**2022 Hennepin County/Minneapolis CoC NOFO Ranking Process, Procedures, and Score Tool**

The working committee of the Minneapolis/Hennepin CoC Governing board (CoC Funding committee) is charged with directing this community’s annual HUD CoC Program funding of approximately $14 million to meet federal requirements and local needs in its efforts to address and end homelessness. To accomplish this goal, the Committee sets priorities for new project funding, and ranks renewal and new applications, based on project and CoC performance criteria, as well as local and HUD priorities.

**I. HUD McKinney-Vento Application Values**

In developing its overall strategy to address and end homelessness, and in particular with respect to ranking of renewal projects and solicitation of new project applications, the CoC and its Funding Committee are committed to upholding and applying the following values:

1. Maintain as much HUD Continuum of Care Program funding in our CoC as possible.
2. Promote our goal to make homelessness rare, brief, and one time in Minneapolis/Hennepin County and address issues of disproportionality
3. Prioritize projects that:
   1. Actively participate in the Continuum of Care and help advance collective goals
   2. Have movement to permanent housing and subsequent stability as the primary focus
   3. Focus on those who are literally homeless (streets, shelter, transitional housing for homeless)
   4. Participate in the HMIS with complete, high-quality data;
   5. Demonstrate low barriers to program entry
   6. Perform well against HUD McKinney Continuum of Care goals and positively impact system performance
   7. Consistently meet and exceed operational standards for spending, match, occupancy and reporting.

**II. Priority Populations and Activities**

In preparation for HUD’s 2022 COC Program Competition (NOFO) the CoC Governing Board examined local needs as identified by the Heading Home Hennepin Plan and Housing Stability. Following a review of relevant data the CoC Funding Committee approved the priority recommendations on **May 24, 2022**. The committee made a recommendation to prioritize projects focusing on single adults, chronically homeless persons, and Permanent Supportive Housing project types, in the 2022 NOFO competition ranking process.  The Executive Committee formally approved these priority populations on **June 3, 2022.**

Key recommendations of support for 2022 NOFO:

1. Population recommendation:
   * First priority: Single adults - chronically homeless
   * Second priority: Families
2. Project type recommendation:
   * First priority: Permanent supportive housing projects
   * Second priority: RRH projects
   * Third priority: Joint component projects
   * Increasing HMIS capacity

Single Chronically Homeless Adults

* Identified by HUD as a priority population in past NOFO Program Competitions
* Chronically homeless
  + While we have seen a decrease in the total number of people experiencing homelessness in the Point-in-Time Count (down to 580 in 2022 from 671 in 2021) the number of actively homeless chronic individuals in March 2022 is the same as it was in March 2021, at 351 people (data from the Built for Zero dashboard) and has increased in January and February 2022 (420 and 426 people) from January and February 2021 (323 and 342 people).
* Single adults:
  + In the 2022 PIT we saw an increase compared to 2021 but this can be attributed to the fact that those experiencing unsheltered homelessness were not included in the 2021 count. When comparing the 2022 count to 2020, we see a decrease across all household types but the smallest decrease in the count of single adults experiencing homelessness (decreasing by 74 people, or by 4%).
  + Single adults have continued to make up a larger proportion of our community of people experiencing homelessness in Hennepin over the years, from 59% in 2020, 62% in 2021, to 64% in 2022.

Permanent Supportive Housing

* 4,978 PSH housing units were counted in the 2022 PIT count, an increase of 10 beds since the 2021 PIT count. These PSH beds made up 43% of the available housing inventory. On the night of the 2022 PIT, 79% of PSH beds were utilized.

Strategies to Address Unsheltered Homelessness

* While an unsheltered count was not conducted in the 2021 PIT, the number of unsheltered persons has decreased from 642 in 2020 to 476 in 2022. While this suggests a decrease, other factors impacted our ability to compare this year’s count to previous years count of unsheltered persons. This is the first year Hennepin County took on the responsibility of planning for and implementing the count. This was a learning year, and we know the methodology can be further refined and expanded upon in future years. Conditions related to COVID also impacted the count in multiple ways including: many service sites remained closed, or were operating at a decreased capacity, making it difficult to encounter people experiencing unsheltered homelessness to complete surveys; and limited capacity of street outreach teams to participate in surveying people experiencing homelessness made it difficult to accurately gather complete information for people staying in encampments and other known locations. The count is expected to improve in methodology in future years as COVID restrictions ease and as Hennepin County moves to a larger integration of HMIS data in completing the count.
* Hennepin county identifies substance use and some severe and persistent mental illness (SPMI) symptoms to be the result/response to traumatic conditions/experiences and the systems that perpetuate them. Projects will be prioritized that:
  + Provide “high support models of care”. These projects may be broader in scope and better able to meet the range and complexity of needs presented in the community of people being served by CoC-funded projects.
  + The “high support model of care” can best serve other populations that will be prioritized through CoC funds including people considered “medically vulnerable”, people experiencing substance use disorders, and people experiencing increased mental health needs.

