

2018 CoC Competition Project Oral Presentation Score Sheet

Agency Name: _____ (Agency name) _____

Questions A thru C are scored using a scale from 0 (lowest score) to 5 (best score). The statements beneath each question can be used as a guide when scoring the presentation.

A. Low Barrier/Less Restrictive Eligibility

<p>The Presenters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Really understand what these terms mean and what that requires so that the project can continue to work with the individual even with problematic behaviors related to substance use or mental health issues <i>(5 points)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have an intellectual understanding of these terms and will work towards implementing them but have not fully thought thru the implementation requirements and so implementation will initially be less than what the terms mean <i>(3 points)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have an intellectual understanding of the terms but have not well planned how the project will deal with the significant mental health/substance use issues that will arise <i>(0 points)</i>

Project Titles			
(Title)	(Title)	(Title)	(Title)

B. Working Well with Other Providers and Resources to Likely Improve Outcomes

The Presenters:

- Really understand that not only should a project have not just within the agency or within the agency and its partner providers the broad array of likely supports needed but to also have a wide array of other contacts/working relationships to assist in meeting less frequently occurring issues individuals may have (5 points)
- Have an intellectual understanding of these terms, have a good network of outside resources if needed, but really seem to see the project by itself as being able to meet all of an individual’s needs (3 points)
- Have some understanding of these terms, have minimal outside resources, but have not yet established an outside network if needed (0 points)

(Title)	(Title)	(Title)	(Title)

C. Quality Improvement

The Presenters:

- Understand the need for internal monitoring as demonstrated by a structured plan addressing a wide array of outcomes and how to utilize this information to change the project’s practices to improve outcomes (5 points)
- Understand the need for internal monitoring addressing a wide array of outcomes and the need to have a feedback loop to improve outcomes but there is not a structured plan in place to easily do so (3 points)
- Understand the need to monitor outcomes but it does not address a broad array of outcomes and does not have a structured plan in place that will lead to successful improvement (0 points)

--	--	--	--

Question D and E should be scored with 0, 1.5, or 3 points.

D. Connection to population being served

The Presenters:
• Appear to have very strong connections to the community/population they are planning to serve (3 points)
• Appear to have somewhat of a connection to the community/population they are planning to serve (1.5 points)
• Appear to have little/no connection to the community/population they are planning to serve (0 points)

(Title)	(Title)	(Title)	(Title)

E. Working History

The Presenters have a history/record of working with persons with multiple issues contributing to their homelessness
It is an exceptional history: 3 points
It is a satisfactory history: 1.5 points
There is no history or only a very weak history: 0 points

--	--	--	--

Question F should be scored with 0, 2, or 4 points

F. Overall Sense

This presentation gave a good understanding of the proposed project and how it would benefit the individuals served and the Continuum of Care.
I strongly agree: 4 points
I agree: 2 point
I disagree: 0 points

--	--	--	--

Overall total score:			
-----------------------------	--	--	--