



## 2022 Supplemental NOFO Project Scoring Guide and Checklist

This checklist and scorecard will be used for all Supplemental project applications.

Applicants with disabilities may contact the Collaborative Applicant office by telephone, email, or mail to request and arrange accommodations. Requests for accommodations should be made as soon as possible to ensure adequate time to make accommodations before the application deadline. Please contact Nathaniel Meece or the Collaborative Applicant office at

Nathaniel Meece  
[Nathaniel@moboscoc.org](mailto:Nathaniel@moboscoc.org)  
Phone: (573)-651-3747 ext. 102  
40 S Sprigg  
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701

Collaborative Applicant  
[collaborativeapplicant@moboscoc.org](mailto:collaborativeapplicant@moboscoc.org)  
Phone: (573)-651-3747  
40 S Sprigg  
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701

### Checklist

Certifications and attachments should be completed via online form. This scoring guide is for new projects only. If your organization is submitting more than one project application, please complete a certification form for each project. Contact [collaborativeapplicant@moboscoc.org](mailto:collaborativeapplicant@moboscoc.org) if you encounter any issues or need assistance.

Certifications- Should the CoC need to review any of the following, project applicants can produce certification, description or waivers if needed.

- Nonprofit documentation
- Records of CoC participation, CoC meeting attendance, Point In Time Count participation
- Documentation of participation with HMIS and the Coordinated Entry System

Attachments- Project applicants must include the following attachments in application

- Documentation of HUD monitoring if monitoring has occurred within the last 2 years.
- Findings of any financial audit in the last two years, or proof of good financial standing. documents may include management representation letters, or unaudited financial statements (if no audit has been completed in the last 2 years)
- Housing First Tool
- Documentation of Minimum Match
- Applicable documentation by MOU, LOA or other contractual agreement between any Healthcare Provider or Housing Resource Provider
- Applicable documentation by MOU, LOA or other contractual agreement between any Supportive Service provider (can be used as match if non CoC or ESG funded)
- Organization's Antidiscrimination Policy, ensuring that LGBTQ+ individuals and families receive supportive services, shelter and housing free of discrimination

MAX POINTS	<b>SCORING SECTIONS</b>
<b>Threshold &amp; Expectations</b>	
Pass/Fail	HUD Eligibility and Threshold Requirements
Pass/Fail	Participation in HMIS/CES or Comparable Database
10	CoC Participation/Planning/Attendance
10	Point in Time Count Participation
10	Housing First Requirements - 100%, (5 points- 95%)
Pass/Fail	Minimum Match Amount
<b>Descriptions</b>	
10	Organizational Experience and Capacity
10	Project Narrative Description
5	Structurally Disadvantaged Area
5	Performance Improvement
10	Representation and Equity
10	Project Participation with a Healthcare Entity or Housing Resource Provider
<b>CoC Priorities</b>	
10	Geography - Rural Set Aside only
15	Client Vulnerability
10	Supportive Services
<b>Special Attachments</b>	
3	Antidiscrimination Policy
5	Budget and Households
123	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>

<b>Threshold Requirements</b>	
<p><b>HUD Eligibility and Threshold Requirements</b> HUD establishes eligibility threshold requirements for applicants and projects. Projects may be considered as having met eligibility threshold requirements through the previously approved grant application unless information to the contrary is received.</p> <p>Attachments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Certification that organization and project meet HUD eligibility and threshold requirements.</li> <li>- Documentation that the organization is a 501(c)3</li> <li>- Certification of active registration in the System for Award Management (SAM).</li> <li>- Financial Audit findings or proof of financial standings</li> </ul> <p>Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Information that may indicate the project is not eligible or does not meet threshold requirements, including but not limited to               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Information about any internal or external investigations or legal actions and outcomes.</li> <li>o Change to organization status (e.g. 501(c)3 incorporation).</li> <li>o Registration status in the SAM.</li> <li>o Financial documentation should indicate the agency has the financial capacity to receive grant, provide or acquire match funds, and operate in good financial standing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>PASS</b> – Meets all criteria established in CoC Program NOFO.</p> <p><b>PASS WITH FINDINGS</b> – Information provided that may affect project eligibility, including but not limited to applicant eligibility (e.g. 501(c)3 organizations and states or local governments), evidence of ongoing investigation, investigation results, SAM registration is not active.</p> <p><b>FAIL</b> - Information provided confirms that the project is not eligible for HUD funding.</p>
<p><b>Participation in HMIS (or comparable database) &amp; CES</b></p> <p>Attachments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Certification that the project will use the coordinated entry system established by the MO BoS CoC and will follow all coordinated entry policies, procedures, and written standards established by the MO BoS CoC.</li> <li>- Description of any reasons the project will not use the coordinated entry system.</li> </ul> <p>Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The organization is already active in HMIS and the Coordinated Entry system</li> <li>-The organization acts as a Coordinated Entry Access Point</li> </ul>	<p><b>PASS</b> – Project already participates in HMIS &amp; CES or agrees to participant, pending funding</p> <p><b>PASS WITH FINDINGS</b> – Provides information causing concern that the organization may not be able to participate for one reason or another.</p> <p><b>FAIL</b> – Provides information that confirms the organization does not plan to participate</p>