**III. Ranking for Renewal of Existing Projects**

As part of the annual NOFO competition process, HUD requires each Continuum of Care to rank order all McKinney-Vento Funded projects (both new and renewal) included in its CoC Consolidated Application using a documented, objective methodology which considers past project performance, and to further divide this ranked list of projects into two Tiers. The purpose of this tiered system is to indicate to HUD the relative funding priority of projects within a CoC, and thus, the priority order in which projects should receive resources should funding fall short of a CoC’s Annual Renewal Demand. Tier 1 projects passing an eligibility and threshold review will be conditionally funded by HUD, beginning with those in the highest-scoring CoC nationwide and proceeding to the lowest-scoring CoC; funding order of Tier 1 projects within a CoC thus depends on that CoC’s own project evaluation process. Tier 2 projects are competitively funded and subject to evaluation by HUD using a scoring system which factors in a CoC’s overall application score, the score awarded the project by the CoC, and the extent to which a project implements a Housing First approach.

To assist the Hennepin County/Minneapolis Continuum of Care McKinney-Vento Funding Committee in evaluating and ranking applications for both renewal and new project applications, Housing Stability has developed the Hennepin County NOFO Program Scoring Tool (see Attachment 1). The Scoring Tool is based on the efforts of all metro area CoCs, through the Metro Data and Evaluation Committee, to establish a shared set of criteria on which to base NOFO project evaluations and builds upon previous scoring tools used by the Suburban Metro and Ramsey County CoCs. While it is intended to serve as a common starting point for CoCs to evaluate NOFO project applications, individual CoCs may add to or amend the Tool based upon their individual needs.

1. Scoring Tool Description

The Scoring Tool evaluates renewal projects along three general performance dimensions – Service Model, Operational Performance, and Client Outcome Performance – each of which includes multiple component measures. Each performance measure is in turn based on one or more defined data elements drawn from a specific data source, including individual project applications, annual progress reports (APRs), HMIS, and HUD reports. For each individual measure, the Scoring Tool also defines three ranges of performance – Low, Medium, and High – and identifies for each a number of points awarded to programs whose outcomes fall within that range.

The intent is for each individual measure within the tool to be an objective metric with a defined method of calculation, and which corresponds to one or more data elements from specific reports. This approach reduces variability in assessment between reviewers, as independent reviewers (including projects engaging in self-assessment) using the same, defined data sources should thus be able to reliably arrive at the same value, and the same point score, for a project on any given measure. The overall score of a project is the sum of the points it receives in each of the component performance measures across the four general performance dimensions.

*Service Model*

The Scoring Tool’s first dimension captures characteristics of a project’s Service Model, and consists of two component measures:

* Low Barrier Program Eligibility - whether projects accept or screen out applicants based on certain characteristics (aligns with HUD NOFO Policy Priorities)
* Housing First - the extent to which project adopt a Housing First approach (aligns with HUD NOFO Policy Priorities)

*Operational Performance*

Operational Performance, the second of the Scoring Tool’s three general dimensions, is comprised of four components:

* Bed Utilization - the extent to which a project’s beds inventory is occupied over the course of a given year
* Funding Management: Unspent Funds - the percentage of a project’s previous grant which was spent
* Funding Management: Drawdowns - the frequency with which a project draws down its funds
* HMIS Data Quality - the percentage of missing data elements within the project’s HMIS client records

*Client Outcome and System Level Performance*

The Scoring Tool’s third dimension, Client Outcome and System Level Performance, contains eight components. This dimension also differs from the other two in that, depending on project type, renewals may not be scored on all eight components. The first two components within Client Outcome and System Level Performance apply only to Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) renewals:

* Chronic Homeless Targeting - the percent of a project’s beds dedicated for chronically homeless clients (aligns with HUD NOFO Performance & Strategic Planning Criteria 6a, HUD NOFO Policy Priorities)
* Housing Stability at 6 Months - the percent of entrants who remain in the project after 180 days

The final five components of the Client Outcome and System Level Performance Dimension apply to both PSH as well as Rapid Rehousing (RRH) and Transitional Housing (TH) projects:

