

THHI – 2018 UNIVERSAL RFP – THRESHOLD AND SCORING CRITERIA – NEW/EXPANDED PROJECTS

Project Applicant: _____ Name of Project: _____

Type of Project: PSH Set-Aside – C.A.S.H PH – RRH Emergency Bridge Housing (CHSC) GAP Funding PH-PSH
 Joint ES/TH + RRH Component Emergency Bridge Housing w/RRH PH-Unaccompanied Youth

THRESHOLD REVIEW (Completed by THHI Staff)			
<i>Any NO answer in the Threshold Review Section to a FATAL FLAW Item = ineligible to apply per FATAL FLAWS listed in the RFP</i>			
Scoring Factor	Description of Scoring Factor	Points Available	Yes/No
A. Applicant attended the Mandatory Pre-Proposal Workshop on February 2, 2018 at 3PM	Ineligible to Apply - RFP clearly stated this workshop was mandatory	Yes = Continue to next factor No = Ineligible to apply	
B. Proposal was submitted to THHI by the Monday February 26, 2018 3PM deadline	Ineligible to Apply - RFP clearly stated deadline and that no proposal submitted after the deadline would be considered	Yes = Continue to next factor No = Ineligible to apply	
C. Non-Profit Organization with 501(c) 3 status (<i>submitted with IRS determination letter</i>)	FATAL FLAW - RFP clearly states this is an eligibility to apply criteria	Yes = Continue to next factor No = Ineligible to apply	
D. Organization has been in operation for at least 2 years	FATAL FLAW - RFP clearly stated this is an eligibility to apply criteria	Yes = Continue to next factor No = Ineligible to apply	
E. Organization is in good standing in the State of Florida, Division of Corporations	FATAL FLAW - RFP clearly states this is an eligibility to apply criteria	Yes = Continue to next factor No = Ineligible to apply	
F. Organization is NOT listed on the “Excluded Parties List”	FATAL FLAW - RFP clearly stated this is an eligibility to apply criteria	Not Listed as Excluded = Continue to next factor Listed as Excluded = Ineligible to apply	
G. RFP Application Form is signed by the agency official designated to execute contracts	FATAL FLAW - RFP clearly stated application must be signed by this person	Yes = Continue to next factor No = Ineligible to apply	
H. Proposal is typed; not completely/mostly handwritten	FATAL FLAW - RFP clearly stated that proposals that are completely/mostly handwritten will have committed a fatal flaw	Yes = Continue to next factor No = Fatal Flaw	
I. Proposal submission included 1 original, 5 copies and 1 electronic copy on thumb drive	FATAL FLAW - RFP clearly stated this failure to submit these items is a fatal flaw	Yes = Continue to next factor No = Fatal Flaw	
J. Proposal submitted follows the order of proposal as outlined in the RFP, section IV.	FATAL FLAW - RFP clearly stated this is a fatal flaw if not followed	Yes = Continue to next factor No = Fatal Flaw	

K. Proposal includes all required documents are stated in section IV of the RFP	FATAL FLAW - RFP clearly stated proposals that do not include all required documents will have committed a fatal flaw	Yes = Continue to next factor No = Fatal Flaw	
L. Proposal does not exceed page limits in any section in which a page limit was indicated	FATAL FLAW - RFP clearly stated that proposals that exceed the page limits will have committed a fatal flaw	Yes = Continue to next factor No = Fatal Flaw	
M. Proposal included a Completed Housing First/Low Barrier Questionnaire	FATAL FLAW – RFP clearly stated failure to include a completed Housing First/Low Barrier Questionnaire will have committed a fatal flaw	Yes = Continue to next factor No = Fatal Flaw	
ELIGIBLE to APPLY <i>(Circle by THHI staff and Signed by THHI Staff)</i>		YES NO	

Name of THHI Staff Member Completing Threshold Review: _____

Signature of THHI Staff Member Completing Threshold Review: _____

Date of Threshold Review _____

END of THRESHOLD REVIEW PORTION

PROJECT PROPOSAL SCORING

Please enter your score for each scoring criteria based on the project proposal. While most scoring factors are related to specific questions, reviewer may consider all elements of the proposal to determine score for each item. Please use only whole and half points.

