Scoring Criteria for New Projects

New Project Scoring Summary

Criterion	Maximum Points
A. Experience	
1. Population Served and Housing	15 points
2. Federal Grant Management	5 points
3. Leadership and Board with Lived Experience	3 points
4. Participant Feedback Practices	2 points
	Subtotal: 25
B. Project Design	
1. Target Population and Needs Alignment	5 points
2. Scale of Reach or Units	5 points
3. Plan for Rapid Implementation	5 points
	Subtotal: 15
C. Supportive Services and Participant Engagement	
1. Supportive Services Provision	5 points
2. Service Participation Requirement	5 points
3. Participant Engagement and Retention	5 points
	Subtotal: 15
D. Outcomes and Performance Measures	
1. Permanent Housing Exits	5 points
2. Returns to Homelessness	5 points
3. Increased Earned Income	5 points
4. Increased Non-Employment Income	5 points
5. Length of Program Participation	5 points
6. Commitment to HMIS and Data Quality	5 points
7. Commitment to Coordinated Entry	5 points
8. Program Cost Effectiveness	5 points
	Subtotal: 40
E. Financial Capacity	
1. Audit	5 points
2. Match Commitment	5 points
3. Detailed Budget	5 points
	Subtotal: 15
F. Coordination	
1. Leveraging Housing Resources/Partnerships	5 points
2. Leveraging Healthcare and Mainstream Resources/Partnerships	5 points
3. Street Outreach Implementation and Encampment Reduction	5 points
4. Involvement of individuals with lived experience of homelessness	2 points
5. Cooperation with Law Enforcement/Public Safety Organization	2 points
6. Coordination with Planning Efforts to Prevent Homelessness from Public Systems	2 points
7. Collaboration Related to Children and Youth	2 points
8. Coordination with Veteran Organizations	2 points
9. Coordination with Victim Service Providers	2 points
10. Partnering with Public Housing Agencies	2 points
11. CoC Participation	1 point
	Subtotal: 30

Bonus Points	
Opportunity Zones	1 point
Verification of Immigration Status using SAVE	1 point
Total Points:	140 points + 2 bonus points

Rating Factor	To Receive Maximum Points	Scoring
A.1: Population Served and Housing	Demonstrate 5+ years of experience (or a subrecipient/partner) providing similar housing/services to the proposed population.	15 pts: 5+ years of experience with both the proposed population and housing/service model. 13 pts: 5+ years with either the population or model, or 3–4 years with both. 10 pts: 2–3 years with both, or 3+ years with one and some experience with the other. 7 pts: 1–2 years with one or both, with clear relevance to the proposed project. 5 pts: Less than 1 year of direct experience, or related work with similar populations or services. 2 pts: No direct experience, but a detailed and feasible implementation plan with identified staff or partners. 1 pt: No experience; a vague or partial plan is mentioned, but lacks sufficient detail. 0 pts: No experience and no plan presented.
A.2: Federal/Public Grant Management Experience	Demonstrate a successful track record managing HUD or comparable federal/state grants within the past 2 or more years.	5 pts: 5+ years managing with any type of federal grant, either directly or as a subrecipient. 4 pts: 5+ years managing state or local grants, or 3–5 years of federal grant management, either directly or as a subrecipient. 3 pts: 2–3 years of public grant management experience (federal, state, or local), either direct or subrecipient. 2 pts: 1–2 years of public grant experience, or relevant involvement in grant-funded programs. 1 pt: No grant experience, but includes a credible plan for grant administration or identifies a fiscal sponsor. 0 pts: No experience and no plan provided.
A.3: Leadership and Board with Lived Experience	Demonstrate inclusion of individuals with lived experience of homelessness in organizational leadership, decision-making roles, or governing boards.	3 pts: Individuals with lived experience currently serve on the board of directors or in formal leadership roles with influence over governance, policy, or program design. 2 pts: Individuals with lived experience participate in formal advisory groups or planning processes that influence decision-making, even if not in governance roles. 1 pt: Organization has a written plan or informal practice to include lived experience, but engagement is inconsistent or non-leadership focused. 0 pts: No representation or influence from individuals with lived experience in leadership, advisory, or planning roles.
A.4: Participant Feedback Practices	Demonstrate how the organization systematically gathers, evaluates, and incorporates feedback from program participants to improve services and operations.	2 pts: Organization uses formal, recurring methods (e.g., surveys, focus groups, advisory groups) to collect participant feedback and can demonstrate that feedback results in program or policy changes. 1 pt: Organization collects feedback occasionally or informally, with limited structure or evidence of influence on program decisions. 0 pts: No process or evidence of participant feedback practices.

