

Scorecard 3. Transitional Housing (new project) - Minimal HUD-Compliant Revision

Project type: Transitional Housing **Scoring basis:** Proposed project design and capacity; no prior-project performance history required

Agency name:		Project name:		
Objective criteria: 60 of 110 points = 54.5%		System-performance-related: 30 of 110 points = 27.3%		
Scored item	Scoring criteria	Max	Data reference	Score
A. Population served (10 objective points)				
Target population, eligibility, and community need	Award 2 points for each documented element: (1) HUD-eligible population; (2) household type(s); (3) priority population(s); (4) planned households/units served; and (5) intended outcomes and the local gap addressed. Maximum = 10.	10	Target population and intended outcomes; proposed project description; meeting a community need	
B. System performance alignment (30 points)				
Pathway to permanent housing and successful exits (SPM 7)	20 = Excellent: specific and credible pathway to permanent housing, including housing planning, document readiness, housing search/landlord engagement, barrier resolution, income or benefits, transition timing, and clear expected exits; 15 = strong with minor gaps; 10 = adequate/general; 5 = limited; 0 = not addressed.	20	Moving people into housing and toward stability; intended outcomes	
Housing retention and reducing returns to homelessness (SPM 2)	5 = Clear follow-up/aftercare and retention strategy with identified supports; 3 = general follow-up approach; 0 = not addressed.	5	Moving people into housing and toward stability; supportive-services description	
Income and self-sufficiency outcomes (SPM 4)	5 = Specific approach to increasing earned income, non-employment income/benefits, education, or employment; 3 = general approach; 0 = not addressed.	5	Intended outcomes; services offered and how participants take part	
C. Supportive services (20 points)				
Detailed description of supportive services, including accessible delivery and treatment/recovery supports	Excellent (detailed, thorough, and clear about how participants access services directly or through partners) = 15; Good (general but adequate) = 10; Limited = 5; Not addressed = 0.	15	Supportive-services description; services offered and how participants take part	
Service capacity: at least 20 hours of supportive-service opportunities available weekly	5 = Application clearly confirms availability and provides staffing/schedule detail; 2 = availability is asserted but not substantiated; 0 = not addressed.	5	Hours of supportive services; staffing and service schedule	
D. Data quality (20 objective points)				
HMIS participation, data quality, and performance management plan	Award 5 points for each documented element: (1) HMIS/comparable-database participation; (2) timely entry standards or assigned staff responsibility; (3) routine data-quality review; and (4) performance monitoring with correction or continuous-improvement steps. Maximum = 20.	20	Database participation; project description; organizational experience	

Scored item	Scoring criteria	Max	Data reference	Score
E. Cost effectiveness (10 points)				
Budget completeness, eligibility, and internal consistency	Award 1 point for each documented element: (1) completed budget template; (2) total request matches the narrative; (3) costs are tied to eligible TH activities; (4) households/units served are identified; and (5) cost-per-household calculation can be verified. Maximum = 5.	5	Budget narrative and completed budget template	
Average cost per household served is reasonable	5 = Reasonable in comparison with the proposed service intensity, household needs, and other TH applications; 0 = not reasonable or not supported.	5	Total request; households served; cost-reasonableness response	
F. Community practice (20 objective points)				
Coordinated Entry participation	10 = Clearly documented commitment to Coordinated Entry referrals, prioritization, and required coordination; 0 = not documented.	10	Project description; coordination with other agencies	
Includes persons with lived experience	10 = Application documents participation through governance, design, service delivery, evaluation, paid/peer roles, or an established feedback process; 0 = not documented.	10	Engagement with people with lived expertise	
Participation in PIT count	Tracked, no points awarded.	0	PIT participation response	
Raw total:	110 points	Weighted total:	100 points	
Objective criteria:	60 / 110 = 54.5%	System performance:	30 / 110 = 27.3%	
Applicant raw total:	_____ points	Applicant weighted total:	_____ points	

Objective-point calculation: Population checklist 10 + service-capacity verification 5 + HMIS/data-plan checklist 20 + budget-completeness checklist 5 + Coordinated Entry 10 + lived expertise 10 = 60 objective points. System-performance points are the 30-point block tied to SPM 7, SPM 2, and SPM 4.