CoC and HMIS PARTICIPATION – RFP clearly states that agencies that are active and participating members of the CoC and HMIS will receive additional points for their participation.

Scoring Factor	Scoring Description/Notes	Points Available	Points Given
1. Applicant is an “Active” Member of the Continuum of Care as defined in the Tampa/Hillsborough County CoC Governance Charter.	THHI will provide Membership Attendance Record for the past 12 months (February 2017 to January 2018)	Yes = 1 pt. No = 0 pt.	
2. Applicant has at least 1 staff member <u>regularly</u> participating on at least 1 of the CoC Committees	THHI will provide CoC Committee Attendance tracking for the past 12 months (February 2017 to January 2018)	Yes = 1 pt. No = 0 pt.	
3. Applicant agency has a leadership role in the Tampa/Hillsborough County CoC as evidence by at least 1 of the agency’s paid staff serving as chair or co-chair of a CoC Committee.	THHI will provide a list of all CoC Committee Chairs and Co-Chairs with their corresponding agency for the past 12 months (February 2017 to January 2018)	Applicant Staff Member Chairs or Co-Chairs a Committee = 1 pt. Applicant Staff member does NOT Chair or Co-Chair a committee = 0 pts.	
4. Applicant’s HMIS participation	Applicant agency actively enters data into HMIS as defined as having entered data within the past 90 days (inclusive of any/all of applicants projects using HMIS) DV providers prohibited from entering into HMIS will receive maximum points <i>THHI staff will provide list of agency’s actively entering data.</i>	Applicant actively enters data in HMIS = 1 pts. Applicant is an HMIS partner agency but is not actively entering data = 0.5 pt. Applicant is not a current HMIS partner = 0 pts.	

Scoring Factor	Scoring Description/Notes	Points Available	Points Given
<p>5. Applicant's Overall HMIS Data Quality</p>	<p>All HMIS projects are required to maintain satisfactory data quality. If the applicant has current HMIS projects, all current projects will be used to determine the Agency's overall data quality.</p> <p>DV providers prohibited from entering into HMIS will receive maximum points</p> <p><i>THHI staff will provide Data Quality Results to the scorers. The time frame for Data Quality Reports will be 10/1/16 to 9/30/17</i></p>	<p>Number of Categories with greater than 10% missing data:</p> <p>0 = 2 points 1-2 = 1 point 3+ = 0 points</p> <p>Applicant does not have a currently operating projects that are entering data into HMIS = 0 points</p>	
<p>Proposal Content – The following elements are directly stated in the RFP as required information related to the project proposal.</p>			
<p>6. Organization's Capacity and Experience: History of addressing the needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or at risk of becoming homeless.</p>	<p>Extensive or high history/experience is defined as 8+ years</p> <p>Some History/experience is defined as 4 to 7 years</p> <p>Minimum or No History/Experience is defined as less than 3 years</p>	<p>Extensive history in addressing the needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or at risk of becoming homeless = 2 pts.</p> <p>Some history in addressing the needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or at risk of becoming homeless = 1 pt.</p> <p>Minimum history in addressing the needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or at risk of becoming homeless = 0.5 pts.</p>	
<p>7. Organization's Capacity and Experience: Experience of operating at least similar projects, including performance outcome data from similar programs operated by the organization that shows the effects of the services provided</p>	<p>Extensive or high history/experience is defined as 8+ years</p> <p>Some History/experience is defined as 4 to 7 years</p> <p>Minimum or No History/Experience is defined as less than 3 years</p>	<p>Extensive experience with operating similar projects (, with documented data performance outcomes to substantiate high performance positive outcomes = 2 pts.</p> <p>Some experience with operating similar projects with documented data performance outcomes, however outcomes are below average = 1 pt.</p> <p>Minimum little experience in operating similar projects and/or does not have data documenting positive outcomes and/or data outcomes indicate poor performance = 0.5 pts.</p>	

