

## CoC-Funded Renewal Projects Evaluation Criteria

2019 Scoring Tool for Renewal Projects

### Score Breakdown

Summary of Factors	Points Possible	Points Assigned
Threshold Requirements	Pass/Fail	
HMIS Data Quality	10	
Bed Utilization	7	
System Performance Measures	50	
CoC Engagement and Collaborative Capacity	15	
Financial Efficiency and Management	13	
Policies & Procedures	5	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	

## Threshold Requirements

Threshold Requirements	Points
<b>HMIS Implementation</b> Projects are required to participate in HMIS, unless the project is a victim-service agency, serving survivors of domestic violence or a legal services agency.	Pass/Fail
<b>Coordinated Entry System</b> Projects are required to participate in the Coordinated Entry System (CES), when it is available for the project type.	Pass/Fail
<b>System for Award Management (SAM) Clearance</b> Project has a System for Award Management (SAM) clearance, meaning the contractor is not suspended or debarred from working on federally funded projects.	Pass/Fail
<b>Match Commitment</b> Match must equal 25% of the total grant request, including administrative costs but excluding leasing costs. Match contributions can be cash, in-kind, or a combination of both. If the source of match is in-kind, documentation will be required at the time of application submission.	Pass/Fail
<b>HUD Requirements</b> All projects will be reviewed for compliance with the eligibility requirements of the CoC Interim Rule and subsequent notices, and must meet the threshold requirements outlined in the 2019 Notice of Funding Availability	Pass/Fail

## HMIS Data Quality

The provided numerical scale is a guide to support the panelists in scoring; panelists can exercise discretion wherever necessary (i.e. very few project exits).

Criteria	Scale	Points
<b>Exits to Known Destinations</b> Percentage error rate for clients with missing destination at exit	<b>&lt; 5%</b>	<b>3</b>
	5-9.9%	2
	10-24.9%	1
	≥ 25%	0
<b>Income &amp; Sources at Start</b> Error rate for clients missing income and sources at project start	<b>≤ 10%</b>	<b>2</b>
	11-24.9%	1
	≥ 25%	0
<b>Income &amp; Sources at Annual Assessment</b> Error rate for clients missing income and sources at annual assessment	<b>≤ 10%</b>	<b>2</b>
	11-24.9%	1
	≥ 25%	0
<b>Income &amp; Sources at Exit</b> Error rate for clients missing income and sources at exit	<b>≤ 10%</b>	<b>2</b>
	11-24.9%	1
	≥ 25%	0
<b>Activities to Maintain or Improve HMIS Data Quality</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>1</b>
	Needs Improvement	0

## Bed Utilization

Criteria	Scale	Points
<p>Is the project serving the number of people experiencing homelessness it was designed to serve?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on utilization of total project beds at four points during the year</li> <li>Panelists may exercise discretion based on factors including but not limited to project size, population served, and facility status issues beyond the project's sphere of influence</li> </ul>	≥ 95%	6
	94.9-90%	5
	89.9-80%	4
	79.9-70%	3
	69.9 - 60%	2
	59.9 - 50%	1
	< 50%	0
<b>Activities to Maintain or Improve Bed Utilization Rates</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>1</b>
	Needs Improvement	0

## System Performance Measures

The numerical scale is a guide to support the panelists in scoring. Panelists can exercise discretion based on factors including, but not limited to, project size, household size, and the number of persons who exited the project in the prior year.

<b>SPM 2: Recidivism</b>	<b>Scale</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>% of Returns in &lt; 6 months</b> The percentage of leavers to permanent housing destination in the year prior to the measurement period who returned to a homeless project in HMIS in less than 6 months <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects with no leavers in the prior year and projects without at least two years of performance data will receive full points</li> </ul>	< 5%	4
	5-9.9%	3
	10-14.9%	2
	15-24.9%	1
	≥ 25%	0
<b>% of Returns in 6 - 12 months</b> The percentage of leavers to permanent housing destination in the year prior to the measurement period who returned to a homeless project in HMIS in 6-12 months <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects with no leavers in the prior year and projects without at least two years of performance data will receive full points</li> </ul>	≤ 5%	4
	5-9.9%	3
	10-14.9%	2
	15-24.9%	1
	≥ 25%	0
<b>% of Returns in 13 - 24 months</b> The percentage of leavers to permanent housing destination in the year prior to the measurement period who returned to a homeless project in HMIS in 13-24 months <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects with no leavers in the prior year and projects without at least two years of performance data will receive full points</li> </ul>	≤ 5%	4
	5-9.9%	3
	10-14.9%	2
	15-24.9%	1
	≥ 25%	0
<b>% of Returns in 2 years</b> The percentage of leavers to permanent housing destination in the year prior to the measurement period who returned to a homeless project in HMIS in 13-24 months <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects with no leavers in the prior year and projects without at least two years of performance data will receive full points</li> </ul>	≤ 5%	4
	5-9.9%	3
	10-14.9%	2
	15-24.9%	1
	≥ 25%	0

