

# FY 2018 CoC Ranking Sheet – SSO

## Supportive Services Only (Excludes Street Outreach)

Reviewer:	Proposal:		
Scoring Elements	Point Values	Score	
<p>1. The percentage who exited to permanent housing (subsidized or unsubsidized) during the operating year. HUD standard is 80%. Max points =30.</p> <p><b>Total number of individuals exiting:</b>  <b>Total number of individuals exiting to permanent housing destinations:</b>  <b>Percentage exiting to permanent housing destinations:</b>  <b>(Source: ESG CAPER Report, Question 23a &amp; b)</b></p>	<p>Housing Results:  80-100% = 30 points  60-79% = 20 points  49-69% = 10 points  0-48% = 0 points</p>		
<p>2. The percentage of persons age 18 and older who increased their total income (from all sources) at program exit. Max. points =20</p> <p><b>Total number of adults exiting during operating year:</b>  <b>Total number of adults increasing income at program exit:</b>  <b>Percentage of adults increasing income at program exit:</b>  <b>(Source: HUD APR, Question 19a2)</b></p>	<p>Income Results:  80-100% = 20 points  50-79% = 10 points  0-49% = 0 points</p>		
<p>3. Percentage of adults receiving benefits at program exit. HUD Standard = 56%. Max. points = 10</p> <p><b>Total number of adults exiting:</b>  <b>Total number of adults with benefits at exit:</b>  <b>Percentage of adults with benefits at exit:</b>  <b>(Source: HUD APR, Question 20b)</b></p>	<p>Mainstream Benefits:  80-100% = 10 points  50-79% = 5 points  0-49% = 0 points</p>		
<p>4. Cost effectiveness: average cost per household served. Max. points = 15</p> <p><b>Total project spending:</b>  <b>Total number of households served:</b>  <b>Average cost per household:</b>  <b>(Source CoC project spending report and CoC APR, Question 8a)</b></p>	<p>Cost Effectiveness (SSO):  ≤ \$500 = 15 points  ≥ \$500 = 0 points</p>		
<p>5. Average VI-SPDAT 2.0 score of individuals and families served during the operating year. Max. points = 15</p> <p><b>Total number of individuals with completed VI-SPDAT 2.0 assessment:</b>  <b>Average score of those with completed assessment:</b>  <b>(Source: HMIS custom report)</b></p>	<p>Vulnerability Results:  ≥ 7 = 15 points  ≤ 6.9 = 0 points</p>		
<p>6. Percentage of people that were served who were categorized as chronically homeless at intake. Max. points = 10</p> <p><b>Total number of individuals served during program year:</b>  <b>Total number of individuals categorized as chronically homeless:</b>  <b>Percentage of individuals categorized as chronically homeless:</b>  <b>(Source: CoC APR Question 26b)</b></p>	<p>Chronically Homeless:  ≥ 75% = 10 points  ≤ 74% = 0 points</p>		
<p>7. Percentage of households served who were categorized as households with children. Max. points = 10</p> <p><b>Total number of households served during program year:</b>  <b>Number of households served who were categorized as households with children:</b>  <b>Percentage of households served who were categorized as households with children:</b>  <b>(Source: CoC APR Question 8a)</b></p>	<p>Homeless Families:  ≥ 75% = 10 points  ≤ 74% = 0 points</p>		
<p>8. Project summary was clear and funding for objectives is reasonable for number of outcomes. Max. points = 10</p>	<p>Max. points = 10 points.</p>		

<p>9. Project summary included detailed budget and budget narrative. Match is documented, budget narrative included, itemized budget is clear. Max. points = 20</p>	<p>All elements are included will = 20 points.</p>	
<p>10. Monitoring Criteria: 1) Documentation of participant eligibility 2) Data quality meets community standard 3) Drawdown dates from HUD were timely 4) Program identified frequency or amount of funds recaptured by HUD. Max. points = 20</p>	<p>Max. Points = 20</p>	
<p>Maximum points available = 160</p>		
<p>Total Points Received by Proposal:</p>		
<p>Comments:</p>		
<p>Reviewer Signature:</p>	<p>Date:</p>	