



Homeless Supportive Housing Services Selection QUALIFICATIONS REVIEW

Instructions:

PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN YOUR SCORES AT THE END OF THE MEETING ON DECEMBER 12

That attached scoring sheet is for the **EVALUATION AND SELECTION** of a property manager and service partner for homeless supportive housing. The Homeless Housing Selection Subcommittee is asked to fill out the attached sheet for each submitted proposal.

As indicated on the scoring sheet, each section of qualifications is assigned a weight that will influence its overall affect on the total score for each team. The Review Committee is asked to rank each section of each proposal on a scale of 1 to 10 with 10 being the highest (see chart below for guidelines).

RATING GUIDELINE		
Points	Description	Explanation
10 - 9	Excellent	Meets/exceeds requirements and expectations.
8 - 7	Very Good	Above average response. Few if any offsetting weaknesses
6 - 5	Good	Average response. Adequately addresses all criteria and meets all requirements.
4 - 3	Fair	Below average. Minimally addresses all requirements.
2 - 1	Poor	Mostly noncompliant. Serious doubts exist about ability to perform work.
0	Unacceptable	Fails to meet baseline requirements



Homeless Supportive Housing Services Selection QUALIFICATIONS REVIEW

Agenda

1:30 – 2:15	Lutheran Social Services
2:30 – 3:15	Porchlight
3:30 – 4:15	Heartland Alliance
4:15 – 5:00	Discussion (Closed Session)

Format

10-15 minute overview of the organization and relevant experience (projector and screen will be provided)

Staff will ask the following questions:

1. What is the key to successful case management with the target population?
2. What will be the most challenging aspect of managing the proposed property (50-60 chronically homeless adults)?

The subcommittee will be allowed to ask follow-up and clarifying questions

		Lutheran Social Services	Porchlight	Heartland Alliance	
RFQ SECTION		RATING (1-10)			Notes
30%	Case Management Experience				Chronically homeless
20%	Partnering/Providing Homeless Supportive Experiences Experience				AODA, mental health, physical disabilities
30%	Property Management Experience				Managing multiunit buildings AND Section 42 financed housing AND Housing with supportive services
15%	Financial Strength				Summary of references from staff
5%	Local Preference				City of Madison local purchasing preference

Use the space below to provide any additional comments on each of the proposals. In addition, based on the interview, indicate if there is a mitigating factor not covered by the scoring criteria that warrants additional consideration.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
<p>Lutheran Social Services</p> <p>Should this proposer be given additional consideration? Y / N</p>
<p>Porchlight</p> <p>Should this proposer be given additional consideration? Y / N</p>
<p>Heartland Alliance</p> <p>Should this proposer be given additional consideration? Y / N</p>