**OVERVIEW**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of Factors** | **Points** |
| 1. Agency-Wide Scoring | 23 |
| 1. Project Performance Outcomes | 24 |
| 1. Efficient Use of Project Funds | 18 |
| 1. Project Consistency with HUD and Local Priorities | 12 |
| 1. Bonus Points | 10 |
| **Total Points Available** | **77 + 10 Bonus Points** |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. AGENCY-WIDE SCORING (23 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).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor 1.A. Client Participation in Program Design and Policy-Making (9 Points- Panel Discretion)** | **Scoring Guide** | **Points** |
| Review the narrative and apply the scoring guide to the right, up to a maximum of 9 points. | Please select all the strategies for integrating client feedback the agency uses:   * The agency has regular meetings of participants where they have the authority to make recommendations directly to agency leadership, such as a Lived Experience/Client or Resident Advisory Board that meets regularly (different from the CoC’s Board); * Strategies exist to recruit, retain, and develop staff with lived experience of homelessness, including peer support specialists; * The agency administers client satisfaction surveys at least twice a year; * The agency convenes client focus groups that include CoC-funded project participants at least twice a year. | Award 2 points for each option selected (4 possible) |
| Agency has a clear process to meaningfully integrate client feedback and lived experience into the design and operation of its projects (which includes specific examples, and details how opportunities to give client feedback are well-advertised to project participants). | 3 |
| Agency has a clear process to ensure agency communications and notices are accessible to clients (i.e., provide clear information and explanations, are at an accessible reading level, are accessible to people with disabilities, and take into account different learning styles by providing visuals, graphics, etc.). | 2 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Scoring Guide** | **Points** |
|  |  | 5 |
|  | 3 |
|  | 1 |
|  | 0 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Scoring Guide** | **Points** |
|  |  | 1 |
|  | 1 |
|  | 1 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Factor 1.D. Ensure privacy, respect, safety, and access regardless of gender identity (2 Points- Panel Discretion)** | **Points** |
| Award up to 2 points based on the extent to which the agency ensures privacy, respect, safety, and access regardless of gender identity or sexual orientation in projects. Do not just describe general measures you take to keep clients safe (including for domestic violence generally).   * If applicable, describe the partnerships the agency has with LGBTQ+ serving organizations and how the agency trains staff regarding gender identity. | 2 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Scoring Guide** | **Points** |
|  |  | 2 |
|  | 1 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Points** |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Points** |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor 1.H. Housing First[[1]](#footnote-3)/Low Barrier (8 Points- Panel Discretion)** | **Scoring Guide** | **Points** |
| Award 1 point for each option selected (up to 8 points). | Yes, the agency has offered all new front line staff (case managers) working on CoC-funded projects Housing First training at the start of their employment and offers current front line staff working on CoC-funded projects Housing First training at least annually. | 1 |
| No, there are no program access restrictions for clients based on income, sobriety, criminal records, or mental health. | 1 |
| No, the agency does use threats of eviction/30 day (or less) notices of eviction as a frequent tool to ensure program compliance from project participants. | 1 |
| No, clients are not required to participate in mandatory classes, therapy, job training, or interventions. | 1 |
| No, the agency does not impose restrictions on clients that go beyond what is typically covered in an ordinary lease agreement. | 1 |
| No, the project will not disqualify applicants for reasons related to experience of domestic violence (lack of a protective order, period of separation from abuser, law enforcement involvement, etc.). | 1 |
| No, unless required by a funder, the project will not conduct criminal background checks for applicants or participants (note: for projects serving households with minor children, a point will still be awarded if sex offense status is checked through [Megan’s Law](https://www.meganslaw.ca.gov/), rather than a criminal background check). | 1 |
| No, the project will not disqualify applicants based on information discovered through a credit check or a check for eviction history. | 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Scoring Guide** | **Points** |
|  |  | 1 |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Factor 1.J. Addressing Racial Biases (4 Points- Panel Discretion)** | **Points** |
