



Sonoma County Continuum of Care New Project Scoring Tool 2023 CoC Program Competition

Section	Measure	Scoring Methodology	Points Possible
1.	Housing Stability (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in project to meet this outcome. Highest percentage of project participants remaining permanently housed at year-end earns full points. 6 points are prorated from highest to lowest percentage of project participants permanently housed at year end, to lowest.	7– staff will calculate
2.	Exits to Permanent Housing (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in project to meet this outcome. Highest rate of proposed exits to permanent housing destinations earns full points. 6 points prorated for the highest percentage of project participants that exit to permanent destinations.	7– staff will calculate
3.	Increase in Earned Income (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in the project to meet this outcome. Highest rate of income growth for participants at annual assessment and exit earns full points. 5 points prorated for the highest percentage of project participants increasing employment income at annual assessment and exit.	5– staff will calculate
4.	Increase in Non-Employment Income (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in project to meet this outcome. Highest rate of other income growth for participants at annual assessment and exit earns full points. Points prorated for the highest percentage of project participants increasing other income at annual assessment and exit.	5– staff will calculate
5.	Maximizing the use of mainstream resources (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in the project receiving outcome mainstream health, social, and employment programs. Points prorated for the highest percentage of project participants increasing other income at annual assessment and exit.	4– Staff will calculate
6.	Housing First Approach and Coordinated Entry	A Housing First approach identifies, engages, and connects homeless persons with the highest level of need; and works to eliminate any barriers to housing in front of the people that need our help the most, utilizing the Coordinated Entry System as the sole source for referrals. The extent to which the narrative reflects how the agency is working to implement a Housing First approach. (Add CES Language) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supplemental Scoring questionnaire 4 points • HUD Housing First Assessment Tool 3 points 	7
7.	Improving Assistance for LGBTQ+ Individuals	Addressing the service needs of LGBTQ+, transgender, gender non-conforming, and non-binary individuals and families in agency planning process, employment, and agency anti-discrimination policies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full points for addressing service needs, employment opportunities at the organization, training for current staff, hiring practices, and having an agency anti-discrimination policy; 	4

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Half points for addressing the needs, but do not have an anti-discrimination policy; and • zero points for no action/work pertaining to meeting the needs of this population. 	
8.	Racial Equity	<p>Emphasizing system and program changes to address racial equity using proven approaches and partnerships with racially diverse stakeholders who have experience serving underserved populations. The extent to which the narrative reflects how agency is working to eliminate barriers to improve racial equity and to address disparities. Such as review procedures, and processes with attention to identifying barriers that result in racial disparities and taking steps to eliminate barriers to improve racial equity and to address disparities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full points for reviewing data and implementing a plan to address these needs as an agency; • half points for reviewing the data without implementing a plan; and • zero points for no action/work completed to address racial inequities in the agency’s programming. 	5
9.	Persons with lived Experience	<p>Incorporating Persons with lived experience or those who have formerly experienced homelessness in program planning, policy development, employment, decision-making bodies, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full points for the inclusion of those with lived experience on decision-making bodies and with employment opportunities at the organization, training for current staff; • half points for only meeting one of the two options for full points; • and zero points for no participation from those with lived experience. 	4
10.	Project Narrative/Design	<p>Narrative is understandable; project design reflects the experience of applicant in working with proposed population; applicant understands client needs, type and scale, and location of the housing fit population being served, how clients are assisted in receiving mainstream benefits, performance measurement indicators for housing and income meet HEARTH benchmarks, plan to assist clients with rapidly obtaining permanent housing is clear and accessible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>*Domestic violence projects will be evaluated based on the degree they improve safety for the population they serve and employ trauma-informed victim-centered approaches to service delivery.</i> 	8
11.	Coordination with Housing Partners	<p>Housing Partners (create new permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing projects that coordinate with housing providers not funded through ESG/CoC Program)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 Points if the project/agency has no planned/committed partnerships with housing providers directly related to the proposed project • 2 Points if the agency has a written commitment from a housing provider to provide subsidies (other than ESG/CoC) to the proposed units for PSH/participants served for RRH, but it is less than 25% of units/participants served proposed • 4 Points if the agency has a written commitment from a housing provider to provide subsidies other than ESG/CoC to the proposed units for PSH/participants served for RRH that will cover at least 25% of the units/participants served being proposed. 	4
12.	Coordination with Healthcare Partners	<p>Healthcare Partners (create new permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing services projects that coordinate with healthcare providers to provide services to participants not funded through CoC or ESG Program):</p>	4

