

## FY2023 HUD COC PROGRAM COMPETITION RENEWAL PROJECT SCORECARD

Applicant and Project Name:				
Rater Name:	Date Reviewed:			
Project Quality Requirements				
Renewal projects must ensure they continue to meet HUD thresholds for funding. Threshold requirements are pass/fail rather than scored.	Maximum Score Possible		<b>75</b> for <b>79</b> for	PSH or RRH TH or TH-RRH TH or TH-RRH unded via DV Bonus
	Total Project Sco	re		
	Weighted Rating (Total Project Sc Maximum Score Possible x 100)	ore /		
General Project Information (reviewed by staff and r	eported to		ssible	Section Score
Funding Review Committee)			ints: <b>0</b> Max tions: <b>23</b>	Staff:
		ucuuc		FRC:
Does the project meet all eligibility and quality threshold	old requirements? (Pass/Fail)	□ Ye	es	□ No
Is match documentation for at least 25% of program ex expenses of leased units inc	-	□ Ye	es	□ No
Are budgeted costs allocable and allow		□ Ye	es	□ No
Were drawdowns made at least quarterly after p	oroject execution? (Pass/Fail)	□ Ye	es	□ No
Does the project meet all Housing First cr		□ Ye	es	□ No
Does the project qualify as low b		□ Ye	es	□ No
Are there unresolved or outstanding findings in an agence monitoring reports? (-2pts for ea  • Agency Financial Audit (other than A133 Audit unresolved audit findings from  • A-133 Audit: Repeat and/or unresolved audit fir audit year associated  • A-133 Audit: Repeat and/or unresolved audit fir audit year associated with federal grants other  • HUD CoC Program Monitoring report: No Corresubmitted by HUD's deadlines, or Correction Actio did not meet	ch of the below): t): Repeat and/or prior audit year. ndings from prior with CoC grants. ndings from prior r than CoC grants ective Action Plan		0	
Was the application complete and accurate and	l were all required		0	
attachments are provided? (yes = Was the application submitted (yes = 0			0	

	Possible	Section Score:
Section I: Project Effectiveness	Points: 20	
Efficient Use of Funding:		
3. Percent of funding recaptured in last completed grant year		
7% or less	5	
8% or more	0	
4. What is the project's utilization rate?		_
95% or higher	10	
80%-94%	5	
79% or lower	0	
Data Quality (HMIS or alternate database for domestic violence projects)	tt	
6. Percentage of APR Data Quality Elements (6a6d.) with 5% or less null or m	_	<del></del>
95% or greater 91%-94%	5	
Less than 91%	3 0	
Less than 91%	Possible	Section Score:
Section II: Project Performance (PSH and RRH Scoring)	Possible Points: <b>65</b>	Section Score:
7. Leavers with Any Cash Income	I	I
PSH & RRH - percentage of adult leavers who leave the project with one or i	more sources of	cash income.
70% -100%	3	
64%-69%	2	
Below 64%	0	
8. Leavers with Any Non-Cash Benefits	Ŭ	
PSH & RRH - percentage of adult leavers who leave the project with one or i	more sources of	non-cash benefits.
64% - 100%	5	
51%-63%	3	
Below 51%	0	
9. Leavers with Earned Income (Employment)		
PSH - percentage of adult leavers who leave the project with earned income		
4% - 100%	3	
1%-3%	1	
Below 1%	0	
RRH - percentage of adult leavers who leave the project with earned income	9	
49% - 100%	5	
35%-48%	3	
Below 35%	0	
10. Increases in Total Cash Income for leavers & stayers		
PSH - percentage of stayers who have an increase in any income		<u> </u>
67%-100%	10	
58%-66%	5	
Below 58%	0	
RRH - percentage of leavers who have an increase in any income	T	1
63% -100%	10	
50%-62%	5	
Below 50%	0	
11. Stayers and leavers with Health Insurance		
PSH - percentage of project leavers and stayers as of 12/31/22 who have he		ı
95% - 100%	2	
93%-94%	1	
Below 93%	0	

0.00		
RRH - percentage of project leavers and stayers as of 12/31/22 who have healt		
63% - 100%	2	
26%-62%	1	
Below 26%	0	
12. Retention in Permanent Housing (PSH only)		
PSH - percentage of participants who either remain in the PSH project as of 12,	/31/2022, or wl	no have exited
that project to another permanent housing destination		_
96% - 100%	25	
92%-95%	20	
87%-91%	10	
Below 87%	0	
13. Exits to Permanent Housing (RRH, TH, & TH-RRH)		
RRH - percentage of participants who exit the project to a permanent housing		
85% - 100%	25	
80%-84%	15	
70%-79%	5	
Below 70%	0	
14. Length of Time from Project Start Date to Housing Move-In (PSH, RRH only)		
PSH— average length of time it took to move clients into housing in 2022.		
20 days or less	3	
21 to 40 days	1	
41 days or more	0	
RRH— average length of time it took to move clients into housing in 2022.		
40 days or less	10	
41 to 80 days	5	
81 days or more	0	
15. Length of Stay (PSH Only)		
PSH - percentage of leavers that remained in the project more than 180 days.		
95% - 100%	10	
92%-94%	5	
Below 92%	0	
16. Length of Stay (RRH Only)		
RRH - whether all persons remained in the project for 730 days (24 months) or	less	
0 persons	0	
1 or more persons	-10	
17. Returns to homelessness within 6 months of exit from project to permanent l		
PSH - percentage of clients who exited the project to permanent housing in the homeless response system within 6 months of that exit	last 2 years an	d returned to the
0% - 9%	4	
10%-20%	2	
Greater than 20%	0	
RRH - percentage of clients who exited the project to permanent housing in the returned to the homeless response system within 6 months of that exit	last HUD fiscal	<del>-2</del> year <del>s</del> and
0% - 6%	5	
7% - 10%	3	
Greater than 10%	0	