| Award up to 4 points based upon the agency’s selection of all of the methods of advancing racial equity and cultural competency that the agency has implemented (1 point for each option selected, up to 4 points).   * Yes, written materials and translation services are available in multiple languages for participants with limited English proficiency. * Yes, racial equity and cultural responsiveness knowledge, skills and practices are part of staff job descriptions and workplans. * Yes, internal structures exist to address issues of racial equity and cultural responsiveness (i.e., formal or informal complaint resolution process, community advisory body, equity committee) * Yes, staff receive training and support around racial equity and cultural responsiveness and their role in addressing racial inequities. * Yes, agency provides an ongoing evaluation of policy, service or program impacts and progress towards racial equity and cultural responsiveness. * Yes, the agency’s staff, board, and leadership are reflective of the racial and ethnic demographics it serves. | 4 |

|  |
| --- |
| PROJECT-SPECIFIC SCORING |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project-Specific Threshold Factors** | **Status** |
| The project certifies that it meets the below thresholds and that none of its policies have changed since last year in ways that could impair its federal obligations. | |
| The project has policies regarding termination of assistance, client grievances, Equal Access/non-discrimination, ADA and fair housing requirements, VAWA protection, and confidentiality that are compliant with HUD CoC Program requirements and are consistent with the CoC’s anti-discrimination policies. | Pass/Fail |
| **FMCoC Member in Good Standing**: the project is a Fresno Madera Continuum of Care Member in Good Standing or will become a member of the CoC within a month of receiving the funding award from HUD. |  |
| **Coordinated Entry**: the project participates in coordinated entry to the extent possible for its project type. Projects that have not agreed to participate in Coordinated Entry are not eligible for funding. |  |
| **HMIS**: the project enters data for all CoC-funded beds into HMIS (or comparable database for domestic violence services). |  |
| **Housing First:** the project identifies and lowers its barriers to housing in line with a Housing First approach. |  |
| **Equal Access and Non-Discrimination**:the project provides equal access and fair housing without regard to sexual orientation, gender identity, local residency status, or any other protected category (this includes ensuring privacy, respect, safety, and access regardless of gender identity or sexual orientation in projects). |  |
| **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 |
|  |  |
| **Financial Management and Audit**: the project maintains adequate internal financial controls, record maintenance and management, and has provided an up to date (within last 21 months) audited financial statement, and single audit (if applicable). |  |

|  |
| --- |
| 2. PROJECT PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES (24 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 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; and
* That project size can influence outcomes, as percentages can over or understate outcomes for smaller projects.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor 2.A. Housing Performance for RRH and PSH Projects [[2]](#footnote-5) (19 Points)** | **Scale** | **Points** |
| **PSH: Increasing Housing Retention**   * **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. * Panelists may exercise up to 3.8 discretion points (20% of the maximum possible value for the scoring factor)to increase (to a maximum of 19) or decrease the score. To utilize discretion to increase points, the project must haveincluded a narrative.   + Factors 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.   + Panelists must award the additional 3.8 points if the project demonstrates with data in their narrative that they would have had 90% retention/positive exits but for a large household exit to a negative destination. * ***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**   * **Calculation**: (Total Exits to Permanent Housing) ÷ (Total Leavers - Total Deceased - Total Neutral Exits)   + Neutral exits are exits to Foster Care, Nursing Homes, or Non-Psychiatric Hospitals or Inpatient Medical Facilities. * Panelists may exercise up to 3.8 discretion points (20% of the maximum possible value for the scoring factor) to increase (to a maximum of 19) or decrease the score. To utilize discretion to increase points, the project must haveincluded 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.   + An additional 3.8 points will be awarded by Panelists if the project demonstrates with data in their narrative that they would have had 90% positive exits but for a large household exit to a negative destination. * 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] | ³95% | 19 |
| 90-94.9% | 17 |
| 85-89.9% | 15 |
| 80-84.9% | 13 |
| 75-79.9% | 10 |
| 70-74.9% | 5 |
| 60-69.9% | 0 |
| 0-59.9% | 0 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor 2.B. Maintaining/Increasing Earned Cash Income[[3]](#footnote-6) (1 Point)** | **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).  Panelists may exercise up to .2 discretion points (20% of the maximum possible value for the scoring factor) to increase (to a maximum of 1) or decrease the score. To utilize discretion to increase points, the project must haveincluded 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 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% | 1 |
| <80% | 0 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor 2.C. Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits[[4]](#footnote-7) (1 Point)** | **Scale** | **Points** |
