

# CoC Bonus - IRT Assessment - SSO

## Project Details

1. Please list all counties you will serve with this funding. Counties not included on this list are not eligible to be served through the TX BoS CoC's CoC Program Competition. (1 point)

2 or more counties served = 1 point

1 county served = 0 points

- 2 or more counties served = 1 point
- 1 county served = 0 points

4. Are you, or any of your CoC Program subrecipients, a Faith-Based Organization? (1 point)

Yes = 1 point

No = 0 points

- Yes= 1 point
- No= 0 points

Project details total score:

{{SUM(PD1.score,PD2.score)}}/2

## Agency Capacity

1. Describe your organization's (and subrecipient(s) if applicable) experience in effectively utilizing Federal funds and performing the activities proposed in the application. Please provide examples that illustrate: (3 points)

(A) Working with and addressing the target population(s) identified housing and supportive service needs,

(B) Developing and implementing relevant program and services,

(C) Identifying and securing match funds from a variety of sources, and

(D) Managing basic organization operations including financial accounting systems

**3 points if:**

- Clearly describes the organization's and any subrecipients' experience administering Federal funds, with specific examples demonstrating successful performance.
- Provides detailed examples addressing all four areas (A–D), showing:
  - A: Strong experience working with the identified target population(s) and addressing their housing and service needs.
  - B: Demonstrated capacity to develop and implement relevant programs and services effectively.
  - C: A track record of identifying and securing match from multiple funding sources.
  - D: Established and reliable organizational operations, including robust financial and grants management systems.
- Demonstrates organizational readiness, capacity, and past performance consistent with successful CoC Program implementation.
- Provides sufficient detail and clarity to support confidence in the organization's ability to carry out the proposed project.

**1.5 points if:**

- Addresses experience with Federal funds and proposed activities, but lacks completeness, clarity, or specificity; OR
- Provides examples for some but not all four areas (A–D); OR
- Describes experience generally but does not clearly demonstrate past performance or organizational capacity; OR
- Adequately addresses experience but provides limited detail regarding financial systems or match funding practices.
- Overall, the response demonstrates partial capacity but is not fully developed or detailed.

**0 points if:**

- Does not describe relevant experience with Federal funds or proposed project activities; OR
  - Provides only vague or generic information that does not demonstrate organizational capacity; OR
  - Does not address most or all of the required areas (A–D); OR
  - Does not provide any meaningful examples of past performance.
- 3 points
  - 1.5 points
  - 0 points

## 2. Describe your organization’s (and subrecipient(s) if applicable) experience in leveraging Federal, State, local and private sector funds (2 points)

### **2 points if:**

Clearly describes the organization’s and any subrecipients’ experience leveraging funding from all or most sources: Federal, State, local, and private sector.

- Provides specific examples demonstrating:
  - A track record of successfully securing and layering multiple funding streams.
  - Effective integration of these funds to support housing, services, and/or operations.
  - Strategic approaches to maximizing resources (e.g., partnerships, fundraising strategies, blended/collaborative funding models).
- Demonstrates strong organizational capacity and established systems for managing diverse funding sources.

### **1 point if:**

- Addresses experience leveraging external funding, but provides limited detail or partial coverage of required funding types; OR
- Describes experience generally but lacks specific examples; OR
- Demonstrates capacity with some funding sources but not all levels (Federal, State, local, private); OR
- Indicates some experience but does not clearly show how leveraged funds supported program goals.
- Overall, the response shows some ability to leverage diverse resources but is not fully developed or comprehensive.

### **0 points if:**

- Does not describe relevant experience leveraging multiple funding sources; OR

- Provides only vague or generic statements that do not demonstrate actual leveraged funding experience; OR
  - Does not address most of the required funding categories; OR
  - Does not provide any meaningful evidence of the organization's or subrecipient(s)' ability to secure or manage leveraged funds.
- 2 points
  - 1 point
  - 0 points

3. Provide a description of the program management and financial accounting system that will be used to administer the grant. Your response must include the accounting system used, your organization's system of checks and balances, and overall structure of how your organization will provide fiscal oversight to this grant. (2 points)

**2 points if:**

- Clearly identifies the financial accounting system used (e.g., specific software/platform) and demonstrates that it is appropriate for Federal grant management.
- Describes a well-defined system of checks and balances, such as separation of duties, approval workflows, internal controls, and reconciliation processes.
- Explains the organizational structure for fiscal oversight, including roles/responsibilities of staff or departments involved (e.g., finance department, grants management, executive oversight).
- Demonstrates strong program management practices, including monitoring, reporting, compliance tracking, and communication between program and finance staff.
- Provides sufficient detail to show the organization has reliable and compliant systems in place to administer the grant effectively.

