

# Alabama Balance of State Continuum of Care Renewal Projects Scoring Form (FY24 & FY25 NOFO)

This scoring form is designed to evaluate and rank renewal project applications for the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program based on the FY24 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) guidelines. The form ensures that all projects are assessed consistently and transparently. Reviewers should score each section according to the criteria provided.

---

## General Information

- **Project Name:**
  - **Applicant Organization:**
  - **Reviewer Name:**
  - **Date of Review:**
- 

## Section 1: Project Performance (Maximum 40 Points)

- 1. Housing Stability (15 Points)**
    - Percentage of participants who remain in permanent housing or exit to permanent housing destinations.
      - 95% or more (15 points)
      - 90-94% (10 points)
      - 80-89% (5 points)
      - Less than 80% (0 points)
  - 2. Increased Participant Income (10 Points)**
    - Percentage of adult participants who increased their total income (earned and non-earned) over the past year.
      - 55% or more (10 points)
      - 40-54% (7 points)
      - 30-39% (5 points)
      - Less than 30% (0 points)
  - 3. Returns to Homelessness (10 Points)**
    - Percentage of participants who exit to permanent housing and do not return to homelessness within 6 or 12 months.
      - 95% or more (10 points)
      - 85-94% (7 points)
      - 70-84% (5 points)
      - Less than 70% (0 points)
  - 4. Utilization Rate (5 Points)**
    - The average bed/unit utilization rate during the last operating year.
      - 95-100% (5 points)
      - 85-94% (3 points)
      - Less than 85% (0 points)
-

## Section 2: Compliance & Project Management (Maximum 25 Points)

### 1. Timeliness of Drawdowns (5 Points)

- Has the project drawn down funds at least quarterly?
  - Yes, consistently (5 points)
  - Sometimes (3 points)
  - No (0 points)

### 2. Spend-Down Rate (5 Points)

- Has the project expended at least 90% of awarded funds for the last completed grant term?
  - Yes (5 points)
  - 80-89% (3 points)
  - Less than 80% (0 points)

### 3. Data Quality (5 Points)

- Does the project meet or exceed the CoC's established data quality standards for accuracy, timeliness, and completeness in HMIS?
  - Yes, high quality (5 points)
  - Some minor issues (3 points)
  - Data quality needs improvement (0 points)

### 4. Monitoring Findings (5 Points)

- Did the project have any significant findings from HUD or CoC monitoring that remain unresolved?
  - No findings or all resolved (5 points)
  - Minor findings, all resolved (3 points)
  - Significant unresolved findings (0 points)

### 5. Compliance with Housing First (5 Points)

- Is the project following a Housing First approach, meaning no barriers to entry (e.g., sobriety, income, criminal background)?
  - Fully implements Housing First (5 points)
  - Partial implementation (3 points)
  - Not implemented (0 points)

---

## Section 3: Impact and Community Integration (Maximum 20 Points)

### 1. Collaboration with Mainstream Resources (5 Points)

- Does the project actively collaborate with mainstream services (e.g., employment, health care, education, legal assistance)?
  - Yes, strong collaboration (5 points)
  - Some collaboration (3 points)
  - Limited or no collaboration (0 points)

### 2. Participation in CoC Activities (5 Points)

- Is the project actively involved in CoC meetings, committees, and other CoC activities?
  - High participation (5 points)
  - Moderate participation (3 points)
  - Low participation (0 points)

**3. Racial Equity Efforts (5 Points)**

- Does the project demonstrate efforts to promote racial equity and ensure services are accessible to people of color and other historically underserved groups?
  - Strong efforts (5 points)
  - Moderate efforts (3 points)
  - Limited or no efforts (0 points)

**4. Participant Feedback and Satisfaction (5 Points)**

- Has the project gathered and acted on participant feedback to improve services and program design?
    - Yes, comprehensive feedback system (5 points)
    - Some feedback collected (3 points)
    - Limited or no feedback system (0 points)
- 

**Section 4: Cost Effectiveness and Leverage (Maximum 15 Points)**

**1. Cost per Household Served (5 Points)**

- Is the cost per household served reasonable compared to similar projects and considering the level of services provided?
  - Highly cost-effective (5 points)
  - Moderately cost-effective (3 points)
  - Not cost-effective (0 points)

**2. Leveraged Resources (5 Points)**

- Does the project leverage additional resources (cash or in-kind) to support its operations beyond CoC funds?
  - Yes, significant leveraged resources (5 points)
  - Some leveraged resources (3 points)
  - Little or no leveraged resources (0 points)

**3. Match Contribution (5 Points)**

- Does the project meet or exceed the required match contribution (cash or in-kind) for its grant?
    - Exceeds required match (5 points)
    - Meets required match (3 points)
    - Does not meet required match (0 points)
- 

**Section 5: Bonus Points (Maximum 10 Points)**

**1. Innovation (5 Points)**

- Does the project incorporate innovative practices that improve housing stability, service delivery, or outcomes for participants?
  - Yes, innovative approach (5 points)
  - Some innovation (3 points)
  - No innovation (0 points)

**2. Serving Underserved Populations (5 Points)**

- Does the project prioritize underserved or high-need populations (e.g., people with disabilities, LGBTQ+, rural areas)?
    - Yes, strong focus (5 points)
    - Some focus (3 points)
    - No specific focus (0 points)
- 

**Final Scoring and Comments**

- **Total Score:** \_\_\_\_\_/110
  - **Ranking Recommendation** (Rank as High, Medium, or Low Priority): \_\_\_\_\_
  - **Comments/Notes:**
- 

**Reviewer Certification**

I certify that I have reviewed this project application objectively and in accordance with the HUD CoC NOFO for FY24.

- **Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_
  - **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_
- 

This scoring form helps ensure that renewal projects are evaluated based on their past performance, compliance, community impact, cost effectiveness, and alignment with CoC priorities, allowing for informed decision-making during the competition process.