OVERVIEW

Summary of Factors	Points
1. Agency-Wide Scoring	30
2. Project Performance Outcomes	29
3. Efficient Use of Project Funds	24
4. Project Consistency with HUD and Local Priorities	12
5. Bonus Points	10
Total Points Available	**100 + 10 Bonus Points**

1. AGENCY-WIDE SCORING (30 Points)

Each agency will receive a score (up to 30 points) for the below agency-wide factors that will then be added to each project's score (up to 70 points + 10 bonus points) to create a final score for each project (i.e., Agency A gets a score of 15 on the agency-wide scoring factors, which will be added to Project B's score of 60 and Project C's score of 70 to create a total score for Project A of 75 and for Project B of 85).

Agency-Wide Threshold Factors (Required but not scored)	Status
1. FMCoC Membership The agency is a member in good standing of the FMCoC.	Pass/Must Fix

Factor 1.A. Client Participation in Program Design and Policy-Making (5 Points- Panel Discretion)	Scoring Guide	Points
Review the narrative and apply the scoring guide to the right, up to a maximum of 5 points.	The agency has at least one strategy for gathering client feedback and input. Strategies may include, but are not limited to: • Having at least one homeless or formerly homeless person on its staff or board of directors • Having a Lived Experience Advisory Board that meets regularly (different from the CoC's Board)	2

Commented [MS1]: Deleted Employment and Volunteerism Factor (2 points) and Fair Housing/Equal Access Factor (2 points- still a threshold)

Commented [MS2]: Same language as the previous threshold factor, now scored

	• Administering client satisfaction surveys • Convening client focus groups	
	Agency incorporates client feedback into program design and/or policy-making.	3

Factor 1.B. Audit Findings (8 Points- Panel Discretion)	Scoring Guide	Points
Agencies were instructed to submit a copy of their most recent audit report. Any type of report can be used – the audit could be from a direct recipient, from an accountant, etc. The report should be dated no earlier than 1/1/2020. Award up to 8 points using the scoring guide to the right.	Agency attached an audit dated 1/1/2020 or later with no significant negative findings.	8
	Agency attached an audit dated 1/1/2020 or later with negative findings, but convincingly explains how it has corrected the negative findings.	5
	Agency attached an audit dated before 1/1/2020, but convincingly explains why it was not audited since 1/1/2020.	5
	Other	0

> **Commented [MS3]:** I removed the option to submit a HUD monitoring. Now it's just a standard agency audit that everyone should have for their agency each year to show agency capacity.

Factor 1.C. Improve Safety for DV Survivors (2 Points- Panel Discretion)	Points
Award up to 2 points based on the extent to which the agency will **improve safety** for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or trafficking in their projects.	2

Factor 1.D. Quality of Services[1] (6 Points- Panel Discretion)	Points
Award up to 6 points based on the agency's narrative regarding the quality of their supportive services. You may consider the extent to which services: • are thoughtfully matched to the needs of the target population • are delivered by an adequate number of staff with appropriate training, including conferences, peer learning, CoC training, and/or on-the-job experience • ~~are supporting positive outcomes that are not accounted for by other scoring factors~~ The Panel should consider whether the agency has multiple CoC-funded housing project types (TH, RRH, PSH, TH-RRH) and whether a narrative	6

---

[1] HUD System Performance Measures 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6

for each project type is included, as services and case management ratios may differ based on the project type.	

