**Local Scoring Guidelines: Renewal PH-RRH, and PH-PSH <u>with</u> an APR**
**FY2022 HUD CoC Competition**

Threshold Requirements:
- Match at 25% for eligible activities (all budget line items, except leasing)
- As applicable, participate in the most recent PIT, HIC, and LSA
- Participates in HMIS
- Accepts referrals through Coordinated Entry
- Meet all requirements listed in the Supplemental or Annual NOFO (part of esnaps review)
- 

Projects which meet all the threshold requirements will be scored according to the following guidelines:

| WEIGHT | CATEGORY | EVALUATION CRITERIA |
|---|---|---|
| 30% | **Project Effectiveness** | • Program Best Practices<br>   ○ Housing First<br>   ○ Consumer input<br>• SLVCEH Strategic Plan<br>   ○ Ensure homelessness is rare, brief, and one-time<br>   ○ Target Population<br>• Review of HUD monitoring results<br>• Review of HUD inspection requirements<br>• Housing Placement Process<br>   ○ Process/time from prioritization to voucher<br>   ○ Process/time from voucher to housing placement<br>• Operating as an integrated network in evaluation criteria<br>   ○ Commitments from range of service providers; integration of education, health, etc.<br>   ○ Commitments to provide case management coverage<br>   ○ Utilize coordinated entry and identifying housing units to quickly move persons experiencing homelessness into stable housing<br>• Address racial disparities to ensure equity |
| 10% | **Budget/Application Quality** | • Drawdown rate<br>• Expenditure History<br>• Cost per positive outcome<br>• Followed instructions<br>• Submitted on time, with all required attachments<br>• Responses provide sufficient detail and are appropriate for the type of project and target population |
| 10% | **Data Quality** | • Program level DQ review: accuracy and timeliness |
| 50% | **Need & Performance** | How well does the program demonstrate it is needed locally?<br>• Occupancy / Average Daily Unit Utilization<br>• Hard to Serve Populations/Barriers to Housing<br>   ○ Percentage of entries with no income<br>   ○ % Entries disabled<br>How well does the program help the community improve system performance measures/achieve positive client outcomes?<br>• Returns to Homelessness /negative exits<br>• Exits to Permanent Housing<br>• Increased income |

## Renewal Housing Projects without an APR

| WEIGHT | CATEGORY | EVALUATION CRITERIA |
|---|---|---|
| **30%** | **Capacity/Application Quality** | • No/minor past audit or monitoring findings or concerns (fiscal or program) from HUD or independent auditors<br>• Grant management system in place for complying with government grants<br>• Involvement in the local homeless housing and services system or local low-income housing and services system.<br>• Effective record of administering government funded housing programs for homeless persons or housing for low-income persons.<br>• Followed instructions<br>• Submitted on time, with all required attachments<br>• Responses provide sufficient detail and are appropriate for the type of project and target population |
| **70 %** | **Need** | • Summary of activities carried out since funds awarded<br>• Demonstrate need using data from Housing Inventory Chart and Point in Time Count.<br>• Impact on community performance related to HUD system performance measures including promoting racial equity<br>• Timeline for project implementation<br>• Plan to fully expend HUD funds<br>• Rapidly securing housing for clients<br>• Assisting clients with employment/other income<br>• Target population<br>    o (DV) Trauma-informed and client-centered policies<br>• Utilization of Housing First |

**Local Scoring Guidelines: Renewal SSO-CE**
**FY2022 HUD CoC Competition**

## Renewal Coordinated Entry Project

| WEIGHT | CATEGORY | EVALUATION CRITERIA |
|---|---|---|
| **30%** | **Capacity/Application Quality** | • No/minor past audit or monitoring findings or concerns (fiscal or program) from HUD or independent auditors<br>• Grant management system in place for complying with government grants<br>• Involvement in the local homeless housing and services system or local low-income housing and services system.<br>• Effective record of administering government funded housing programs for homeless persons or housing for low-income persons.<br>• Followed instructions<br>• Submitted on time, with all required attachments<br>• Responses provide sufficient detail and are appropriate for the type of project and target population |
| **70 %** | **Need** | • System Function<br>   o Clients are prioritized/referred as appropriate<br>• Inclusive coordination with stakeholders<br>• System design that is accessible for all persons seeking information regarding homelessness assistance<br>   o (DV) Trauma-informed and client-centered policies<br>• Advertised program to reach homeless persons with the highest barriers<br>• Standardized assessment process<br>• Ensuring that program participants are directed to appropriate housing and services |