* Retention/Exits to Permanent Destinations - the percentage of a project’s clients who are retained in the project at the time of data collection, or who have exited to permanent destinations in the past year (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 7b.1, 7b.2)
* Change in Retention/Exits to Permanent Destinations – the percent change in a project’s ‘Retention/Exits to Permanent Destinations’ from CY2020 to CY2021
* Maintain or Increase Employment Income - the percent of eligible adults whose income from employment was maintained or increased relative to employment income at admission (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 4.1, 4.4) measured at both annual assessment and at program exit
* Change in Maintain or Increase Employment Income – the percent change in a project’s ‘Maintain or Increase Employment Income’ from CY2020 to CY2021 measured at both annual assessment and at program exit
* Maintain or Increase Total Income - the percent of clients who maintained or increased income from all sources, including employment, when compared to total income at project entry (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 4.3, 4.6) measured at both annual assessment and at program exit
* Change in Maintain or Increase Total Income – the percent change in a project’s ‘Maintain or Increase Total Income’ from CY2020 to CY2021 measured at both annual assessment and at program exit

*Reallocation Bonus*

In 2022, bonus points will also be awarded to projects willing to reallocate funds from their grant request to other projects identified by the Funding Committee as priority targets and areas of need for the CoC. Any project that has had more than 10% of their grant unspent for 2 or more grant years can consider voluntary reallocation.

The Scoring Tool provides the Funding Committee an objective point from which to start its ranking process. From this point, the Committee may consider other project characteristics not incorporated in the Scoring Tool, including (but not limited to): project capacity and expected number of individuals served; type and scope of services provided; client subpopulation(s) targeted by the project; extent to which a project meets existing areas of CoC need; provider performance using the coordinated entry system; changes in project performance over time; history of continuous improvement plan participation; project feedback or context provided to the CoC Funding Committee; responses to racial equity questions; tenant selection criteria, provider responsiveness, or other factors it deems relevant, to reorder projects and arrive at the CoC’s final project ranking list.

It is also imperative to note that the Scoring Tool is intended to provide a relative, rather than an absolute, ranking of projects. While it is expected that a project’s rank will be correlated with its overall performance to some degree, at the same time, a low rank on the Scoring Tool is not necessarily an indicator that a project is performing poorly; similarly, it is possible for a high-ranking project to fall short of expectations in one or more performance areas.

The Scoring Tool, as described above and presented in Attachment 1, was presented for approval to the CoC Funding Committee on **May 11, 2022.** At that time, the Committee elected to unanimously approve the tool for use in the 2022 NOFO Program Competition ranking process.

1. Scoring Tool Application and Project Ranking Process

Projects are sent the Letter of Intent to Apply and NOFO Scoring Tool template on **May 24, 2022**. Following the submission of the Letter of Intent by all renewal projects and the completed NOFO Scoring Tool template by the deadline of **June 6, 2022** Housing Stability will use the NOFO Scoring Tool to begin to calculate each project’s provisional score. These results, including both the overall project score, the score for each component metric within the Scoring Tool, and the raw outcome values from which those scores are calculated are shared with each project individually on **July 1, 2022** to ensure there are no data or calculation errors, and to assist all projects in understanding the measures and data from which their score is derived. Following this period for comment and (if necessary) correction, projects will submit formal approval & comments regarding their score to the CoC by **July 8, 2022.** The Scoring Tool will then be applied to these applications to produce a preliminary project ranking for all renewal projects.

This ranking, along with contextual information drawn from projects’ applications, 2021 Calendar Year APRs, tenant selection criteria, and narrative responses to Housing Stability inquiries regarding projects’ performance relative to HUD targets for income, receipt of non-cash benefits, subpopulations served, and racial equity questions will be made available to the CoC Funding Committee. The Committee will then use this information in its meeting on **August 10, 2022** to rank order projects, designate which projects fall into the Tier 1 and Tier 2 ranges, and make any reallocation decisions in order to fund new project proposals (see Section IV, below). Results of this preliminary ranking process will be communicated to new and renewal project applicants via e-mail the week of **August 15, 2022**, and through public posting on the Hennepin County website. At this point, projects rejected by the CoC may appeal the decision to the CoC following the procedure outlined in Section V, below. Following the conclusion of the appeals process, the final rankings will be presented to the CoC Governing Board for a formal vote of approval.

**IV. Submission and Ranking Process for New Project Proposals**

In addition to scoring and ranking renewal projects, the Hennepin County/Minneapolis Continuum of Care McKinney-Vento Funding Committee will also evaluate, score, and rank new project proposals as part of the 2022 CoC NOFO competition.

