**2024 Balance of State Continuum of Care Application**

**Bonus Project Scoring Worksheet for Reviewers**

**(Please complete one scoring worksheet for each application)**

**(Approval by the Governance Advisory Board August 26, 2024**

**Note—Scoring can be completed in this Word document or by hand and scanned back—whatever is easier for you.**

**Name of Agency\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Project Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Type of application**

**CoC Bonus—PSH  CoC Bonus-RRH  DV Bonus-RRH  DV Bonus-SSO-CE**

| **Area** | **Criteria** | **Scale** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Threshold-**  **Q1, Q1a** | Applicant met initial threshold requirements including no unresolved monitoring findings, is good legal standing related to non-profit status, and completes an annual audit**.**  *Guidance: Non-Profit operating within AZBOSCOC geographic boundaries for no less than one year. Has a current audit with no outstanding concerns or findings****.***  *ADOH will complete a threshold review as well prior to including the project in the application****.*** | * All criteria are met---3 points * Not all criteria are met—0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Involvement in the LCEH Q2, Q3, Q4** | Applicant is actively involved in the LCEH including attending meetings and participating in the Unsheltered Point In Time Count | * Applicant participates in LCEH meetings and participated in Unsheltered Point in Time Count-2 points * Applicant participated in meetings or the Unsheltered Point in Time Count—but not both—1 point * Applicant is not involved in LCEH activities-0 point |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **HMIS/**  **alternative that meet HUD standards**  **Q5** | Applicant explained how they will use HMIS or if a DV provider, use a comparable database.  *Guidance: If potential new provider, is explanation sufficient to know there is an understanding of HMIS/comparable database ?* | * Applicant use of HMIS or comparable database description was complete and clear—4 points * Applicant use of HMIS use or comparable database description was adequate—2 points * Agency did not provide sufficient information to indicate competent use of a client level database—0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Organization Overview and Project Description**  **Q6, Q7** | Applicant provided a complete and clear description about the project and target population?  *Guidance: Is it clear what service activities will be provided and by whom? Were the methods of outreach reasonable for the service area? Is there a strategy for targeting those most at need?* | * Organization overview and project description was complete and clear-8 points * Organization overview and project description was adequate-4 points * Organization overview and project description was insufficient and did not provide a full overview—0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Project specifically leverages other housing and/or health resources with commitment of signed MOU –Q7a** | Applicant must demonstrate that at least 25% of the project’s total units must be supported by other housing or healthcare funding and that the Applicant committed to provided signed MOU documenting the leverage. | * Applicant demonstrated leverage of housing resources at 25% of units.- 3 points * Applicant demonstrated leverage of healthcare resources at 25% of funding requested * Applicant demonstrated leverage of both housing and health care resources in the amount of 25% of units for housing and 25% of funding requested for healthcare resources—6 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Need for project**  **Q8** | Applicant provided clear description about how the project will fill gaps in service and what need will be addressed through the project. The applicant cited local data to demonstrate the need. The applicant described how LCEH members were consulted.  *Guidance: Is data stated recent? Does it relate to services being proposed? Is it logical?* | * Applicant provided information about need that was complete and compelling—4 points * Applicant provided information about need that was adequate —2 points * Applicant did not provide a compelling reason for the project—0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Focus—Project is in community unserved/**  **Underserved Q8a** | The applicant included information that the project will serve a county where there are currently no CoC PSH/RRH projects. OR  The applicant included information that the project will serve a county that has insufficient PSH/RRH units and documented how the county is underserved related to PSH/RRH. | * Applicant demonstrated that the project will be located in an unserved county—6 points * Applicant demonstrated that the project will be located in an underserved county—3 points. * Project will not be located in a county that is unserved or underserved.-0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Coordinated Entry for Bonus, DV Bonus**  **Or**  **Bonus SSO-CE**  **9, 9a** | Applicant provided complete information about how they (or will) participate in Coordinated Entry including use of the Vi-SPDAT, matching participants to housing and participation in the local coordinated entry process.  OR  For SSO-CE Applicant demonstrated understanding of how the Coordinated Process must include adaptations to effectively serve survivors of domestic violence  *Guidance: How is the applicant involved in the local Coordinated Entry System? Is an explanation more than a statement on attending meetings? Is there demonstrated comprehension of CE?* | * CE/CC activity were clearly articulated or for SSO-CE applicant clearly demonstrated understanding of CE in relationship to survivors of DV—8 points * CE/CC activity description was adequate or for SSO-CE applicant demonstrated and adequate understanding of CE in relationship to survivors of DV—4 points * CE/CC activities description was incomplete or for SSO-CE clear understanding was not articulated—0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Move to safe, affordable permanent housing-**  **Q9b** | Applicant provided a clear description about how households will be quickly moved into safe, affordable housing. Or  If SSO-CE project, applicant provided a clear description about how the project will support organizations with housing placement.  *Guidance: Does the applicant have experience in this work? Is plan for outreach, services and moving into housing comprehensive? If SSO-CE does the applicant know who the service organizations are and work with them currently?* | * Applicant demonstrated clear understanding about housing placement-4 points * Applicant did not demonstrate a clear understand about housing placement-0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Housing Affordability**  **Q12, Q13, Q13a, Q13b, Q14** | Applicant provided information that demonstrates their understanding of the rental markets in the community (ies) they propose to serve. Applicants demonstrate they participate in housing affordability efforts in the communities they serve.  *Guidance: How are units identified? Is the proposed number of units reasonable for the described rental market? Not applicable to SSO-CE* | * Applicant demonstrated clear plans to implement strategies to ensure the community has units that have reasonable rents. 4 points * Applicant demonstrated basic plans to provide minimal support to ensure community has units that have reasonable rents. 2 points * Applicant demonstrated no understanding about how to contribute to the community to promote reasonable rents-0 |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Landlord Collaboration, Q14a, Q14b** | Applicant provided information that demonstrates they have active relationships or have plans to establish collaborations related to promoting the use of units for participants and have relationship that results in problem solving if issues come up.  *Guidance: Did the applicant identify strategies related to recruiting landlords? Not applicable to SSO-CE* | * Applicant demonstrated clear collaborations and partnerships-4 points * Applicant demonstrated basic minimal partnerships and collaborations 2 points * Applicant demonstrated partnerships or collaborations |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Housing First/Low Barrier**  **Q15, Q16, Q17, Q18, Q18a, Q19** | Applicant demonstrated an understanding of Housing First principles and how they will be implemented through the project including attributes such as   * No barriers to entry * No preconditions * Does not terminate program participants for lack of participation in services beyond normal tenancy rules. * Supportive services participation is voluntary. | * Applicant demonstrated clear understanding of Housing First and strategies to implement—8 points * Applicant demonstrated basic of understanding of Housing First and will need support for implementation—4 points * Applicant demonstrated no understanding of Housing First and related attributes –0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Justice, Equity, Diversity, Inclusion**  **processes—services**  **Q20, Q20a, Q20b, Q20c, Q20d, Q20e, Q21, Q21a, Q22** | The applicant described how strategies to implement justice, equity, diversity and inclusion will be implemented as a part of the program?   * Use of appropriate assessments * How outreach and referral will take place with to ensure racial equity * How individuals coming from the justice system (i.e., jail or corrections) or other institutions will be served through the program.   *Guidance: Is there a clear understanding of barriers to participation (e.g. lack of outreach) faced by persons of different races and ethnicities, particularly those over-represented in the local population of individuals experiencing homelessness?* | * Applicant clearly explained and proposed activities that will promote justice, equity, diversity and inclusion—10 points * Applicant sufficiently explained and proposed activities that will promote justice, equity, diversity and inclusion—8 points * Applicant demonstrated basic understanding of implementing services through a social justice and racial equity lens but will need additional support for implementation —6 points * Applicant demonstrated no understanding of how to implement strategies through a justice, equity, diversity, inclusion lens –0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Permanent Housing**  **Q25** | Applicant described how program participants will be supported in remaining or obtaining permanent housing?  *Guidance: Did applicant articulate communication with participants and how there is connection to resources?* | * Description articulated clearly how connections to permanent housing will be implemented--8 points * Description was adequate—4 points * Description was incomplete—0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Mainstream Resources**  **Q26, Q26a** | Applicant described how coordination takes place with other organizations and how the program participant will be connected to mainstream resources including SSI, SSDI, Food Stamps, Veteran Benefits and others. | * Description articulated clearly about coordination with other organization and how connections to mainstream resources will be implemented--4 points * Description was adequate—2 points * Description was incomplete—0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Education**  **Q 26a** | Applicant described how the agency works with homeless school liaisons or help clients/tenants in enrolling in education activities? | * Description articulated clearly how connections to education will be implemented--4 points * Description was adequate—2 points * Description was incomplete—0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Employment**  **Q26a** | Applicant described how the program participant would be connected to employment support and what types of employment support are provided? | * Description articulated clearly how connections to employment will be implemented--4 points * Description was adequate—2 points * Description was incomplete—0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | |  |
| **Insurance**  **SSDI/SOAR**  **Q27a, 27b, 27c, 27d, 27e, 27f** | Applicant described how clients/tenant are connected to insurance and social security (SSI/SSDI) benefits or a SOAR trained individual to apply for benefits?  *Guidance: Does the agency have SOAR trained staff? If no staff, is there a clearly defined relationship detailing how applicant will work with entity that has SOAR trained staff?* | * Description articulated clearly how individuals are connected--4 points * Description was adequate—2 points * Description was incomplete—0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Survivors of Domestic Violence**  **Q28, Q29, Q30** | Applicant explained how they will provide services in alignment with HUD/VAWA guidelines related to survivors of domestic violence  *Guidance: Did the applicant articulate an understanding of VAWA and strategies related to the delivery of supportive services, strategies related to sustainable housing stability, and addressing safety?* | * Applicant demonstrated clear plans to meeting program participants service needs-6 points * Applicant demonstrated basic plans to provide minimal support to program participant service needs 4 points * Applicant demonstrated no understanding of how to provide support services to program participants–0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Fair Housing**  **Q32** | Applicant demonstrated an understanding of fair housing and indicated training attendance. | * Applicant demonstrated clear understanding of fair housing tenets and implementation -4 points * Applicant demonstrated basic understanding of fair housing tenets and implementation and will need support to fully implement -2 points * Applicant demonstrated no understanding of fair housing tenets and implementation. -0 points |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| **Total Score** | | | |