Factor 1.E. Housing First[2] (5 Points- Panel Discretion)	Scoring Guide	Points
Award up to 5 points based on each "No" response the agency provides, using the scoring guide on the right. The Panel has discretion to adjust this score up or down based on an optional interview of the program and/or an optional review of the project's policies and procedures.	No, the agency will not leave "Housing First" boxes in e-snaps unchecked (for all projects).	1
	No, there are no program access restrictions for clients based on income, sobriety, criminal records, or mental health.	1
	No, clients are not required to find their own housing unit before accessing housing programs.	1
	No, clients are not required to participate in mandatory classes, therapy, job training, or interventions.	1
	~~Is able to address unpleasant client behavior without exiting or evicting those clients.~~ No, the agency does not impose restrictions on clients that go beyond what is typically covered in an ordinary lease agreement.	1

Factor 1.F. Severity of Needs[3] (2 Points- Panel Discretion)	Scoring Guide	Points
Award up to 2 points based the scoring guide to the right.	Potential clients served in various projects are anticipated to have at least 2 of the following severe needs: (i.) low or no income, (ii.) current or past substance use, (iii.) a history of victimization such as domestic violence or sexual assault, (iv.) criminal histories, and/or (v.) chronic homelessness.	1
	Agency's narrative includes a realistic plan to meet the above-listed specific client needs and vulnerabilities.	1

---

[2] HUD System Performance Measure 2
[3] HUD System Performance Measure 1

Factor 1.G. Addressing Racial Biases (2 Points-Panel Discretion)	Scoring Guide	Points
Using the scoring guide on the right, award up to 2 points based on the degree to which the agency has identified any barriers to participation in their projects (e.g., lack of outreach) faced by persons of different races and ethnicities, particularly those over-represented in the local homelessness population, and has taken or will take steps to eliminate the identified barriers.	Yes, agency has reviewed client outcomes with an equity lens, including the separation and review of data by race, ethnicity, gender identity and/or age.	1
	Agency's narrative demonstrates that they have identified project changes needed to make client outcomes more equitable and created a plan to make those change (if N/A is written here, award 0 points).	1

PROJECT-SPECIFIC SCORING

Project-Specific Threshold Factors	Status
1. Policies Remain Compliant All of the project's relevant policies and procedures were examined as part of a previous year's review and rank process. The project should pass this threshold factor for each project if it certifies that none of its policies have changed in ways that could impair its federal obligations, including: • identifying and lowering its barriers to housing in line with a Housing First approach • participating in coordinated entry to the extent possible for each project type • entering data for all CoC-funded beds into HMIS (or comparable database for domestic violence services). • maintaining adequate internal financial controls, record maintenance and management, and policies regarding termination of assistance, client appeals, ADA and fair housing requirements, and confidentiality. • providing equal access and fair housing without regard to sexual orientation, gender identity, local residency status, or any other protected category only accepting new participants if they can be documented as eligible for this project's program type based on their housing and disability status.	Pass/Fail
2. Match The project demonstrates 25% match per grant using match letters that specify the kind and amount of resources to be used or donated.	Pass/Must Fix

2. PROJECT PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES (29 POINTS)

Projects will be scored based on data in the CoC's HMIS, except for projects operated by victim services providers which will be scored based on data from the victim service provider's comparable database. **Panelists should not adjust a score by more than 20% of the maximum possible value for that scoring factor**. For example, placement into permanent housing is worth 24 points. 20% of 24 points is 4.8 points, so the Panel should not normally adjust a project's score on placement into permanent housing up or down by more than 4.8 points. This 20% discretion is not above and on top of any discretion that is explicitly provided for in the scoring tool. E.g., if the scoring tool says that a project may be awarded 2 additional points for a specific reason, the Panel may use its discretion to add 2 points and may not to add 20% on top of that.

When using discretion, Panelists should keep in mind:
- That outcomes will naturally be lower in a more difficult to serve population with severe needs and vulnerabilities such as persons experiencing chronic homelessness, mental illness, substance use disorders and/or domestic violence survivors;
- That project size can influence outcomes, as percentages can over or understate outcomes for smaller projects; and
- That COVID-19 may have affected clients' ability to increase their income.

