



# FY2022 HUD COC PROGRAM COMPETITION

## RENEWAL PROJECT SCORECARD

### HOUSING PROJECTS

Applicant and Project Name: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Rater Name: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Date Reviewed: [Click or tap to enter a date.](#)

Project Quality Requirements		
Renewal projects must ensure they continue to meet HUD thresholds for funding.	Maximum Score Possible	300
	Total Project Score	
	Score Percentage	

Please note that the numbered questions on the application correspond with the numbered scoring areas below.

Section I: CoC Threshold Requirements (Although this section is scored, any "no" response may be sufficient to disqualify project from continued funding.)	Possible Points: 85	Possible Deductions: -5	Section Score:
<b>1. Does the project take 100% of its referrals through the Coordinated Entry process?</b>			
Yes	10		
No	0		
<b>2. Does the project meet all Housing First criteria?</b>			
Answered "None of the Above"	10		
Checked any other boxes	0		
<b>3. Does the project have documented and secured match?</b>			
Yes	10		
No	0		
<b>4. Project has reasonable costs per permanent housing exit</b>			
Yes	5		
No	0		
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
<b>5. Project is financially feasible</b>			
Yes	10		
No	0		
<b>6. Applicant serves on MIBOSCOC committee(s) beyond LPB</b>			
Yes	5		
No	0		
<b>7. Application is complete, and data are consistent</b>			
Yes	10		
No	0		
<b>8. Data Quality is at or above 95%</b>			
Yes	10		
No	0		

9. Acceptable organizational audit/financial review		
Yes	10	
No	0	
Efficient Use of Funding:		
10. What is the project's utilization rate?		
90% or higher	5	
80%-89%	0	
79% or lower	-5	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>		

<b>Section II: Project Performance</b>		Possible Points: 165	Section Score:
<b>Performance Data</b>			
<b>Permanent Supportive Housing</b>			
11. Length of Stay			
Percentage of leavers that remained in project more than 180 days (APR 22a.1)			
95% and more	20		
85%-94%	15		
75%-84%	10		
65%-74%	5		
55%-64%	0		
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
12. Exits to Permanent Housing			
Percent who remain in or move to PH			
95% or higher	25		
90%-94%	20		
85%-89%	15		
80%-84%	10		
75%-79%	5		
Less than 75%	0		
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
13. New or Increased Income and Earned Income			
a. Project Stayers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.1)			
6% and higher	2.5		
3%-5%	1.5		
Less than 3%	0		
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
b. Project Stayers: New or increased other (non-employment) income (APR 19a.1)			
40% and higher	2.5		
15%-39%	1.5		
Less than 15%	0		
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
c. Project Leavers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.2)			
6% and higher	2.5		

	3%-5%	1.5	
	Less than 3%	0	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
d. Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2)			
	40% and higher	2.5	
	15%-39%	1.5	
	Less than 15%	0	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
<b>Rapid Re-Housing</b>			
11. Length of Stay			
Percentage of participants that took 30 days or less from project entry to lease up (CAPER 22C)			
	70%-100%	20	
	50%-69%	15	
	30%-49%	10	
	10%-29%	5	
	0%-9%	0	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
12. Exits to Permanent Housing			
Percent who exit to PH			
	98% or higher	25	
	95%-97%	20	
	90%-94%	15	
	80%-89%	10	
	75%-79%	5	
	Less than 75%	0	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
13. New or Increased Income and Earned Income			
a. Project Leavers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.2)			
	30% and higher	5	
	20%-29%	2.5	
	Less than 20%	0	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
b. Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2)			
	20% and higher	5	
	10%-19%	2.5	
	Less than 10%	0	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			

<b>Serving High Need Populations</b>			
14. What percentage of the households were in the high need population defined as having zero income at start/entry? (APR 18)			
	70% or more	10	
	60%-69%	8	
	40%-59%	5	

	Less than 40%	0	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
15. What percentage of participants were in the high need population defined as having two or more physical or mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2)			
	More than 50%	10	
	30%-49%	8	
	20%-29%	5	
	Less than 20%	0	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
16. What percentage of the households served were in the high need population defined as chronically homeless? (APR Q26a.)			
	PSH: 90%, RRH: 75% or more	10	
	PSH: 70%-79%, RRH: 50-74%	8	
	PSH: 60%-69%, RRH: 25-49%	5	
	PSH: Less than 40%, RRH: Less than 24%	0	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
<b>Project Effectiveness</b>			
17. Consumer Participation			
	All of the criteria are met	9-10	
	A large amount of the criteria are met	6-8	
	Some of the criteria are met	3-5	
	Little to none of the criteria are met	0-2	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
18. Eviction and Project Termination Prevention			
	All of the criteria are met	9-10	
	A large amount of the criteria are met	6-8	
	Some of the criteria are met	3-5	
	Little to none of the criteria are met	0-2	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
19. Caseload Size			
	Caseload size is 25:1 or less	5	
	Caseload size is greater than 25:1	2.5	
	Caseload size is greater than 30:1	0	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			

<b>Section III: Equity Factors</b>		Possible Points: Possible 50 Deductions: -	Section Score:
20. Does the applicant have diverse representation within Management and Leadership Positions?			
	Yes	5	
	In Planning	2.5	
	No	0	
21. Does the applicant have diverse representation on its Board of Directors?			

	Yes	5	
	In Planning	2.5	
	No	0	
22. Does the applicant have an adequate process for receiving and incorporating feedback from project participants?			
	Yes	10	
	Somewhat	5	
	No	0	
23. Does the applicant disaggregate data by race, ethnicity, gender?			
	Yes	5	
	No	0	
<i>Narrative review: Does the narrative warrant further consideration in scoring?</i>			
24. Does the applicant have a process for reviewing data and outcomes through an equity lens?			
	Yes	5	
	No	0	
25. Has the applicant made specific changes to projects in order to advance equity?			
	Yes	5	
	No	0	
26. Has the project regularly submitted reports as requested for monitoring purposes?			
	Yes	5	
	No	0	
27. Does the applicant require all project staff to complete all MIBOSCOC recommended online training modules for the project type?			
	Yes	10	
	In Planning	5	
	No	0	
<b>DV Projects Only</b>			
28. Does the project have adequate processes in place to ensure and increase the safety of project participants?			
	Yes	10	
	Some	5	
	None	0	
29. Extent of which the applicant uses a trauma-informed, victim-centered approach in service delivery			
	Fully	10	
	Some	5	
	None	0	