Rural Nevada
CONTINUUM OF CARE

FY2026 RATING GUIDANCE FOR NEW PROJECT APPLICATIONS

. **Rating & Ranking Committee | 100 Total Points**

Purpose. Use this guide to review and score the entire New Project Application. The objective section is worth 60 points and is scored from verifiable application information and required documentation. The narrative section is worth 40 points and is scored from the three published narrative questions. Do not add requirements that are not contained in the application or competition materials.

General Scoring Principles

- Read the entire application and all attachments before assigning scores.
- Score only submitted information; do not rely on personal knowledge, reputation, or assumptions.
- Use information anywhere in the application when it directly supports the criterion being scored.
- For objective criteria, score the quality and completeness of verifiable evidence—not writing style.
- For narrative criteria, award full points only when all parts of the prompt are answered clearly, logically, specifically, and consistently.
- Reduce points for missing, vague, unsupported, inconsistent, or unrealistic information.
- Provide brief reviewer comments identifying the evidence and basis for each score.

Scoring Structure

Application Portion	Points	Reviewer Role
Objective Evaluation	60	Review and score the specified application sections and required documentation using the objective rubrics.
Narrative Evaluation	40	Score the three narrative questions using the published point ranges and the full application for context and verification.
TOTAL	**100**	**Add objective and narrative scores. No individual score may exceed the listed maximum.**

Objective Point Conversion

Apply consistently. Objective metrics use four levels: Full = 100% of the metric; Strong = approximately 80%; Partial = 50%; No Points = 0%. Use the exact point values shown in each table and document the evidence supporting the score.

Objective Evaluation - 60 Points

Objective scoring rule. Award points only when the application or required attachment provides sufficient, relevant, and verifiable information. A document's presence alone does not warrant full points; its content must support the criterion.

Organizational Capacity (20 points)

Reviewer note: Use the application and required attachments. Record a brief comment identifying the evidence reviewed and the basis for the score.

Points	Scoring Standard	Quick Example
History & Experience (5 points)		
5	Specific, documented experience serving the target population and operating relevant housing or supportive services.	Application describes comparable programs, years of experience, and results for the proposed population.
4	Relevant experience is documented, with only minor gaps in scope, duration, or direct comparability.	Agency has related housing experience but limited history with the exact target population.
2.5	Some related experience is described, but important details or direct relevance are limited.	Agency lists general human-services experience without clear housing outcomes.
0	Relevant experience is not documented or cannot be verified.	Response is blank or provides no applicable experience.
Grant Management (5 points)		
5	Successful administration of comparable federal, state, or local grants is clearly documented.	Applicant identifies comparable awards, responsible staff, reporting systems, and successful compliance.
4	Grant experience is credible but has a minor gap in comparability or supporting detail.	Applicant has managed state grants but provides limited detail about federal requirements.
2.5	Limited experience is shown, but transferable systems or controls are identified.	Applicant has smaller grants and describes how existing controls would support the CoC award.
0	Grant-management capacity is not demonstrated.	No grant history, responsible staff, or management system is provided.
Staffing & Structure (5 points)		
5	Qualified staff, clear roles, supervision, and adequate coverage are documented.	Organizational chart and staffing plan identify leadership, fiscal oversight, program staff, and supervision.
4	The structure is generally adequate with one minor vacancy or role clarification needed.	Most positions are identified, but one supporting role is still being finalized.
2.5	Major roles are vacant or unclear, but a feasible staffing plan is provided.	Key positions are unfilled, but qualifications, recruitment timing, and interim coverage are described.
0	The staffing structure is inadequate, unrealistic, or unsupported.	No staffing plan or responsible project leadership is identified.
Board Governance (5 points)		
5	Current board information demonstrates active and appropriate organizational oversight.	Board roster and governance information show relevant expertise, regular oversight, and clear authority.
4	Governance is generally sound, with a minor documentation or composition gap.	Board is active, but committee or oversight details are limited.

Points	Scoring Standard	Quick Example
2.5	Basic governance is shown, but oversight responsibilities are not well developed.	A roster is provided, but the application does not explain how the board oversees grants.
0	Board or governance evidence is missing or materially deficient.	No current board roster or oversight structure is submitted.