Factor 2.A. Housing Performance for RRH and PSH Projects [4] (24 Points)	Scale	Points
PSH: Increasing Housing Retention ~~Count each person who either remained in the project at the end of the measurement period or exited to permanent housing. Divide this count by the total number of people who participated in the project during the measurement period, excluding people who passed away or who exited to foster care, nursing homes, or non-psychiatric hospitals or inpatient medical facilities, and then apply the scale to the right.~~ • **Calculation**: (Total Stayers + Total Exits to Permanent Housing by end of measurement period) ÷ (Total Clients - Total Deceased - Total Neutral Exits) ○ Neutral exits are exits to Foster Care, Nursing Homes, or Non-Psychiatric Hospitals or Inpatient Medical Facilities. • <u>Panelists may exercise up to 4.8 discretion points</u> (20% of the maximum possible value for the scoring factor) to increase (to a maximum of 24) or decrease the score. To utilize discretion to increase points, the project must have included a narrative. Factors	≥95% 90-94.9% 85-89.9% 80-84.9% 75-79.9% 70-74.9% 60-69.9%	24 22 20 18 15 10 5

Commented [MS5]: Changed scale to be more forgiving. Was 95+ - 24 points, 90-94- 18 points, 85-90 - 12 points, 80-85 - 6 points, under 80% was 0 points.

---

[4] HUD System Performance Measures 3, 7

	0-59.9%	0
that can affect performance include, but are not limited to, project size, population served and severity of barriers, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence. • ***APR Sources:*** `[APR 5a Stayers + APR 23c Permanent Dest Subtotal] ÷ [APR 5a Persons Served - APR Q23c Deceased - APR Q23c Foster Care Home - APR Q23c Hospital Non-Psychiatric – APR 23c Nursing Home]`		
RRH: Exits to Permanent Housing/Housing Stability		
~~Count each person who exited the project to permanent housing. Divide this count by the total number of people who participated in the project during the measurement period, excluding people who passed away or who exited to foster care, nursing homes, or non-psychiatric hospitals or inpatient medical facilities, and then apply the scale to the right.~~ • **Calculation**: Total Exits to Permanent Housing ÷ (Total Leavers - Total Deceased - Total Neutral Exits) o Neutral exits are exits to Foster Care, Nursing Homes, or Non-Psychiatric Hospitals or Inpatient Medical Facilities. • Panelists may exercise up to 4.8 discretion points (20% of the maximum possible value for the scoring factor) to increase (to a maximum of 24) or decrease the score. To utilize discretion to increase points, the project must have included a narrative explaining their performance. Factors that can affect performance include, but are not limited to, project size, the number of persons who exited the project, population served and severity of barriers, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence. • Projects with no leavers will receive full points. • ***RRH APR Sources:*** `[APR 23c Permanent Destinations Subtotal ÷ APR 5a Leavers – APR 23c Deceased – APR 23c Hospital Non-Psychiatric – APR 23c Foster Care – APR 23c Nursing Home]`		

> **Commented [MS6]:** This is the RRH metric we used previously vs. the 2021 Efficient Housing/Reliable Housing metric that was used.

Factor 2.B. Maintaining/Increasing Cash Income[5] (2 Points)	Scale	Points
Calculation: (Adult with any cash income at exit + adults with any cash income at a timely annual assessment) ÷ (the number of living adults - the number of adult stayers not yet due for an annual assessment)~~Count each adult who had~~ any cash income ~~(from employment or otherwise) at exit or at a timely annual assessment. These are the successes. Divide the number of successes by the number of living adults (minus the number of adult stayers not yet due for an annual assessment) and award up to 2 points applying the scale to the right~~.	≥90~~5~~%	~~3~~2
	80-89.9%	1
Panelists may exercise up to .4 discretion points (20% of the maximum possible value for the scoring factor) to increase (to a maximum of 2) or decrease the score. To utilize discretion to increase points, the project must have included a narrative explaining their performance. If the data shows annual assessments were not timely, the narrative should include a plan to improve assessment timeliness. • **APR Sources/Calculation:** `[APR 18 One or More Source of Income at Latest Annual Assessment + APR 18 One or More Source of Income at Exit] ÷ [APR 5a Adults – APR 18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]`	<80%	0

> **Commented [MS7]:** Lowered the points from 3 to 2 due to most grant cycles occurring during COVID again, which negatively impacted this factor last year. Also lowered the scale from 95% to 90% for full points.

