**2023 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 $14.5 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 2023 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 10th, 2023**. The committee made a recommendation to prioritize projects focusing on serving families and/or chronically homeless single adults in permanent supportive housing programs that add to available inventory in the 2023 NOFO competition ranking process.  The Executive Committee formally approved these priority populations on **June 28th, 2023.**

Key recommendations of support for 2023 NOFO:

1. Population recommendation:
	* First priority: families
	* Second priority: chronically homeless single adults
2. Project type recommendation:
	* First priority: Permanent supportive housing projects that add new units
	* Second priority: RRH projects

**Population recommendation (household type): Based on the 2022 to 2023 PIT Counts, the recommendation is to prioritize families in the FY2023 NOFO process**

Projects serving families: first priority

* When comparing the 2023 count to 2022 there was a significant increase in families experiencing homelessness, increasing by 223 households (a 84.8% increase) and 746 people (a 79.4% increase). Family households now make-up 51% of the entire population of people experiencing homelessness in Hennepin, an increase from 35% in 2022. Specifically, families residing in emergency shelters on the night of the PIT count in 2023 more than doubled from 2022, now including 1463 people (a 112% increase from 2022) and 411 households (a 128% increase from 2022).

Prioritize projects serving chronically homeless single adults: second priority

* While the total number of single adults experiencing homelessness in Hennepin County decreased in the 2023 PIT by 6.7% compared to 2022, the number of single adults residing in emergency shelter and unsheltered locations remained largely unchanged in the 2023 PIT. Single adults staying in unsheltered locations decreased by 21 people (a 4% decrease) and single adults staying in emergency shelter decreased by just 4 people (a 0.4% decrease).
* The number of people identified as chronically homeless in the 2023 PIT increased by 158 people, a 27% increase from 2022. Similarly, data from Built for Zero indicates the number of people defined as chronically homeless has increased throughout the first months of 2023, from 339 people in January to 370 people in April. As chronically homeless individuals continue to make up a large portion of our community of people experiencing homelessness in Hennepin, and often present with complex service needs, CoC-funds will be prioritized to projects serving people who meet the HUD definition of chronically homeless. This decision aligns with HUDs prioritization of people experiencing chronic homelessness.

Youth projects will not be prioritized

* Youth households make up the smallest proportion of the community of people experiencing homelessness in Hennepin County at just 1% consistently since 2020. Additional funding has recently been made available for youth-serving projects in Hennepin through the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP). Due to the smaller size of the youth population, and additional funding made available, CoC-funds will not be prioritized for youth serving projects.

**Project component type recommendation: prioritize permanent supportive Housing (PSH) projects first and RRH projects second**

PSH projects will be prioritized first:

* PSH has proven to be a cost-effective solution that can increase housing stability and improve health outcomes for chronically homeless and/or highly vulnerable people by linking subsidized housing with access to supportive services.
* We know the most common reason given by people who opt out of PSH options and instead remain in sheltered and/or unsheltered settings is the increased burden of required resident contributions in housing support funded programs (currently the primary funding source for PSH in Hennepin). Increasing CoC funded PSH capacity will help increase the number and proportion of PSH units available that require only 30% of the resident’s income towards rent.
* 2,782 PSH housing beds were counted in the 2023 HIC count. These PSH beds made up just 21% of the available housing inventory. On the night of the 2023, 92% of the PSH beds were utilized indicating a need to increase the availability of PSH inventory in Hennepin.
* Additionally, PSH programs that propose to create new units will be prioritized over PSH programs that utilize vouchers.

RRH projects will be prioritized second:

* 1,122 RRH units were counted in the 2022 HIC count and make up just 8.5% of the total inventory in Hennepin indicating a need to increase the availability of RRH inventory in Hennepin.