Financial Capacity (15 points)

Reviewer note: Use the application and required attachments. Record a brief comment identifying the evidence reviewed and the basis for the score.

Points	Scoring Standard	Quick Example
Fiscal Policies (5 points)		
5	Current policies address key grant-finance functions and are ready for implementation.	Policies cover approvals, procurement, cost allocation, cash management, records, and conflict controls.
4	Policies are generally complete with only minor updates needed.	Core policies are present, but one procedure needs clarification.
2.5	Policies have notable gaps, but a credible correction plan is documented.	Several procedures need updates, with responsible staff and completion dates identified.
0	Policies are missing, outdated, or inadequate for federal grant management.	Required fiscal policies are not submitted or do not address basic controls.
Financial System (3 points)		
3	The system can track the grant budget, costs, match, drawdowns, and supporting records.	Accounting system uses grant-level cost centers and produces budget-to-actual reports.
2.5	The system is generally adequate with a minor configuration or reporting gap.	Grant tracking exists, but match reporting requires a planned adjustment.
1.5	Notable limitations exist, but a credible improvement plan is provided.	Current system needs a new grant code and reconciliation process before start-up.
0	Adequate grant-level financial tracking is not demonstrated.	Applicant cannot explain how costs and match will be separately tracked.
Audit / Financial Statements (5 points)		
5	Current financial evidence shows sound condition and no unresolved material concerns.	Audit or statements show stable finances and no material findings.
4	Evidence is generally sound with a minor issue that has been resolved or is low risk.	One minor finding was corrected and documented.
2.5	A material concern exists, but corrective action and financial stability are credibly demonstrated.	Audit notes a weakness, with a completed corrective action and supporting documentation.
0	Evidence is missing or shows unresolved material financial concerns.	No statements are submitted or material findings remain unresolved.
Internal Controls (2 points)		
2	Approvals, reconciliations, separation of duties or mitigation, and oversight are clearly documented.	Different staff authorize, process, and reconcile transactions, with supervisory review.
1.5	Controls are generally adequate with one minor limitation and documented mitigation.	Small staff limits segregation, but independent board review and monthly reconciliation are used.
1	Several weaknesses exist, but corrective or mitigating controls are described.	Controls rely heavily on one staff member, with planned secondary review.
0	Material control weakness or insufficient evidence is present.	No approval, reconciliation, or oversight process is documented.

Partnerships & Community Coordination (10 points)

Reviewer note: Use the application and required attachments. Record a brief comment identifying the evidence reviewed and the basis for the score.

Points	Scoring Standard	Quick Example
Executed MOUs (5 points)		
5	Current agreements clearly define partner roles, referrals, resources, and responsibilities.	Executed MOU identifies services, referral process, responsible parties, and term.
4	Agreements are relevant and substantially complete, with a minor detail missing.	MOU defines roles but provides limited information about reporting or coordination frequency.
2.5	Support is indicated, but agreements are not executed or are insufficiently specific.	Draft MOU or letter indicates intent but does not fully define commitments.
0	No relevant commitment is documented, or documents are generic or unrelated.	No MOU is provided for a partnership relied upon in the project design.
Letters of Support (3 points)		
3	Current, project-specific letters document concrete commitments or resources.	Partner commits staff time, referrals, space, services, or another specific resource.
2.5	Letters are relevant but contain limited detail about the commitment.	Partner supports the project and mentions referrals but does not quantify or define the role.
1.5	Letters provide general support with little project-specific information.	Letter endorses the organization but does not describe a project role.
0	No current relevant letters are provided.	No letter supports the partnerships described in the application.
Community Coordination (2 points)		
2	Active or clearly planned coordination with CoC, Coordinated Entry, housing, and service partners is demonstrated.	Application explains CE participation, case coordination, referral pathways, and local partner engagement.
1.5	Coordination is credible but one element or relationship is underdeveloped.	Applicant describes CE and referrals but provides limited detail on ongoing case coordination.
1	Limited history is shown, but a specific and feasible engagement plan is provided.	New applicant identifies meetings, responsible staff, and steps to join local coordination structures.
0	Meaningful coordination is not demonstrated or the plan is vague.	Application only states that collaboration will occur.

Organizational Readiness (15 points)

Reviewer note: Use the application and required attachments. Record a brief comment identifying the evidence reviewed and the basis for the score.

