



ARCH | AL-507 ALABAMA BALANCE OF STATE CONTINUUM OF CARE

Renewal Project Scoring Worksheet

For housing renewals: TH, PSH, RRH, and applicable joint components.

Project: _____ Agency: _____
 Reviewer: _____ Review date: _____
 Component: _____ Reporting period: _____

Threshold review: PASS / FAIL Staff reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Verify eligibility, complete application, applicable certifications, match, CE, HMIS/comparable database, and relevant monitoring findings before merit review.

I. Project Performance 35 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Exits to permanent housing: percentage of leavers exiting to permanent housing; numerator, denominator and destination data verified.	5	
Permanent housing retention: percentage remaining in permanent housing or retaining permanent housing after exit, as applicable to the component. Do not count continued TH enrollment as permanent housing retention.	5	
Returns to homelessness: percentage returning within the published follow-up period; lower is better. Use consistent HMIS/comparable data and identify coverage limitations.	10	
Employment income growth: percentage with new or increased earned income. Identify earned income separately from benefits and other non-employment income.	10	
Occupancy / utilization: occupied beds or units relative to funded capacity over the reporting period.	5	

II. Program Design and HUD Priorities 25 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Supportive-service participation requirements: evaluate the project's written participation expectations or agreements, how they are applied, and applicable exemptions, accommodations, and survivor protections. Record whether participation is required.	5	
Treatment and recovery connections: documented access, referral arrangements and follow-through.	5	
Employment and self-sufficiency: practical employment services and participant goals.	5	
Housing stability: permanent housing plan, tenancy support and prevention of repeat homelessness.	5	
Overall project design: service delivery, population needs and implementation feasibility.	5	

Sections I and II subtotal: _____ / 60

III. System Coordination 15 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Coordinated Entry participation: verified referral acceptance and participation consistent with applicable project requirements.	5	
HMIS / comparable database: participation, accuracy, completeness and timely data entry.	3	
Mainstream resource coordination: verified benefit access and service connections.	4	
Community partnerships: documented collaboration supporting participant needs.	3	

IV. Organizational and Fiscal Capacity 15 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Federal grant experience: documented administration and compliance history.	3	
Financial management and timely expenditures: accounting records, draws, reconciliation and documented expenditure performance.	3	
Audit / monitoring history: findings, corrective actions and resolution status.	3	
Staffing capacity: verified staffing levels, qualifications and coverage.	3	
Internal controls: written controls and evidence they are implemented.	3	

V. Budget and Cost Reasonableness 5 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Cost reasonableness: eligible, justified and reasonable costs; cost per household or outcome compared with appropriate projects.	5	

VI. Equity and Access 5 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Equity and access: fair access, nondiscrimination, reasonable accommodations and response to documented access barriers.	5	

Sections I and II: ____ / 60 + Sections III to VI: ____ / 40 = TOTAL: ____ / 100

HUD crosswalk

Objective criteria: Section I (35) + Section IV (15) + Section V (5) = 55/100 points.

System-performance measures: permanent housing exits (5) + permanent housing retention (5) + returns to homelessness (10) + employment income growth (10) = 30/100 points.

Supportive-service participation requirements: Section II, first criterion = 5 points.

System-performance points are also objective points; these are overlapping classifications, not extra points.

Recommendation

Full funding / Reduced funding / Conditions / Reallocation / Not recommended

Recommended amount: \$ _____

Rationale / evidence references: _____

Reviewer signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Scoring instructions

This worksheet applies to housing renewals. HMIS and SSO-CE projects are not scored with this instrument.

Performance benchmarks

Use component-appropriate numerical benchmarks, consistent reporting periods, sources, minimum sample handling and a rule for unavailable or inapplicable data. The bands below are local benchmarks, not HUD-mandated thresholds.

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Permanent housing exits (5): 90%+ = 5; 80% to under 90% = 4; 70% to under 80% = 3; 60% to under 70% = 2; 50% to under 60% = 1; under 50% = 0.	5	
Permanent housing retention (5): 95%+ = 5; 90% to under 95% = 4; 85% to under 90% = 3; 80% to under 85% = 2; under 80% = 1.	5	
Returns to homelessness (10): 0% through 5% = 10; over 5% through 10% = 8; over 10% through 15% = 6; over 15% through 20% = 4; over 20% = 2.	10	
Employment income growth (10): 60%+ = 10; 50% to under 60% = 8; 40% to under 50% = 6; 30% to under 40% = 4; under 30% = 2.	10	
Occupancy / utilization (5): 95%+ = 5; 90% to under 95% = 4; 85% to under 90% = 3; 80% to under 85% = 2; under 80% = 1.	5	

Evidence-based qualitative categories

5-point items: 5 = fully supported; 4 = strong evidence with minor gaps; 3 = adequate evidence; 2 = partial evidence with significant gaps; 1 = minimal evidence; 0 = not addressed.

4-point items: 4 = fully supported; 3 = adequate with minor gaps; 2 = partial evidence; 1 = minimal evidence; 0 = not addressed.

3-point items: 3 = fully supported; 2 = adequate but incomplete; 1 = minimal evidence; 0 = not addressed.

Record the evidence and rationale.

Missing data and component fit

An APR that is not yet due is not itself a performance failure. Use the most recent completed reporting period plus uniformly supplied information. Do not treat no exits, no eligible participants, or unobservable returns as a zero outcome or automatically award full points. Apply the published rule consistently. Adapt retention and employment measures to the population and component while preserving transparent weights.

Service-participation review

Score the clarity, applicability and implementation of the participation framework. Do not impose a universal treatment mandate or treat every project as subject to identical service requirements. Record whether requirements exist and how lawful exceptions and protections are addressed.

Reference: HUD FY2026 CoC Application Detailed Instructions, pp. 23-24, question 1D-1. [hud.gov: FY26 CoC Application Detailed Instructions](#)