**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 five 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
* Coordinated Entry Participation – the percent of received referrals from coordinated entry that end in a successful result (participant accepted into the program)

*Client Outcome and System Level Performance*

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

* 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)
* Average length of time from project entry to housing move-in- measures the average number of days from the time a participant enters the project until they move into housing placement (this is evaluated relative to like projects (e.g. RRH to RRH) and by population served (e.g. singles or families)
* Exits to Homelessness- the percentage of a project’s clients who exit the project directly back to homelessness in the past year
* 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
* Maintain or Increase Other Income- the percent of clients who maintained or increased other income, including non-employment cash benefits, when compared to other income at both annual assessment and at program exit

*Reallocation Bonus*

In 2023, 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 **March 8, 2023.** 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 **February 24th, 2023**. Following the submission of the Letter of Intent by all renewal projects and the completed NOFO Scoring Tool template by the deadline of **March 13th, 2023,** 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 **April 14th, 2023,** 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 **April 21st, 2023.** 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, 2022 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, populations 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 **May 10th, 2023,** 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 11th** 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 2023 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 June 9th, 2023**
	+ 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 2023 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) Projects serving families, 4) Projects serving single adults identified as chronically homeless.

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:

* + **Alignment with HUD Priorities,** including alignment with Housing First principles, activities to advance equity, and strategies related to implementation of evidence-based practices and fully utilizing HMIS (5 points possible)
	+ **Projects Alignment to Filling Gaps in Hennepin’s Homeless Response System,** including alignment to prioritized project component, target population and service model (5 points possible)
	+ **Commitment to Advancing Diversity, Equity and Inclusion**, 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 (4 points possible)
	+ **Performance Plans**, including where the project has articulated plans for successfully achieving performance measures including: increasing exits to permanent destinations, decreasing participant’s length of time homeless (rapid connection to housing move-ins), reducing the rate at which people return to homelessness, and increasing income (including earned income, other income, and total income) (4 points possible)
	+ **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)
	+ **Leverage**, including the extent to which the project leverages outside funding and the percent of leveraged funding currently in place (3 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 (3 points possible)
	+ **Project Readiness,** including the feasibility that the proposed project will be up and running in the necessary timeline (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 30 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 **June 9th,2023** deadline. New project applications will be reviewed by the CoC Funding Committee on **June 23rd, 2023.** Approved new project proposals will be included in the ranking process occurring in the Committee’s meeting on **July 12th, 2023** 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 11th,2023** 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 11th**,**2023** 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 FY2023 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 2023** |
| *Rating criteria and score shared with all renewal projects in April 2023 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** | 98% households stable for 6 months | APR Q22a1 | Stayers <97% | 97% < Stayers < 100% | Stayers=100% | 2 |
| **Retention or Exits to Permanent Destinations** | 95% retention or exits to PH destinations | APR Q5a1 and Q23c | Retention + PH Exits < 93% | 93% < Retention + PH Exits < 100% | Retention + PH Exits = 100% | 2 |
| **Exits Directly Back to Homelessness** | 0% of exits from program will be direct returns to homelessness | CORE- summary outcomes, exits to homelessness/ total leavers | >11% exits back to homelessness | Between 11% and 0% exits back to homelessness | 0% exits back to homelessness | 2 |
| **Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Annual Assessment** | 20% of participants who maintained/increased employment income at annual assessment (program stayers) | APR Q19a1, row 1 (at annual assessment) | Qualifying adult participant <8% | 8% < Qualifying adult participant < 21% | Qualifying adult participant > 21% | 2 |
| **Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Exit** | 20% 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 < 27% | Qualifying adult participant > 27% | 2 |
