

Appendix A. 2024 Three County CoC Renewal Project Outcomes, Measures, and Scoring Tool

2024 Project Level Measures & Outcomes for Ranking & Evaluation

Total overall points: Adult PSH – 195.5, Adult Joint Component - 201.5, Adult TH – 190.5, YHDP RRH - 186, YHDP Joint Component - 198, YHDP PSH – 194

Outcome	Indicator	Measure	Total Points	Points Spread	Project Type			YHDP Project Type			
					TH	Joint TH/RRH	PSH	NAV/RRH	Joint TH/RRH	PSH	RRH
Site Monitoring = 85 -all project types											
Written organizational policies and procedures	See site monitoring tool for description	CoC Projects Policies Checklist	40	Participant process=6 pts	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
				Program Administration – Client Files =1 pt							
				Provision and Operations of Supportive Services = 2 pts							
				Equity Factors = 16 pts (see Table B- Equity Factors for detail)							
				Fiscal Operations = 4 pts							
				Privacy, Security and HMIS = 5 pts							
				Program Administration – Grant Management = 6 pts							
Effective utilization of funds	95% funding utilization	Fiscal site monitoring	5		5	5	5	5	5	5	
Eligible costs and fiscal management	Drawdowns at least quarterly, costs eligible, match, income eligible, staff timesheets	Fiscal site monitoring	6		6	6	6	6	6	6	
Monthly Billing Packet	LOCCS/Invoice request are accurate,	Fiscal site monitoring	10		10	10	10	10	10	10	

	Summary Sheets present, Rent Roll includes client portion, Rent GL, Leases, Rent Calculators, Documentation, Payroll GL or Proof of Payment										
Participant Eligibility Information	Homeless Status Documented, Disability Status Documented, Income Status, Chronic Status Documented	Site monitoring file review	4	0.25 pts/participant file review/documentation	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Rent and Occupancy Charges	Rent/Occupancy Calculation Conducted/Renewed Annually, Rent Calculations in Compliance, program participant not charged a fee beyond applicable occupancy fee	Site monitoring file review	3	0.25 pts/participant file review/factor	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Supportive Services	Assessment of Needs conducted at intake and annually, supportive services available throughout participant enrollment	Site monitoring file review	2	0.25 pts/participant file review/factor	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Housing Units and Leases	Lease/Occupancy in place, Lease/Occupancy meets requirements, Correct Lease Parties in Place, HQS Conducted at Initial Lease Signing and	Site monitoring	8	0.25 pts/participant file review/factor	8	8	8	8	8	8	8

	Annually Thereafter, FMR for Unit documented, Rent Reasonableness documented, unit meets reasonableness standard or FMR (depending on type), environmental review documented											
Corrective actions	See site monitoring tool for description	Site monitoring	5	None=5 pts	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
				Corrections completed=2.5 pts								
				Corrections not completed or major issues=0 pts								
Total Project Effectiveness (Site Monitoring)			85		85	85	85	85	85	85	85	
					Project Type			YHDP Project Type				
Outcome	Indicator	Measure	Total Points	Points Spread	TH	Joint TH/RRH	PSH	NAV/RRH	Joint TH/RRH	PSH	RRH	
System Performance Measures = 65 – Adult Joint component TH/RRH, 55- Adult TH, 50 - PSH, YHDP PSH & YHDP RRH – 50, YHDP Joint Component – 65												
Episode of homelessness is brief	Average length of participation in transitional project < under 180 days	APR Q22b length of participation - CoC Projects	15	< 180 =15 pts	15	15	N/A	N/A	15	N/A	N/A	
				180-299=10 pts								
				300-599=5 pts								
				600-730=2.5 pts								
				+730=0 pts								
*Persons are quickly re-housed	Length of time between project start and housing move-in < 30 days	CoC APR: Q22c Length of Time between project start date and housing move-in date. (searching period)	10	<30=10 pts	N/A	10	10	10	10	10	10	
				30-60=5 pts								
				>60=0 pts								

*Limited returns to Homelessness	Less than 15% exits to homelessness	CoC APR Q23c exit destination	15	<15%=15 pts	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	
				15-25% = 5 pts									
				>25% = 0 (Small programs opt to advocate)									
Obtain/maintain permanent housing	> 95% of participants retained their housing and/or exited to permanent housing	CoC APR: Q23c Exit Destination	20	>95%=20 pts	N/A	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	
				80-95% = 10 pts									
				<80%=0 pts									
Obtain permanent Housing	> 95% of participants exited to permanent housing	CoC APR: Q23c Exit Destination	20	>95% = 20 pts	20	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
				75-95% = 10 pts									
				50-74% = 5 pts									
				<50% = 0 pts									
Increase income since entrance to the project	>8 % of participants increased their income since project entry	CoC APR Q16-19 to find best measure for your outcomes OR Use SRT Increased Income (Q19 gives final change over time)	2.5	No spread	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	
Increased income resources	>8% of participants increased non-employment income since project entry	See APR Q17-19. Individuals with increased and earned income	2.5	No spread	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	
Total System Performance Measures					55	65	50	50	65	50	50		
							Project Type			YHDP Project Type			
Outcome	Indicator	Measure	Total Points	Points Spread	TH	Joint TH/RRH	PSH	NAV/RRH	Joint TH/RRH	PSH	RRH		
Coordinated Entry = 15 points - all project types													
CE—filling vacancies from the By Name’s list	greater than 95%	CE data elements - HMIS, case conferencing (CE APR)	5	TH only: if 80-95%=2.5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5		