<p>-The organization agrees to become an official member of the CoC and will participate in the CES &amp; HMIS</p>	
<p><b>CoC Participation/Planning/Meeting Attendance</b></p> <p>Please respond in application regarding participation in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One or more MOBoSCoC board, committee, workgroup, regional meeting, or other entity.</li> <li>- Participation in the MOBoSCoC Coordinated Entry System. (indicate Access point level and coverage)</li> <li>- Participation in two of the last Full Membership Meetings.</li> </ul> <p>Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extent of participation in committees</li> <li>- Extent of participation in Coordinated Entry</li> <li>- Attendance at the two meetings of the full MO BoS CoC membership directly prior to submission of the project application as reflected by CoC attendance records.</li> </ul>	<p><b>10 Points</b> – Organization staff had meaningful participation in all three of the criteria mentioned in the details provided</p> <p><b>7 Points</b> – Organization staff had meaningful participation in two of the criteria mentioned.</p> <p><b>5 points</b> - Organization staff had meaningful participation in one of the criteria mentioned.</p> <p><b>0 Points</b> – Organization staff had meaningful participation in one of the criteria mentioned.</p> <p><i>Participation in regional meetings as a regular member will not be considered for scoring purposes. Regional meetings often occur for coordinated entry purposes, and coordinated entry participation is a requirement of the CoC Program.</i></p>
<p><b>Point-in-Time (PIT) Count Participation</b></p> <p>Project should provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Certification of participation in the most recent MO BoS CoC PIT Count.</li> <li>- Description of PIT Count role.</li> </ul> <p>Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Degree of participation in the PIT Count.</li> </ul>	<p><b>10 Points</b> – Organization staff participated as a leader of one or more counties or in an equivalent leadership and planning role.</p> <p><b>5 Points</b> – Organization staff participated in a planning or leadership role other than as a county leader OR participated as a volunteer on the day of the count.</p> <p><b>0 Points</b> – Organization staff did not participate in the PIT Count.</p>
<p><b>Housing First Tool Assessment</b></p> <p>Projects should complete the HUD provided Housing First Assessment Tool and indicate accurate answers to how the project will comply with Housing First Expectations. Housing First Tool should be completed for each project application and submitted as an attachment to the application.</p> <p>Attachments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Completed Housing First Assessment Tool.</li> </ul> <p>Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Degree of tool completion including additional notes and responses to all questions and fields</li> <li>- Tool score</li> </ul>	<p><b>Completeness of Tool: Up to 10 Points</b></p> <p><b>10 Points</b> – Project received all points available for project type.</p> <p><b>5 Points</b> – Project received at least 95% of points available for project type</p> <p><b>0 Points</b> – Project received less than 95% of points available for project type.</p>

<p><b>Minimum Match Amount</b> Projects should provide documentation of all match sources that will be utilized by project. Funds or In-Kind services should be considered in dollar values and match 25% of requested funds.</p>	<p><b>Pass</b> - Letter of Support, MOU, or other documentation is attached and amount is 25% of requested funds <b>Fail</b> - Documents are not attached, value is not provided, or amount is less than 25% of requested funds</p>
<b>Descriptions</b>	
<p><b>Organizational Experience and Capacity</b> Describe the organization’s experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Working with and addressing the target population’s housing and supportive services needs;</li> <li>- Developing and implementing relevant program systems and services;</li> <li>- Identifying and securing matching funds;</li> <li>- Managing basic organization operations including financial accounting systems;</li> <li>- Leveraging federal, state, local, and private sector funds.</li> </ul>	<p><b>10 Points</b> – Organization has experience with all items. <b>5 Points</b> – Organization has experience with some but not all required items. <b>0 Points</b> – Organization does not have experience with any required items.</p>
<p><b>Project Narrative Description</b> Criteria for meeting expectations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Description matches other details in project application, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Budget</li> <li>o Project Type</li> <li>o Housing First Assessment Tool</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Rationale for funding and service design explain program strengths</li> <li>- Use of current data (e.g. PIT Count, system performance measures) for community need</li> <li>- Project outcomes are measurable</li> <li>- Clear explanation of all activities with specific details</li> <li>- Target populations to be served</li> <li>- Plan for addressing the identified housing and supportive services needs</li> <li>- Anticipated project outcomes</li> <li>- Coordination with other organizations</li> <li>- The reason CoC Program funding is required</li> </ul>	<p><b>5 to 10 Points</b> – Project descriptions with good or exceptional clarity and consistency will be awarded up to 10 points. Exceptionally clear descriptions use direct, specific, and concise language. <b>Up to 5 Points</b> – Project descriptions with adequate clarity and consistency will be awarded up to 5 points. Adequately clear descriptions lack detail and specificity or may be overly repetitive. <b>0 Points</b> – Project descriptions that are confusing or incomprehensible may be awarded 0 points.</p>

