



Rural Nevada

CONTINUUM OF CARE

FY2026 RATING GUIDANCE FOR NEW APPLICATIONS

Rating & Ranking Committee

Purpose. Use this guide to review the entire application and score the three narrative questions exactly as presented in the application. Applicant Profile, organizational and project information, required documentation, and attachments provide context and may verify claims, but they do not receive separate points unless the application expressly assigns points.

General Scoring Principles

- Read the entire application and all attachments before assigning scores.
- Score only the information submitted by the applicant; do not rely on personal knowledge or outside information.
- Consider relevant information anywhere in the application when determining whether a narrative response is complete, credible, and supported.
- Award full points only when every part of the prompt is answered clearly, logically, specifically, and consistently with the rest of the application.
- Reduce points when information is incomplete, vague, unsupported, internally inconsistent, unrealistic, or difficult to follow.
- Provide reviewer comments. Comments may be brief, but should identify the basis for the score, especially when points are deducted.
- Do not create additional requirements or preferences that are not stated in the application.

How to Review the Unscored Application Sections

Application Section	Reviewer Use
Applicant Profile / Organization Overview	Confirm the fields are complete and internally consistent. Use this information to understand the applicant's identity, service area, staffing, mission, and operating history. Do not assign separate points.
Proposed Project Information	Confirm the project name, type, counties, target population, units/beds/participants, funding

Application Section	Reviewer Use
	request, and overview are clear. Use these details when evaluating need, design, implementation, and sustainability.
Organizational Capacity	Review experience serving the target population, grant administration experience, and housing/supportive services experience. Use this information to test whether implementation claims are credible.
Financial Capacity	Review the financial management description and attached audit or financial statements. Consider whether the application supports the organization's ability to manage the proposed project.
Partnerships	Review listed partners, roles, and attached MOUs. Use this information when scoring implementation and collaboration.
Project Design	Review the housing model, implementation plan, and performance measurement information. Use these sections to verify narrative claims.
Required Documentation / Certification	Confirm required attachments and certification are present. Missing documentation may weaken or fail to support a narrative claim, but reviewers should not invent separate point deductions unless directed by RNCOC competition rules.

1. Community Need & Project Design (15 points)

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

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

Points	Scoring Standard	Quick Example
14-15	All required elements are answered concisely, clearly, and logically. The need and target population are specific; the design directly responds to the need; and the intervention is well explained and consistent with the rest of the application.	Clearly identifies an underserved population, describes the unmet need, explains the project model, and shows why that model fits the need.
11-13	Most or all elements are addressed and the response is generally clear, but one element lacks specificity, explanation, or support.	Need and design are described, but the explanation of why the intervention is appropriate is brief.
8-10	The response addresses the basic question but is uneven, 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. The project design is only loosely connected to the identified need.	Mentions homelessness broadly but does not clearly define the target population or project approach.
1-3	Minimal response. Major elements are missing, unclear, or inconsistent with other application information.	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: Briefly identify what was complete and credible, and note any missing, unclear, unsupported, or inconsistent elements that affected 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, services delivery and implementation.

Full-point elements: staffing; implementation timeline; partnerships; how participants will access the project; how services will be delivered; the overall implementation approach.

Points	Scoring Standard	Quick Example
14-15	All required elements are complete, specific, feasible, and logically connected. The staffing, timeline, partnerships, access process, and service delivery approach demonstrate readiness to implement.	Identifies staff roles, a realistic startup sequence, partner responsibilities, referral/access steps, and how services will be delivered.
11-13	Most or all elements are addressed and appear feasible, but one element lacks detail or is not fully supported elsewhere in the application.	Provides a clear plan but gives limited detail about participant access or one partner's role.
8-10	The response presents a workable general approach, but multiple elements are underdeveloped, unclear, or not well connected.	Lists staff and services but provides only a broad timeline and little implementation detail.
4-7	Implementation is only partially described. Important details such as staffing, timeline, participant access, partnerships, or service delivery are missing or unrealistic.	States the project will begin quickly but does not explain staffing, access, or service delivery.

Points	Scoring Standard	Quick Example
1-3	Minimal implementation information is provided and the response does not demonstrate readiness.	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: Briefly identify what was complete and credible, and note any missing, unclear, unsupported, or inconsistent elements that affected 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 successes and sustainability. In your response include: partnerships, community coordination, organizational sustainability, capacity for long-term implementation.

Full-point elements: partnerships; coordination with existing community resources; organizational sustainability; 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/organizational capacity will support continued operation.
7-8	Most or all elements are addressed, but one area—such as partner roles, coordination methods, or sustainability—is less specific or only partially supported.	Identifies credible partners and sustainability plans but provides limited detail on coordination processes.
5-6	The response shows some collaboration and sustainability planning, but multiple elements are	Mentions referrals and future funding but does not explain

Points	Scoring Standard	Quick Example
	general, incomplete, or weakly connected.	partner roles or long-term capacity.
3-4	Limited evidence of meaningful coordination or long-term sustainability. Several required 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, organizational sustainability, or long-term capacity.	Provides general statements such as 'we will collaborate' without detail.
0	No response, or the response does not address collaboration and sustainability.	Blank or unrelated response.

Reviewer comment prompt: Briefly identify what was complete and credible, and note any missing, unclear, unsupported, or inconsistent elements that affected the score.

Final Review and Score Confirmation

- ☐ The entire application and all submitted attachments were reviewed.
- ☐ Each narrative score reflects all parts of the applicable prompt.
- ☐ Information elsewhere in the application was used only to clarify or support the scored response.
- ☐ No criteria were added beyond the application.
- ☐ Comments identify the basis for the score and any material point deductions.
- ☐ Total narrative score equals the sum of Questions 1-3 and does not exceed 40 points.

Narrative Question	Maximum	Reviewer Score
Community Need & Project Design	15	
Project Implementation	15	
Community Collaboration & Sustainability	10	
TOTAL NARRATIVE SCORE	40	