1. Scoring Tool Description

As detailed in the New Project Request for Proposal (RFP) release issued by the CoC in conjunction with Hennepin County, new project proposals must meet the following minimum threshold requirements to be considered for funding:

* + Project applicants must be a nonprofit organization, state or local government, public housing agency, or instrumentality of a state or local government, without limitation or exclusion
  + The population targeted by the project meets current HUD and CoC requirements
  + The service model adopted by the project meets current HUD and CoC requirements
  + New project pre-applications are submitted to the CoC Coordinator and Performance Evaluator on or before the **deadline of July 7, 2022**
  + Projects have both a plan in place, and the capacity, to participate fully in HMIS and the CoC’s Coordinated Entry System
  + Applicant organizations have a mission/purpose statement, bylaws to govern operations, an active governing board that includes at least one member who is homeless or formerly homeless (or has a formal plan to recruit such a member), clear policies and procedures to address potential conflicts of interest of board members, and possesses adequate levels of, and expertise in, staffing
  + Applicants provide complete financial information which suggests the project is likely to be viable
  + Applications include the most recent audited financial and year-to-date financial and management letter, and this letter contains no significant adverse disclosures

Pursuant to the Priority Populations and Activities outlined in Section II, above, for the 2022 CoC Program NOFO competition, the CoC Funding Committee, & CoC Governance Board local priority approval, will limit its consideration of new project applications to 1) Permanent Supportive Housing projects; 2) Rapid Rehousing projects; 3) HMIS capacity expansion project, 4) Projects serving single adults identified as chronically homeless; 5) Projects serving families.

Project applications meeting these requirements will then be evaluated and scored by the CoC Funding Committee using the New Project Evaluation and Scoring Too1 (see Appendix 2), as outlined in the Pre-Application RFP document, which considers the following dimensions of a project’s application:

* + **Innovation and Effectiveness**, including whether the project employs research-based and/or evidence-based practices and has demonstrated experience in using such practices to inform decision-making and service provision (4 points possible)
  + **Performance Measures**, including whether the project has articulated plans for successfully achieving performance measures (4 points possible)
  + **Leverage**, including the extent to which the project leverages outside funding and the percent of leveraged funding currently in place (4 points possible)
  + **Applicant Experience for Proposed Activities**, including whether the project applicant or partners have past experience providing housing services, have past experience providing housing services to the population targeted by the proposed project, and have demonstrated objective outcomes of past success in this service provision (2 points possible)
  + **Employment Services Plan**, including whether the project articulates a plan or partnership to increase employment outcomes for program participants and a plan for increasing participants’ income (2 points possible)
  + **Commitment to Advancing Racial Equity**, including project strategies used to meet the cultural and racial needs of the people they serve (including culturally specific services and partnerships with culturally specific organizations) and the extent to which organizational policies and training offerings reflect an agenda for promoting anti-racism practices (2 points possible)

1. Scoring Tool Application and Project Ranking Process

Using this tool, each new project proposal will be awarded a total score of 0 to 18 points and ranked by the CoC Funding Committee. The Committee will then determine whether it wishes to select one or more top-ranking new projects for funding through reallocation and/or propose for funding through HUD bonus funds (if available). Approved new project proposals will be notified by the CoC and must submit a formal Project Application Draft by the **July 7, 2022** deadline. New project applications will be reviewed by the CoC Funding Committee on **August 8, 2022.** Approved new project proposals will be included in the ranking process occurring in the Committee’s meeting on **August 10, 2022** during which they will be assigned an overall rank and Tier 1 or Tier 2 designation alongside renewal project applications, as detailed in Section III, above. Results of this preliminary ranking process will be communicated to new and renewal project applicants via e-mail the week of **August 15, 2022** and through public posting on the Hennepin County website. At this point, projects rejected by the CoC may appeal the decision to the CoC following the procedure outlined in Section V, below. Following the conclusion of the appeals process, the final rankings will be presented to the CoC Governance Board for a formal vote of approval.

**V. Appeals Process**

Once projects have been notified of the preliminary results of the CoC Funding Committee’s ranking process on the week of **August 15, 2022** projects who wish to do so will have the opportunity to formally appeal the Committee’s decision before an Appeals Committee which is separate from the CoC Funding Committee conducting the original project ranking. Formal appeals may be made for the following reasons:

* + A project’s application was not ranked
  + A project’s application did not receive the full funding amount for which it applied

The following are **not** considered to be eligible grounds for submission of a formal appeal:

* + Determination that a project has not met threshold requirements
  + Ranking of a project in Tier 2 rather than Tier 1

All appeals eligible under the criteria listed above will be read, reviewed and evaluated by the Appeals Committee. All notices of appeal must be based on the information submitted as part of a project’s draft application by the application due date - no new or additional information will be considered as part of an appeal. Omissions to the application are not eligible grounds for appeal.