---

[5] HUD System Performance Measure 4

Factor 2.C. Connection to Health Insurance[6] (3 Points)	Scale	Points
Calculation: (Participant who had at least one form of health insurance at exit + participant who had at least one form of health insurance at a timely annual follow-up assessment) ÷ (the number of living adults - the number of adult stayers not yet due for an annual assessment).Count each participant who had at least one form of health insurance at exit or at a timely annual follow-up assessment. These are the successes. Divide the number of successes by the number of living adults (minus the number of adult stayers not yet due for an annual assessment) and award up to 3 points applying the scale to the right. Panelists may exercise up to .6 discretion points (20% of the maximum possible value for the scoring factor) to increase (to a maximum of 3) or decrease the score. To utilize discretion to increase points, the project must have included a narrative explaining their performance. If the data shows annual assessments were not timely, the narrative should include a plan to improve assessment timeliness. • **APR Sources:** *[APR 21 1 Source Health Insurance at Exit + APR 21 1 Source Health Insurance at Annual Assessment + APR 21 More than 1 Source Health Insurance at Exit + APR 21 More than 1 Source Health Insurance at Annual Assessment] ÷ [APR 5a Total Served – APR 21 Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment]*	≥95% 90-94.9% 80-89.9% <80%	3 2 1 0

3.   EFFICIENT USE OF PROJECT FUNDS (24 POINTS)

---

[6] HUD System Performance Measures 2, 7

Factor 3.A. Bed Utilization [7] (12 Points)	Scale	Points
Is the project serving the number of people it was designed to serve? Count the average number of people enrolled in the project on the last Wednesday of each quarter, and divide it by the number of beds promised in e-snaps (or as evidenced by another agreement with HUD) to get the bed utilization rate. Then, award up to 12 points based on the scale on the right. <u>Panelists may exercise up to 2.4 discretion points</u> (20% of the maximum possible value for the scoring factor) to increase (to a maximum of 12) or decrease the score. To utilize discretion to increase points, the project must have included a narrative explaining their performance: • Faced circumstances beyond its control that made it difficult or impossible to fully utilize grant resources (this could include a consolidation or expansion with a project that has less than a year of operating data), <u>and</u> • Has a concrete, plausible plan to improve utilization of grant resources for future years <u>or</u> • Demonstrates through data that its unit utilization is high and convincingly explains why the associated bed utilization data is low. ***APR Sources:*** *[(APR 7b January Total + APR 7b April Total + APR 7b July Total + APR 7b October Total) ÷ 4] ÷ Number of Beds]*	≥90% 80-89.9% 70-79.9% 60-69.9% 50-59.9% 40-49.9% <40%	12 10 8 6 4 2 0

---

[7] HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3

Factor 3.B. Grant Spenddown [8] (12 Points)	Scale	Points
Divide the amount of money drawn down from e-LOCCs (per HUD's Spend Report) during the project's most recently completed contract, by the amount of CoC funding shown for that project on the corresponding Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW).	≥90%	12
	80-89.9%	10
• If an underspending project provided evidence that they initiated a spenddown plan (grant amendment, reallocation (full or partial), transition application, or spend plan approved by the CoC Board Grant Spend Subcommittee ("Subcommittee")) within the requested timelines, then it has been awarded ten points for this factor, which is not subject to panel discretion).	70-79.9%	8
	60-69.9%	6
• If a project has not completed a spenddown plan under the oversight of the CoC Board, then, award points based on the scale to the right. <u>Panelists may add up to 2 additional points</u> (to a maximum of 12) based on the project's narrative **if** the project:	50-59.9%	4
	40-49.9%	2

