

2023 Scoring Tool

Project Name	Threshold 2 points if threshold requireme nts met	Renewal Grant 5 points Renewal applicatio ns receive 5 points	Renewal Provider in Good standing 3 points	Performa nce - Financial 3 points	Performa nce – Results 3 points	Perform ance - Operatio ns 3 points	HUD Priority 2 points Projects listed as a current HUD priority receive	HUD Bonus Project 3 points	Severity of Needs 3 points	Local Priority 3 points Projects listed as a current local priority receive 3 points	Emerging Issue/not priority 1 point Projects that are not a current local priority, but have been identified as a local emerging issue receive 1 point	Tie- breaker points (1-4) Projects tied in points through criteria 1-6, will be scored for 1-4 tiebreake r points based on the tie breaker criteria	Total Points Possible  35

Scoring form 7/2023

## **Scoring Criteria and Process for 2023 – Approved and distributed \_\_\_\_ 2023**

Background: Criteria for scoring and ranking applications in 2023. The following objective criteria adopted by the CoC was designed to prioritize and rank projects that demonstrate 1) The provider has a proven track record in past successful performance on planned results – the HUD 20% required percentage of points), 2) the homeless population they are proposing to serve and the type of housing proposed are both a priority for funding to HUD and a priority needed in our local community (the HUD 33% required percentage of objective criteria points). Finally, as a performance standard we include, evaluate and prioritize the providers participating in our collaborative goals for the community in system change in general and addressing social justice through DEI efforts at an agency level.

### **Scoring:**

**Met all HUD Application threshold requirements** – Total possible 2 points – (baseline for scoring, not included in either 20 or 33%)

**Renewal grant** – Total possible 5 points (5 maximum points to include in meeting criteria for performance criteria for both objective performance data (33% required) and past performance (20% required) criteria)

**Renewal Provider in good standing in CoC** Total possible 3 points (good standing means both met CoC Objective Performance criteria and system performance criteria and is regularly active within the CoC's collaborative scope of work– 3 points (3 maximum points for meeting criteria for performance criteria for both objective performance data (33% required) and past performance (20% required) criteria)

**Objective Performance (Quality) Score** (has 3 subparts parts) total possible 9 points

*Financial Performance* (cost effectiveness of proposal, timely draws, match and leverage provided) 0 – 3 points; 0 for non-performance; 1 for substantially poor performance based on APR and Application Performance questions; 2 for minor performance/quality issues reported; 3 pts for no performance issues. (3 maximum points for meeting criteria for performance criteria for objective performance data (33% required) criteria)

*System performance* – did met the planned criteria in prior application for HUD Standards of: did serve the type of population planned and did provide the type of housing proposed in the quantity proposed? As well as program performance in meeting planned exits to permanent housing, destinations, retention of permanent housing, length of time homeless, return to homeless, etc. as tracked in STELLA/APR. 0 – 3 points; 0 for non-performance; 1 for substantially poor performance based on APR and Application Performance questions; 2 for minor performance/quality issues reported; 3 pts for no performance issues (3 maximum points for meeting criteria for system performance criteria for both objective performance data (33% required) and past performance (20% required) criteria)

*System Operations* - Provides timely data on program performance of both HUD performance standard and local priorities -0 – 3 points; 0 for non-performance; 1 for substantially poor performance based on APR and Application Performance questions; 2 for minor performance/quality issues reported; 3 pts for no performance issues. (3 maximum points for meeting criteria for system performance criteria for both objective performance data (33% required) and past performance (20% required) criteria)

*HUD priority* – Total possible 2 points. 2 points if application addressing a current HUD priority HUD identified in this year’s NOFO. 0 points if not a current HUD priority

HUD Bonus Project (if applicable) Total possible 3 points. When available, evaluate proposal scoring by how complete the project is according to the stated HUD criteria. For example with DV bonus projects, does the project address population safety, does the project use lived experience with homelessness (as DV or youth or chronically homeless) in design phase. 1 points if a bonus project but not addressed, 2 points if addressed, 3 points if fully addressed. (3 maximum points for meeting criteria for performance criteria for objective performance data (33% required) criteria)

*Serving the Severity of needs and vulnerabilities* identified by CoC for current year funding. Total possible 3 points. In 2023 these are: DV, Youth, Hardest to serve. 3 points if addressing a CoC local priority, 0 points if not a local priority. (3 maximum points for meeting criteria for performance criteria for objective performance data (33% required) criteria)

*Community Priority* – Total possible 3 points. Engagement in DEI goals and promoting Racial Equity in homelessness and in serving the homeless. 0 points if not addressed. 1-2 points if policies identified. 3 points if operational implementation identified.

*Emerging Issues* – Total possible 1 point. 1 point if identified as a newly emerging issue that is not a current community priority

A tiebreaker score from 1 – 4 will be provided to applicants with tied scores. Tiebreaker ranking determined by the impact of potential loss of program impacts community at large/CoC strategic Plans; then potential loss of program to residents, and finally capacity of agency’s sustainability if program not funded. 4 points to a proposal with greatest potential impact on community work; 3 points for the program considered greatest loss to homeless residents; and 2 points if agency cannot be sustained if program unfunded and 1 point for any longstanding program that significantly supports homeless work that funding is considered not replaceable in short term.

**Process.** The ranking done by the review/ranking community based on the criteria is then made as a recommendation to the full CoC membership, with the supporting rationale for the scoring. The full CoC membership votes to approve the ranking recommendation, or rejects the ranking criteria scores and approves alternative criteria/scores to rank the projects meeting threshold requirements.