CE—timely Notification of vacancies (within 1 week of vacancy)	for 95% of vacancies	HMIS- current bed/unit inventory vs housing stock, case conferencing (CE APR)	5	No spread	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
CE—attends case conf when needed; conducts assessments when appropriate; participates in referral process	100% of the time per opening	CE case conferencing, CE APR	5	No spread	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Total Coordinated Entry			15		15	15	15	15	15	15	15

Outcome	Indicator	Measure	Total Points	Points Spread	Project Type			YHDP Project Type			
					TH	Joint TH/RRH	PSH	NAV/RRH	Joint TH/RRH	PSH	RRH
CoC Priority Populations = 5 points - all project types											
Serving marginalized groups/high need groups (May include overrepresented populations in local data)	40% of participants meet a high need category (POC, LGBTQ, gender non-conforming, DV survivor)	CoC to determine how to track special populations - CE to track those housed annually/client files	5	40%=5 pts	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
				20-39%=2.5 pts							
				<20%=0 pts							
Total CoC Priority Populations			5		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
HUD Priority Populations = 15 points - all PSH & YHDP PSH, 5 - Adult Joint Component TH/RRH & TH, 10 - YHDP Nav/TH & YHDP Joint TH/RRH & YHDP RRH											
Serve participants		CoC APRQ16 income range at start	5	50%=5 pts	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Data Quality - Timeliness	UDE, PSDE, client enrollments completed in expected timeframe for project type; APR reporting within 45 days of project close	APR reports	0	Will be scored starting next year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Data - Accuracy	Data entered into HMIS reflects client's reality	Client file spot checks vs data entry	2.5	No spread	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Participation/ leadership	Chair committee, quarterly participation	Committee meeting tracking	5	Committee chair from project=5 pts	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
				Quarterly mtg participant=2.5 pts							
Project annual narrative participation	presents to CoC Board of Directors	Written/spoken documentation	2.5	Up to 2.5 points for a Narrative	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Total Other & Local Criteria			30		30	30	30	30	30	30	30

Table B – Equity Factors

Outcome	Indicator	Measure	Total Points	Points Spread	Project Type			YHDP Project Type			
					TH	Joint TH/RRH	PSH	NAV/RRH	Joint TH/RRH	PSH	RRH
Equity Factors - Agency Leadership, Governance, and Policies = 15 points, all project types											
Under-represented individuals have a significant voice in agency operations	Recipient has under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ) in managerial, supervisory, and leadership positions	Project self-evaluation % of total program leadership who are part of underrepresented populations	3	>=10% = 3 pts	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
				6-9% = 2 pts							
				1-5% = 1pt							
				0% = 0 pts							
Persons with lived	Recipient's Board of Directors includes	Project self-evaluation and Board of Directors	3	>=10% = 3 pts	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

experience have a significant voice on the agency Board of Directors	representation from more than one person with lived experience	list Representation of at least 10% of people with lived experience of homelessness on the board of directors		<10% with plan = 1.5 pts								
				<10% with o plan = 0 pts								
Persons with lived experience have ample opportunity to guide the direction of agency management and policies and procedures	Recipient has relational process for receiving and incorporating feedback from persons with lived experience	Project self-evaluation and program policies	3	Clear explanation around how feedback is incorporated = 3 points	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
				Not developing policies with feedback from PLE or 'yes' with no explanation = 0								
Agencies are low barrier for all persons and evaluate how the barriers that exist might disproportionately affect different populations	Recipient has reviewed internal policies & procedures with an equity lens & has a plan for dev and implementing equitable policies that addresses historical barriers & do not impose undue barriers	Project self-evaluation and program policies	3	Well-developed plan being implemented = 3pts	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
				Well-developed plan exists = 1 pt								
				No plan = 0 pts								
At the program level, there are	Recipient has reviewed program participant	Project self-evaluation, data evaluation	N/A	Not scored yet	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

equitable participant outcomes or a plan to address equitable housing access	outcomes with an equity lens & is working to address inequity in housing access for persons with disabilities, the LGBTQ community, people of color, or other special populations.											
Programs are utilizing data & training on equity & outcomes to inform policies & procedures & make changes if needed	Recipient participated in the CoC's equity trainings in 2023 & has identified programmatic changes needed to make program participant outcomes more equitable and developed a plan to make those changes	Project self-evaluation and program policies, COC tracking of participation	3	Attendance with meaningful use of the information to create positive programmatic changes/ more equitable outcomes for participants = 3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
				Attendance with no follow up – 1.5 pts								
				No attendance = 0 pts								
Agency/program has written policy for Anti-Discrimination & Equal Opportunity.	Program has written policies in place	Project self-evaluation and program policies	1	No spread	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total Equity Factors - Program Participant Outcomes			16		16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16

	PSH (195.5)	TH (190.5)	Joint Component (201.5)
System Performance Measure % (20% target)	20%	29%	27%
Objective Criteria % (33% target)	41%	48%	45%

	YHDP PSH (194)	YHDP RRH (186)	YHDP Joint Component (198)
System Performance Measure % (20% target)	2%	22%	28%
Objective Criteria % (33% target)	39%	41%	46%