FY2024 CoC Program Competition Renewal Project Scoring Tool

This is the most recent Renewal Project Scoring Tool marked up with proposed revisions for the 2025 CoC NOFO Competition. Please read the margin comments for proposed revisions that will be discussed further at the 8/19/25 Funding Committee Work Group meeting. Revisions were proposed with two goals in mind: alignment with federal policy and streamlining the process.

OVERVIEW

Factor	Points
1. Project's Work is Consistent with HUD and Local Priorities	14
2. Project Performance Outcomes	36
3. Agency Capacity	30
4. Efficient Use of Funds	20
5. *Reallocation Bonus*	*+5*
Total	**100**

Note: The following projects will be reviewed for threshold in response to supplemental questions and placed at the bottom of Tier 1 at the discretion of the panelists:

- HMIS renewal projects,
- Coordinated Entry renewal projects, and
- Renewal projects operational less than one year.

THRESHOLD CRITERIA

Factor	Points
1. Coordinated Entry Project participates in coordinated entry to the extent possible for this project type.	N/A
2. HMIS Project will enter data for all CoC-funded beds into HMIS. A project serving survivors of domestic violence is required to use a comparable database to HMIS.	N/A
3. Successful Drawdown Project, if operational, has made at least one successful drawdown of federal funds as of the time of this application.	N/A
4. Program Policies & Procedures Project has submitted policies and procedures that are consistent with minimum HUD requirements.	N/A
5. Participant Eligibility The project will only accept participants that can be documented as eligible for this project's program type based on their housing and disability status.	N/A
6. Equal Access/Fair Housing The project provides equal access and fair housing, and will not discriminate against a program participant or prospective program participant on the basis of race, color, citizenship, national origin, ancestry, religion, sex, age, familial status, disability, actual or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, marital status, source of income, genetic information, status as a survivor of domestic violence, or other reasons prohibited by law.	N/A
7. Housing First The project is committed to the principles of Housing First, and this is reflected in the project's written policies and procedures.	N/A
8. Lived Experience Satisfaction Surveys The project regularly administers satisfaction surveys to the people with lived experience of homelessness it serves.	N/A
9. Involving People with Lived Experience in Program Development The project regularly involves people with lived experience of homelessness in program development and operations.	N/A

Commented [RM2]: Recommend to remove this threshold question to help streamline. P&Ps are reviewed in CoC monitoring process

Commented [RM3]: Recommend to remove this threshold question in alignment with federal policy

Commented [RM4]: Recommend to remove this threshold question alignment with federal policy

Commented [AM5R4]: Additionally, Housing First is reviewed in the CoC monitoring process.

Commented [RM6]: Not recommending to remove, but flagging for additional review once NOFO comes out

Adopted by Council on Homelessness – 6/6/2024

10. Public Commitment to Address Racial Inequities The agency has a public written commitment to address/eliminate racial and ethnic inequities included in the organization's mission, vision, goals, etc.	N/A

Commented [RM7]: Recommend to remove this threshold question in alignment with federal policy

SCORING CRITERIA

All the scoring factors in this tool measure projects' contribution to improving Contra Costa CoC's System Performance by strengthening the overall system of care through data collection, coordination, prioritization, and increasing resources available to end homelessness in Contra Costa. Certain scoring factors relate to specific Performance Measures, as enumerated in each factor.

Discretion for Review and Rank Panelist - Outcomes for some factors may be naturally lower when serving a harder to serve population with severe needs and vulnerabilities such as persons experiencing chronic homelessness, mental illness, substance use disorders and/or domestic violence survivors. For certain factors, Review and Rank panelists may deviate (up or down) from a scaled score up to 25% of the max points based on the severity of barriers experienced by program participants and/or circumstances outside of an agency's control, as indicated by narrative provided by the agency. When exercising discretion, panelists must 1) follow the panelist discretion guidelines described in each factor, 2) not exceed the max point total for the factor, 3) document a reason for exercising discretion, and 4) apply discretion fairly and consistently across all projects.