Points	Scoring Standard	Quick Example
Policies & Procedures (5 points)		
5	Required program and financial policies are complete, applicable, and ready for implementation.	Submitted policies address eligibility, services, grievances, confidentiality, fiscal controls, and operations.
4	Policies are substantially complete with only minor revisions needed.	One procedure needs project-specific language, but the overall policy framework is ready.
2.5	Several policies require revision, but a feasible completion plan is documented.	Applicant identifies missing sections, responsible staff, and completion dates before start-up.
0	Material policies are missing, inapplicable, or unlikely to be completed timely.	Key program or financial policies are absent.

Points	Scoring Standard	Quick Example
Staffing Plan (3 points)		
3	Positions, qualifications, supervision, timing, and coverage are clearly identified.	Plan includes job titles, required experience, hiring dates, supervision, and contingency coverage.
2.5	The plan is feasible with a minor sequencing or detail gap.	Most positions and timing are clear, but one support role remains under development.
1.5	Notable staffing or timing risks exist, but credible mitigation is provided.	Several hires are pending, with interim coverage and a realistic recruitment schedule.
0	The staffing plan is incomplete, unrealistic, or unsupported.	No qualifications, hiring timeline, or supervision structure is provided.
Implementation Timeline (3 points)		
3	Realistic milestones cover start-up, staffing, enrollment, services, data systems, and compliance.	Timeline assigns dates and responsible parties from award through full operation.
2.5	The timeline is generally feasible with minor sequencing or detail gaps.	Key milestones are included, but one dependency is not fully explained.
1.5	Significant risks exist, but mitigation makes implementation potentially achievable.	Timeline is compressed, but applicant identifies contingencies and responsible staff.
0	The timeline is missing, internally inconsistent, or unlikely to meet requirements.	Major start-up activities have no dates or responsible parties.
UEI & SAM (2 points)		
2	UEI is verified and SAM registration is active through the anticipated application or award period.	Application includes a verifiable UEI or current SAM record.
1.5	UEI is verified and SAM is active, but renewal will be needed soon with a documented plan.	SAM expires soon, and the applicant provides a renewal schedule.
1	UEI exists, but SAM activation or renewal is pending with evidence of timely action.	Applicant submits proof that renewal is in process.
0	UEI or SAM requirements are not met or cannot be verified.	Registration is inactive and no timely corrective action is documented.
Certifications (2 points)		
2	All required certifications are complete, signed by an authorized official, and internally consistent.	Certification form is complete, dated, and signed by the authorized representative.
1.5	One minor administrative correction was required and resolved by the deadline.	A date or checkbox was corrected during the permitted correction period.
1	Multiple administrative corrections were required but completed by the deadline.	Several non-substantive omissions were corrected timely.
0	Certifications are missing, unsigned, materially inconsistent, or not corrected timely.	Required certification remains incomplete after the correction deadline.

Objective total. Confirm that the sum of all objective metrics does not exceed 60 points. Comments should identify the document or application section used for each score.

Narrative Evaluation - 40 Points

Narrative scoring rule. Read the entire application before scoring. Consider supporting information elsewhere in the application, but score each narrative question against the exact elements requested in that prompt. Do not award points for polished writing alone.

1. Community Need & Project Design (15 points)

Application prompt: Describe unmet need the proposed project is intended to address. Describe the project design. Explain the target population, community need, why the project is needed, and why the proposed intervention is appropriate.

Full-point elements: target population; unmet community need; why the project is needed; project design; and why the intervention is appropriate.

Points	Scoring Standard	Quick Example
14-15	All required elements are answered concisely, clearly, logically, and consistently with the full application. The design directly responds to the identified need.	Clearly identifies an underserved population, documents the unmet need, describes the project model, and explains why the model fits the need.
11-13	Most or all elements are addressed, but one element lacks specificity, explanation, or support.	Need and design are clear, but the explanation of why the intervention is appropriate is brief.
8-10	The basic question is addressed, but the response is general or only partially explains the connection between need, design, and intervention.	Describes a general need and project idea but provides little connection between them.
4-7	Several required elements are incomplete, vague, unsupported, or difficult to follow.	Mentions homelessness broadly but does not clearly define the target population or approach.
1-3	Minimal response; major elements are missing, unclear, or inconsistent.	Provides only a few sentences with no meaningful explanation.
0	No response or the response does not address the question.	Blank or unrelated response.

