

# Northwest Minnesota Continuum of Care (NWCoC) 2023 Project Applicant Scorecard

Prepared by Planning & Evaluation Committee



Annually, CoC program applicants will be scored and ranked per CoC policy and HUD guidance. The purpose is to ensure that HUD funded programs are providing the highest quality housing and services and that the programs are focused on achieving outcomes to end homelessness.

## HUD COC Threshold Eligibility Criteria

Criteria	ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	INFORMATION SOURCE	Eligible?
GENERAL APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY				
<b>Eligible Entity</b>	Nonprofit organizations, states, local governments, instrumentalities of state and local governments, Indian Tribes and TDHE	Any entity that does not meet criteria identified in earlier column.	Project Application	
<b>SAM Registration</b>	Applicants is registered with <a href="https://www.sam.gov/SAM">https://www.sam.gov/SAM</a> before submitting their application	Applicants is not registered with <a href="https://www.sam.gov/SAM">https://www.sam.gov/SAM</a> before submitting their application	SAMS Esnaps submission	
<b>Outstanding Delinquent Federal Debts</b>	Applicant does not have outstanding delinquent federal debt	Applicant has outstanding delinquent federal debt	Applicant disclosure	
<b>Debarments and/or Suspensions</b>	Applicant is not debarred; suspended; proposed for debarment; or voluntarily excluded from doing business with the Federal government.	Applicant is debarred; suspended; proposed for debarment; or voluntarily excluded from doing business with the Federal government.	Applicant disclosure	
<b>Match</b>	25% match for everything but leasing	No required match	Project Application Budget	
<b>HMIS Participation</b>	Project participates (or plans to participate) in HMIS (or other comparable database for DV providers)	Project does not participate or plan to participate in HMIS (or other comparable database for DV providers)	Project Application ICA/CoC verification	

Criteria	ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	INFORMATION SOURCE	Eligible?
GENERAL ELIGIBILITY				
<b>Eligible Population</b>	Meets HUD requirements	Does NOT meet HUD requirements	Project Application	
<b>Geographic Location</b>	Applicant project is in NW CoC geographic area.	Applicant project is not in NW CoC geographic area.	Project Application	
<b>Project Type</b>	Meets HUD Requirements	Does NOT meet HUD requirements	Project Application	
<b>Coordinated Entry Participation</b>	Applicant participates in the Coordinated Entry System, including attending training, completing CES assessments and receiving referrals through Coordinated Entry as outlined in the NW CoC Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures (IF NEW APPLICANT, applicant agrees to these expectations)	Applicant does not participate in the NW CoC Coordinated Entry System (IF NEW APPLICANT, applicant DOES NOT agree to these expectations)	CE Staff Verification	

Eligibility	ELIGIBLE	NOT ELIGIBLE	INFORMATION SOURCE	Eligible?
<b>Fair Housing/Equal Access</b>	Applicant assures that CoC program staff will complete Fair Housing training annually.	Applicant does not assure that CoC program staff will complete Fair Housing training annually.	Project Application	
<b>Housing First</b>	Applicant agrees to follow CoC Housing First policies	Applicant does not agree to follow CoC Housing First policies	Project Application	
<b>CoC Policies</b>	Applicant agrees to follow NW CoC Guidelines and Written Standards	Applicant does not agree to follow NW CoC Guidelines and Written Standards	Project Application	
<b>Financial/Administrative Management</b>	Applicant has no outstanding HUD monitoring findings.	Applicant has no outstanding HUD monitoring findings that are not in the process of being resolved.	Project Application Esnaps Application	

## Applicant Performance (Renewal Projects Only)

ELIGIBLE POINTS	SCORING SECTIONS	LOW CRITERIA	MEDIUM CRITERIA	HIGH CRITERIA	INFORMATION SOURCE	REVIEWER SCORE
<b>2</b>	<b>Geographic priority areas.</b>	Project is not in a NW CoC priority area.  (0 points)		Project is in a NW CoC priority area.  (2 points)	Project Application  NW CoC geographic priorities	
<b>8</b>	<b>Budget Expenditure</b>	Spent 89% or less of grant award (0 points)	Spent 90-94% of grant award (4 points)	Spent 95% or more of grant award. (8 points)	ELOCCS Reports	
<b>4</b>	<b>Quarterly Drawdowns</b>	Drawdowns not made quarterly (0 points)		Drawdowns made quarterly (4 points)	ELOCCS Reports	