1. PROJECT'S WORK IS CONSISTENT WITH HUD AND LOCAL PRIORITIES   (14 PTS.)

Factor 1.A. Project Impact & Responsiveness to Local Need *Panelist Discretion: none*	Scale	Points
Impact of the program in addressing local needs. Consider: • Subpopulations served • Demonstrated need for the project type in the community • Leveraged resources (e.g., site-based housing, match) Panelists should consider the impact on the community if the project's funding were reduced or eliminated. Data packet provided during the competition can help inform if a project is meeting local need.	Excellent	14
	Very Good	11
	Good	8
	Fair	5
	Poor	0

Commented [RM8]: Recommend to prepopulate answers from last year with an option to update to reduce applicant burden for this factor. Responses rarely change year to year here.

2. PROJECT PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES   (36 PTS.)

Projects will be scored based on data in the CoC's HMIS, except for projects operated by victim services providers which will be scored based on data from a comparable database.

Factor 2.A.1 Housing Stability for RRH and PSH Projects WITH *21 OR MORE UNITS*[1]	Scale	Points
Panelist Discretion: up to 5 pts (25% of max), or can award 20 pts if no "living-leavers" exited to a permanent destination during period *Number of units determined by e-snaps Project Application*		
RRH: Exits to Permanent Housing % of "living-leavers" who exited to a permanent destination	100%	20
• Project will provide an explanation if there were no "living-leavers" that exited to a permanent destination during this reporting period.	95-99.9%	19
	90-94.9%	18
• When there are no "living-leavers" that exited to a permanent destination during this reporting period, panelists may award 20 points with discretion.	85-89.9%	17
	80-84.9%	16
RRH APR Sources: [(APR 23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + APR 23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal) ÷ APR 5a Leavers]	75-79.9%	15
PSH: Increasing Housing Retention % of participants who remained in the program for at least 6 months or "living-leavers" who exited to another permanent destination	70-74.9%	10
	65-69.9%	5
• Project will provide an explanation if there were no participants in the program for at least 6 months and there were no "living-leavers" who exited to another permanent destination during this reporting period. • When no participants were in the program for at least 6 months and there were no "living-leavers" who exited to another permanent destination during this reporting period, panelists may award 20 points with discretion. *PSH APR Sources: [APR22a1 Stayers 181 to 1825 Days + APR23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + APR23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal] ÷ [APR5a Total Served - APR22a1 Stayers Less than 30 Days to 180 Days - APR23a Deceased - APR23b Deceased]*	<65%	0

Commented [RM9]: No recommended changes to Factor 2A

Adopted by Council on Homelessness – 6/6/2024

Factor 2.A.2 Housing Stability for RRH and PSH Projects WITH *20 OR LESS* UNITS[2]	Scale	Points
Panelist Discretion: up to 5 pts (25% of max), or can award 20 pts if no "living-leavers" exited to a permanent destination during period *Number of units determined by e-snaps Project Application*		
RRH: Exits to Permanent Housing % of "living-leavers" who exited to a permanent destination	≥95%	20
• Project will provide an explanation if there were no "living-leavers" that exited to a permanent destination during this reporting period.	90-94.9%	19
	85-89.9%	18
• When there are no "living-leavers" that exited to a permanent destination during this reporting period, panelists may award 20 points with discretion.	80-84.9%	17
	75-79.9%	16
RRH APR Sources: [(APR 23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + APR 23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal) ÷ APR 5a Leavers]	70-74.9%	15
PSH: Increasing Housing Retention % of participants who remained in the program for at least 6 months or "living-leavers" who exited to another permanent destination	60-69.9%	10
	40-59.9%	5
• Project will provide an explanation if there were no participants in the program for at least 6 months and there were no "living-leavers" who exited to another permanent destination during this reporting period. • When no participants were in the program for at least 6 months and there were no "living-leavers" who exited to another permanent destination during this reporting period, panelists may award 20 points with discretion. *PSH APR Sources: [APR22a1 Stayers 181 to 1825 Days + APR23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + APR23b Permanent Destinations*	<40%	0

[1] HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7
[2] HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7

Adopted by Council on Homelessness – 6/6/2024

Subtotal] ÷ [APR5a Total Served - APR22a1 Stayers Less than 30 Days to 180 Days - APR23a Deceased - APR23b Deceased]		

