



Scoring for the 2024 CoC Competition – Renewal Projects Project Performance Measurement and Local Priorities

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
<i>1. Housing performance</i>			
1a. PSH Housing Outcome: % of living leavers + stayers stably housed at contract year end (HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7)	From APR: (Q5a. total number of clients - (Q23a + Q23b subtotal temporary + institutional + Other destinations)) ÷ Q5a., total number of clients. Prorated up to 5 points for 89% or higher. - Staff scored	6	Pro-rated by % stably housed Ex: 89% = 5 pts 67% = 3.75 pts 50% = 2.5 pt
1b. % of PSH beds dedicated to chronically homeless people \RRH prioritizing Chronic Homeless	From APR Q2, Actual Bed & Unit Inventory, CH beds ÷ (total) Beds. Prorated up to 5 points for 100% of beds. - Staff scored	6	Pro-rated by % CH dedication Ex: 100% =5 pts 50% = 2.5 pts
1c. Cost Per PSH/RRH Outcome	From APR Measured by total project expenditures (project expenditures + match) ÷ total number of successful stable housing outcomes (Retention of or Placement into PSH/RRH)- Staff scored	6	Less than \$5,000 per outcome = 6 points \$5,000 - \$9,999 = 5 points \$10,000 - \$14,999 = 4 points \$15,000 - \$19,999 = 3points \$20,000 -24,999 = 2 points \$25,000-29,999= 1 point 30,000+ = 0 points
<i>2. Income performance</i>			
2b1. % who increased income from employment from program entry to exit (HUD System Performance Measure 4)	From HMIS APR:(Q19a.1+2) Number of Adults with Earned Income: Retained Income Category and Increased \$ at Follow-Up/Exit + Did Not Have the Income Category at Entry and Gained the Income Category at Follow-Up/Exit) ÷ Q5a Total Adults - Staff scored	3	Pro-rated by % exiting w/ increased income Ex: 100% =5 pts; 50% =2.5 pts
2b2. % who increased income from sources other than employment (HUD System Performance Measure 4)	From HMIS APR:(Q19a. 1+2) Number of Adults with Other Income: Retained Income Category and Increased \$ at Follow-Up/Exit + Did Not Have the Income Category at Entry and Gained the Income Category at Follow-Up/Exit) ÷ Q5a Total Adults - Staff scored	7	Pro-rated by % increased other income Ex: 100% = 5pts; 50% = 2.5 pts

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
3. Mainstream resources: % of clients accessing mainstream resources (HUD System Performance Measure 4)	From APR: (1 - (Q20b. Number of Non-Cash Benefit Sources, Adults with No sources) ÷ Q5a., total number of adults. - Staff scored	7	Pro-rated by % #of sources gained Ex: 100% = 5pts; 50% = 2.5 pts
4. Year-end Utilization	From APR Q2 & 5a stayers/total beds, prorated up to 5 points. - Staff Scored	5	Pro-rated by % #of beds utilized Ex: 100% = 5pts; 50% = 2.5 pts
5. Housing First Practice and Implementation	Full points awarded for compliance with responses to <i>Questionnaire Section 2: Housing First Practice</i>	7	7pts total Housing First Practice Section;
6. Coordinated Entry Participation (Total 7pts)	Percentage of accepted eligible referrals from Coordinated Entry- Reporting Period- Last 12 months (HMIS Coordinator will score) Staff Scored	3	3 pts- 100% accepted 2 pts- 99-80% accepted 1 pt 79-70% accepted 0 pt less than 70% accepted
	Percentage of enrollments in the project with CES referrals- Reporting Period- Last 12 months (HMIS Coordinator will score) Staff Scored	4	3 pts- 100% referrals accepted from CES- in compliance; 2 pts- 99-90% of referrals accepted from CES- not in compliance CAP needed; 1 pt- 89-80% of referrals accepted from CES- not in compliance CAP needed; 0 pt- 79% or below referrals accepted from CES- not in compliance CAP needed
Local & HUD Priorities			
7. Alignment with 10-year plan goals and priorities in the HUD NOFO	<i>Questionnaire Section 4: Local and HUD Priorities</i> - 1 point for each goal that is a focus of the project, up to 6 points. Goals include (options a-f below):	6	Full pts for detailed examples of collaboration in each component.
a. Evidence of Project's collaborations with corrections partners b. Evidence of SSI/SSDI Outreach Access & Recovery (SOAR) benefits advocacy. c. Alignment with Upstream Investments as evidenced by agency practices on the Upstream portfolio, or other evidence-based practice databases d. Staff training/screening for mainstream resources (e.g. Medi-cal, Calfresh, TANF, substance abuse programs, employment assistance)			

