

**Scoring for the 2023 CoC Competition – Renewal Projects**  
**Project Performance Measurement and Local Priorities Draft**

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
<b>1. Housing performance</b>			
1a. PSH Housing Outcome: % of 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 = 5 points \$5,000 - \$9,999 = 4 points \$10,000 - \$14,999 = 3 points \$15,000 - \$19,999 = 2 points \$20,000 = 1 point
<b>2. Income performance</b>			
<del>2a. Clients exiting with earned income (HUD System Performance Measure 4)</del>	<del>From APR Q17 Cash Income sources - leavers, number of adults with Earned Income ÷ Q5a. total number of adults. - Staff scored</del>	<del>5</del>	<del>Pro-rated by % exiting with earned income Ex: 100% = 5 pts 50% = 2.5 pts</del>
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	5	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	6	Pro-rated by % increased other income Ex: 100% = 5pts; 50% = 2.5 pts
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	6	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

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
			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> and HUD Housing First Assessment Tool	8	.5 pts/4pts total awarded per question Housing First Practice Section; <b>4 pts for Housing First Fidelity Tool</b>
6. Coordinated Entry Participation (Total 6pts)	Percentage of accepted eligible referrals from Coordinated Entry- Reporting Period- 2021-2022  (HMIS Coordinator will score)	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- 2021-2022  (HMIS Coordinator will score)	3	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
<b>Local &amp; HUD Priorities</b>			
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):		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) e. Promotion of/supporting volunteering, community engagement, and employment services f. Coordination with Healthcare g. Coordination with Housing Partners		6	
<b>Total Points for Performance/Local Priorities</b>		<b>60</b>	

### 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>	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>	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	<i>Questionnaire Section 8: Cultural Competency &amp; 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>	3	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 &amp; Policies</i>	4	1 pt per question, full pts for having a Anti-discrimination policy (with required Equal Access/Gender Identity Final Rules), examples to 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>	5	Full pts for complete description of data informed practices and examples of project performance review , 2.5 pts for each question

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
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	8	<p>There are 3 criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Universal Data Elements (Name, SSN, DOB, gender, race &amp; ethnicity) are at least 95% complete;</li> <li>2) Data Quality Score: Income and Benefits health insurance</li> </ol> <p>2) Assessment data is entered in HMIS 5 days or less after assessments are administered;</p> <p>3) Data Validation Reports from HMIS are clean</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Full pts for meeting all 3 criteria; pro-rated pts for missing one or more criteria</li> </ol>
<b>Total Agency &amp; Management Capacity points</b>		<b>40</b>	
<b>Total Possible Points</b>		<b>100</b>	