		<p>Scoring methodology (Healthcare):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 Points If the project/agency has no planned/committed partnerships with healthcare providers directly related to the proposed project • 2 Points if the agency has a written commitment from a healthcare provider to provide in-kind services to the proposed project, but it is less than 25% of the total amount of application • 4- Points if the agency has a written commitment from a healthcare provider to provide in-kind services match with services totaling 25% of the total amount of the application 	
13.	Project Readiness	Plan for opening services and housing is understandable, realistic, and timely (e.g., open within 90 days of contract execution- 2024/2025 term). The extent to which the narrative addresses expedited plan for housing placement after technical submission of contract (within 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days)	5
14.	Budget	Up to 5 points for a budget that is reasonable and meets threshold requirements for eligible expenses. Line item narratives document how CoC funds requested are essential to helping people become permanently housed. Required match (cash or in-kind) is adequate, from appropriate sources, and accurately calculated.	4
15.	Cost Effectiveness	Total Project Budget (including estimated match) ÷ number projected to achieve housing performance measures defined in the project application. 5 prorated points; lowest cost per successful projected housing outcome earns full points. The difference between the highest and lowest cost per successful outcome is spread over the 5 points to create a deduction factor per added dollar cost.	5
16.	Financial Audit and Health	<p>Scoring based on most recent audit including identification of agency as “low risk”, number (if any) of findings, documented match, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 points = no findings, timely audit, and documented match • 2-3 points = 1 finding in the past 3 years, inaccurate/inconsistent match; <p>0-1 points = multiple findings, late audit, etc.</p>	4- staff will calculate
17.	Organizational capacity and experience/ Demonstrated Capacity to Manage CoC Awards	<p>New Projects : If you are new to the CoC Program HUD notes that demonstrating capacity may include a description of other funds the project receives, which are either federal or state funding.</p> <p>Scores will be drawn from the 20223 CoC Project Evaluations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewal Providers: cumulative rankings from past 3 CoC Competitions. Full points awarded to agencies scoring in the Top 5 of the previous 3 CoC Competitions with no projects falling into At-Risk Tier in past 3 competitions. 	5
18.	Local & Other HUD Priorities	<p>Alignment with 10-year plan goals and HUD priorities. 1 point for each goal this is in the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of Project’s collaborations with corrections/Justice partners • Evidence of SSI/SSDI Outreach Access & Recovery (SOAR) benefits advocacy. 	5

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with Upstream Investments as evidenced by agency practices on the Upstream portfolio, or other evidence-based practice databases. Alignment with Upstream Investments as evidenced by agency practices on the Upstream portfolio, or other evidence-based practice databases • Staff training/screening for mainstream resources (e.g. Medi-cal, Calfresh, TANF, substance abuse programs, employment assistance) • Promotion of/supporting volunteering, community engagement, and employment services 	
19.	HMIS data quality, timeliness and coverage of all programs serving homeless	<p>There are 3 criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal Data Elements (Name, SSN, DOB, gender, race & ethnicity) are at least 95% complete; • Assessment data is entered in HMIS 5 days or less after assessments are administered; • Data Validation Reports from HMIS are clean and data is 95% complete. <p>Full points for meeting all 3 criteria; pro-rated points for missing one or more criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • **For Victim Services providers, this will be measured by analysis of data quality submitted by victim services providers that does not contain identifying information. 	8- staff will calculate
	Total Points Possible		
			100