Factor 2.B. Maintaining/Increasing Cash Income[3]	Scale	Points
Panelist Discretion: up to 1.5 pts (25% of max), or can award 6 pts if no clients were in the program long enough for an annual assessment and no clients exited the program during period		
% of adults who maintained or increased any non-zero cash income (employment and/or mainstream benefits) based on last completed annual assessment for stayers and based on exit for leavers	≥90%	6
	80-89.9%	5
• Project will provide an explanation for any leavers that exit in less than 6 months. Panelists may use their discretion to award points based on a calculation that excludes leavers that exited in less than 6 months.	70-79.9%	4
	60-69.9%	2
• When no clients were in the program long enough to be eligible for an annual assessment and no clients exited the program during the reporting period, panelists will award 6 points. *APR Sources: [Q19a3 Adults with increased income + Q19a3 Adults who gained income + Q19a3 Adults with the same non-zero income] ÷ [APR 5a Adults - APR 18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]*	<60%	0

Commented [RM11]: No recommended changes to Factor 2B

---

[3] HUD System Performance Measure 4

Adopted by Council on Homelessness – 6/6/2024

Factor 2.C. Connecting to Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits[4]	Scale	Points
Panelist Discretion: up to 1 pt (25% of max), or can award 4 pts if no clients were in the program long enough for an annual assessment and no clients exited the program during period		
% of adults who access at least one non-cash mainstream benefit based on last completed annual assessment for stayers and based on exit for leavers • Project will provide an explanation for any leavers that exit in less than 6 months. Panelists may use their discretion to award points based on a calculation that excludes leavers that exited in less than 6 months. • When no clients were in the program long enough to be eligible for an annual assessment and no clients exited the program during the reporting period, panelists will award 4 points. *APR Sources: [APR 20b 1Plus Sources Leavers + APR 20b 1Plus Sources Stayers] ÷ [APR 5a Adults - APR 18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]*	≥80% 65-79.9% 50-64.9% <50%	4 3 2 0

Commented [RM12]: No recommended changes to Factor 2C

---

[4] HUD System Performance Measures 2, 7

Adopted by Council on Homelessness – 6/6/2024

Factor 2.D. Connecting to Health Insurance[5]	Scale	Points
Panelist Discretion: up to 1.5 pts (25% of max), or can award 6 pts if no clients were in the program long enough for an annual assessment and no clients exited the program during period		
% of adults who access at health insurance benefits based on last completed annual assessment for stayers and based on exit for leavers	100%	6
	95-99.9%	5
• Project will provide an explanation for any leavers that exit in less than 6 months. Panelists may use their discretion to award points based on a calculation that excludes leavers that exited in less than 6 months.	85-94.9%	4
	60-84.9%	2
• When no clients were in the program long enough to be eligible for an annual assessment and no clients exited the program during the reporting period, panelists will award 6 points.	<60%	0
APR Sources: [APR 21 Stayers 1 Source of Health Insurance + APR 21 Stayers More than 1 Source of Health Insurance + APR 21 Leavers 1 Source of Health Insurance + APR 21 Leavers More than 1 Source of Health Insurance] ÷ [APR 5a Adults - APR 18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]		

Commented [RM13]: No recommended changes to Factor 2D

3. AGENCY CAPACITY   (30 PTS.)

Factor 3.A. HMIS Data Quality	Scale	Points
Panelist Discretion: up to 1.5 points (25% of max)		
% of values that are missing/unknown for required HUD Universal Data Elements (UDEs)	1% or fewer	8
	1.1-2%	4
Consider: HMIS Data Quality Report	2.1% or more	0

Factor 3.B. CoC Mandatory Training Participation	Scale	Points
Panelist Discretion: up to 2 points (25% of max)		
	Attended all trainings	6

Commented [RM14]: Recommend to add this provision: "Projects that serve Domestic Violence (DV) survivors that are prohibited from entering client-level data into HMIS will receive full points for this factor if they use a comparable database."