| **Calculation:** (Adults with non-cash mainstream benefit sources at exit + adults with any non-cash mainstream benefit sources at a timely annual assessment) ÷ (the number of living adults - the number of adult stayers not yet due for an annual assessment).  Panelists may exercise up to .2 discretion points (20% of the maximum possible value for the scoring factor) to increase (to a maximum of 1) or decrease the score. To utilize discretion to increase points, the project must haveincluded 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 20b Number of Non-Cash Benefit Sources at Latest Annual Assessment + APR 20b Number of Non-Cash Benefit Sources at Exit] ÷ [APR 5a Adults – APR 18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment] | ³90% | 1 |
| <90% | 0 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor 2.D. Connection to Health Insurance[[5]](#footnote-8) (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 people served - the number of stayers not yet due for an annual assessment).  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 haveincluded 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]* | ³95% | 3 |
| 90-94.9% | 2 |
| 80-89.9% | 1 |
| <80% | 0 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. EFFICIENT USE OF PROJECT FUNDS (18 POINTS) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor 3.A. Bed Utilization [[6]](#footnote-9) (8 Points)** | **Scale** | **Points** |
| Is the project serving the number of people it said it would serve in its project application?  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 8 points based on the scale on the right. Panelists may exercise up to 1.6 discretion points (20% of the maximum possible value for the scoring factor) to increase (to a maximum of 8) or decrease the score. To utilize discretion to increase points, the project must haveincluded 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), and * Has a concrete, plausible plan to improve utilization of grant resources for future years or * An additional 1.6 points will be awarded by Panelists if the project demonstrates with data in their narrative that their unit utilization is 90% or higher and explains why the associated bed utilization is low.   ***APR Sources:*** *[( APR 7b January Total + APR 7b April Total + APR 7b July Total + APR 7b October Total ) ÷ 4 ] ÷ Number of Beds]* | ³90% | 8 |
| 80-89.9% | 7 |
| 70-79.9% | 6 |
| 60-69.9% | 4 |
| 50-59.9% | 2 |
|  |  |
| <49.9% | 0 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor 3.B. Grant Spenddown [[7]](#footnote-10) (10 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).   * If an underspending project voluntarily reallocated a portion of their funds during the FY2022 or FY2023 NOFO then it has been awarded 8 points for this factor, which is not subject to panel discretion). * If a project has not voluntarily reallocated funds then award points based on the scale to the right. Panelists may add up to 2 additional points (to a maximum of 10) based on the project’s narrative **if** the project:   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) and   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) and   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). | ³90% | 10 |
| 80-89.9% | 8 |
| 70-79.9% | 6 |
| 60-69.9% | 4 |
| 50-59.9% | 2 |
|  |  |
| <49.9% | 0 |

|  |
| --- |
| 4. PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH HUD AND LOCAL PRIORITIES (12 POINTS) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor 4.A. HMIS/Comparable Database Participation and Data Quality[[8]](#footnote-11) (3 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. | < 5% error | 3 |
| 5-9.9% | 2 |
| 10-14.9% | 1 |
| Greater than or equal to 15% error | 0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor 4.C. Coordinated Entry[[9]](#footnote-13) (6 Points- Panel Discretion)** | **Scale** | **Points** |
| Award up to 6 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 (Domestic Violence-CES included) 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 (Domestic Violence-CES included) and divide it by how many referrals the project received (suitable or otherwise) from the Coordinated Entry System. Apply the scale to the right. | Bed Openings Reported: Greater than or equal to 80% | 3 |
| Referrals Accepted: Greater than or equal to 80% | 3 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Factor 4.D. Weekly Vacancy Tracker Inputs [[10]](#footnote-14) (3 Points)** | **Points** |
| Competition facilitator has awarded up to 3 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. | 3 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Scoring Guide** | **Points** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| * 1. BONUS POINTS (10 POINTS) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Factor 5.A. Bonus Points for Renewal Housing Project (10 Points)** | **Points** |
| Award the project 10 points if it is applying to renew a Housing Project. | 10 |

1. HUD System Performance Measure 2 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
2. HUD System Performance Measures 3, 7 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
3. HUD System Performance Measure 4 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
4. HUD System Performance Measure 4 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
5. HUD System Performance Measures 2, 7 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
6. HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
7. HUD System Performance Measure 3 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
8. HUD System Performance Measures 5.1, 5.2 [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
9. HUD System Performance Measure 1 [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
10. HUD System Performance Measure 1 [↑](#footnote-ref-14)