1. Provides historical spend data showing greater than 80% spend during the last two previously completed contracts (or one, if there is only one previously completed contract; or not a requirement for projects with no previously completed contracts) <u>and</u>
    2. Shows that spend on the current contract is up to 15% less than the percentage of time that has elapsed on the contract (using the last HUD Spend Report) <u>and</u>
    3. Shows that during this contract year the project had circumstances beyond its control that made it difficult or impossible to fully utilize grant resources (this could include a consolidation or expansion with a project that has less than a year of operating data).
    4. ~~Has a concrete, plausible plan to improve grant spenddown during the next contract.~~
	<40%	0

Commented [MS8]: Factor revised to account for CoC's Grant Spend Committee initiative.

---

[8] HUD System Performance Measure 3

4. PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH HUD AND LOCAL PRIORITIES (17 POINTS)

Factor 4.A. HMIS Participation and Data Quality[9] (5 Points)	Scale	Points
First, review the percentage of data points that are recorded as missing, don't know, client refused to answer, and/or unable to calculate and award up to 3 points using the scale to the right. Lower percentages are better. Panelists may exercise up to .6 discretion point (20% of the maximum possible value for the scoring factor) to increase or decrease the score (to a maximum of 3). When utilizing discretion, the Panel can consider data timeliness and its potential effect on data quality. **Second**, award up to 2 points if the project submitted 80% of their required data quality reports/monthly HMIS Annual Performance Reports (APR) to the HMIS Lead. If the project uses a comparable database (i.e., is a Victim Service Provider), award 2 points *(DV projects will be required to meet this reporting requirement during the next NOFO).*	< 5% error	3
	5-9.9%	2
	10-14.9%	1
	Greater than or equal to 15% error	0

Factor 4.B. Coordinated Entry[10] (10 Points- Panel Discretion)	Scale	Points
Award up to 4 Points using the scale to the right: - Bed Openings Reported: Take by the number of bed openings the project reported to the Coordinated Entry System and divide it by the number of bed openings the project had during the measurement period. Apply the scale to the right. - Referrals Accepted: Take the number of referrals (suitable or otherwise) the project accepted from the Coordinated Entry System and divide it by how many referrals the project received (suitable or otherwise) from the Coordinated Entry System. Apply the scale to the right. Award up to 2 additional points if the project entered their bed availability into the Vacancy Tracker (or emailed project bed availability to the matcher) weekly, totaling 80% of the time (at least 42 of 52 weeks) during the local competition period. Award up to 2 additional points based on the project's subjective description of how it contributes to the Coordinated Entry System, including but not limited to participating in CE workgroups, participating in case conferencing, and serving as an official access site.	Bed Openings Reported: Greater than or equal to 80%	3
	Referrals Accepted: Greater than or equal to 80%	3

Commented [MS9]: Raised from 7 points to 10

---

[9] HUD System Performance Measures 5.1, 5.2
[10] HUD System Performance Measure 1

Factor 4.C. Special Populations[11] (2 Points)	Scoring Guide	Points
Award up to 2 points based the scoring guide to the right.	Project targets <u>one or more</u> of the following specialized populations: i. Homeless Youth, ii. Domestic Violence survivors, iii. Homeless Families with Children, iv. Chronic Homeless, v. Homeless Veterans, *and/or* vi. Transgender/Gender Nonconforming	2
	Project does not target any of the above subpopulations.	0

Commented [MS10]: Other potential additions for the community to consider: individuals with Limited English Proficiency, older adults, persons of different races and ethnicities, particularly those over-represented in the local population.

Commented [MS11]: Lowered from 3 to 2 points.

5. BONUS POINTS (10 POINTS)

Factor 5.A. Bonus Points for Permanent Supportive Housing (10 Points)	Points
Award the project 10 points if it is applying to renew a Permanent Supportive Housing Project.	10

---

[11] HUD System Performance Measure 1