Commented [RM15R14]: DV projects have been unfairly penalized for missing data in the past

Commented [RM16]: No recommended changes to Factor 3B

---

[5] HUD System Performance Measures 2, 7

Adopted by Council on Homelessness – 6/6/2024

At least 1 agency staff attended each of the mandatory monthly CoC trainings from July through June (fiscal year), exact dates will be provided during the competition.	Missed 1	3
	Missed 2+	0

Factor 3.C. Lived Experience Engagement	Points
Panelist Discretion: none	
- Does the agency describe <u>one example of feedback</u> received from participants in the past two years and the way the agency responded to that feedback, including its process for ensuring feedback is implemented and any concrete changes it made to program design, policy, or operations? (2 pts) - Does the agency have a <u>board with at least one person</u> with current or past experience of homelessness OR some other regular mechanism for people with lived experience of homelessness to meaningfully impact the agency's strategic direction? (2 pts) - Does the agency provide a <u>percentage of its total staff</u> who have current or past lived experience of homelessness? (2 pts) - Does the agency describe <u>how it intends to maintain or improve</u> upon the percentage provided of staff with current or past experience of homelessness? (2 pts)	8

Commented [RM17]: Not recommending to remove, but flagging for additional review once NOFO comes out

Factor 3.D. Racial Equity _Panelist Discretion: none_	Points
Does the agency implement one or more of the strategies below to advance racial equity? 1 point will be awarded for each strategy. (5 pts) 1. Internal structures exist to address issues of racial equity and barriers participants face that are related to their race, ethnicity, or cultural background (i.e., community advisory body, equity committee). 2. Strategies exist to recruit, retain, and develop staff who represent communities of color and/or speak languages frequently encountered by the organization, including Spanish, Tagalog, Chinese, and other languages as necessary. The agency should also highlight how it intends to maintain or improve upon the percentage provided of BIPOC staff overall and BIPOC staff at management/leadership levels (see below). 3. Staff receive regular training and support regarding racial equity, including structured conversations within the agency and training provided by the CoC around racial equity, understanding the barriers participants may face that are related to their race, ethnicity, or cultural background, and staff's role and tools for addressing them. Racial equity and cultural responsiveness knowledge, skills and practices are also part of both staff job descriptions and workplans. 4. Staff regularly review project data on populations being served, outcomes, and performance metrics by race and ethnicity. 5. Written materials and translation/interpretive services are provided in Spanish, Tagalog, and Chinese, as well as other languages as necessary. Does the agency provide a percentage of its total staff who are Black, Indigenous, and/or People of Color (BIPOC)? (1.5 pts) Does the agency provide a percentage of its management/leadership level staff who are BIPOC? (1.5 pts)	8

Commented [RM18]: Recommend to remove this scoring factor in alignment with federal policy.

4. EFFICIENT USE OF FUNDS   (20 PTS.)

Factor 4.A. Utilization Rate[6]	**Scale**	**Points**
Panelist Discretion: up to 2.5 points (25% of max)		
Is the project at capacity in meeting the number of homeless people it is designed to serve?	≥100%	10
	95-99.9%	8
• Consider: Annual Performance Report and other relevant utilization data on units for stayers and living-leavers who exit to a permanent housing destination.	90-94.9%	6
	85-89.9%	4
	80-84.8%	2
	<80%	0

Commented [RM19]: No recommended changes to 4A

Factor 4.B. Unspent Grant Funds	**Scale**	**Points**
Panelist Discretion: up to 2.5 points (25% of max)		
Has the agency left project grant funds unspent in the past 2 years?	<5%	10
• Consider if the program is running at capacity in the past 2 years and if the project receives leasing or rental assistance funding.	5.1 – 10%	8
	10.1 – 20%	6
	20.1 – 30%	4
	>30.1%	0

Commented [RM20]: No recommended changes to 4B

5. REALLOCATION BONUS   (5 PTS.)

Factor 5.A. Reallocation	**Points**
Did the Agency voluntarily reallocate a renewal project? Consider:	5
• How much funding was reallocated?	
• What was the project type?	
• Panelists will award up to 5 points if the agency has voluntarily reallocated funds to a renewal project during this NOFO cycle.	

Commented [RM21]: Recommendation from last year: only give bonus points to the project, not the entire agency, reallocating. Change question to ask "Did the project voluntarily reallocate some or all of its funding?"

---

[6] HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3

Adopted by Council on Homelessness – 6/6/2024