

## CRITERIA REWEWALS

### Renewal Projects Qualifying Requirements

Projects must meet all Qualifying Criteria to be considered for funding

Criterion	Ineligible	Eligible
<b>Submission deadline</b>	Project application is submitted to CoC coordinator <u>after</u> deadline	Project application is submitted to CoC coordinator by deadline
<b>HMIS and Coordinated Entry</b> <i>Coordinated Entry is a comprehensive initial assessment of individual/family housing and service needs, and coordinates intake into appropriate housing and services</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project does <u>not</u> have the capacity nor an acceptable plan for participation</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Or</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Renewal project has <u>not</u> demonstrated minimally acceptable participation in HMIS and Coordinated Entry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project has the capacity and an acceptable plan to participate fully in HMIS and Coordinated Entry</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>And</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Renewal project has demonstrated at least minimally acceptable participation in HMIS and Coordinated Entry</li> </ul>
<b>Organizational Capacity</b>	<p><b><i>Any of the following disqualifies the provider:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organization <u>does not</u> have a mission/purpose statement and bylaws that govern operations</li> <li>Organization <u>does not</u> have an active governing board (e.g., Board of Directors) that includes at least one member who is homeless or formerly homeless, or a formal plan to immediately recruit someone</li> <li>Organization <u>does not</u> have clear policies and procedures to address potential conflicts of interest for board members</li> <li>Organization <u>does not</u> have adequate level and expertise in staffing</li> </ul>	<p><b><i>Provider must meet <u>all</u> of the following to be eligible:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organization has a mission/purpose statement and bylaws that govern operations</li> <li>Organization has an active governing board (e.g. Board of Directors) that includes at least one member who is homeless or formerly homeless, or a formal plan to immediately recruit someone</li> <li>Organization has clear policies and procedures to address potential conflicts of interest for board members</li> <li>Organization has adequate level and expertise in staffing.</li> </ul>
<b>Financial Audit</b>	Most recent audit and management letter is <u>not</u> provided or contains significant adverse or disclosure/findings that reviewers determine should preclude applicant from inclusion in application.	Most recent annual audited financial and year-to-date financial and management letter is provided and no significant findings are identified.

## Renewal Project Evaluation and Scoring

Those projects that meet the qualifying criteria are further evaluated to identify those that most closely align with the needs, goals, and funding priorities of the Minneapolis/Hennepin Continuum of Care (HC) and HUD.

	Measures	Source	Low	Mid	High
<b><u>GENERAL PERFORMANCE</u></b>					
1	Priority Populations (2)	HC			Bonus points for projects that serve current Hennepin County (HHH) priority populations of families or youth, and PSH projects that prioritize/dedicate chronically homeless singles (on application and in practice).
2	Target Populations	HC+ HUD			<p><u>Family/Youth providers</u> As CoC –funded units become available, provider demonstrates that they have specific programs or services to meet the unique needs of youth or families with multiple barriers or multiple/sustained episodes of homelessness.</p> <p><u>Singles providers:</u> As CoC funded units become available, provider demonstrates that they have specific programs or services to meet the unique needs of people who are chronically homeless, unsheltered, seniors or veterans. Singles PSH dedicate units to chronically homeless.</p>
<b><u>CLIENT OUTCOMES, FINANCIAL</u></b>					
3	Non-cash benefits for all participants (-1/1/2)	HUD	0-55% (HUD target=56%)	56-89% (From HUD target up to performance that many providers have been able to achieve, want to support continued good performance)	90-100% (Raising it to where a good chunk of the providers already are-so supporting them-and creating incentive for those not yet there)
4	Increase income for adults through employment (0/2/3)	HUD	0-19 (HUD target=20%)	20-24%	25-100% (At this time only a few projects are in this range, so this establishes a realistic bar/incentive.)
5	Increased income for adults through non-employment sources (0/2/3) <i>Social security, SSI or SSDI, unemployment, veteran's disability, workers comp, etc</i>	HUD	0-34% (HUD target=54%)	35-53%	54-100%