Scoring Factor	Scoring Description/Notes	Points Available	Points Given
<p>8.Organization’s Capacity and Experience: Federal, state, and/or local government grant experience and capacity of the organization and person(s) responsible for administering the project and overseeing all compliance requirements</p>	<p>Extensive or high history/experience is defined as 8+ years</p> <p>Some History/experience is defined as 4 to 7 years</p> <p>Minimum or No History/Experience is defined as less than 3 years</p>	<p>Extensive experience with government grants with high staff experience in project administration and compliance requirements = 2 pts.</p> <p>Some experience with government grants with some staff experience in project administration and compliance requirements = 1 pt.</p> <p>Minimum or no experience with government grants and staff has minimum/no experience in project administration and compliance requirements = 0 pts.</p>	
<p>9.Project Description – Overview: Describes the overall scope of the project including the clients to be served, which services will be provided and how they will be provided, and process for quickly assisting clients into permanent housing</p>		<p>Clearly and in detail describes the overall scope of the project including the clients to be served, which services will be provided and how they will be provided, and process for quickly assisting clients into permanent housing = 3 pts.</p> <p>Describes, but lacks important details, the overall scope of the project including the clients to be served, which services will be provided and how they will be provided, and process for quickly assisting clients into permanent housing = 1 pts.</p> <p>Vaguely or inadequately describes, the overall scope of the project including the clients to be served, which services will be provided and how they will be provided, and process for quickly assisting clients into permanent housing = 0 pts.</p>	
<p>10. Project Description – Client Demographics/Target Populations: Describes the project’s proposed populations to be served, including identifying targets, and information demonstrating an understanding of the needs of the clients they propose to serve.</p>	<p>Target = serve at least 75 percent of the household type / sub-populations they indicate are the project’s “target</p>	<p>Clearly defines the target demographics of the individuals/households to be served with details that demonstrates an understanding of the needs of those they propose to serve = 3 pts</p> <p>Adequately defines the target demographic, but lacks some detail to demonstrate a full understanding of the needs of those they propose to serve = 1 pt.</p> <p>Vaguely defines the target demographic, does not demonstrate an understanding of the needs of those they propose to serve = 0 pts</p>	

Scoring Factor	Scoring Description/Notes	Points Available	Points Given
<p>11. Project Description – Project Performance Outcomes: Outcomes are the primary way for projects to demonstrate effectiveness and impact in effectible ending homelessness.</p>	<p>Outcomes should be based on client accomplishments and not on the number of services/activities provided to an individual/household</p> <p>Example: 80% will receive a referral to a permanent housing program is an activity. 70% will exit to permanent housing is a measurable outcome.</p>	<p>Outcomes are concise, identified and measurable outcomes, are not based on number of activities/services and include all required outcome measurements indicated in the RFP for project type = 3 pts</p> <p>Outcomes are adequate, but not concise, included some that are based on number of activities/services, and include all required outcome measurements indicated in the RFP for project type = 1 pts</p> <p>Outcomes are all based on number of services/activities provided, outcomes are vague, low and/or does not include the required outcome measurements indicated in the RFP for project type = 0 pts</p>	
<p>12. Housing First/Low Barrier Questionnaire Score</p>	<p>Housing First/Low Barrier access to needed services is a proven best practice. If form is altered/changed/has additional information added by the Applicant, the score = “0”</p>	<p>0-24 Points = Enter Score From Submitted Housing First/Low Barrier Questionnaire</p>	
<p>13. Budget Summary Form and Detailed Budget/Financial Plan Narrative</p>	<p>The Detailed Budget/Financial Plan Narrative should provide the detail and describe/explain the numbers on the Budget Summary Form</p>	<p>Detailed, clear and complete; aligns with the information on the Budget Summary Form; presents a feasible project = 5 pts.</p> <p>Adequately provides necessary information and aligns with the Budget Summary Form, but lacks some information needed to determine if project is feasible = 2.5 pts.</p> <p>Vague, missing key information and/or does not present a feasible project = 0 pts.</p>	
<p>14. Match Narrative and Committed Match</p>	<p>All funding sources require some percentage of match, therefore applicant needs to have both an understanding of match and the ability to provide required match</p>	<p>Detailed, clear and complete indicating the applicant understands match and will be able to provide required project match = 3 pts.</p> <p>Demonstrates a basic understanding of match, however the applicant’s may have difficulty providing necessary match = 1.5 pts.</p> <p>Vague, missing key information and/or does not demonstrate an understanding of match and/or the ability to provide required project match = 0 pts.</p>	