<p><b>Structurally Disadvantaged Area</b></p> <p>Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project effectively proves that the area they would be provided services and support for is structurally disadvantaged.</li> <li>- Project is serving an area that previously has little to no MO BoS CoC support.</li> <li>- Project provides community data and demonstrates that the area is underserved and in need.</li> </ul>	<p><b>5 Points-</b> Project describes the disadvantages of the area and the structural needs, is servicing an area currently not being served by CoC and provides sufficient support proving area need. Counties in coverage area correspond with counties without CoC coverage</p> <p><b>2.5 Points-</b> Project somewhat describes the needs, serves an area that may have some CoC support, and has some needs being unmet.</p> <p><b>0 Points-</b> Project does not sufficiently describe or provide data for the area’s needs.</p>
<p><b>Performance Improvement</b></p> <p>If Agency has operated housing projects (from any funding source) describe the following System Performance Measures from those projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Percent returns to homelessness</li> <li>- Percent increase in all income</li> <li>- Percentage of successful exits to permanent housing</li> </ul> <p>For all agencies describe the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- how participants will be assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing (Successful exit to permanent housing);</li> <li>- how the project will help program participants obtain income (increase in employment and income);</li> <li>- how the supportive services provided will lead directly to program participants gaining employment, accessing SSI, SSDI, or other mainstream income streams (increase in employment and income);</li> <li>- how the requested CoC Program funds will contribute to program participants becoming more independent (e.g. accessing Medicare, Medicaid, early childhood education) (Client stability towards successful exit and reducing returns to homelessness);</li> <li>- how the project will ensure clients receive the appropriate support to retain stable housing (reducing returns to homelessness).</li> </ul> <p>An acceptable response will acknowledge the needs of the target population, include plans to address those needs through current and proposed case management activities, and describe the availability and accessibility of supportive services such</p>	<p><b>5 Points</b> – Project has a plan for addressing all elements and has demonstrated prior contributions.</p> <p><b>3 points</b> – Project has a plan for addressing all elements and has demonstrated prior contributions to at least one of the indicated goals above.</p> <p><b>1 points</b> – Project has a plan for addressing all elements but does not have prior performance history to indicate performance capacity.</p> <p><b>0 points</b> – Project has not adequately addressed all elements as listed</p>