<b>SPM 4: Income</b>	<b>Scale</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>4.1: % w/ Increased Earned Income (Stayers)</b> The percentage of stayers who increased earned income during the current FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Panelists may exercise discretion if the project serves a population with more severe service needs.</li> </ul>	<b>≥ 20 %</b>	<b>3</b>
	19.9-15%	2
	14.9-5%	1
	< 5%	0
<b>4.2: % w/ Increased Non-Employment Cash Income (Stayers)</b> The percentage of stayers who increased non-employment cash income during the current FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Panelists may score up or down one point based on extenuating factors</li> </ul>	<b>≥ 30 %</b>	<b>3</b>
	29.9-25%	2
	24.9-10%	1
	< 10%	0
<b>4.3: % w/ Increased Total Income (Stayers)</b> The percentage of stayers who total income during the current FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Panelists may score up or down one point based on extenuating factors</li> </ul>	<b>≥ 30 %</b>	<b>3</b>
	29.9-25%	2
	24.9-10%	1
	< 10%	0
<b>4.4: % w/ Increased Earned Income (Leavers)</b> The percentage of leavers who increased earned income during the current FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Panelists may score up or down one point based on extenuating factors</li> </ul>	<b>≥ 30 %</b>	<b>3</b>
	29.9-25%	2
	24.9-10%	1
	< 10%	0
<b>4.5: % w/ Increased Non-Employment Cash Income (Leavers)</b> The percentage of leavers who increased non-employment cash income during the current FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Panelists may score up or down one point based on extenuating factors</li> </ul>	<b>≥ 20 %</b>	<b>3</b>
	19.9-15%	2
	14.9-5%	1
	< 5%	0
<b>4.6: % w/ Increased Total Income (Leavers)</b> The percentage of leavers who total income during the current FY. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Panelists may score up or down one point based on extenuating factors</li> </ul>	<b>≥ 30 %</b>	<b>3</b>
	29.9-25%	2
	24.9-10%	1
	< 10%	0

<b>SPM 7b2: Exits to/Retention of Permanent Housing</b>	<b>Scale</b>	<b>Points</b>
The percentage of persons in project (who exited after moving into housing or moved into housing and remained in the PH project) who retained or exited to a permanent housing destination.	<b>&gt; 98%</b>	<b>14</b>
	97.9-96%	13
	95.9-94%	12
	93.9-92%	10
	91.9-90%	9
	89.9-88%	8
	87.9-86%	7
	85.9-84%	6
	83.9-82%	5
	81.9-80%	4
	79.9-78%	3
	77.9-76%	2
	75.9-74%	1
	< 74%	0
<b>Explanation of Performance on System Performance Measures</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>2</b>
	Fair	1
	Poor	0

## CoC Engagement and Collaborative Capacity

Criteria	Scale	Points
<b>Participation in CoC Committees</b> Panelists should also evaluate the applicant's narrative explanation for this criteria.	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>4</b>
	Good	3-2
	Needs Improvement	1-0
<b>Homeless Count Participation</b> Did the applicant participate in the 2019 Homeless Count?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>1</b>
	No	0
<b>Participation in Coordinated Entry System</b> Does the project participate in the CES?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>1</b>
	No	0
<b>Promoting and Increasing Employment</b> How well does the applicant describe how they work with public and private organizations to increase access to employment opportunities to assist participant's with increasing total income?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>4</b>
	Good	3-2
	Needs Improvement	1-0
<b>Promoting Education and Training Opportunities</b> How well does the applicant describe how they work with local organizations to increase access to education and training opportunities for program participants?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>3</b>
	Good	2
	Needs Improvement	1-0
<b>Promoting Volunteering and Community Service</b> How well does the applicant describe the proactive steps they are taking to increase volunteer and community service opportunities for program participants?	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>2</b>
	Good	1
	Needs Improvement	0



## Financial Efficiency and Management

Criteria	Scale	Points
<b>Monthly Claims Submitted On Time</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>1</b>
	No	0
<b>Audit Fundings</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>2</b>
	Yes, but resolving	1
	Yes, but no action taken	0
<b>Unspent Funds</b>	<b>&lt; 2.5 %</b>	<b>10</b>
	2.5-4.9%	9
	5-7.4%	8
	7.5-9.9%	7
	10-12.4%	6
	12.5-14.9%	5
	15-17.4%	4
	17.5%-19.9%	3
	20%-22.4%	2
	22.5-24.9%	1
	≥ 25%	0

## Policies & Procedures

Criteria	Scale	Points
<b>Housing First</b>	<b>Full alignment</b>	<b>3</b>
	Partial alignment	2-1
	No alignment	0
<b>Connection to Mainstream Benefits in Place</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>1</b>
	No	0
<b>Compliant with HEARTH Act</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>1</b>
	No	0