<b>8</b>	<b>Data Quality</b>	Most recent total QDQ score below 80%. (0 points)	Most recent total QDQ score between 81 -90% (4 points)	Most recent total QDQ score above 90%. (8 points)	HMIS QDQ Reports	
<b>8</b>	<b>Bed Utilization (Renewal Housing Projects Only)</b>	Average of less than 85% of project beds. (0 points)	Average of 85-90% of project beds. (4 points)	Average of more than 90% of project beds (8 points)	Project APR	

## HUD Needs & Priorities (All Applicants)

ELIGIBLE POINTS	SCORING SECTIONS	LOW CRITERIA	MEDIUM CRITERIA	HIGH CRITERIA	INFO SOURCE	REVIEWER SCORE
<b>4</b>	<b>Removing Barriers to Housing/Housing First</b>	Applicant scores less than 7 points on Housing First Assessment (0 points)	Applicant scores between 7 and 10 points on Housing First Assessment (2 points)	Applicant scores 11 or more points on Housing First Assessment (4 points)	Housing First Assessment	
<b>2</b>	<b>Protocols for Serving LGBTQ+</b>	Applicant does not follow protocols for serving LGBTQ+ populations, as outlined in NW CoC Anti-Discrimination Policy. (0 points)		Applicant follows protocols for serving LGBTQ+ populations, as outlined in NW CoC Anti-Discrimination Policy. (2 points)	Project Application	
<b>2</b>	<b>Healthcare Partnerships</b>	Applicant does not partner with healthcare agencies. (0 points)	Applicant has healthcare partnership. (1 point)	Applicant has a formal agreement with a healthcare partner. (2 points)	Project Application	

ELIGIBLE POINTS	SCORING SECTIONS	LOW CRITERIA	MEDIUM CRITERIA	HIGH CRITERIA	INFO SOURCE	REVIEWER SCORE
2	<b>Public Housing Authorities (PHA)/Housing &amp; Redevelopment Authority (HRA) Partnerships</b>	Agency does not coordinate with PHA.  (0 points)	Agency coordinates with PHA but it is unclear how clients access vouchers.  (1 point)	Agency has a clear and executable plan to ensure clients have access to Housing Choice Vouchers and other subsidized housing options. (2 points)	Project Application	
2	<b>Culturally Specific/ Responsive Programming</b>	Project does not provide culturally specific/responsive programming.  (0 points)	Project has plans to provide culturally specific/responsive programming.  (1 point)	Project provides culturally specific/responsive programming. (2 points)	Project Application	
2	<b>Addressing inequities in access to housing</b>	Agency does not have plan/existing plan is not sufficient to address inequities in access. (0 points)	Agency has plan to address inequities to accessing housing but action steps have not been implemented (1 point)	Agency has action steps identified and is currently working to address inequities to accessing housing. (2 points)	Project Application	
2	<b>Serving Special Populations</b>	No beds/slots are reserved for Unaccompanied youth ages 24 & Under; Families ages 25+ with school-age children; Veterans; Chronic Homeless; DV Survivors; or Singles ages 25+  (0 points)	Less than 25% of beds/slots are reserved for Unaccompanied youth ages 24 & Under; Families ages 25+ with school-age children; Veterans; Chronic Homeless; DV Survivors; or Singles ages 25+ (1 point)	25% or more of beds/slots are reserved for Unaccompanied youth ages 24 & Under; Families ages 25+ with school-age children; Veterans; Chronic Homeless; DV Survivors; or Singles ages 25+  (2 points)	Esnaps Application	

<b>2</b>	<b>Adapting Programs to Meet Emerging Needs/ Innovation</b>	Project does not have evidence of meeting emerging needs.  (0 points)	Project is doing some things to meet emerging needs.  (1 point)	Project is actively innovating to meet emerging needs.  (2 points)	Project Application	
----------	---	---	---	--	---------------------	--

## Service Quality Plan (All Applicants)

ELIGIBLE POINTS	SCORING SECTIONS	LOW CRITERIA	MEDIUM CRITERIA	HIGH CRITERIA	INFO SOURCE	REVIEWER SCORE
<b>2</b>	<b>Case Management Training</b>	No training attended by staff.  (0 points)	Staff participated in training.  (1 point)	Staff participated in training and Agency is implementing strategies from training.  (2 points)	Project Application	
<b>4</b>	<b>Collaboration with mainstream and key support services</b>	Does not collaborate with mainstream and key support services (0 points)	Uses best practices for connecting participants to mainstream resources (2 points)	Goes "above and beyond" with activities to collaborate and to help participants secure other resources. (4 points)	Project Application	
<b>2</b>	<b>Educational Assurances (Family programs only)</b>	Does not comply with NW CoC policy.  (0 points)	Applicant complies with NWCoC policy.  (1 point)	Applicant demonstrates a clear partnership with school district.  (2 points)	Project Application	
<b>2</b>	<b>Separation Policy (Family programs only)</b>	Does not comply with policy.  (0 points)		Agency complies with NWCoC policy.  (2 points)	Project Application	