B.1: Target Population and Needs Alignment	Demonstrate that the proposed project is designed to serve a clearly defined target population with high needs and aligns with current gaps and priorities identified by the CoC.	5 pts – The project targets a high-need population prioritized by the CoC and HUD (e.g., unsheltered individuals, youth, survivors of domestic violence) and cites 3 or more data sources (e.g., PIT Count, SPM, coordinated entry, local needs assessment) to demonstrate strong alignment with identified gaps. 4 pts – The project targets a CoC- and/or HUD-prioritized population and cites 2 data sources to demonstrate alignment with documented needs. 3 pts – The project targets a generally relevant population and cites 1 data source suggesting partial alignment with CoC or HUD priorities. 2 pts – The project identifies a population served but provides limited data and weak connection to CoC or HUD priorities. 1 pt – The project serves a population not currently prioritized by the CoC or HUD and provides minimal or no supporting data. 0 pts – The project does not clearly identify a population or demonstrate alignment with CoC or HUD needs.
B.2: Scale of Reach or Units	Evaluate the number of unduplicated households to be served annually and the geographic coverage of the project. Full points require meeting both thresholds for scale and geographic reach.	5 pts – Project will serve 20 or more households annually and operate in two or more counties. 4 pts – Project will serve 20 or more households in one county, or 15–19 households in two or more counties. 3 pts – Project will serve 15–19 households in one county, or 10–14 households in two or more counties. 2 pts – Project will serve 10–14 households in one county, or 5–9 households in two or more counties. 1 pt – Project will serve 5–9 households in one county, regardless of need level. 0 pts – Project will serve fewer than 5 households or does not define household scale or geographic reach.
B.3: Plan for Rapid Implementation	Evaluate the project's readiness to begin operations quickly after grant award, including key elements such as housing or service site identification, partner coordination, hiring plans, and fund accessibility.	5 pts – Project has a clear and feasible implementation plan with identified service and/or housing sites, executed or draft partner agreements, a hiring strategy, and a timeline that positions the project to begin operations on or near May 1, 2026. 4 pts – Project has most key implementation elements identified and a realistic plan to begin operations within one month of the expected start date. 3 pts – Project has a general plan in place but several key components (e.g., location, MOUs, hiring) are still in development; timeline indicates readiness within the first quarter of the grant period. 2 pts – Project has an early-stage or conceptual implementation plan with limited progress on critical elements or unclear timelines. 1 pt – Project provides minimal information about implementation readiness or startup plans. 0 pts – No implementation plan provided or lacks feasibility to begin within the first year of the grant.
C.1: Supportive Services Provision	Evaluate the type, availability, and coordination of supportive services proposed to meet the needs of the target population.	5 pts – Offers a comprehensive array of on-site or coordinated services (e.g., case management, behavioral health, employment, life skills), demonstrated through MOUs or service plans. 4 pts – Provides a broad set of supportive services aligned with participant needs, with some formal agreements or staffing identified. 3 pts – Provides access to a basic set of supportive services, including case management, through internal staff or community partnerships. 2 pts – Offers general services but lacks detail on coordination, staffing, or access pathways. 1 pt – Mentions services but does not explain how they will be delivered or accessed. 0 pts – No supportive services are provided or planned.