**1 point if:**

- Identifies the accounting system but provides limited or general information about how it supports grant administration; OR
- Describes some checks and balances, but the description is incomplete or lacking clarity; OR
- Provides basic information about fiscal oversight structure, but does not clearly show strong internal controls or defined roles; OR
- Adequately describes either program management or financial oversight, but not both.
- Overall, the response demonstrates some capacity, but lacks the completeness or specificity needed for full points.

**0 points if:**

- Does not describe the accounting system, checks and balances, or oversight structure; OR
- Provides statements so vague or generic that they do not demonstrate an actual management or financial system; OR
- Omits key required components (e.g., fails to identify accounting system or internal controls); OR
- Does not demonstrate the organization has the systems needed to manage a Federal grant.

- 2 points
- 1 point
- 0 points

4. Select all project and funding types your organization has experience with in the past 5 years. Please indicate the type of project and the corresponding funding source. Applicants may enter up to 5 awards. If more than 5, please select the most relevant 5 to the proposed project. Leave blank if no relevant experience. (6 points)

Points awarded per the number of prior projects operated, as follows:

- 0-2 projects = 0 pts
  - 3 projects = 2 pts
  - 4 projects = 4 pts
  - 5 projects = 6 pts
- 0 points
  - 2 points
  - 4 points
  - 6 points

Agency Capacity total score:

$\{\{\text{SUM}(\text{AC1.score}, \text{AC2.score}, \text{AC3.score}, \text{AC4.score})\}\} / 13$

### **SSO: Component Specific Questions**

1. Please describe why this SSO supportive services project is necessary to help people exit homelessness, address barriers to

housing, and increase self-sufficiency. In your answer, describe:  
(1 point)

A) The specific gaps or needs in your community that this project addresses;

B) How the services you will provide directly support exits from homelessness and increases in income, stability, or other self-sufficiency measures; and

C) How you will conduct an ongoing assessment of the service needs of program participants and how frequently (including how you gather input, review data, and adjust services based on the results).

**1 point if:**

Response clearly includes all three:

- CoC gaps/needs named that this project fills (e.g., lack of employment navigation, benefits enrollment capacity, transportation, language access, linkage from Coordinated Entry to services).
- Direct link to exits/self-sufficiency — explains how the specific services provided (what + brief frequency) drive exits from homelessness and increases in income/stability (e.g., employer MOUs/Workforce Innovations Opportunity Act co-enrollment, SSI/SSDI via SOAR, budgeting/tenancy skills, warm handoffs to Permanent Housing).
- Ongoing needs assessment process & frequency — states how often (e.g., at intake + 30/90 days, quarterly), how input is gathered (surveys, focus groups, case reviews), what data are reviewed (HMIS outcomes, Coordinated Entry referrals, data quality), and how services are adjusted based on results.

**0 points if:**

- Missing any of the three elements; or
- Only generic claims (“services help people become self-sufficient”) with no CoC gap, no service→outcome link, or no assessment cadence/process.

- 1 point
- 0 points

2. Please describe your strategy for providing supportive services to eligible participants in this SSO project, including those with histories of unsheltered homelessness and those who do not traditionally engage with services. In your answer, explain: (2 points)

A) How you will identify and engage participants who have been unsheltered or disconnected from services;

B) The types of supportive services you will provide or coordinate; and

C) How your approach reduces barriers and increases participation for people who are reluctant, distrustful, or historically under-engaged in supportive services.

