have the resources readily available and plan for getting it done seems weak.
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not seem possible; not ready and not realistic to be ready in time to be successful.
Budget Sheets	(Maximum 10 points)	
Renewals: Budget line items correlate to SHP Grant Inventory	10	Line items all correlate to SHP Grant Inventory
Applicant Financial Capacity	(Maximum 10 points)	
Renewals: No delay in meeting program timelines, no unresolved HUD monitoring findings, has spent money in a timely fashion and does not or has not returned money to HUD. All: Agency has a line of credit or an operating reserve to cover one-month payroll, OR can document 12 months of having met payroll obligations and the agency is current on all payroll taxes. Has had a satisfactory independent audit been performed?	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean independent audit & HUD audit, no delay in implementing project (unless beyond the control of the agency), meets payroll, expends HUD funds in timely manner.
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HUD audit with resolved findings, some delay in implementation, HUD fund expenditures uneven.
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HUD audit with resolved findings, some HUD funds expended too fast, or left over. New projects with poor independent audit or limited other funding sources.
Need/Targeting Identified Gap	(Maximum 15 points)	
Does the applicant's proposed program fill a gap in a high priority area of the Continuum of Care? Does it meet a BoS CoC Priority?	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely Likely. It is targeted at high priority group and fills in a critical need.
	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very likely. Targeted at a high priority group, addresses a critical need, but other program in area.
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Probably. Is targeted at some high priority groups, but duplicates others area needs.
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Likely. Does not emphasize high priority groups needs, not responsive to the highest community priorities or needs at this time.
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not responsive to what the community has determined are its highest priorities at this time.
Relative Geographic Need	(Maximum 20 points)	
Does this project address the needs in the most underserved counties?	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is proposed to serve an area with no existing services and housing for homeless.
	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is proposed in an area with some services but fills a critical gap in the continuum of services
	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is proposed to serve an area with little existing or seasonal only services or housing activities
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are similar projects and/or CoC projects
Emphasis on Housing Activities	(Maximum 20 points)	

What is the percent of funding request for housing activities?	<p>20 • 100%</p> <p>15 • 90-80%</p> <p>10 • 70 – 80%</p> <p>5 • 60 – 70%</p> <p>0 • 59% and below</p>
Soundness of Approach (Maximum 15 points)	
Has the applicant adequately described what is planned to address the problem? Does the proposed program/housing make sense? Is it feasible?	<p>15 • Extremely Likely. The project is clearly described and certain to succeed in getting the results.</p> <p>10 • Very likely. There are some questions remaining about the project, but they are not major. The direction that is going is sound and should be successful.</p> <p>5 • Not sure. Not clear what will be done, there are some risks and possible pitfalls.</p> <p>0 • Vague project description. Not a thoughtful or sensible approach.</p>
Measurement of Success (Maximum 20 points)	
<p>New: Will the project meet HUD's performance objectives? Is it clearly described in their application?</p> <p>Renewal: APR performance on HUD's objectives?</p>	<p>20 • Extremely Likely. Logic Model is clear and has well defined measures for success. APRs demonstrate outcomes above HUD's outcomes.</p> <p>15 • Very likely. Has definition for success and logic model is clear. The direction is its going should be successful. APRs demonstrate outcomes at HUD's outcome levels.</p> <p>10 • Not sure. Definition of success and methods to measure success in logic model are not well developed. APRs demonstrate outcomes below HUD's outcomes.</p> <p>0 • Does not seem feasible. No thought has been given to a definition of success or methods of measurement. APRs demonstrate outcomes well below HUD's outcomes.</p>
HMIS Participation (Maximum 20 points)	
<p>Renewals: Has the project been participating in HMIS?</p> <p>New Project: Has the applicant agency participating in HMIS for this or other programs?</p>	<p>20 • Applicant has been actively and correctly entering data in HMIS. APRs are generated with HMIS and 100% bed coverage was achieved for January 28, 2009.</p> <p>15 • Applicant has been entering data, but did not have bed coverage for January 28, 2009.</p> <p>10 • Application began consistently entering data during 2009.</p> <p>5 • Renewal project participates but does not enter data consistently.</p> <p>0 • No participation in HMIS</p>