C.2: Service Participation Requirement	Incorporates service participation requirements based on individual needs and documents them in occupancy agreements or equivalent	5 pts – Project requires service participation and includes written documentation of the requirement. 4 pts – Project requires service participation for key services and outlines how this is communicated to participants. 3 pts – Project encourages but does not require participation in supportive services. 2 pts – Project offers services on a voluntary basis with no clear structure for engagement. 1 pt – Project briefly mentions services but does not describe expectations for participation. 0 pts – Project does not address service participation.
C.3: Participant Engagement and Retention	The project describes all of the following strategies to promote participant engagement and housing retention: (1) Regular, scheduled contact (e.g., monthly case management); (2) Reassessment of participant needs over time; (3) A plan for re-engaging participants who disengage; (4) Use of supportive services to help participants remain housed.	5 pts – All four strategies are clearly described. 4 pts – Three of the four strategies are clearly described. 3 pts – Two of the four strategies are clearly described. 2 pts – One of the four strategies is clearly described. 1 pt – Engagement or retention is mentioned, but none of the four strategies are clearly described. 0 pts – No engagement or retention strategies are described.
D1. Permanent Housing Exits	Demonstrate that participants exit to permanent housing at a rate that exceeds the CoC average from a similar current or previous project. ***Refer to the "Scoring Criteria for Renewal Projects" for CoC Standards/Averages***	5 pts – Project performance exceeds the CoC standard and provides data from the proposed project or a similar current or previous project. 4 pts – Project performance meets the CoC standard and provides data from the proposed project or a similar current or previous project. 3 pts – Project performance falls below the CoC standard and provides data from the proposed project or a similar current or previous project. 2 pts – Project does not have performance data but presents a strong plan to support permanent housing exits. 1 pt – Project commits to promoting permanent housing exits but does not include a clear plan. 0 pts – No information provided.
D2. Returns to Homelessness	Demonstrate that participants return to homelessness at a percentage rate that is below the CoC average for returns within 6-12 months from a similar current or previous project. ***Refer to the "Scoring Criteria for Renewal Projects" for CoC Standards/Averages***	5 pts – Project performance exceeds the CoC standard and provides data from the proposed project or a similar current or previous project. 4 pts – Project performance meets the CoC standard and provides data from the proposed project or a similar current or previous project. 3 pts – Project performance falls below the CoC standard and provides data from the proposed project or a similar current or previous project. 2 pts – Project does not have performance data but presents a strong plan to prevent returns to homelessness. 1 pt – Project commits to minimizing returns but does not include a clear plan. 0 pts – No information provided.
D3. Increased Earned Income	Demonstrate that participants increase earned income at a rate that exceeds the CoC average from a similar current or previous project. ***Refer to the "Scoring Criteria for Renewal Projects" for CoC Standards/Averages***	5 pts – Project performance exceeds the CoC standard and provides data from the proposed project or a similar current or previous project. 4 pts – Project performance meets the CoC standard and provides data from the proposed project or a similar current or previous project. 3 pts – Project performance falls below the CoC standard and provides data from the proposed project or a similar current or previous project. 2 pts – Project does not have performance data but presents a strong plan to increase earned income. 1 pt – Project commits to supporting earned income but does not include a clear plan. 0 pts – No information provided.
D4. Increased Non-Employment Income	Demonstrate that participants increase of non-employment income at a rate that exceeds the CoC average.	5 pts – Project performance exceeds the CoC standard and provides data from the proposed project or a similar current or previous project. 4 pts – Project performance meets the CoC standard and provides data from the proposed project or a similar current or previous project.

