**Metro Area Continuum of Care for the Homeless**

**Program Evaluation Process & Criteria**

**Overview**

Annually, every CoC funded program will be ranked and tiered per 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.

**Program Performance**

To provide both project-specific outcome information and CoC-wide contributions, each CoC-funded program will be evaluated based on data entered into HMIS, the HUD Annual Performance Report (APR), the Project Application submitted for the CoC proposal, and other HUD-recommended data tools. The APR scoring criteria assess outcomes that directly relate to goals set by the HEARTH Act including reducing the length of homelessness, reducing returns to homelessness and increasing income. The performance measures now comprise HUD’s performance measures against which every Continuum will be assessed.

Submit the renewal scorecard and required attachments (APR, etc.) to MACCH Executive Director Charles Coley via email at [ccoley@unomaha.edu](mailto:ccoley@unomaha.edu) and MACCH Assistant Director Lisa Vukov at [lvukov@unomaha.edu](mailto:lvukov@unomaha.edu) no later than **Friday, August 1st at 5 PM**. The APR period will be October 1st, 2014-September 30th, 2015.

**NOTES**

1. The Site Review Score is incorporated into the Performance Score Card Scores.
2. All criteria are scored based on materials submitted by the submission deadline (e.g., accuracy of charts/budgets will be scored based on first submission; not based on corrections made after review).
3. A penalty will be applied if any required information is incomplete or missing at deadline
4. CoC-funded HMIS programs and CoC Planning Grant use the Site Review evaluation and review process results for scoring.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Name |  | Type of Program | PSH RRH TH |
| Contact Person |  | Date |  |
| E-mail |  | Phone |  |