<b>CLIENT OUTCOMES: HOUSING STABILITY</b>					
<b>PERMANENT HOUSING</b>					
6	<b>Reduced Barriers to Housing (0/1/2) HUD 2015 NOFA</b> <i>HUD is scoring CoC's based on at least 75% of projects having lower barriers (Part 3B, Q4B in Project Applications)</i>	<b>HUD + CES</b>	<b>Does not</b> have reduced barriers according to answer to Question 4b	<b>Has</b> reduced barriers according to the answer to Question 4b	<b>Does</b> have reduced barriers, according to answer to Question 4b and incorporates best practices as informed by CE and evaluation narrative
7	<b>Housing First (APR + (0/1/2) HUD 2015 NOFA</b> <i>HUD is scoring CoC's based on at least 75% of projects using Housing First approach (Part 3B, Q4c in Project Application)</i>	<b>HUD</b>	<b>Does not</b> have a Housing First approach (does not move people quickly into PH and does not meet all entrance and exit criteria) according to answer to Q4c.in project application  No training for staff on housing first principles	<b>Has</b> reduced barriers according to the answer to Part 3B Question 4c.  Has training for staff on housing first principles.	<b>Does</b> have a Housing First approach, (does move people quickly into permanent housing and meets all entrance and exit criteria) according to answer to Q4c and incorporates best practices as informed by CE and evaluation narrative  Has training for staff on housing first, trauma informed services and other best practices.
7a	<b>Housing First ( information from CES+ Questionnaire) (0/1/3)</b>  <b>(In 2017 projects that have not fully adopted housing first practices will receive negative points).</b>	<b>Questionnaire + CES</b>	<b>Does not</b> demonstrate full understanding/implementation of housing first principles	Basic application of housing first principles.	Demonstrates good understanding of housing first best practices and has incorporated practices that are hallmarks of high achieving housing first programs. Practices include removing barriers to program entry, adopt client-centered service methods that meet the unique needs of individual clients and ensure that program participants have access to the services that could help participants reach tenancy and stability goals.
8	<b>Permanent housing stability (stayers + leavers to permanent destinations) (-1/1/3)</b>	<b>HUD</b>	<b>0-79%</b> <b>(HUD target = 80%)</b>	<b>80-89%</b>	<b>90-100%</b>
9	<b>PSH: chronic homeless prioritization-(1/0/1)</b>	<b>HUD</b>	<b>Does not</b> prioritize chronically homeless populations	<b>Prioritizes</b> chronically homeless populations	<b>Actively</b> recruits CH and dedicates units to serve CH with highest barriers and has programs to ensure housing stability of CH.
<b>TRANSITIONAL HOUSING</b>					
10	<b>Exits to permanent housing (-1/0/2)</b> <i>HC 2014 Performance = 75%</i>	<b>HUD + HC</b>	<b>0-64%</b> <b>(HUD target=65%)</b>	<b>65-75%</b> <b>(HC target=75%)</b>	<b>76% or more</b>