	Refer to the "Scoring Criteria for Renewal Projects" for CoC Standards/Averages	3 pts – Project performance falls below the CoC standard and provides data from the proposed project or a similar current or previous project. 2 pts – Project does not have performance data but presents a strong plan to increase non-employment income. 1 pt – Project commits to supporting non-employment income but does not include a clear plan. 0 pts – No information provided.
D5. Length of Program Participation	Project proposes a length of participation or service engagement that is appropriate for the project type and target population. The timeline is supported by data from the proposed project or a similar current or previous program, and aligns with housing-focused outcomes and effective service delivery.	5 pts – Proposed participation length is appropriate for the project type and supported by data from the proposed or a similar current/previous project. 4 pts – Proposed participation length aligns with the project type and is supported by general experience or narrative description. 3 pts – Proposed length appears misaligned for the project type (e.g., very long SO engagement or very short PSH durations) but includes some data or justification. 2 pts – No performance data provided, but the proposal includes a strong plan and rationale for expected length of engagement or stay. 1 pt – Project commits to an appropriate duration but provides no plan or justification. 0 pts – No information provided.
D6. Commitment to HMIS and Data Quality	Project demonstrates full participation in HMIS (or a comparable database for VSPs) and a strong approach to ensuring high-quality data, including accuracy, completeness, and timeliness.	5 pts – Agency has previous experience entering client-level data into HMIS or a VSP-comparable system and provides evidence of maintaining high data quality in past projects. 4 pts – Agency commits to full HMIS participation (or comparable system if VSP) and has previous experience collecting and reporting data using systems or standards aligned with HMIS. 3 pts – Agency commits to HMIS participation but has limited or no previous experience in data collection or reporting; general understanding of HMIS standards is described. 2 pts – Agency is not currently using HMIS or a comparable system but presents a clear plan for participation and data quality improvement. 1 pt – Agency briefly mentions HMIS participation but provides no information on readiness or quality standards. 0 pts – No information provided.
D7. Commitment to Coordinated Entry	Project demonstrates full participation in the CoC's Coordinated Entry (CE) system, including accepting referrals and adhering to the standardized access, assessment, and referral process. Projects must commit to accepting at least 95% of CE referrals to be eligible for partial points.	5 pts – Agency has prior experience participating in CE and provides data or a narrative showing that 100% of referrals were accepted in a previous or current project. 4 pts – Agency has prior experience in CE and provides data or a narrative showing that 95%–99% of referrals were accepted. 3 pts – Agency does not have prior experience in CE but commits to accepting 100% of referrals and describes how it will integrate CE into operations. 2 pts – Agency does not have prior experience in CE but commits to accepting at least 95% of referrals and outlines a general implementation plan. 1 pt – Agency expresses intent to participate in CE but does not commit to accepting at least 95% of referrals or provides no implementation details. 0 pts – Agency commits to accepting less than 95% of referrals or does not describe CE participation.
D8. Program Cost Effectiveness	Demonstrate that the project's cost per permanent housing exit or retention is lower than the CoC average.	5 pts – Cost per household is lower than the CoC average for the project type. 4 pts – Cost per household is equal to the CoC average for the project type. 3 pts – Cost per household is higher than the CoC average for the project type. 0 pts – Required cost per household calculation cannot be completed due to missing or inconsistent data.

