

Desert Regional Steering Committee HHAP Scoring Rubric

Agency Name _____

Total Points Awarded: _____

Housing First Emphasis	Total Possible Score (PS): 25 points	PS	Score
[15 Excellent] [10-14 Good] [5-9 Fair] [1-4 Poor] [0 Unacceptable]			
Excellent:	Housing First emphasis is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to the Housing First model. Description is clearly based on the tenets of the Housing First model.		
Good:	Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the Housing First emphasis.		
Fair:	Housing First emphasis is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will ensure Housing First services.		
Poor:	Housing First emphasis is vague and poorly described. Housing First emphasis appears to have been an afterthought.		
Unacceptable:	Housing First emphasis is not stated. The description does not have any evidence of applying the tenets of the Housing First model.		
<p><u>California's Housing First Legislation:</u> In 2016, the California Legislature passed Senate Bill 1380 (Mitchell). It required all housing programs to adopt the Housing First model¹. The Legislation defined Housing First as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tenant screening and selection practices promote accepting applicants regardless of their sobriety or use of substances, completion of treatment, or participation in services. • Applicants are not rejected on the basis of poor credit or financial history, poor or lack of rental history, criminal convictions unrelated to tenancy, or behaviors that indicate a lack of "housing readiness." • Housing providers accept referrals directly from shelters, street outreach, drop-in centers, and other parts of crisis response systems frequented by vulnerable people experiencing homelessness. • Supportive services emphasize engagement and problem solving over therapeutic goals and service plans that are highly tenant-driven without predetermined goals. • Participation in services or program compliance is not a condition of housing tenancy. • Tenants have a lease and all the rights and responsibilities of tenancy. • The use of alcohol or drugs in and of itself, without other lease violations, is not a reason for eviction. • Funding promotes tenant selection plans for supportive housing that prioritize eligible tenants based on criteria other than "first-come-first-serve," including, but not limited to, the duration or chronicity of homelessness, vulnerability to early mortality, or high utilization of crisis services. • Case managers and service coordinators are trained in and actively employ evidence-based practices for engagement, including motivational interviewing and client-centered counseling. • Services are informed by a harm-reduction philosophy that recognizes drug and alcohol use and addiction as a part of tenants' lives, where tenants are engaged in nonjudgmental communication regarding drug and alcohol use, and where tenants are offered education regarding how to avoid risky behaviors and engage in safer practices, as well as connected to evidence-based treatment if the tenant so chooses. • The project and specific apartment may include special physical features that accommodate disabilities, reduce harm, and promote health and community and independence among tenants. 			
¹ Codified as California Welfare & Institutions Code § 8255.			
a) The extent to which applicant conforms to California and the CoC's Housing First policy.		15	
[10 Excellent] [7-9 Good] [4-6 Fair] [1-3 Poor] [0 Unacceptable]			
Housing First practices include rapid placement and stabilization for housing permanency and does not have service participation requirements or preconditions.		10	
Total Score		25	

COMMENTS:

Project Focus		Total Possible Score (PS): 25 points	PS	Score
	[5 Excellent] [3-4 Good] [2 Fair] [1 Poor] [0 Unacceptable]			
Excellent:	Project focus is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to the purpose of the program. Description indicates a well-planned project focus.			
Good:	Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the project focus.			
Fair:	Project focus is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will be providing services through this funding.			
Poor:	Project focus is vague and poorly described. Description of the project appears to have been an afterthought.			
Unacceptable:	Project focus is not stated. The description does not have any evidence of clear project intent.			
a)	The extent to which the proposed project is for a HHAP eligible use/service.		5	
b)	The extent to which the proposed project improves the current homeless services system/structure.		5	
c)	The applicant's ability to focus on long-term sustainable results.		5	
d)	The extent to which the proposed project addresses the fundamental underlying issues of homelessness rather than only addressing its symptoms.		5	
e)	The extent to which measurable outcomes will be tracked and reported.		5	
Total Score			25	

COMMENTS:

Experience and Capacity		Total Possible Score (PS): 25 points	PS	Score
	[5 Excellent] [3-4 Good] [2 Fair] [1 Poor] [0 Unacceptable]			
Excellent:	Project experience/capacity/innovation is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to the organization's ability to administer the program.			
Good:	Similar to above, but could provide more detail about the organization's experience/capacity/innovation.			
Fair:	Project experience/capacity/innovation is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding the organization's ability to administer the program.			
Poor:	Project experience/capacity/innovation is vague and poorly described.			
Unacceptable:	Project experience/capacity/innovation is not stated. The description does not have any clear indication of experience/capacity/innovation in administering the program.			
a)	The applicant's experience in providing services to the public.		5	

b) The applicant's capacity in providing services to the public.	5	
c) The applicant's innovation in providing services to the public.	5	
d) The applicant's experience level of key staff.	5	
e) The applicant's ability to adequately describe the target population and address requirements set out in the CoC HHAP RFA.	5	
Total Score	25	

COMMENTS:

Budget Detail	Total Possible Score (PS): 10 points	PS	Score
	[5 Excellent] [3-4 Good] [2 Fair] [1 Poor] [0 Unacceptable]		
Excellent:	Project budget is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to extent of expenditures. Description indicates a well-planned budget.		
Good:	Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the budget costs.		
Fair:	Project budget is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will expend the funding.		
Poor:	Project budget is vague and poorly described. Budget appears to have been an afterthought.		
Unacceptable:	Project budget is not stated. The description of the budget costs is unrealistic.		

a) The applicant's proposed budget costs are adequate and realistic to complete the project.	5	
	[2.5 Excellent] [2 Good] [1.5 Fair] [1 Poor] [0 Unacceptable]	
Excellent:	Project funding obligation is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to the date of expenditures.	
Good:	Similar to above, but could provide more detail about the funding obligation.	
Fair:	Project funding obligation is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will obligate the funds.	
Poor:	Project funding obligation is vague and poorly described.	
Unacceptable:	Project funding obligation is not stated.	
b) Fifty percent of project funds will be expended by 5/31/2023.	2.5	
c) One hundred percent of project funds will be expended by 5/31/2025.	2.5	
Total Score	10	

COMMENTS:

Collaboration		Total Possible Score (PS): 15 points	PS	Score
	[15 Excellent] [10-14 Good] [5-9 Fair] [1-4 Poor] [0 Unacceptable]			
Excellent:	Project collaboration is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to extent of collaborative partners. Description indicates a well-planned collaborative project.			
Good:	Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the project collaboration and partners.			
Fair:	Project collaboration is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will collaborate with its partners.			
Poor:	Project collaboration is vague and poorly described. Collaboration appears to have been an afterthought.			
Unacceptable:	Project collaboration is not stated. The description does not have any evidence of clear collaboration with other agencies or municipalities.			
a)	Evidence of the applicant's ability to collaborate with other agencies and/or municipalities.		15	
Total Score			15	
COMMENTS:				
Total Points Awarded			100	

Scorer Name _____