Leveraging Resources (Maximum 20 points)	
Ratio of leveraging to HUD request. Have the letters been submitted?	<p>20 • Leverage is 3:1 or greater, based on relationships that have been effectively used in the past, and includes new partnerships or funding sources.</p> <p>15 • Leverage is proposed to be about 2:1 or greater, but some of it is a little speculative or no new finding sources or partnerships have been established.</p> <p>10 • Leverage is less than 2:1 and/or some of it seems rather problematic.</p> <p>0 • Less than 1:1.</p>
Comprehensive and Coordination (Maximum 10 points)	
Has the applicant demonstrated how the project/housing activity is related to other housing activities/strategies taking place in the community and how the project will work in coordination with other service providers/programs/housing?	<p>10 • Extremely Likely. A highly collaborative project that has clear linkages to other services and planned, value-added inter-relationships with them. Project has MOU/MOAs.</p> <p>8 • Very likely. The proposed relationships are clear, but aren't spelled-out in detail. Coordination will add to effectiveness.</p> <p>5 • Not sure. Not apparent how this project will fit in with others, but there are possibilities that can be pursued.</p> <p>0 • Little or no relationship with other services. No thought has been given to the positioning of this project in the community or overall continuum of care.</p>
Cost Effectiveness (Maximum of 10 points)	
Does the project seem to be cost effective in the use of funds available?	<p>10 • Very cost effective. Proposes to use every dollar effectively and does so in ways which are sustainable and unlikely to compromise service. The ratio of individuals and families served to the cost of project dollars is high.</p>

	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not sure. Some of the costs proposed and value gained seem a little optimistic. May not be able to deliver, or may cost more than is suggested. 						
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project doesn't really utilize the resources requested cost effectively or efficiently. 						
Participation in CoC Planning Process	(Maximum of 20 points)							
Has the project applicant or applicant's agency participated in CoC planning process and has the applicant or applicant's agency provided information for Exhibit 1?	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Coordinator and/or regular attendance at local, regional or state meetings. Provides information for Exhibit 1. 						
	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occasional attendance at meetings and some information for Exhibit 1. 						
	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occasional attendance at meetings; provides no information for Exhibit 1. 						
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little participation but provides some information for Exhibit 1. 						
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No participation or information. 						
Energy Star	(Maximum 5 points)							
Does the project use Energy Star?	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project uses Energy Star 						
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project doesn't use Energy Star 						
Renewal Impact/Sustainability	(Maximum 10 points)							
Does the project show a decreasing need for funding and have they attempted to secure funds from other sources?	10	The agency demonstrates the ability to continue housing and/or supportive service delivery for homeless individuals and families if the grant application were not renewed at the end of the project period. There is a decreasing amount of funds requested over the budget period and there is a high amount of leveraging.						
	5	Modest ability to continue the project if not renewed, likely to request renewal and modest about of leveraging. Funding levels do not decrease annually.						
	0	Very likely to request renewal. HUD funding is the major source of funding with very little leveraging.						
SHP Employment Policies	(5 points added to score)							
If the project is building or rehabbing, does the project implement policies to ensure employment opportunities are directed to low-income persons?	5	Yes						
	0	No						
Client Survey's (2 bonus points)								
Renewal projects: Does the projects conduct client satisfaction surveys and provide a report? New Projects: Does the project plan to conduct satisfaction surveys and has provided the documents?	Renewal projects: Does the projects conduct client satisfaction surveys and provide a report? New Projects: Does the project plan to conduct satisfaction surveys and has provided the documents?							
Permanent Housing Projects	(Maximum 8 bonus points)							
Points are added based on the percentage of CH beds	8	100%	6	70 - 80%	4	50 - 60%	2	20 - 30%
	7	80 - 90%	5	60 - 70%	3	40 - 50%	1	10 - 19%
Total Base Points - Renewals Total Base Points – New Projects Bonus Points	<p style="text-align: center;">_____ points out of _____ _____ points out of 15</p>							