E.1: Audit	Agency must submit a recent independent audit with unmodified opinions, no findings, and adherence to GAAP.	5 points: Agency has an audit with unmodified opinions and no findings. Accounting practices follow GAAP (General Accepted Accounting Principles). 4 points: Agency has an audit with findings and is following a corrective action plan/response. Accounting practices follow GAAP (General Accepted Accounting Principles). 3 points: Agency has a financial review with no findings. 2 points: Agency has a financial review with findings and is following a corrective action plan/response. 1 point: Agency provides unaudited financial statements or an outdated audit (more than 2 years old), with unclear or partial adherence to GAAP. 0 points: No audit or financial review provided.
E.2: Match	Applicant must submit signed and dated match documentation specifying source, amount, and eligible use, consistent with HUD match requirements.	5 points: Match is fully documented with signed, dated letters or agreements that clearly state the source, amount, and eligible use of funds, in compliance with 24 CFR § 578.73. 0 points: Match documentation is missing, incomplete, unsigned, or does not meet HUD eligibility requirements.
E.3: Budget	Applicant must submit a complete and accurate budget with only eligible costs, fully aligned with the project narrative and HUD CoC Program requirements.	5 pts: Budget is complete, accurate, and clearly aligned with the project narrative. All costs are eligible and appropriately categorized with strong justification. 4 pts: Budget is mostly complete with minor formatting or calculation issues. Costs are eligible and reasonably aligned with the narrative. 3 pts: Budget is complete but contains moderate inconsistencies with the project narrative or has vague line-item justifications. All costs are eligible. 2 pts: Budget lacks clarity, contains structural or alignment issues, or omits important information—but all costs remain eligible. 1 pt: Budget is submitted but is poorly structured or lacks necessary detail. No ineligible costs are included. 0 pts: Budget includes any ineligible costs or is not submitted.
F.1: Leveraging Housing Resources/Partnerships	Demonstrate coordination with public or private housing providers, including commitments to provide units, subsidies, or prioritization of referrals.	Reviewed through documentation of signed MOUs, formal agreements, or letters of commitment. 5 pts: Applicant provides current, signed MOUs or formal agreements with housing providers, documenting access to units, subsidies, or prioritized referrals. 4 pts: Applicant provides letters of commitment or contracts that indicate clear housing access, but not formalized as ongoing agreements. 3 pts: Applicant describes active and ongoing informal coordination (e.g., consistent referrals, planning meetings), but lacks formal documentation. 2 pts: Applicant references past or occasional collaboration with housing providers but lacks detail or recent engagement. 1 pt: Applicant expresses intent or general support for partnerships but provides no clear evidence of coordination. 0 pts: No documentation or coordination with housing providers described.

F.2: Leveraging Healthcare Resources/Partnerships	Demonstrate formal partnerships with healthcare organizations to provide services, care coordination, or direct funding (e.g., Medicaid billing, in-kind services) to support the program.	Reviewed through documentation of signed agreements or evidence of healthcare funding or service provision.	5 pts: Applicant provides current, signed MOUs or formal agreements with healthcare providers that document care coordination, service delivery, or resource contributions. 4 pts: Applicant submits letters of commitment or similar documentation confirming healthcare support or service availability. 3 pts: Applicant describes active informal coordination with healthcare partners (e.g., warm handoffs, regular referrals), but lacks formal documentation. 2 pts: Applicant references general collaboration or past partnerships but provides limited detail or current engagement. 1 pt: Applicant indicates intent to coordinate with healthcare but shows no current activity or documentation. 0 pts: No documentation or healthcare coordination described.
F.3 Street Outreach Implementation	Demonstrate that the project either currently implements or commits to implementing street outreach activities aligned with the CoC's Street Outreach strategies.	Reviewed through documentation of current or proposed outreach activities, budgeted staff roles, narrative descriptions, and alignment with CoC policies. For projects making a new commitment, evidence must include a detailed implementation plan or statement of intent.	5 pts: Applicant has a structured street outreach program, a formal partnership (e.g., with law enforcement, co-responders, or outreach teams) focused on encampment engagement, or a clear, time-bound plan to create one. 4 pts: Applicant has informal coordination or internal procedures for encampment engagement, or a commitment to establish them within the project term. 3 pts: Applicant conducts outreach without structure or encampment focus, or commits to begin outreach with limited detail. 2 pts: Applicant provides a general intent to engage in outreach or encampment response, but lacks specific planning or timelines. 1 pt: Applicant acknowledges the importance of outreach, but provides no meaningful plan, detail, or structure. 0 pts: No outreach activity, description, or plan is provided.
F.4 Involvement of Individuals with Lived Experience of Homelessness	Demonstrate meaningful involvement of individuals with lived experience in program design, governance, or operations.	Reviewed through narrative explanation (e.g., employment, advisory boards, compensated participation).	2 pts: Individuals with lived experience are currently involved in project design, service delivery, or advisory roles, or the organization has a clear, time-bound plan to establish meaningful involvement. 1 pt: Organization expresses support for involvement and provides general descriptions, but has no current participation or clear plan to develop it. 0 pts: No involvement of individuals with lived experience is described.
F.5 Cooperation with Law Enforcement / Public Safety	Submit a current MOU or formal agreement with a law enforcement or public safety agency, and describe your planned role in a structured initiative such as diversion, co-responder response, or encampment outreach.	Reviewed through narrative explanation or formal documentation	2 pts: Formal MOU with law enforcement/public safety and a clearly defined role in a structured initiative (e.g., diversion, co-responder team, encampment response). 1 pt: Evidence/narrative of regular coordination or informal partnership without a formal agreement or structured initiative.