**2 points if:**

Covers all three with clear specifics:

- Identify & engage unsheltered/disconnected folks (e.g., Coordinated Entry/by-name list referrals, field outreach routes & hours, co-response with first responders, peer navigators, encampment protocols, safety planning).
- Service types + who provides them (in-house vs partners/MOUs) and basic frequency (e.g., weekly case management, same-day benefits screening, rapid behavioral health/medication assisted treatment linkage).
- Barrier reduction & participation: field enrollments, flexible hours, minimal paperwork, language/Americans with Disabilities Act access, accompaniment to appointments, incentives (bus passes/phones), trauma-informed/harm-reduction—explicitly aimed at reluctant/under-engaged people.

**1 point if:**

- Addresses some but not all elements, or uses generic language; or
- Good engagement plan but vague services/frequency; or
- Clear services but little on barrier-reduction for hard-to-engage; or
- Mentions tactics without indicating who provides services.

**0 points if:**

Generic statements with no specific engagement tactics, no clear service list, and/or no barrier-reduction plan for reluctant/under-engaged participants.

- 2 points
- 1 point
- 0 points

3. Please describe how this SSO project will be supplemented with resources from other public or private sources. In your answer, identify: (1 point)

A) The specific mainstream health, social, and employment programs you will help participants access (e.g., Medicare, Medicaid, SSI/SSDI, TANF, SNAP, WIOA/employment services);

B) Any additional public or private funding or in-kind resources (e.g., behavioral health providers, FQHCs, workforce partners, charitable or faith-based supports) that will complement the SSO services; and

C) How project staff will assist participants to apply for, enroll in, and maintain these benefits and resources, and how this will be documented (e.g., in HMIS or another data system).

**1 point if:**

Includes all three clearly:

- Specific mainstream programs named the project will help participants access (e.g., Medicaid/Medicare, SSI/SSDI, TANF, SNAP, Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act/Workforce, Vocational Rehab, Veterans Administration/Supportive Services for Veteran Families if relevant).
- Other funding/in-kind supports identified that complement SSO (e.g., behavioral-health provider/federally qualified health center MOUs, workforce partners, charitable/faith-based supports, city/county funds, transport passes, furniture/food banks)—ideally with partner names.

- Assistance & documentation process described (how staff apply/enroll/maintain benefits—field enrollments, warm handoffs, document collection—and how this is tracked in HMIS or a comparable system with case notes/scanned verifications/dashboards).

**0 points if:**

- Only vague mentions of “public/private resources” with no specific programs; or
  - No complementary funding/in-kind supports identified; or
  - No explanation of how staff enroll/maintain benefits and how it’s documented (no HMIS/comparable process).
- 
- 1 point
  - 0 points

4. Please describe how the services provided by this SSO project are cost-effective, consistent with 2 CFR 200.404. In your answer, describe: (1 point)

A) How you determine that service costs are reasonable in relation to the number, needs, and outcomes of participants served;

B) How your costs compare to similar projects or local benchmarks, if known; and

C) Any strategies you use to control or reduce costs while still delivering high-quality services that help participants exit homelessness and increase self-sufficiency.

**1 point if:**

- Response clearly includes all three:
- Reasonableness test: States how costs are judged relative to number served, acuity/needs, and outcomes (e.g., cost per participant, cost per successful exit/linkage, caseload ratios, outcome targets).
- Benchmark comparison: Briefly compares costs to similar local projects or benchmarks (prior years, peer agencies, CoC averages) and explains any difference.
- Cost-control strategies with quality intact: Names specific practices that reduce/control costs without degrading services (e.g., shared/mobile staffing, collaborative funding,

competitive procurement, route/scheduling efficiency, tele/field enrollment, targeted incentives) while still achieving exits/self-sufficiency gains.