| Weight | Criteria Category | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | Source of Criteria | Point Range | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30% | Project Effectiveness | Program Best Practices | Agency Application | Score of 1-5; Multiplied by 2 | | | 10 |
| | | SLVCEH Homeless Policy Priorities | | Score of 1-5; Multiplied by 2 | | | 10 |
| | | Review of HUD monitoring results | | Score of 1-5 | | | 5 |
| | | Review of HUD inspection requirements | | Score of 1-5 | | | 5 |
| | | Housing Placement Process: Process/time from prioritization to voucher | | Score of 1-5 | | | 5 |
| | | Housing Placement Process: Process/time from voucher to housing placement | | Score of 1-5 | | | 5 |
| | | Integrated Network: Partnerships | | Score of 1-5 | | | 5 |
| | | Integrated Network: Case Management Coverage | | Score of 1-5 | | | 5 |
| | | Coordinated Entry/Identifying Units | | Score of 1-5 | | | 5 |
| | | Integrated Network: Utilizing Coordinated Entry/Identifying Units | | Score of 1-5 | | | 5 |
| 10% | Budget/Application Quality | Quarterly Drawdowns | LOCCs Report verified by Field Office/Agency Application | Score of 1-5 | | | 5 |
| | | Expenditure History | Agency Application | within (+ or -) 5% | within (+ or -) 10% | >10% | 5 |
| | | Followed instructions, Timely submission, with attachments | Agency Application | Score of 1-5 | | | 5 |
| | | Responses sufficient detail and appropriate | Agency Application | Score of 1-5 | | | 5 |
| 10% | Data Quality | HUD and local Data Quality Standards | Data Quality Report, Application Narrative | Score of 1-5; Multiplied by 4 | | | 20 |

| Weight | Criteria Category | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | Source of Criteria | Full Points | Half Points | 0 Points | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30.0% | Need and Performance (All Projects) | Occupancy / Average Daily Unit Utilization | Unit Utilization Rate / 2018 Application Data | >90% | 80-90% | <80% | 10 |
| | | Percentage of entries with no income | APR Q16 | >40% | 19-40% | <19% | 10 |
| | | Leavers who exit to shelter, streets or unknown | APR Q23a & 23b | <10% | 10-15% | ≥15% | 15 |
| | | Returns to homelessness | HMIS Report: Measure 2a and 2b: Persons who Exit Homelessness to PH Return to Homelessness | <15% | 15%-45% | >45% | 10 |
| | | Percentage of adult stayers who increased earned income | APR Q19 | >10% | 5-10% | <5% | 3.75 |
| | | Percentage of adult stayers who increased non-employment income | APR Q19 | >20% | 10-20% | <10% | 3.75 |
| | | Percentage of adult leavers who increased earned income | APR Q19 | >10% | 5-10% | <5% | 3.75 |
| | | Percentage of adult leavers who increased non-employment income | APR Q19 | >20% | 10-20% | <10% | 3.75 |
| 20.0% | Project Specific Need and Performance (PSH) | % entries disabled | APR Q13a2 | >85% | 65-85% | <65% | 20 |
| | | Percentage of participants who remain in PSH or exited to permanent housing | The % of stayers and leavers to permanent housing during the operating year | >80% | 70-80% | <70% | 20 |

| Weight | Criteria Category | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | Source of Criteria | Full Points | Half Points | 0 Points | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **20.0%** | **Project Specific Need and Performance (RRH)** | % entries disabled | APR Q13a2 | >40% | 20-40% | <20% | **10** |
| | | Percentage of participants who exited to permanent housing | The % of stayers and leavers to permanent housing during the operating year | >70% | 60-70% | <60% | **10** |
| | | On average, participants spend XX days from project entry to residential move-in | APR Q22c | <60 | 61-180 | >180 | **20** |

Renewal Housing Projects without an APR

| Weight | Criteria Category | Evaluation Criteria | Source of Criteria | Point Range | Total (200 points) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **30%** | **Capacity** | Audits/Monitoring Review | Local Application | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| | | Grant management system | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| | | Involvement in the local homeless system | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| | | Record of administering government funded housing programs | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| | | Followed instructions, Timely submission, with attachments | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| | | Responses sufficient detail and appropriate | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| **70%** | **Need** | Summary of activities carried out | Local Application | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4 | 20 |
| | | Target population | Local and Esnaps | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4 | 20 |
| | | Utilization of Housing First | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 6 | 30 |
| | | Demonstrate need using data | Local Application | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| | | Impact on community performance including promoting racial equity | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| | | Timeline for project implementation | | Score of 1-5 | 5 |
| | | Plan to fully expend HUD funds | | Score of 1-5 | 5 |
| | | Rapidly securing housing for clients | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4 | 20 |
| | | Assisting clients with employment/other income | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4 | 20 |

Renewal Coordinated Entry **Project**

| Weight | Criteria Category | Evaluation Criteria | Source of Criteria | Point Range | Total (200 points) |
|--------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| **30%** | **Capacity** | Audits/Monitoring Review | Local Application | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| | | Grant management system | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| | | Involvement in the local homeless system | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| | | Record of administering government funded housing programs | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| | | Followed instructions, Timely submission, with attachments | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| | | Responses sufficient detail and appropriate | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2 | 10 |
| **70%** | **Need** | System Function-current implementation | Local Application | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 8 | 40 |
| | | Inclusive plan for coordination w/ stakeholders | E-snaps & Local Application | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4 | 20 |
| | | System design that is accessible | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4 | 20 |
| | | Strategy for advertising | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4 | 20 |
| | | Standardized assessment process | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4 | 20 |
| | | Directed to appropriate housing and services | | Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4 | 20 |