Scoring for the 2022 CoC Competition – Renewal Projects
Project Performance Measurement and Local Priorities (Subject to Revision by CoC Competition
Evaluation Committee)

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
1. Housing performance			
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.	5	Pro-rated by % stably housed Ex: 89% = 5 pts 67% = 3.75 pts 50% = 2.5 pts
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.	5	Pro-rated by % CH dedication Ex: 100% = 5 pts 50% = 2.5 pts
1c. Cost Per PSH/RRH Outcome	Measured by total project expenditures (project expenditures + match) ÷ total number of successful stable housing outcomes (Retention of or Placement into PSH/RRH)	5	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
2. Income performance			
3a. Clients exiting with earned income (HUD System Performance Measure 4)	From APR Q17 Cash Income sources - leavers, number of adults with Earned Income ÷ Q5a. total number of adults.	5	Pro-rated by % exiting with earned income Ex: 100% = 5 pts 50% = 2.5 pts
3b1. % 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	5	Pro-rated by % exiting w/ increased income Ex: 100% = 5 pts; 50% = 2.5 pts
3b2. % 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	5	Pro-rated by % increased other income Ex: 100% = 5pts; 50% = 2.5 pts
4. 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.	5	Pro-rated by % # of sources gained Ex: 100% = 5pts; 50% = 2.5 pts
5. Year-end Utilization	From APR Q2 & 5a stayers/total beds, prorated up to 5 points.	5	Pro-rated by % # of beds utilized

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
			Ex: 100% = 5pts; 50% = 2.5 pts
6. Housing First Practice and Implementation	Full points awarded for compliance with responses to Housing First Questionnaire and Fidelity Tool	10	.5 pts awarded per question (10 total questions); 5 pts for Housing First Fidelity Tool
7. Collaboration with Coordinated Entry	Percentage of accepted eligible referrals from Coordinated Entry (HMIS Coordinator will review)	6	6 pts – 100% of referrals accepted 4 pts - 80-89% of referrals accepted 2 pts – 70-79% of referrals accepted 0 pt – Less than 70% accepted referrals
Local Priorities			
1. Alignment with 10-year plan goals	1 point for each goal that is a focus of the project, up to 4 points. Goals include (options a-d below):	4	Full pts for detailed examples of collaboration in each component. Project monitoring questionnaire question 12
a. Evidence of Project's collaborations with corrections partners b. Evidence of SSI/SSDI Outreach Access & Recovery (SOAR) benefits advocacy. c. Evidence of current practice to prioritize chronically homeless or otherwise medically compromised for permanent housing. (Ex: linkage to HOST or linkage to healthcare partners) d. Alignment with Upstream Investments as evidenced by agency practices on the Upstream portfolio, or other evidence-based practice databases			
Total Points for Performance/Local Priorities		**60**	

Agency Management and Capacity

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
Financial/Audit: process, timeliness; findings/management letter, overall fiscal health	Review of financial documents by CoC Coordinator/SCCDC Accounting staff/Agency Monitoring Questionnaire	5	4-5 pts: No findings, timely audit, etc 2-3 pts: Findings in past 3 years, late audit 0-1 pts: Lack of audit
Contract administration: CoC APR Review – accuracy and timeliness of reporting.	Review of APR by CoC Coordinator and Senior Community Development Specialist	5	5 pts: timely submission & no inaccuracy of reporting 3-4 pts: 2-3 errors in submission 0-2 pts: late submission 3+ errors

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
Spend down of funds/match	Review of APR by CoC Coordinator	5	5 pts: full spenddown 4 pts: 85-99% spend 3 pts: 75-84% spend 2 pts: 65-74% 0-1 pts: <65%
Cultural Competency and Client/lived experience Feedback Process	Review of cultural competency questionnaire & Project Monitoring Questionnaire	5	Full pts for having a client advisory board, full explanation on procedures, all forms submitted
Data-informed program research; use of HMIS & other local data to guide program development & delivery (including efforts made to address racial equity). Use of documented best practices; outcomes information is used as an indicator of how well the project is accomplishing its goals	Project & Agency Monitoring Questionnaire responses	5	Full pts for complete description of data informed practices
Change Management & Institutionalization of Knowledge: Procedures are in place to ensure transmission of program and grants management knowledge when staff changes take place.	Project & Agency Monitoring Questionnaire responses	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
High data quality and timeliness of assessments.	HMIS Coordinator analysis & report	10	There are 3 criteria: 1) Universal Data Elements (Name, SSN, DOB, gender, race & ethnicity) are at least 95% complete; 2) Assessment data is entered in HMIS 5 days or less after assessments are administered; 3) Data Validation Reports from HMIS are clean 1. Full pts for meeting all 3 criteria; pro-rated pts for missing one or more criteria
Total Agency & Management Capacity points		**40**	
Total Possible Points		**100**	