1. *Procedure for Appeal*

Appeals must be received in writing within five business days (as practicable) of a project being notified of their ranking – the due date will be shared in writing along with the notification of preliminary ranking. Appeals should be directed to the CoC Coordinator, and must adhere to the following requirements:

* + Appeals should be scanned and submitted as an attachment via e-mail
  + The Notice of Appeal must include a written statement specifying, in detail, the grounds asserted for the appeal, and must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the sponsor agency (e.g. Executive Director)
  + The notice of Appeal must be single-spaced, in 12-point font, and may be no longer than one page

The appeal must include a copy of the project’s application and all accompanying materials as submitted to the CoC Funding Committee for original review and ranking; no additional information may be added to the original application

1. *Constitution of the Appeals Committee*

A single Appeals Committee shall hear and consider all eligible appeals submitted to the CoC. The Appeals Committee will be comprised of four members, subject to the following constraints:

* + Two Appeals Committee members must be voting members drawn from the CoC Governing Board
  + Two Appeals Committee members must be members of the Funding Committee who participated in the original project ranking process
  + No member of the Appeal Committee may have a conflict of interest with any of the agencies applying for McKinney-Vento funding, and must sign a conflict-of-interest statement to this effect

1. *Activity of the Appeals Committee*

The Appeals Committee will convene to consider each eligible appeal placed before it. Applicants will be invited to make a formal, time-limited statement before the Committee regarding their appeal. Following this statement, the Appeals Committee will review and consider only the following materials associated with the appeal:

* + The original project application submitted to the CoC Funding Committee for review and ranking
  + The project rankings made by the CoC Funding Committee
  + The one-page Notice of Appeal submitted by the applicant
  + The statement(s) of the Applicant made before the Appeals Committee during the appeals process

The Appeals Committee’s review will extend only to consideration of those specific portions of the project application being appealed. The decision of the Appeals Committee will formally be determined by a simple majority vote. All decisions of the Appeal Committee will be final.