Reviewer comment prompt: Identify the strengths supporting the score and any missing, unclear, unsupported, or inconsistent element that reduced the score.

2. Project Implementation (15 points)

Application prompt: Describe how the organization will successfully implement the proposed project. Include staffing, timeline, partnerships, participant access, service delivery, and implementation.

Full-point elements: staffing; implementation timeline; partnerships; participant access; service delivery; and the overall implementation approach.

Points	Scoring Standard	Quick Example
14-15	All required elements are complete, specific, feasible, and logically connected. The response and supporting documents demonstrate readiness to implement.	Identifies staff roles, realistic milestones, partner responsibilities, referral/access steps, and how services will be delivered.
11-13	Most or all elements are addressed and feasible, but one element lacks detail or support.	Provides a clear plan but gives limited detail about participant access or one partner role.
8-10	A workable general approach is presented, but multiple elements are underdeveloped or not well connected.	Lists staff and services but provides only a broad timeline and limited implementation detail.
4-7	Implementation is partially described; important details are missing, unclear, or unrealistic.	States the project will begin quickly but does not explain staffing, access, or service delivery.
1-3	Minimal implementation information; readiness is not demonstrated.	Provides vague assurances without an actual implementation plan.
0	No response or the response does not address implementation.	Blank or unrelated response.

Reviewer comment prompt: Identify the implementation elements that were credible and complete and any missing or unsupported elements affecting the score.

3. Community Collaboration & Sustainability (10 points)

Application prompt: Describe how the proposed project will coordinate with existing community resources and how the organization will support long-term project success and sustainability. Include partnerships, community coordination, organizational sustainability, and capacity for long-term implementation.

Full-point elements: partnerships; coordination with existing community resources; organizational sustainability; and capacity for long-term implementation.

Points	Scoring Standard	Quick Example
9-10	All required elements are addressed clearly and credibly. Partner roles and coordination are specific, and the response explains how the organization will sustain and implement the project over time.	Explains named partner roles, coordination methods, use of existing resources, and how staffing, financial, and organizational capacity support continued operation.
7-8	Most or all elements are addressed, but one area is less specific or only partially supported.	Identifies credible partners and sustainability plans but provides limited detail on coordination.
5-6	Some collaboration and sustainability planning is shown, but multiple elements are general, incomplete, or weakly connected.	Mentions referrals and future funding but does not explain partner roles or long-term capacity.
3-4	Limited evidence of meaningful coordination or long-term sustainability; several elements are missing or unclear.	Lists partners without describing coordination and provides only a vague sustainability statement.
1-2	Minimal response with little indication of collaboration, sustainability, or long-term capacity.	States “we will collaborate” without meaningful detail.
0	No response or the response does not address collaboration and sustainability.	Blank or unrelated response.

Reviewer comment prompt: Identify the evidence supporting collaboration and sustainability and any missing or underdeveloped elements affecting the score.

Final Review and Score Confirmation

☐ The entire application and all submitted attachments were reviewed.

☐ Every objective metric was scored using verifiable evidence and does not exceed its maximum.

☐ Objective comments identify the application section or document supporting the score.

☐ Each narrative score reflects all parts of the applicable prompt.

☐ Information elsewhere in the application was used only when relevant to the scored criterion.

☐ No criteria or requirements were added beyond the application and competition materials.

☐ Comments identify the basis for scores and any material point deductions.

☐ Total objective score does not exceed 60; total narrative score does not exceed 40; total application score does not exceed 100.

Score Summary

Scoring Category	Maximum	Reviewer Score
Organizational Capacity	20	
Financial Capacity	15	
Partnerships & Community Coordination	10	
Organizational Readiness	15	
TOTAL OBJECTIVE SCORE	**60**	
Community Need & Project Design	15	
Project Implementation	15	
Community Collaboration & Sustainability	10	
TOTAL NARRATIVE SCORE	**40**	
FINAL APPLICATION SCORE	**100**	

Final reminder. The purpose of scoring is not to reward polished writing or organizational familiarity. It is to evaluate whether the submitted application and documentation clearly and credibly meet the published criteria.