Scoring Factor	Scoring Description/Notes	Points Available	Points Given
15. Agency Compliance Narrative	Using the provided Narrative, Financial Audit including Supplementary Information and Other Reports and The Management Letter <i>(THHI Finance Staff will review submitted Audit and provide data/info for this scoring criteria)</i>	No deficiencies = 2 pts. Technical/Corrected = 1.5 pts. 1 unresolved finding = 1 pt. 2+ unresolved findings = 0 pt.	
16. Cost Allocation Plan	Applicant will be asked to utilize cost allocation in relation to items such as building usage, admin expenses	Clearly indicates and details how the applicant will allocate costs between other projects within their organization that share costs = 2 pts. Indicates how the applicant will allocate costs between other projects within their organization that share costs, but lack sufficient detail = 1 pts. Does not clearly indicates how the applicant will allocate costs between other projects within their organization that share costs and/or indicates the use of an indirect rate = 0 pts	
17. Utilizing the submitted IRS 990 and/or Audit material, applicant organization has adequate cash flow for project.	All funding will be awarded on a Cost Reimbursement process, therefore Applicant must have adequate cash flow to continue operations while reimbursement is processed	Applicant has adequate cash flow = 2 pts. Applicant does not have adequate cash flow = 0 pts.	
18. Project proposal describes how the project will help <u>move the community forward</u> in achieving HUD and CoC priorities and goals to <u>effectively end homelessness</u> in our CoC.	Using all proposal content, the project addresses the needs of one or more of the identified priorities, goals and/or overall system performance	Clearly describes how the proposed project helps move the community forward to effectively ending homelessness by achieving HUD and CoC priorities and goals. = 5 pts. Somewhat describes how the proposed project helps move the community forward to effectively ending homelessness by achieving HUD and CoC priorities and goals = 2.5 pts. Does not or vaguely describes how the proposed project helps move the community forward to effectively ending homelessness by achieving HUD and CoC priorities and goals = 0 pts.	

Scoring Factor	Scoring Description/Notes	Points Available	Points Given
19. Proposed Project is <i>innovative</i>, “outside the box” utilizing with <i>proven, effective practices</i>.	Using all proposal content, the project is innovative, ‘outside of the box,” and uses proven effective best practices.	Clearly and in detail described an innovative project utilizing proven and effective practices = 5 pts. Touches on some innovative ideas and effective practices, but lacks detail = 2.5 pts. Not innovative and/or does not utilize proven effective practices = 0 pts.	
20. Overall proposal Presentation	The overall presentation of the proposal – formatting, content, flow of narratives, adherence to RFP instructions – demonstrates attention to detail and quality	Presented in a detailed, concise organized manner that was easy to understand and review = 1 pt. Lacked attention to detail and overall organization of information making it difficult for the reviewer(s) to locate information needed to complete scoring = 0 pts.	

Maximum Points Possible: 70

Total Points Awarded: _____

Reviewer’s Overall Observations/Concerns:

Reviewer’s Name: _____ Reviewer’s Signature: _____ Date Reviewed: _____