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
e. Promotion of/supporting volunteering, community engagement, and employment services			
f. Coordination with Healthcare			
g. Coordination with Housing Partners			
Total Points for Performance/Local Priorities		60	

Agency Management and Capacity

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
8. Financial/Audit: process, timeliness; findings/management letter, overall fiscal health	Review of financial documents by CoC Coordinator/ Accounting staff & <i>Questionnaire Section 5: Financial Management Section</i> Staff Scored	4	4 pts: No findings, timely audit, etc 2-3 pts: Findings in past 3 years, late audit 0-1 pts: Lack of audit
9. Contract administration: CoC APR Review – accuracy and timeliness of reporting.	Review of APR by CoC Staff & <i>Questionnaire Section 6: Contract Administration</i> Staff Scored	4	4 pts: timely submission & no inaccuracy of reporting 3 pts: Timely submission and 1 error 2 pts: 2-3 errors in submission 1 pts: late submission no errors 0 pts: late submission & errors
10. Spend down of funds/match	Review of APR by CoC Coordinator staff scored <i>Questionnaire Section 7: Contract Spenddown of Funds and Match</i> Informational Review only	4	4 pts: full spenddown 3pts: 85-99% spend 2 pts: 75-84% spend 1 pts: 65-74% 0pts: < 65%
11. Cultural Competency – INCLUDE which attachments to be reviewed	<i>Questionnaire Section 8: Cultural Competency & Disability Access</i>	3	.5 pt per question total of 3 pts. Includes answering the questions as well as the required attachments
12. Client/lived experience Feedback Process	<i>Questionnaire Section 9: Lived Experience Feedback Process</i>	4	1 pt per question, full pts for having a client advisory board, full explanation, and examples
13. Racial Equity and Anti-discrimination Practices & Policies	<i>Questionnaire Section 10: Racial Equity and Anti-Discrimination Practices & Policies</i>	6	1.5 pt per question, full pts for having a Anti-discrimination policy (with required Equal Access/Gender Identity Final Rules), examples to

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
			review/address disparities within their programming in, full explanation and examples
14. Data-informed program research; use of HMIS & other local data to guide program development & delivery. Use of documented best practices; outcomes information is used as an indicator of how well the project is accomplishing its goals	<i>Questionnaire Section 11: Data Informed Program Research</i>	4	Full pts for complete description of data informed practices and examples of project performance review, 2.5 pts for each question
15. Change Management & Institutionalization of Knowledge: Procedures are in place to ensure transmission of program and grants management knowledge when staff changes take place.	<i>Questionnaire Section 12: Change Management and Institutionalization of Knowledge</i>	5	Full pts for plan and procedure for management change and turnover and evidence of Interim Rule training; Pro-rated pts for lack of formal procedures
16. High data quality and timeliness of assessments.	HMIS Coordinator Score Staff Scored	6	<p>There are 3 criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Universal Data Elements (Name, SSN, DOB, gender, race & ethnicity) are at least 95% complete; 2) Data Quality Score: Income and Benefits health insurance 2) Assessment data is entered in HMIS 6 days or less after assessments are administered; 3) Data Validation Reports from HMIS are reasonable for project type. <p>Full pts for meeting all 3 criteria; pro-rated pts for missing one or more criteria</p>
Total Agency & Management Capacity points		40	
Total Possible Points		100	