Eligible project applicants that attempted to participate in the CoC planning process and believe they were denied the right to participate in a reasonable manner may make a further appeal directly to HUD. The process for such a direct appeal is outlined in Section X of the FY2022 Continuum of Care Program Competition NOFO.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix 1: Minneapolis/Hennepin County CoC**  **Project Evaluation Requirements and Scoring for Renewal Projects**  **Minneapolis/Hennepin CoC (MN-500) Project Rating Criteria 2022** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Rating criteria and score shared with all renewal projects in May 2021 for correctness and comments.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Renewal Project Criteria** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | |  | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Rating Factor** | | | | | **Performance Standards** | | | | | **Data Source** | | **Rating Scale** | | | **Max Pts** |
|  | | | | |  | | | | |  | | Does not meet standard | Partially Meets Standard | Meets or exceeds standard |  |
| **Performance Measures - PSH** | | | | |  | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Housing Stability at 6 months** | | | | | 100% households stable for 6 months | | | | | APR Q22a1 | | Stayers <90% | 90% < Stayers < 100% | Stayers=100% | 2 |
| **Retention or Exits to Permanent Destinations** | | | | | 100% retention or exits to PH destinations | | | | | APR Q5a1 and Q23c | | Retention + PH Exits < 94% | 94% < Retention + PH Exits < 100% | Retention + PH Exits = 100% | 2 |
| **Annual Change in Retention or Exits to Permanent Destinations** | | | | | Change from 2020-2021 | | | | | APR Q23a + Q23b and 2020 score card | | Annual Change in Retention or Exits to PH Destinations  <0% | Annual Change in Retention or Exits to PH Destinations between 0% and 2% | Annual Change in Retention or Exits to PH Destinations >2% | 2 |
| **Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Annual Assessment** | | | | | 24% of participants who maintained/increased employment income at annual assessment (program stayers) | | | | | APR Q19a1, row 1 (at annual assessment) | | Qualifying adult participant <4% | 4% < Qualifying adult participant < 24% | Qualifying adult participant > 24% | 2 |
| **Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Exit** | | | | | 19% of participants who maintained/increased employment income at exit (program leavers) | | | | | APR Q19a2, row 1 (at exit) | | Qualifying adult participant  <0% | 0% < Qualifying adult participant < 19% | Qualifying adult participant > 19% | 2 |
| **Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Annual Assessment** | | | | | Change from 2020-2021 | | | | | APR Q19a1 and 2020 scorecard | | Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Employment Income <-43% | Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Employment Income between -43% and 9% | Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Employment Income ≥ 9% | 2 |
| **Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Exit** | | | | | Change from 2020-2021 | | | | | APR Q19a2, and 2020 score card | | Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Employment Income <-48% | Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Employment Income between -48% and 22% | Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Employment Income ≥ 22% | 2 |
| **Maintain or Increase Total Income at Annual Assessment** | | | | | 88% of participants who maintained/increased total income at annual assessment (program stayers) | | | | | APR Q19a1, row 5 (annual assessment) | | Qualifying adult participants < 59% | 59% < Qualifying adult participants < 88% | Qualifying adult participant ≥ 88% | 3 |
| **Maintain or Increase Total Income at Exit** | | | | | 100% of participants who maintained/increased total income at exit (program leavers) | | | | | APR Q19a2, row 5 (exit) | | Qualifying adult participants < 52% | 52% < Qualifying adult participants < 100% | Qualifying adult participant ≥ 100% | 3 |
| **Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Total Income at Annual Assessment** | | | | | Change from 2020-2021 | | | | | APR Q19a1 and 2020 scorecard | | Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Total Income <-17% | Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Total Income between -17% and 1% | Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Total Income >1% | 3 |
| **Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Total Income at Exit** | | | | | Change from 2020-2021 | | | | | APR Q19a2 and 2020 scorecard | | Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Total Income <-29% | Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Total Income between -29% and 0% | Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Total Income >0% | 3 |
|  | | | | |  | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Performance Measures - RRH/TH** | | | | |  | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Exits to Permanent Destinations** | | | | | 83% of participants exits to Permanent Destinations | | | | | APR Q23a | | PH Exits < 67% | 67% < PH Exits < 83% | PH Exits > 83% | 2 |
| **Annual Change in Exits to Permanent Destinations** | | | | | Change from 2020-2021 | | | | | APR Q23a and 2020 scorecard | | Annual Change in exits to Permanent Destinations  < -3% | Annual Change in exits to Permanent Destinations between  -3% and 23.2% | Annual Change in exits to Permanent Destinations >23.2% | 2 |
| **Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Annual Assessment** | | | | | 29% of participants who maintained/increased employment income at annual assessment (program stayers) | | | | | APR Q19a1, row 1 (annual assessment) | | Qualifying adult participant  < 8% | 8% < Qualifying adult participant < 29% | Qualifying adult participant > 29% | 2 |
| **Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Exit** | | | | | 50% of participants who maintained/increased employment income at exit (program leavers) | | | | | APR Q19a2, row 1 (exit) | | Qualifying adult participant  < 27% | 27% < Qualifying adult participant < 50% | Qualifying adult participant > 50% | 2 |
| **Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Annual Assessment** | | | | | Change from 2020-2021 | | | | | APR Q19a1 and 2020 scorecard | | Annual Change in participants Maintain or Increase Employment Income < -30.5% | Annual Change in participants Maintain or Increase Employment Income between -30.5% and 68.5% | Annual Change in participants Maintain or Increase Employment Income >68.5% | 2 |
| **Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Exit** | | | | | Change from 2020-2021 | | | | | APR Q19a2 and 2020 scorecard | | Annual Change in participants Maintain or Increase Employment Income < -9.8% | Annual Change in participants Maintain or Increase Employment Income between -9.8% and 35.3% | Annual Change in participants Maintain or Increase Employment Income >35.3% | 2 |
| **Maintain or Increase Total Income at Annual Assessment** | | | | | 76% of participants who maintained/increased total income at annual assessment (program stayers) | | | | | APR Q19a2, row 5 (annual assessment) | | Qualifying adult participant < 39% | 39% < Qualifying adult participant <76% | Qualifying adult participant > 76% | 3 |
| **Maintain or Increase Total Income at Exit** | | | | | 90% of participants who maintained/increased total income at exit (program leavers) | | | | | APR Q19a1, row 5 (exit) | | Qualifying adult participant < 62.5% | 62.5% < Qualifying adult participant < 90% | Qualifying adult participant > 90% | 3 |
| **Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Total Income at Annual Assessment** | | | | | Change from 2020-2021 | | | | | APR Q19a2 and 2020 scorecard | | Annual Change in participants Maintain or Increase Total Income < -34% | Annual Change in participants Maintain or Increase Total Income between -34% and 35% | Annual Change in participants Maintain or Increase Total Income > 35% | 3 |
| **Annual Change in Maintain or Increase Total Income at Exit** | | | | | Change from 2020-2021 | | | | | APR Q19a1 and 2020 scorecard | | Annual Change in participants Maintain or Increase Total Income < -8.5% | Annual Change in participants Maintain or Increase Total Income between -8.5% and 22.8% | Annual Change in participants Maintain or Increase Total Income > 22.8% | 3 |
|  | | | | |  | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **COORDINATED ENTRY - SSO GRANTS** | | | | |  | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Number served in program year compared to project application proposed** | | | | | Number of persons served in project year/proposed in project application | | | | | APR Q5a and Project Application | | Project served 80% of participants projected in Project Application | Project served 80-100% of participants projected in Project Application | Project served 100% or more of participants projected in Project Application | 2 |
| **Domestic Violence Programs** | | | | |  | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Rapid connection to housing: time to housing move-in** | | | | | Days between program enrollment and date housed | | | | | DV alternative database | | Days to housing move-in >70 days |  | Days to housing move-in < 70 days | 2 |
| **Housing stability: % of participants who exit to permanent destinations** | | | | | % of participants who exit the program that exit to a permanent destination | | | | | DV alternative database | | Exit to perm housing < 68% |  | Exit to perm housing > 68% | 2 |
| **Other Local Criteria** | | | | |  | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Project management & Bed Utilization** | | | | | 100% project beds are utilized in APR year | | | | | APR Q8b and Units from Program application | | 77% < bed utilization | 77% < Bed Utilization < 99% | Bed Utilization < 99% | 2 |
| **HMIS Data Quality (alternate DB for DV)** | | | | | 100% Data completion | | | | | APR Q6c | | Data quality < 90.6% | 90.6% < Data completion < 100% | Data completion = 100% | 2 |
| **Voluntary Reallocation** | | | | |  | | | | | Letter of Intent | | <1% of award | 1-3% of award | >3% of award | 2 |
| **Funding Management- eLOCCS draws** | | | | | Drawdowns occur monthly | | | | | eLOCCS screenshot of drawdowns from most recent completed grant year | | Drawdowns occur less than quarterly | Drawdowns occur at least quarterly but less than monthly | Drawdowns occur monthly | 2 |
| **Funding Management- unspent funds** | | | | | 100% of grant spent | | | | | eLOCCS screenshot of drawdowns from most recent completed grant year | | % of grant spent < 85% | 85% of grant spent < 100% | 100% of grant spent | 2 |
| **Housing First Implementation** | | | | | Is project Housing First | | | | | Project Application Q3B.3.d - Letter of Intent | | <6 of 9 options and NO | 7 or more of 9 options and NO | 9 of 9 options and YES | 3 |
| **Low Barrier Program Eligibility** | | | | | Is project Low Barrier to entry | | | | | Project Application Q3B.4.b | | 0-1 options (of 4) | 2-3 options (of 4) | 4 options (of 4) | 3 |
| **Policy/System Alignment - CoC Participation** | | | | | Participation in CoC Governing board or working committees | | | | | Letter of Intent | | |  |  | N/S |
| **Coordinated Entry Compliance** | | | | | Participation in Coordinated Entry - report all vacancies/referrals | | | | | Letter of Intent | | |  |  | N/S |
| **Equal Access Rule compliance** | | | | | Compliant with the Equal Access Rule | | | | | Letter of Intent | | |  |  | N/S |
| **POPULATION-SPECIFIC CRITERIA** | | | | |  | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| ***for projects serving households with children or youth*** | | | | | | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Early Childhood development** | | | | | Early Childhood check list | | | | | Letter of Intent | | No plan | Partial plan | Full plan | N/S |
| **K-12 Education** | | | | | K-12 check list | | | | | Letter of Intent | | No plan | Partial plan | Full plan | N/S |
|  | | | | |  | | | | |  | |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  | |  | | |  |
|  |  | |  | | |  | | |  | |
|  |  | |  | | |  | | |  | |