<p>as-housing search, primary health services, mental health services, educational services, employment services, life skills, child care services, etc. Example: A project that targets its housing and services to serving young parents might provide a specific service array of supportive services including parenting classes, education programming, and childcare services.</p>	
<p><b>Representation and Equity</b></p> <p>Projects should describe how the organization and board are representative of the individuals served or are proposing to serve in this project? Three text fields will cover representation, feedback, and training.</p> <p>Criteria for meeting expectations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of persons with lived experience in decision making roles.</li> <li>- Methods of client feedback opportunities</li> <li>- Methods of improving client outcomes and stability across disparities that exist</li> <li>- Projects should demonstrate an understanding of challenges that exist in their community.</li> </ul>	<p><b>10 Points</b> – Description completely addresses all required items.</p> <p><b>8 points</b> - Description addresses most but not all required items.</p> <p><b>5 Points</b> – Description addresses some of all required items.</p> <p><b>0 Points</b> – Description does not address any required items</p>
<p><b>Project Participation with a Healthcare Entity or Housing Resource Provider</b></p> <p>Projects will describe how the project works with a Healthcare Entity to provide healthcare to participating clients.</p> <p>Explain how the Healthcare entity may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide direct medical services to clients; or</li> <li>- Provide direct funding to access healthcare services;</li> </ul> <p>The agreement of the Healthcare entity must include the value of the services provided and the value should comprise 50% of the project funding request. Project eligibility must follow HUD program and Fair Housing requirements and not be restricted by eligibility requirements of the health care service provider.</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>Projects will describe how the project works to leverage housing subsidies. Housing provided by Housing Resource Provider should comprise 50% of available Units for the Project. Partner organizations may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Private organizations;</li> </ul>	<p><b>10 Points</b> – Project has established a partnership with either a Healthcare or Housing resource provider, and has supplied documentation detailing the extent of resources being provided.</p> <p><b>0 points</b> – Project has not adequately addressed all elements as listed</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- State or local government, including through the use of HOME funding provided through the American Rescue Plan;</li> <li>- Public Housing Agencies, including through the use of a set aside or limited preference;</li> <li>- Faith-based organizations; or</li> <li>- Federal programs other than the CoC or ESG programs.</li> </ul> <p>Documentation for either partnership by MOU, LOA, or other contractual agreement must be included and detailed values for support provided.</p>	
<b>CoC Priorities</b>	
<p><b>Geography - Rural Set Aside only</b></p> <p>Projects should provide the list of counties covered and provide a narrative description regarding how the project addresses need in those counties.</p> <p>Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project provides &gt;50% of unique coverage (counties currently not covered by CoC funds for project type)</li> <li>- Addresses all counties in coverage areas in description and explanation</li> <li>- Demonstrates needs based on local data</li> <li>- Demonstrates capacity to serve counties in coverage area</li> </ul>	<p><b>Up to 10 points will be awarded</b></p> <p><b>+4 points</b> - over 50% of Counties listed are not covered by CoC projects of the same type as project submission</p> <p><b>+3 points</b> - Project Description demonstrates distinct need for services in all counties included</p> <p><b>+3 points</b> - Project Description demonstrates capacity to provide services in all counties included</p>
<p><b>Client Vulnerability</b></p> <p>Project should indicate all counties covered. For each vulnerability measure, all county scores will be averaged to create a project score. REFER TO LISTS</p> <p><b>Poverty</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Percentile rank of <b>number of persons</b> in poverty</li> <li>- Percentile rank of <b>percentage of persons</b> in poverty</li> </ul> <p><b>Point in Time</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Percentile rank of <b>Total Persons</b> recorded in county</li> <li>- Percentile rank of <b>Unsheltered Persons</b> recorded in county</li> </ul> <p><i>example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Project serves 3 counties: A, B, and C. For one measure, county A has percentile rank of 75, county B has a percentile rank of 35, county C has a percentile rank of 88. <math>(75+35+88)/3 = 66</math>. Project score for that measure is 66 and</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Up to 15 Points will be awarded</b></p> <p><b>+4 Points</b> - project score for <i>number in poverty</i> is 65 or more</p> <p><b>+4 Points</b> - project score for <i>percent in poverty</i> is 65 or more</p> <p><b>+4 Points</b> - project score for <i>Total persons</i> is 65 or more</p> <p><b>+3 Points</b> - project score for <i>Unsheltered persons</i> is 65 or more</p>



<p><i>that project will score points as 66 is greater than 65.</i></p> <p>Criteria for the Rank and Review Committee will include verification of county scores. Lead agency will provide the agreed upon data elements per county.</p>	
<p><b>Supportive Services</b></p> <p>Projects are expected to provide substantial supportive services to clients to improve project outcomes. Projects should consider adequate budget for supportive services and partnerships with community resources. Details from Performance questions, Budget Items, and other narratives will be reviewed for this scoring factor.</p> <p>Criteria for the Rank and Review committee will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presence of an adequate Budget Line Item for supportive services.</li> <li>- Presence of a Community Resource and partnership. Documentation of relationship through letter of support or MOU is required</li> </ul>	<p><b>10 Points</b> - Project has sufficient Supportive Services budget and a partnership with a local community partner to ensure optimal project outcomes</p> <p><b>5 Points</b> - Project has one of the following: A sufficient Supportive Services Budget, or a partnership with a local community partner.</p> <p><b>0 Points</b> - Project does not have adequate Supportive Services provided by the project or a community partner</p>
<p><b>Special Attachments</b></p>	
<p><b>Antidiscrimination Policy</b></p> <p>Attachments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Organization’s antidiscrimination policy</li> </ul> <p>Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If the policy ensures that LGBTQ+ individuals and families receive supportive services, shelter and housing free of discrimination</li> </ul>	<p><b>5 Points</b> – Policy completely addresses all required items.</p> <p><b>3 Points</b> – Policy addresses some of all required items.</p> <p><b>0 Points</b> – Policy does not address any required items</p>
<p><b>Budget and Households</b></p> <p>Attachments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project’s budget, either using the CoC provided Budget Tool or <i>e-snaps</i> pages.</li> </ul> <p>Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project provides a complete and full budget for: rental assistance and/or supportive services using the CoC provided Budget Tool or <i>e-snaps</i> budget screens.</li> </ul>	<p><b>5 Points-</b> Project budget is complete and viable for the competition expectations</p> <p><b>3 Points-</b> Project budget is somewhat complete and is viable for the competitions</p> <p><b>0 Points-</b> Project did not complete budget</p>