<b>EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PROJECTS SERVING CHILDREN</b>					
11	<b>K-12 Education (0/1/2)</b>	HUD	<b>Meets HUD requirements</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Written plan and staff in place to ensure children and youth are enrolled in and attending school, and connected to services to support their educational needs per McKinney Vento Education Law.</li> </ul>	<b>Meets HUD requirements plus:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education plan for children and youth part of family's case plan</li> <li>Staff development</li> <li>Appropriate study space</li> <li>Measures in place</li> </ul>	<b>Meets HUD requirements plus</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education plan</li> <li>Staff development</li> <li>Appropriate study space</li> <li>Measures in place</li> <li><b>Demonstrated success</b></li> </ul>
12	<b>Early childhood development (0/1/2)</b>	HUD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets HUD requirement: Written plan and staff in place to ensure families can access Head Start and other public early childhood education programs; facilitates participation</li> </ul>	<b>Meets HUD requirements plus:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinates with providers for birth-5 screening</li> <li>Space for early intervention providers to serve children &gt;3 years with developmental delays</li> <li>Facilitates access to family education</li> </ul>	<b>Meets HUD requirements plus:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinates with providers for birth-5 screening</li> <li>Space for early intervention providers to serve children &gt;3 years with developmental delays</li> <li>Facilitate access to family education</li> <li><b>Demonstrated success</b></li> </ul>
<b>OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE</b>					
13	<b>Unit Utilization (0/1/2)</b> <i>No HUD standards; CoC 2016 PIT average 94% ; lowest 50%; Highest 120%; this is due to programs being able to stretch their funds to fund more than their original budget/plan</i>	HC	79% or less project units	80-94% of project units	95% or more of project units
14	<b>Funding Mgmt: % funds spent (-3/-1/1)</b> <i>HUD and CoC places high value on projects fully utilizing their awarded grant funds.</i>	HUD + HC	Spent 89% or less of grant award	Spent 90%-97% of grant award	Spent 98% or more of grant award
15	<b>Funding Mgmt: frequency of drawdowns (-1/0/1)</b> <i>HUD values regular drawdowns (spending) of the grant, expecting this at least quarterly and strongly encouraging this monthly.</i>	HUD	Drawdowns occur less than quarterly	Drawdowns occur at least quarterly	Drawdowns occur monthly.
18	<b>Grantee Responsiveness (-1/0/0) (Yes/No)</b>		Grantee is not responsive to CoC funding committee and or CoC Coordinator	Grantee is responsive to CoC funding committee and CoC Coordinator	Grantee is responsive to CoC funding committee and CoC Coordinator
19	<b>HMIS data quality (-1, 0, 1)</b>		HMIS data has more than 8% errors	HMIS data has less than 3% errors	HMIS data has less than 2% errors
20	<b>Site Visit concerns (-1, 0, 0) (Yes/No)</b>		Funding committee has concerns after site visit	No concerns	No concerns

INFORMATION FROM COORDINATED ENTRY SYSTEM AND QUESTIONNAIRE NOT included in scoring for 2016					
16a	<b>Coordinated Entry Outcomes for projects that participate in CES only.(all projects that serve families with children) (-1/1/2) Not included in scoring for 2016</b>	HC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time to contact clients is more than 7 days after referral from Housing Referral Coordinator</li> <li>• Not responsive to CES staff</li> <li>• Avg time to intake is longer than 2 weeks (from referral)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time to contact clients is within 7 days of referral from Housing Referral Coordinator</li> <li>• Responsive to CES staff.</li> <li>• Average time to intake is within 2 weeks (from referral)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time to contact clients is 5 days or less after referral from Housing Referral Coordinator</li> <li>• Responsive to CES staff</li> <li>• Average time to complete intake is within 7 days (from referral)</li> </ul>
16b	<b>CE housing placement outcomes (0/1/2)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time from intake to permanent housing is more than 45 days (RRH and scattered site PSH )</li> <li>• Average time from intake to permanent housing is more than 35 days (site-based PSH+TH)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time from intake to permanent housing 30-45 days (RRH and scattered site PSH )</li> <li>• Average time from intake to permanent housing is 30 -35 days-(site-based PSH+TH)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average time from intake to permanent housing is less than 30 days (RRH and scattered site PSH )</li> <li>• Average time from intake to permanent housing is 29 days-or less (site-based PSH+TH))</li> </ul>
17	<b>Outcomes for projects that do not receive referrals from CES (from questionnaire) (-1/1/2)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No outreach policy</li> <li>• Referrals are received from few sources.</li> <li>• No policy for prioritization for program participation based on need.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has an outreach policy</li> <li>• Referrals are received from multiple sources</li> <li>• Program participation is prioritized according to need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a well-developed outreach policy</li> <li>• Referral are received from multiple sources</li> <li>• Has an assessment tool to determine acuity of need.</li> <li>• Chronic homeless and highest barrier clients are prioritized</li> </ul>