

HMIS Project Scoring Worksheet

For Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) project applications.

Project: _____ Applicant: _____

Reviewer: _____ Reporting period: _____

Application: **Renewal / New / Expansion** (circle one)

Threshold review: PASS / FAIL Component threshold checks: privacy/security policies, current data standards, permitted uses and disclosures, reporting capability, and eligible HMIS costs.

I. Contribution to System Performance 30 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Length of time homeless and permanent housing outcomes: accurate, reproducible system-performance analysis; timely identification of delays and outcome gaps; documented reports and data-supported improvement work.	10	
Returns to homelessness: valid matching and follow-up methodology; reliable return-rate reports, coverage limitations and documented use in performance review.	10	
Employment and income performance: accurate earned-income analysis, distinction from non-employment income, and documented feedback to providers and CoC leadership.	10	

II. Objective Operational Performance / Readiness 20 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Coverage and data quality: participation/coverage reports, completeness and error rates, consistent review periods, and documented corrections.	10	
Reporting and service delivery: required submissions, issue resolution, training delivery, system availability and vendor oversight against published targets.	10	

III to VI. Capacity, Budget, Coordination and Access 50 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Organizational / fiscal capacity: staffing and qualifications (5); financial systems and controls (5); audit/monitoring resolution (5); grant administration and expenditure performance or documented readiness (5).	20	
Budget / cost reasonableness: eligible, supported costs (5); cost effectiveness relative to documented scope and appropriate comparisons (5).	10	
Coordination: documented provider participation (5), performance feedback and joint problem resolution (5), clear roles and follow-up accountability (5).	15	
Equity / access: documented barrier review, accessible practices and corrective actions; protections for survivors and people with disabilities.	5	

TOTAL: _____ / 100

Recommendation: _____

Evidence / rationale: _____

Reviewer signature: _____ **Date:** _____

SSO - Coordinated Entry Project Scoring Worksheet

For Supportive Services Only - Coordinated Entry (SSO-CE) project applications.

Project: _____ Applicant: _____

Reviewer: _____ Reporting period: _____

Application: **Renewal / New / Expansion** (circle one)

Threshold review: PASS / FAIL Component threshold checks: eligible SSO-CE activities, written CE policies, geographic access, privacy and consent practices, and safe coordination with victim service providers.

I. Contribution to System Performance 30 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Timely access to housing: referral-to-enrollment and referral-to-housing intervals, unresolved referrals and documented action to reduce delays. Distinguish CE intervals from HUD length-of-time-homeless measures.	10	
Permanent housing connections: referral acceptance, enrollment and housing-placement outcomes where observable; closed-loop follow-up and resolution of barriers.	10	
Returns to homelessness: coordinated tracking with HMIS and providers, assessment of repeated referrals/returns, appropriate reassessment and documented improvement actions.	10	

II. Objective Operational Performance / Readiness 20 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Access and assessment: availability across the CoC geography; accessible entry points; timely, consistent assessment and referral records.	10	
Prioritization and referral operation: adherence to written standards, current referral lists, documented matches and resolution of declined or uncompleted referrals.	10	

III to VI. Capacity, Budget, Coordination and Access 50 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Organizational / fiscal capacity: staffing and qualifications (5); financial systems and controls (5); audit/monitoring resolution (5); grant administration and expenditure performance or documented readiness (5).	20	
Budget / cost reasonableness: eligible, supported costs (5); cost effectiveness relative to documented scope and appropriate comparisons (5).	10	
Coordination: documented provider participation (5), performance feedback and joint problem resolution (5), clear roles and follow-up accountability (5).	15	
Equity / access: documented barrier review, accessible practices and corrective actions; protections for survivors and people with disabilities.	5	

TOTAL: _____ / 100

Recommendation: _____

Evidence / rationale: _____

Reviewer signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Reviewer Instructions

HMIS and SSO-CE Project Scoring Worksheets

HUD criteria allocation

Total points: each worksheet totals 100 points.

System-performance measures: Section I = 30/100 points.

Objective criteria: Section II operational performance (20) + organizational/fiscal capacity (20) + budget/cost reasonableness (10) = 50/100 points, scored against verified evidence and published standards.

Housing-project elements: HUD question 1D-1 elements 4 to 6 (returns to homelessness, employment income and supportive service participation requirements) apply to TH, PSH and RRH housing projects. Housing occupancy and participant-treatment criteria are not applied to HMIS or CE projects.

System-performance section: three criteria at 10 points each

For each criterion: measurement quality and defined baseline/target (0-3); documented delivery or feasible implementation plan (0-3); analysis and corrective action (0-2); documented coordination and follow-up (0-2). Record the underlying measure, denominator, period, source and limitations. A generic statement that a project supports the system is insufficient.

HMIS: evaluate the project's ability to produce and use reliable outcome evidence. Do not attribute all CoC-wide housing or employment outcomes to the HMIS grant. General data-quality or software-uptime scores belong in operational performance, not in the system-performance allocation.

CE: evaluate observed contribution to timely housing access and outcomes, with housing supply and provider constraints documented. Do not equate a referral with a housing placement. Separate CE process measures from HUD-defined system-performance measures and explain their connection.

Evidence-based scoring scales

Other 10-point criteria: 9-10 = complete evidence and strong performance against published targets; 7-8 = strong with minor gaps; 5-6 = adequate with material gaps; 3-4 = limited; 1-2 = minimal; 0 = unaddressed. Explain the point selected within each band.

Each 5-point subcriterion: 5 = fully supported; 4 = strong with minor gaps; 3 = adequate; 2 = limited; 1 = minimal; 0 = unaddressed. Use evidence rather than narrative polish.

Renewals, new projects and fair review

Renewals: use verified results from a consistent completed period. New/expansion projects: evaluate measurable targets, delivery milestones, committed resources and credible feasibility evidence; do not demand nonexistent project history. Apply component-specific benchmarks, unavailable-data rules and tie-breakers consistently. Avoid counting the same deliverable twice under different categories.

ARCH-sponsored HMIS and CE projects require independent review and documented conflict recusals. Victim service providers must be accommodated through compliant comparable-data and safe referral arrangements; these worksheets do not require their client-level data in HMIS.

Scope

These worksheets cover HMIS and SSO-CE projects. Street outreach and other SSO projects are not scored with these worksheets.

Reference: HUD FY2026 CoC Application Detailed Instructions, pp. 23-24, question 1D-1.