	Possible	Section Score:
	Points -	
Section II: Project Performance (TH and TH-RRH Scoring)	Orig. DV	
	bonus: <b>59</b>	
	All others: <b>55</b>	
7. Leavers with Any Cash Income		
TH — percentage of adult leavers who leave the project with one or more s	ources of cash in	come.
70%-100%	6	
64%-69%	4	
Below 64%	0	
TH-RRH — percentage of adult leavers who leave the project with one or m	ore sources of ca	ash income.
70%-100%	3	
64%-69%	2	
Below 64%	0	
8. Leavers with Any Non-Cash Benefits		
TH and TH-RRH - percentage of adult leavers who leave the project with one benefits.	e or more source	s of non-cash
64% - 100%	5	
51% - 63%	3	1
Below 51%	0	
9. Leavers with Earned Income (Employment)		l
TH - percentage of adult leavers who leave the project with earned income		
54% - 100%	7	
35% - 53%	4	1
Below 35%	0	
TH-RRH - percentage of adult leavers who leave the project with earned inc	ome	
49% - 100%	5	
35%-48%	3	
Below 35%	0	
10. Increases in Total Cash Income for leavers or stayers		
TH and TH-RRH - percentage of persons (leavers or stayers) who have an inc	crease in any inco	ome
63%-100%	10	
50%-62%	5	
Below 50%	0	
11. Stayers and leavers with Health Insurance	1.1 .	
TH - percentage of project leavers and stayers as of 12/31/22 who have hea	_	Т
30% - 100%	2	4
15%-29%	1	4
Below 15%	0	1
TH-RRH - percentage of project leavers and stayers as of 12/31/22 who hav		ce.
63% - 100% 26%-62%	1	4
26%-62% Below 26%		-
	0	
13. Exits to Permanent Housing	mank become	ationatia :-
TH and TH-RRH - percentage of participants who exit the project to a perma		stination
85% - 100%	25	-
80%-84%	15	-
70%-79%	5	-
5   700/		
Below 70%	0	

17. Returns to homelessness within 6 months of exit from project to permanen	nt housing	
TH-RRH - percentage of clients who exited the project to permanent housing	g in the last <u>HUD f</u>	<u>iscal</u> 2 year <del>s</del> and
returned to the homeless response system within 6 months of that exit		
0% - 6%	5	
6% - 10%	3	
Greater than 10%	0	
18. Increasing Participant Safety (Projects Originally Funded through DV Bonus	Only)	
Strategies to increase participant safety for survivors of domestic violence/hi	uman trafficking (	DV/HT),
assessment of improvements to participant safety		
multiple strategies for improving safety for DV/HT survivors; clear description	4	
of how improvements to participant safety are assessed; at least one		
concrete, substantive, and current example of relevant work; demonstrates		
that improving safety for DV/HT survivors is a key part of the project.		
At least one strategy for improving safety for DV/HT survivors and at least one	2	
way that the project assesses improvements to participant safety; example		
may not be concrete, substantive, current or clearly relevant to the project		
At least one strategy for improving safety for DV/HT survivors, but does not	1	
provide concrete or substantive examples of what this work looks like or how		
the project assesses improvements to participant safety.		
No strategies for improving safety	0	

ebreaker: Severity of Barriers	Possible Points: 6	Section Score:
19a. Zero income		
PSH - Percentage of clients that entered the program with zero income		
80%-100	% 2	
50%-79	% 1	
Below 50	% 0	
RRH, TH-RRH, TH - Percentage of clients that entered the program with ze	ero income	
50%-100	% 2	
30-49	% 1	
Below 30	% 0	
9b. Chronically homeless		
PSH - Percentage of clients that entered the program as chronically home	eless	
100	% 2	
Below 100	% 0	
RRH, TH-RRH, TH - Percentage of clients that entered the program as chro	onically homeless	
15%-100	% 2	
5%-14	% 1	
Below 5	% 0	
9c. Conditions at Entry	<u>.</u>	
PSH - Percentage of persons that entered the program who met two or mentry	nore harder to serve	e conditions at
50%-100	% 2	
30%-49	% 1	
Below 30	% 0	
RRH, TH-RRH, TH - Percentage of persons that entered the program who conditions at entry	met two or more h	arder to serve
10%-100	% 2	
5%-9	% 1	
Below 5	% 0	