			0 pts: No collaboration described.
F.6 Coordination with Planning Efforts to Prevent Homelessness from Public Systems	Demonstrate coordination with public institutions (e.g., foster care, behavioral health, hospitals, jails, prisons) to prevent homelessness at discharge. This may include participation in interagency discharge planning, shared protocols, or data-informed coordination strategies.	Reviewed through narrative explanation or formal documentation	2 pts: Demonstrates formal collaboration with at least one system (e.g., MOU, participation in discharge planning group, shared protocols or data use agreements). 1 pt: Demonstrates informal communication or case-by-case coordination without formal agreements or systemic planning. 0 pts: No coordination demonstrated.
F.7 Collaboration Related to Children and Youth	Demonstrate collaboration with youth- and family-serving systems (e.g., child welfare, schools, juvenile justice, youth shelters) to support children, youth, and families at risk of or experiencing homelessness.	Reviewed through narrative explanation or formal documentation	2 pts: Demonstrates formal partnerships or structured coordination (e.g., MOUs, joint initiatives, active coordination with McKinney-Vento liaisons, foster care, or youth justice systems). 1 pt: Demonstrates informal collaboration or limited engagement with youth- or family-serving agencies. 0 pts: No collaboration demonstrated.
F.8 Coordination with Veteran Organizations	Demonstrate coordination with veteran-serving agencies to ensure veterans experiencing or at risk of homelessness are identified, engaged, and connected to appropriate housing and services.	Reviewed through narrative explanation or formal documentation	2 pts: Demonstrates formal partnerships (e.g., MOUs, joint case conferencing, referrals, or participation in coordinated entry) with VA-funded or veteran-specific organizations. 1 pt: Demonstrates informal or ad hoc communication with veteran providers but lacks formal coordination. 0 pts: No coordination demonstrated.
F.9 Coordination with Victim Service Providers	Demonstrate coordination with domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking service providers to ensure access to safe housing and trauma-informed services for survivors.	Reviewed through narrative explanation or formal documentation	2 pts: Demonstrates formal collaboration with VSPs (e.g., MOUs, coordinated entry protocols, use of comparable databases, shared safety planning, supportive services or case conferencing). 1 pt: Demonstrates informal coordination or referrals to VSPs without formal agreements or system-level integration. 0 pts: No coordination demonstrated.
F.10 Partnering with Public Housing Agencies	Demonstrate coordination with one or more Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) to increase access to subsidized housing for people experiencing homelessness.	Reviewed through narrative explanation or formal documentation	2 pts: Demonstrates formal partnership with a PHA (e.g., MOU, coordinated waiting lists, joint planning, or project-based voucher access for participants). 1 pt: Demonstrates informal coordination or occasional referrals to PHAs, without formalized partnership or shared planning.

			0 pts: No coordination demonstrated.
F.11 CoC Participation	Demonstrate regular and active participation in CoC meetings, workgroups, trainings, and other system-level planning activities.	Verified through CoC meeting attendance records, workgroup participation logs, and committee rosters.	1pts: Meets Requirements 0pts: Does not meet requirements
Opportunity Zone	Demonstrate that the project is located within a federally designated Opportunity Zone, as determined by [Map of Opportunity Zones	HUD.gov / U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)]		1pt: Project is located in an Opportunity Zone.
SAVE Use	Demonstrate that the applicant organization verifies immigration status using the SAVE system directly or in coordination with a state or local government, in accordance with the FY2025 CoC Program NOFO Policy Initiative Preference Point criteria.		1pt: Applicant uses the SAVE system for program.