**Summary Comments:**

**Summary Scoring Matrix**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Maximum Points**  **For Bonus Projects or**  **DV Bonus Projects** | **Maximum Points for DV Bonus SSO-CE** |
| **Threshold** | **3** | **3** |
| **Involvement in LCEH** | **2** | **2** |
| **HMIS and Comparable Database** | **4** | **4** |
| **Organization Overview and Project Description** | **8** | **8** |
| **Project Description-Leverage of Housing and/or Healthcare Resources** | **6** | **NA** |
| **Need for the project** | **4** | **4** |
| **Project Description unserved/underserved area** | **6** | **6** |
| **Coordinated Entry/Case Conferencing** | **8** | **8** |
| **Move to safe, affordable housing** | **4** | **4** |
| **Housing Affordability not applicable to SSO-CE** | **4** | **NA** |
| **Landlord/Property Management** | **4** | **NA** |
| **Housing First** | **8** | **8** |
| **Justice, Equity, Inclusion, Diversity** | **10** | **10** |
| **Permanent Housing** | **8** | **8** |
| **Mainstream Resources** | **4** | **4** |
| **Education** | **4** | **4** |
| **Employment** | **4** | **4** |
| **Insurance/SSDI/SOAR** | **4** | **4** |
| **Survivors of Domestic Violence** | **6** | **6** |
| **Fair Housing** | **4** | **4** |
| **Total** | **105** | **91** |