2018 Guilford CoC New Projects

Components	Sources	Maximum scores available
Threshold		n/a
Financial		n/a
Most recent agency audit demonstrated there were no unresolved material findings.	Last completed Agency Audit	n/a
HMIS		n/a
Agency is willing to participate in entering data into HMIS.	Written statement from agency	n/a
Housing First		n/a
Project utilizes Housing First implementation.	Project provide information on how they will utilizing Housing First implementation including 1) eligibility criteria, 2) process for accepting new clients, 3) process and criteria for exiting clients.	n/a
Project Narratives		
Agency Experience		
Project describes the experience of the applicant in working with the proposed populations and in providing housing similar to that proposed in application.		up to 15
Project describes agency experience in contract compliance with HUD regulations and contract provisions.		up to 10
Design of Housing & Supportive Services		
Project describes 1)an identifiable gap/need that project will be filling; 2) understanding the needs of the clients to be served; 3) how the type, scale, and location of the housing fit the needs of clients to be served.		up to 15
Financial		
Project is cost effective.	Compare projected cost per person to the CoC average within project type	up to 5

2018 CoC New Projects Scorecard

Budget costs are reasonable and allowable.		20
Project described mechanism by which consumers will have a voice into how the program is shaped.		yes 5 points / no 0 points
Project offers evidence to demonstrate that it meets an existing gap in the continuum of services. Project demonstrates effective community partnerships/collaborations to maximize program impact.		up to 5 points

GUILFORD CONTINUUM OF CARE (CoC) 2 0 1 8 NO T I C E O F F U ND I NG A V A I L A B I L I T Y (N O F A)

Methodology for assigning scores for new project applications

APPROVED BY System Performance and Evaluation Committee on 07.13.18 for recommendation to CoC Board of Directors
ADOPTED BY CoC Board of Directors:

1) Each performance measure will be scored with a goal of placing an equal number of projects in four, tiered categories.

2) To that end, projects will be scored in relation to each other as follows*:
Step 1: All responses will be place in numerical order.
Step 2: The ranked list will then be broken down into 4 groups**
Step 3: Projects will be assigned score according to the group they are in.
- highest group numbers will receive max points
- next group will receive 75% of max score
- third group will receive 50% of max score
- final group will receive 25% of max score

*For exits to PH, project will be scored with same PH component (RRH or PSH)
** If the total number of projects responses is not divisible by 4, then excel will perform a
statistical analysis and group projects into quartiles based on a bell curve methodology.
Note:
· _Rounding principals will be utilized if response is not a whole number: down for .49 or under; up for .50 or higher.

3) Each question with a narrative response will be assigned a score (up to the maximum score available) by review committee members. The average of the assigned score will be used on the overall project scorecard.

4) Project Effectiveness Component on renewal scorecard will not be scored during this completion. Information collected will be utilized to provide baseline data.