|  | **Criteria** | **Standard**  **(Source)** | **Max. Points** | **Scoring/Scaling** | **Response** | **Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **0** | **Project eligibility** | Meets Threshold  **See HUD Project Renewal Threshold narrative printed at the end of this score card[[1]](#endnote-1). Mark each criteria pass or fail.** | 0 | Pass/Fail 1a Pass/Fail 2a  Pass/Fail 1b Pass/Fail 2b  Pass/Fail 1c Pass/Fail 2c  Pass/Fail 1d Pass/Fail 2d  Pass/Fail 2e  Pass/Fail 2f  Pass/Fail 2g | See criteria below | N/A |
| **1** | **Project Type** | Type of project application and the population that will be served are weighted for ranking | 5 | 5 points for renewal permanent housing (PSH and RRH)  4 points for renewal TH projects that serve survivors of domestic violence or other specified subpopulations (such as youth exiting foster care). |  |  |
| **2** | **Utilization Rate.** Is the utilization rate at or above 85%? | Yes  **APR (Use average number of persons served each night found on Q8 of the APR and divide by the number of beds)** | 5 | 95-100% = 5  90-94% = 3 points  85-89% = 1 point  Below 85% = 0 points |  |  |
| **3** | **Housing Stability**. Is the recidivism rate (returns to ES or TH projects after exit) of persons who exited to permanent housing below 20%? | Yes  **Use Question 36 of the APR (for Housing Stability Measure 1)** | 5 | 5 points for 0-15% recidivism  3 points for 16-20% recidivism  0 points for over 20% |  |  |
| **4** | **Length of Stay.** For TH, was the overall program length of stay reduced this year? | Yes | 1 | 1 points Yes  0 points No | \_Average length of participation between October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2015 |  |
| **5** | **Destination upon Program Exit.** What percentage of persons served exit to permanent housing destinations or retain permanent housing? | Use (a) for TH & RRH and (b) for PSH  a. **Indicate the number of persons in CoC funded (TH), and rapid re-housing (RRH) project types who exited between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015. Of the persons in the Universe above, how many of those exited to permanent destinations?**  ***Or***  **b. Indicate the number of persons in PSH project between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015. Of the persons in the Universe above, how many of those remained in applicable PH projects and how many of those exited to permanent destinations?** | 6 | **5a**  4 points for 93-100%  2 points for 80-92%  0 points below 80%  **5b**  6 points for 91-100%  3 points for 80-90%  0 points below 80% | **5a**  \_\_\_\_\_ # persons who exited  \_\_\_ # who exited to permanent destinations  \_\_\_% Successful Exits  **or 5b**  \_\_\_ # persons in PSH  \_\_\_ # persons who remained in PSH  \_\_\_ # who exited to permanent destinations  \_\_\_% Successful Exits |  |
| **6** | **Increasing participant income.** For TH & RRH, did at least 35% of adults served (stayers and leavers) increase their overall income? For PSH, because of the **severity of needs** of participants in PSH projects, this measure includes both maintained and increased. | APR Q24bc  **Divide ‘Adults Any Income’ who increased and gained $ total by the ‘Total Adults’ (which includes leavers and stayers) For PSH only, include maintained & increased** | 5 | 5 points Yes. At least 35% increased income  3 points 30-34% increased income  2 points 25-29% increased income  1 point 20-24% increased income  0 points Less than 20% increased overall income | Using Adults Any Income row:  \_\_ # increased $ at follow-up/Exit  (PSH only) \_\_\_\_\_\_ # maintained and/or increased  \_\_  \_# did not have income at entry and gained at follow-up/Exit  \_\_\_ Total Adults (including those with no income)  \_\_\_% increasing overall income |  |
| **7** | **Connecting program participants to mainstream benefits.** Did at least 56% of adults served (current and leavers) increase the number of mainstream benefits being received? | APR  **Use Total column to divide ‘Leavers & Stayers with 1+ Mainstream Benefits by the ‘Total’** | 0 | Requested for monitoring purposes. No points. | \_\_ # Leavers with 1+ Mainstream Benefits  # Stayers with 1+ Mainstream Benefits  # Total  % Connected |  |
| **8** | **Project Capacity.** Does the project exhibit capacity to implement CoC Program requirements? | APRs & Drawdowns  **If “No is answered for either response, please attach a written explanation.** | 0 | Requested for monitoring purposes. No points. | Has the project been timely in submitting APRs? \_\_\_  Has the project been timely in drawdowns from LOCCS? \_\_\_ |  |
| **9** | **Ending Chronic Homelessness.** Were the total number of PSH beds identified as dedicated/prioritized for use by CH persons on the 2016 HIC greater than or equal to those identified on the 2015 HIC? | Yes, for PSH projects  **If “No” is answered, please attach a written explanation.** | 4 | *For PSH projects*  4 points Yes  0 points No | \_ # 2016 CH beds  # 2015 CH beds |  |
| **10** | **Ending Homelessness among Households with Children & Ending Youth Homelessness.** Were more households served using RRH from 2015 to 2016? | Yes, for RRH projects  **Use two prior APRs for comparison of RRH households served** | 1 | *For RRH projects*  1 points Yes  0 points No | \_ \_ # 2016 RRH households served  \_\_\_ # 2015 RRH households served |  |
| **11** | **Ending Veterans Homelessness.** Did you project serve any veterans during the prior APR year? | **List number of veterans served per APR.** | 0 | Not scored. Please list number of veterans served (as reported per the attached APR). | This metric is not scored but will be used for data collection relevant to MACCH’s 10 Year Plan and the Federal Opening Doors goal of ending veteran homelessness. | N/A |
| **12** | **Data Quality.** Is the project reporting high-quality data to HMIS? | Yes  **Use time period of October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2015** | 4 | 2 points Number of unduplicated client records with null or missing values for the Universal Data Elements is below 10%.  2 points Number of unduplicated client records with refused or unknown values for the Universal Data Elements is below 10%. |  |  |
| **13** | **Participant Eligibility / Additional Policies.** Does the PSH, RRH or TH project operate using a “low barrier” model? | Yes  **Does the 2016 project applicant reflect “Low Barrier” Designation? This means the project allows entry to**  **program participants regardless of their income, current or past substance use, criminal**  **records–with the exceptions of restrictions imposed by federal, state or local law or ordinance (e.g., restrictions on serving people who are listed on sex offender registries), and history of domestic violence.**  **If “No”, please attach a written explanation.** | 4 | 4 | Does the project use a low barrier standard? If so, please describe. |  |
| **14** | **Participant Eligibility / Additional Policies.** Does the PSH, RRH or TH project operate using a “Housing First” approach? | Yes  **Per 2016 NOFA, “Housing First” approach means the project uses a low barrier model, has no service participation requirements or preconditions to entry and prioritizes rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing**  **If “No”, please attach a written explanation.** | 4 | 4 | Does the project fully use Housing First? If so, please describe. |  |
| **15** | **Coordinated Entry:**  Does the project fully participate in MACCH’s Coordinated Entry System? **(PSH, RRH, and TH)** | Yes  **Does the project fully participate in the coordinated entry system, including weekly submission of Openings Report and only accepting referrals from the CE system; regular participation in the invite-only Coordinated Entry Work Group; and regular participation in the Homeless Review Team (HRT** | 6 | 2 points:  Project regularly attends Coordinated Entry Work Group (at least 75% participation)  2 points: Project regularly attends Homeless Review Team (HRT) (at least 75% participation)  2 points: Project submits Openings Reports weekly and only accepts referrals through Coordinated Entry (RRH and TH Projects – award 2 points) | Detail Coordinated Entry participation. **(information will be confirmed by MACCH Assistant Director)** |  |
| **16** | **Cost effectiveness (NOT SCORED): What is the cost effectiveness of your project?** | What is the renewal project’s cost per unit? | N/A | Not Scored | Enter final number here. This metric will be used for consideration purposes in 2016 but will likely be scored in 2017. | N/A |
|  | **PERFORMANCE TOTALS (PSH maximum=50; RRH maximum=49; TH maximum=48** | | **43 (PSH and RRH) or 42 (TH)** |  |  |  |
|  | **SITE REVIEW TOTALS** | | **31 total site review points** | Please enter your site review score |  |  |
|  | **TOTAL** | |  |  |  |  |

ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, CORRECTIVE ACTION OR FOLLOW-UP (attach additional pages if necessary and contact MACCH Executive Director).

1. *Project Renewal Threshold.* A CoC must consider the need to continue funding for projects expiring in CY 2017. Renewal projects must meet minimum project eligibility, capacity, timeliness, and performance standards identified in this NOFA or they will be rejected from consideration for funding.

   **(1)** When considering renewal projects for award, HUD will review information in LOCCS; Annual Performance Reports (APRs); and information provided from the local HUD CPD Field Office, including monitoring reports and A-133 audit reports as applicable, and performance standards on prior grants, and will assess projects using the following criteria on a pass/fail basis:

   **(a)** Whether the project applicant’s performance met the plans and goals established in the initial application as amended; Pass

   **(b)** Whether the project applicant demonstrated all timeliness standards for grants being renewed, including that standards for the expenditure of grant funds have been met; Pass

   **(c)** The project applicant’s performance in assisting program participants to achieve and maintain independent living and record of success, except HMIS-dedicated projects are not required to meet this standard; Pass and

   **(d)** Whether there is evidence that a project applicant has been unwilling to accept technical assistance, has a history of inadequate financial accounting practices, has indications of project mismanagement, has a drastic reduction in the population served, has made program changes without prior HUD approval, or has lost a project site. Pass

   **(2)** HUD reserves the right to reduce or reject a funding request from the project applicant for the following reasons:

   **(a)** Outstanding obligation to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon; Pass

   **(b)** Audit finding(s) for which a response is overdue or unsatisfactory; Pass

   **(c)** History of inadequate financial management accounting practices; Pass

   **(d)** Evidence of untimely expenditures on prior award; Pass

   **(e)** History of other major capacity issues that have significantly affected the operation of the project and its performance; Pass

   **(f)** History of not reimbursing subrecipients for eligible costs in a timely manner, or at least quarterly; Pass and

   **(g)** History of serving ineligible program participants, expending funds on ineligible costs, or failing to expend funds within statutorily established timeframes. Pass [↑](#endnote-ref-1)