**Appendix 2: Minneapolis/Hennepin County CoC**

**Project Evaluation Requirements and Scoring for New Projects**

**New Project Qualifying Requirements**

All projects must meet the following Qualifying Criteria to be considered for funding:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | Ineligible |  | Eligible |
| Eligible Applicant | * Entity is NOT a nonprofit organization, state, local government, public housing agency, or instrumentality of a state or local government (as defined in 24CFR5.100), without limitation or exclusion |  | * Entity is a nonprofit organization, state, local government, public housing agency, or instrumentality of a state or local government (as defined in 24CFR5.100), without limitation or exclusion |
| Eligible Population | * Does NOT meet HUD requirements and/or * Does NOT meet current CoC requirements |  | * Meets HUD requirements * Meets current CoC requirements |
| Eligible Service Model | * Does NOT meet HUD requirements and/or * Does NOT meet current CoC requirements |  | * Meets HUD requirements * Meets current CoC requirements |
| Submission Deadline | * Project application submitted to CoC Coordinator AFTER deadline |  | * Project application submitted to CoC Coordinator on or before deadline |
| HMIS and Coordinated Entry  (Coordinated entry is a comprehensive initial assessment of individual/family housing and service needs, and coordinates intake into appropriate housing and services) | * Project does NOT have the capacity or an acceptable plan in place to participate fully in HMIS and the CoC’s Coordinated Entry System |  | * Project has both the capacity and an acceptable plan in place to participate fully in HMIS and the CoC’s Coordinated Entry System |
| Organizational Capacity | * Organization does NOT have a mission/purpose statement and bylaws to govern operations * Organization does NOT have an active governing board (e.g. Board of Directors) that includes at least one member who is homeless or formerly homeless, and does NOT have a formal plan to immediately recruit such a member * Organization does NOT have clear policies and procedures to address potential conflicts of interest for board members * Organization does not have adequate levels of, and expertise in, staffing |  | * Organization has a mission/purpose statement and bylaws to govern operations * Organization has an active governing board (e.g. Board of Directors) that includes at least one member who is homeless or formerly homeless, or has a formal plan to immediately recruit such a member * Organization has clear policies and procedures to address potential conflicts of interest for board members * Organization has adequate levels of, and expertise in, staffing |
| Project Financial Viability | * Financial information is incomplete and/or * Financial information suggests project is unlikely to be viable |  | * Financial information is complete * Financial information suggests project is likely to be viable |
| Financial Audit | * Most recent annual audited financial and year-to-date financial and management letter is not provided and/or * Audit/management letter contains significant adverse disclosures (as determined by reviewers) |  | * Most recent annual audited financial and year-to-date financial and management letter is provided * Audit/management letter contains no significant adverse disclosures (as determined by reviewers) |
|  |  |  |  |