<b>2</b>	<b>Safety and support for victims is a part of services/plan.</b>	Applicant doesnot have a safety plan.  (0 points)	Applicant has a safety plan.  (1 point)	Applicant has a safety plan and is implementing the plan strategies. (2 points)	Project Application	
<b>4</b>	<b>Plan to increase Income</b>	Applicant doesnot have a plan for increasing income.  (0 points)	Applicant identifies some key strategies to connect clients to income resources.  (2 points)	Applicant identifies creative and outside the box solutions to addressing the challenge of increasing income. (4 points)	Project Application	

## CoC Participation (All Applicants)

ELIGIBLE POINTS	SCORING SECTIONS	LOW CRITERIA	MEDIUM CRITERIA	HIGH CRITERIA	INFO SOURCE	REVIEWER SCORE
<b>2</b>	<b>General Membership Meeting Attendance</b>	Applicant agency attended one meeting or less.  (0 points)	Agency attended two or three meetings. (1 point)	Agency attended all four meetings. (2 points)	General Membership Meeting Minutes	
<b>2</b>	<b>Agency staff participation in CoC Committees</b>	No staff participating on CoC Committee in last-year.  (0 points)	Agency staff participated in at least one committee. (1 point)	Agency staff participated in more than one COC Committee. (2 points)	Committee Meeting Minutes	
<b>4</b>	<b>Participate in Case Conferencing</b>	Does not participate. (0 points)		Participates in Case Conferencing. (4 points)	Case Conferencing Meeting Notes	



## System Performance (Renewal Applicants)

ELIGIBLE POINTS	SCORING SECTIONS	LOW CRITERIA	MEDIUM CRITERIA	HIGH CRITERIA	INFO SOURCE	REVIEWER SCORE
8	Returns to Homelessness	15% or more of participants returned to homelessness within 12 months of exit to PH (0 points)	10-15% of participants returned to homelessness within 12 months of exit to PH (4 points)	Less than 10% of participants returned to homelessness within 12 months of exit to PH.  (8 points)	HMIS Returns to Homelessness Report	
2	Earned Income--Maintain/Increase (Leavers and Stayers)	Less than 10% for PSH, Less than 40% for TH/RRH (0 points)	10-19% for PSH, 40-49% for TH, RRH (1 point)	20% or more for PSH, 50% or more for TH, RRH (2 points)	APR	
2	Non-Employment Income--Maintain/Increase (Leavers and Stayers)	Less than 50% for PSH, Less than 40% for RRH, Less than 5% for TH  (0 points)	50-74% for PSH, 40-49% for RRH, 5-9% for TH  (1 point)	75% or more for PSH, 50% or more for RRH, 10% or more for TH  (2 points)	APR	
4	Increase Overall Income	Less than 20% (0 points)	20-29% (2 points)	30% or more (4 points)	APR	
8	Retention/Successful exits (PSH only)	Under 85% (0 points)	85-90% (4 points)	Over 90% (8 points)	APR	
8	Exits to permanent housing (TH/RRH only)	70% or less of participants exited to permanent destinations.  (0 points)	71-80% of participants exited the program to permanent destinations. (4 points)	More than 80% of participants exited the program to permanent destinations.  (8 points)	APR	

## New Projects

ELIGIBLE POINTS	SCORING SECTIONS	LOW CRITERIA	MEDIUM CRITERIA	HIGH CRITERIA	INFORMATION SOURCE	REVIEWER SCORE
<b>4</b>	<b>CoC Priorities</b>	(1 point)	(2 points)	(4 points)	Application Project Type	

### SCORING

- Renewal Applicant Performance: 30 POINTS = 28%
- HUD Priorities: 18 POINTS = 17%
- CoC Participation: 8 POINTS = 7%
- Service Quality Plan: 16 POINTS = 15%
- System Performance: 32 POINTS = 30%
- New Project Priorities: 4 POINTS = 4%

**Total Points: 108 points**