

experience pertaining to specific activities to be relevant; and experience producing specific accomplishments to be successful. The more recent and substantial the experience of the staff, particularly the institution's own staff who will work on the project have in successfully conducting and completing similar activities, the higher the number of points an applicant can receive for this rating factor. The following categories will be evaluated:

(a) Undertaking specific successful community development projects with community-based organizations or local governments; and

(b) Providing leadership in solving community problems that have a direct bearing on the proposed activities.

(2) Past Performance For previously Funded Grant Applicants Only (15 Points).

This subfactor will evaluate the extent to which an applicant has performed successfully under all previously awarded and current grant(s) as measured by:

(a) Achievement of specific measurable outcome objectives consistent with the timeline in the grant proposal(s). Provide a detailed list outlining those achievements as they relate to the approved timeline in the past grant award(s);

(b) Leveraging of funding consistent with or exceeding the funds originally proposed to be leveraged for that project. In addressing leveraging, provide information that compares the proposed leveraged funds and resources with what was actually leveraged; and

(c) Full points will be awarded for performance that has met the goals and objectives as outlined in the past awarded grant proposal(s).

Rating Factor 2: Need/Extent of the Problem (10 Points)

This factor addresses the extent to which there is a need for funding the proposed program activities and an indication of the importance of meeting the need in the target area. In responding to this factor, the proposal will be rated on the extent to which the level of need for the proposed activities and the importance of meeting the need are documented.

Applicants should use statistics and analyses contained in at least one or more current data sources that are sound and reliable. The data provided must be current. In rating this factor HUD will consider data collected within the last five years to be current. To the extent that the targeted community's Five (5) Year Consolidated Plan and Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) identify the level of

the problem and the urgency in meeting the need, applicants should include references to these documents in the response to this factor.

If the proposed activities are not covered under the scope of the Consolidated Plan and Analysis of Impediments for Housing Choice (AI), indicate such in the proposal and use other sound data sources to identify the level of need and the urgency in meeting the need. Other reliable sources include, but are not limited to Census reports, HUD Continuum of Care gap analysis and its E-MAP (www.hud.gov/emaps), law enforcement agency crime reports, Public Housing Authorities' Comprehensive Plans, community needs analyses such as provided by the United Way, the applicant's institution, and other sound and reliable appropriate sources. Needs in terms of fulfilling court orders or consent decrees, settlements, conciliation agreements, and voluntary compliance agreements may also be addressed.

The data used should be specific to the area where the proposed activities will be carried out. Needs should be documented as they apply to the area where the activities will be targeted, rather than the entire locality or state, unless the target area is the entire locality or state.

Rating Factor 3: Soundness of Approach (50 Points)

This factor addresses the quality and cost effectiveness of the proposed work plan, the commitment of the institution to sustain the proposed activities, and actions regarding HUD's priorities, goals and objectives, and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing. In addition, HUD will also consider the extent to which the budget is consistent with the Work Plan and the dollars indicated on the HUD 424 form.

This factor will be evaluated based on the extent to which the proposed work plan will:

(1) *Quality of the Work Plan (35 Points)*

(a) (10 Points) *Work Plan Impact.* Describe how the proposed activities will:

(i) Expand the role of the institution in its community;

(ii) Alleviate and/or fulfill the needs identified in Factor 2;

(iii) Relate to and not duplicate other activities in the target area. Duplicative effort will be acceptable only if an applicant can demonstrate through documentation that there is a population in need that is not being served;

(iv) Involve and empower citizens of the target area in all stages of the

proposed project (particularly through a committee that is representative of the target community to guide the project); and

(v) Be disseminated to a wide variety of audiences, both academic and community-based, using a wide variety of media, including print and Internet technology.

(b) (20 Points) *Specific Services and/or Activities.* The work plan must incorporate all proposed activities. HUD will consider the feasibility of success of the program, measurable objectives, and how timely products will be delivered.

Describe each proposed activity and the tasks required to implement and complete the activities. Also for each activity describe:

(1) Which CDBG national objective is being met and how;

(2) The sequence, duration, and the products to be delivered in 6 month intervals, up to thirty-six (36) months. Indicate which staff member, as described in Factor 1, will be responsible and accountable for the deliverables; and

(3) Measurable objectives to be accomplished, e.g., the number of persons to be trained and employed; houses to be built (pursuant to 24 CFR 570.207) or rehabilitated; minority owned businesses to be started.

(c) (5 Points) *Involvement of the Faculty and Students.* The extent to which the applicant proposes to integrate the institution's students and faculty into proposed project activities.

(2) (5 Points) *HUD Policy Priorities.* HUD encourages applicants to undertake specific activities that will assist the Department in implementing its policy priorities and which help the Department achieve its goals and objectives in FY2004, when the majority of grant recipients will be reporting programmatic results and achievements. In addressing this factor, HUD will evaluate the extent to which a program will further and support HUD's priorities. The quality of the responses provided to one or more of HUD's priorities will determine the score an applicant can receive. For each policy priority addressed, an applicant will receive one point. Applicants cannot receive more than five points. For the full list and explanation of each policy priority, please refer to the General Section of this SuperNOFA.

(3) (5 Points) *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.* This subfactor will be evaluated on the extent to which an applicant proposes to undertake activities designed to affirmatively further fair housing, for example:

(a) Working with other entities in the community to overcome impediments to