**Appendix 3: Minneapolis/Hennepin County CoC**

**Project Evaluation Requirements and Scoring for New Projects**

**New Project Evaluation and Scoring**

Projects meeting the qualifying criteria listed above will be further evaluated by the Minneapolis/Hennepin County Continuum of Care Funding Committee to identify those that most closely align with the needs, goals, and funding priorities of both the CoC and HUD.

The Committee will award proposals up to 18 total points in the six Proposal Characteristic areas indicated below, with those applications best presenting a feasible plan to address the items listed in the ‘Key Evaluation Criteria’ column receiving higher scores within a given category. To receive the greatest number of points possible, projects are encouraged to provide a clear and detailed description in their application of the manner in which their proposal meets the criteria indicated.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Proposal Characteristic | Key Evaluation Criteria | Points (Max) |
| Innovation and Effectiveness | * Project employs research-based and/or evidenced-based practices * Applicant has demonstrated experience in using research and/or evidence to inform decision-making and service provision | 4 |
| Performance Measures | * Project has articulated plans for successfully achieving performance measures | 4 |
| Leverage | * Extent of outside funding which can be leveraged by grant (HUD requires a minimum match equal to 25% of the total grant request) * Percent of leveraged funding currently in place | 4 |
| Applicant Experience for Proposed Activities | * Applicant or partners have past experience providing housing services * Applicant or partners have past experience providing housing services *to the population targeted by the proposed project* * For the housing services noted above, applicant demonstrates objective outcomes of past success | 2 |
| Employment Services Plan | * Project articulates a plan or partnership to increase employment outcomes for program participants * Project articulates a plan for increasing program participants’ income | 2 |
| Commitment to Advancing Racial Equity | * Project describes strategies they use to meet the unique cultural and racial needs of the people they serve, including culturally specific services provided and partnership with culturally specific organizations * Project’s organizational policies and training offerings reflect an agenda for promoting anti-racism practices | 2 |
|  | Total Points Possible | 18 |

**Appendix 4: Minneapolis/Hennepin County CoC**

**Renewal Project Racial Equity Questions**

**Racial Equity Questions**

Minneapolis/Hennepin Continuum of Care (MN-500)

Instructions:

All Renewal Projects are required to answer questions about the strategies, policies, and practices they are using to address racial inequities and advance equity in their programs and the larger system.

**Racial Equity Questions**

**Access for clients**

* Describe cultural, racial, or other differences in the people who make up the target population which you expect will require more than one approach to service delivery.

Click or tap here to enter text.

* In what ways do you change your service delivery in response to those differing cultural, racial, or other characteristics within the target population?

Click or tap here to enter text.

* What culturally specific services do you provide and/or what partnerships with culturally specific organizations do you have to meet the needs of BIPOC households?

Click or tap here to enter text.

* How will you respond to individuals for whom English is not their native language? (What resources do you have available for non-English speakers? Do you offer interpreter services? Do you provide guidelines/program rules in other languages aside from English?)

Click or tap here to enter text.

**Policies & Trainings**

* For what reasons do you screen people out based on your tenant selection criteria?

Click or tap here to enter text.

* For what reasons would you discharge or exit a person from your program to a negative destination?

Click or tap here to enter text.

* Describe how you incorporate BIPOC households and people with histories of homelessness and housing instability in decision making.

Click or tap here to enter text.

* What is your agency doing to promote anti-racism practices/policies?

Click or tap here to enter text.

* Do you hold trainings for Racial Equity or Anti-Discrimination? Have you held any within the last 12 months? What is the date and percentage of staff that attended these trainings?

Click or tap here to enter text.

**Staff, Leadership & Hiring practices**

* Describe any practices your agency uses to hire and retain diverse staff.

Click or tap here to enter text.

* Have people at your organization attended any trainings specifically on implicit bias around hiring?

Click or tap here to enter text.

* In what ways do you include people served in hiring practices/decisions?

Click or tap here to enter text.

**Strategies to reduce racial inequities**

* How does your work address systemic disparities?

Click or tap here to enter text.

* What strategies to reduce racial inequities are you currently working on?

Click or tap here to enter text.

* What strategies will you continue to work on to advance racial equity in the coming year?

Click or tap here to enter text.