



EVALUATION FORM FOR COC PR-502 2017 PROPOSALS NEW PROJECTS – SSO FOR COORDINATED ENTRY

EVALUATION CRITERIA			
CRITERIA	SCORE	POINTS GIVEN	COMMENTS
1. Submitted Letter of Intent for Proposals on or before the deadline established by the COC.	<p>YES, begin with the next question.</p> <p>Did not submit Letter of Intent by the established deadline-Proposal is rejected.</p>		<p>If a Letter of Intent was not submitted by the deadline established in the Public Announcement, the proposal will be automatically rejected.</p>
2. Submitted the proposal on time in ESNAPS on or before the deadline established by the COC.	<p>Submitted the proposal on time.</p> <p>Did not submit the proposal on time. .</p>		<p>If the proposal was not submitted in ESNAPS by the deadline established by the COC, the proposal will be automatically rejected.</p>
3. Experience of the applicant in the effective use of federal funds to achieve the activities proposed.	<p>Experience</p> <p style="text-align: center;">YES NO</p> <p>Effective use of funds</p> <p style="text-align: center;">YES NO</p> <p style="color: red;">Funds not adequate to achieve proposed activities</p> <p style="text-align: center;">YES NO</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(2 points) (0 points)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(2 points) (0 points)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(1 points) (0 points)</p>	
4. The proposal clearly describes the administrative structure of the organization. Includes evidence of internal coordination and an adequate accounting system.	<p>Detailed description that includes coordination and the accounting system.</p> <p>Does not include a detailed description that includes coordination and the accounting system.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(5 points)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(0 points)</p>	
5. Monitoring findings, if applicable	<p>Does not have monitoring findings.</p> <p>Has monitoring findings, with a corrective action plan.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(5 points)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(3 points)</p>	



**EVALUATION FORM FOR COC PR-502 2017 PROPOSALS
NEW PROJECTS – SSO FOR COORDINATED ENTRY**

EVALUATION CRITERIA				
CRITERIA	SCORE		POINTS GIVEN	COMMENTS
	Has monitoring findings without a corrective action plan.	(0 points)		
6. Capability of the Project to begin immediately, once HUD approves same.	Can begin immediately.	(5 points)		
	Project requires more time.	(3 points)		
	Not indicated.	(0 points)		
7. Evaluation of Costs vs activities.	The project is cost effective.	(5 points)		
	Is not cost effective.	(0 points)		
8. Sources of Matching Funds.	Demonstrates 25% of total requested in Matching Funds.	(5 points)		
	Does not demonstrate 25% of total requested in Matching Funds. .	(0 points)		
9. Population to be attended: Chronic Homeless, Veterans, Youth under 24 years, families, domestic violence victims, substance abusers, mentally ill, HIV/AIDS infected, others.	All of the populations mentioned.	(5 points)		
	Some of the populations mentioned.	(0 points)		
10. The Coordinated System proposed is going to attend all of the geographic area of the CoC.	YES	(5 points)		
	NO	(0 points)		
11. History of the Organization offering SSO or similar services to homeless persons. NOTE: Indicates the period of time.	Has experience offering SSO or similar services.	(5 points)		
	Does not have experience.	(0 points)		



EVALUATION FORM FOR COC PR-502 2017 PROPOSALS NEW PROJECTS – SSO FOR COORDINATED ENTRY

EVALUATION CRITERIA				
CRITERIA	SCORE		POINTS GIVEN	COMMENTS
12. Description of the strategy for publicizing the coordinated entry process and how it is designed to reach those with the greatest access barriers for assistance.	Includes detailed description, as requested in the question.	(5 points)		
	Includes an incomplete description.	(3 points)		
	Does not include a description.	(0 points)		
13. Description of the process for evaluating the participants.	Includes a detailed description of an adequate evaluation system, as requested in the question.	(5 points)		
	Incomplete description.	(3 points)		
	Does not include a description.	(0 points)		
14. Description of the referral process and how it is ensured that the participants go directly to an appropriate housing placement with services.	Includes a detailed description of an adequate process.	(5 points)		
	Incomplete description.	(3 points)		
	Does not include a description.	(0 points)		
15. Accessibility of facilities to homeless persons. NOTE: Includes where services will be located.	Easy access.	(5 points)		
	Limited access.	(0 points)		
16. Proposes coordination through Collaborative Agreements with other CoC organizations.	YES	(5 points)		
	NO	(0 points)		
17. Service hours.	From seventeen (17) to twenty-four hours.	(5 points)		In this question, the hours that the organization provides



**EVALUATION FORM FOR COC PR-502 2017 PROPOSALS
NEW PROJECTS – SSO FOR COORDINATED ENTRY**

EVALUATION CRITERIA				
CRITERIA	SCORE		POINTS GIVEN	COMMENTS
	More than eight (8) and up to sixteen (16) hours.	(3 points)		services should be indicated.
	Eight (8) hours or less.	(0 points)		
18. Telephone numbers that the project will use to provide services in order to attend calls immediately.	Various telephone lines or various numbers.	(5 points)		
	Only one line.	(3 points)		
19. Transportation for the participants.	YES	(5 points)		
	NO	(0 points)		
20. If an expansion of a renovation project, does the project provide the grant (PIN) number for the renovation?	YES	(1 point)		
	NO	(0 points)		
21. Does the proposal indicate how the project is going to expand services in the geographic area of the CoC?	YES	(5 points)		
	NO	(0 points)		
22. Number of persons to be served in addition to those of the original proposal.	50% or more than the number in the original proposal.	(5 points)		
	Less than 50% more than the number proposed in the original proposal.	(0 points)		

Maximum score per question: (5) points; a lower score may be given based on the considerations of the Evaluation Committee.

Comments: _____



**EVALUATION FORM FOR COC PR-502 2017 PROPOSALS
NEW PROJECTS – SSO FOR COORDINATED ENTRY**

Recommendation:

Recommended: _____ Not recommended: _____

Evaluation Committee

Evaluation Committee

Evaluation Committee

Date

Date

Date