**0 points if:**

- Missing any of the three: no reasonableness method, no benchmark comparison, or no cost-control strategies; or
- Only generic claims (“our services are cost-effective”) with no numbers/process.
- 1 point
- 0 points

5. Will the project require Supportive Service Participation requirements in order to maintain project enrollment consistent with 24 CFR 578.75(h)? (6 points)

Yes = 6 points

No = 0 points

- Yes = 6 points
- No = 0 points

6. Using past or current performance outcomes, please indicate the percentage of persons who will exit the project with increased employment income as a result of their participation. (4 points)

**4 pts if:**

50% or more

**2pts if:**

25%- <50%

**0pts if:**

<25%

- 50% or more = 4 points
- 25% - <50% = 2 points
- <25 % = 0 points

7. Using past or current performance outcomes, respond to the following: (4 points)

Of the number that will exit to Permanent Housing annually, please provide the number of persons that return to homelessness in the following timeframes:

A) Less than 6 months

- 0-5%
- >5-10%
- >10%

B) 6-12 months

- 0-5%
- >5-10%
- >10%

C) 13 to 24 months

- 0-5%
- >5-10%
- >10%

**4 points if:**

0 responses are >10%

**2 points if:**

1 response is >10%

**0 points if:**

2 or more responses are >10%

- 4 points
- 2 points
- 0 points

## SSO Component Specific Questions Total Score

{{SUM(SSO1.score,SSO2.score,SSO3.score,SSO4.score,SSO5.score,SSO6.score,SSO7.score)}}/19

### Match Commitments and Monitoring History

3. In the last 5 years, has your agency had any funds recaptured (meaning reclaimed by the funder due to slow spending, monitoring findings, disallowed costs, or any other reason that required returning funds rather than using them as intended)?

If yes, please list the funding source, the grant start and end dates, the total grant award, and the amount recaptured. If more than five recaptures occurred, list only the five largest. Do not include any Pandemic Relief Funds. If none, please enter NA. (6 points)

#### 6 points if:

The amount recaptured for any award is between 0-3% of the total award

#### 3 points if:

The amount recaptured for any award is greater than 3% but less than 10%

#### 0 points if:

The amount recaptured for any award is more than 10% of the total award

The reviewer must calculate the Amount Recaptured as a percentage for each Funding Source where funds were recaptured in order to score this question.

To determine the percentage that was unspent, the reviewer should use the following formula:

$(\text{Amount recaptured} / \text{total award}) \times 100 = \% \text{ unspent}$

Example: \$10,000 recaptured divided by a total award of \$200,000 = 0.05. Then, 0.05 multiplied by 100 = 5%.

- 6 points
- 3 points
- 0 points

Match Commitments and Monitoring History Total Score:

$\{\{SUM(MCMH1.score)\}\}/6$

### Leveraged Partnerships

**2. Leveraged Partnerships Upload:** Please upload one or more preliminary commitment letters on partner letterhead, signed and dated by an authorized representative.

Letters must describe resources or commitments that are in addition to the required 25% CoC Program Match. Resources counted toward match will not be eligible for local leverage/partnership points.

For full points, each letter must include:

- A) The partner organization name;
- B) The proposed project name (used consistently across application materials);
- C) A brief description of the services, resources, coordination, access, or implementation support the partner intends to provide;
- D) How the partnership will support project participants or project implementation;

E) The dates the benefit will be available (aligned with project dates in e-snaps); and

F) A statement attesting that the described resources or commitments are in addition to, and not being counted toward, the required 25% CoC Program Match.

**3 points if:**

- Applicant uploads one or more preliminary commitment letters that clearly demonstrate:
  - Specific, project-relevant partnerships that materially support project implementation or participant access to housing, services, treatment, or other community-based supports, and
  - The documentation clearly reflects that the described commitments are in addition to the required 25% CoC Program Match.

**1.5 points if:**

- Applicant uploads at least one preliminary commitment letter showing: a relevant partnership or resource commitment, but the documentation is less specific regarding the partner's role, the nature of the support, the anticipated dates of the benefit, or how the partnership supports project participants or project implementation.

**0 points if:**

- No qualifying preliminary commitment letter is uploaded; or the uploaded documentation is too vague to verify the partner's intended role; or the uploaded documentation reflects resources being counted toward the required 25% CoC Program Match; or the required attestation that the commitment is in addition to, and not being counted toward, the required Match is missing.

- 3 points
- 1.5 points
- 0 points

## Leveraged Partnerships Total Score

{{SUM(LP1.score)}}/3

Total Score:

8.0/43