| **Maintain or Increase Other Income at Annual Assessment** | 68% of participants who maintained/increased total income at annual assessment (program stayers) | APR Q19a1, row 5 (annual assessment) | Qualifying adult participants < 55% | 55% < Qualifying adult participants < 81% | Qualifying adult participant ≥ 81% | 3 |
| **Maintain or Increase Other Income at Exit** | 68% of participants who maintained/increased total income at exit (program leavers) | APR Q19a2, row 5 (exit) | Qualifying adult participants < 35% | 35% < Qualifying adult participants < 77% | Qualifying adult participant ≥ 77% | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Performance Measures - RRH/TH** |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Exits to Permanent Destinations** | 84% of participants exits to Permanent Destinations | APR Q23a  | PH Exits < 68% | 68% < PH Exits < 90% | PH Exits > 90% | 2 |
| **Exits Directly Back to Homelessness** | 0% of participants exit directly back to homelessness | CORE- summary outcomes, exits to homelessness/ total leavers | Exits directly back to homelessness>15% | Exits directly back to homelessness between 0% and 15% | Exits directly back to homelessness = 0% | 2 |
| **Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Annual Assessment** | 41% of participants who maintained/increased employment income at annual assessment (program stayers) | APR Q19a1, row 1 (annual assessment) | Qualifying adult participant < 22% | 22% < Qualifying adult participant < 50% | Qualifying adult participant > 50% | 2 |
| **Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Exit** | 41% of participants who maintained/increased employment income at exit (program leavers) | APR Q19a2, row 1 (exit) | Qualifying adult participant < 20% | 20% < Qualifying adult participant < 32% | Qualifying adult participant > 32% | 2 |
| **Maintain or Increase Other Income at Annual Assessment** | 53% of participants who maintained/increased total income at annual assessment (program stayers) | APR Q19a2, row 5 (annual assessment) | Qualifying adult participant < 1% | 1% < Qualifying adult participant <52% | Qualifying adult participant > 52% | 3 |
| **Maintain or Increase Other Income at Exit** | 53% of participants who maintained/increased total income at exit (program leavers) | APR Q19a1, row 5 (exit) | Qualifying adult participant < 25% | 25% < Qualifying adult participant < 44% | Qualifying adult participant > 44% | 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** |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Same measures as used in like programs (e.g. RRH or PSH)** |  | DV alternative database |  |  |  |  |
| **Other Local Criteria** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project management & Bed Utilization** | 100% project beds are utilized in APR year | APR Q8b and Units from Program application | 72% < bed utilization | 72% < Bed Utilization < 96% | Bed Utilization < 96% | 2 |
| **HMIS Data Quality (alternate DB for DV)** | 100% Data completion  | APR Q6c | Data quality < 87% | 87% < Data completion < 97% | Data completion = 97% | 2 |
| **Voluntary Reallocation** |  | Letter of Intent | <1% of award | 1-3% of award | >3% of award | 2 |
| **Coordinated Entry Participation: % of Successful Referrals** | 60% referrals are marked in HMIS as successful | CE Dashboard | <31% successful referrals | Between 37% and 60% referrals successful | >60% referrals successful | 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 30 total points in the eight 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 | Priority Area | Application Alignment | Points (Max) |
| Alignment with HUD priorities | * **Housing First:** 1) extent to which project, and tenant selection criteria, demonstrates alignment with a Housing First model; 2) organization has made and describes efforts to ensure access to housing for all that are referred to the program; 3) if applicable, organization’s other projects are aligned with Housing First Principles
* **Equity:** 1) project addresses historical disparities and advances equity by targeting historically marginalized and underserved communities; 2) project describes strategies they use to meet the unique cultural and racial needs of the people they serve, including providing culturally specific services and establishing/maintaining partnerships with culturally specific providers in the community; 3) project promotes the inclusion of people with lived experience
* **Data**: 1) project employs research-based and/or evidence-based practices; 2) applicant has demonstrated experience in using research and/or evidence to inform decision-making and service provision; 3) project has the capacity to fully participate in HMIS providing data that is accurate, complete, up to date, and consistent with HUD/HMIS data standards
 | 1 | 6c,q5e4f-j6m5c6d,r,s8.3 | 5 |
| Project’s alignment to filling gaps in Hennepin response system | * **Project type:** PSH priority one; RRH priority two
* **Population served:** Families priority one; singles chronic priority two
* **Service model**: project describes strategies for identifying and providing supportive services to those with the highest service needs; “high service needs model of care”
 | 1 | 36b6c | 5 |
| Commitment to Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion | * 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 describes strategies that address the needs arising from historical trauma and systemic racism
* Project’s organizational policies and training offerings reflect an agenda for promoting anti-racism practices
* Project promotes the inclusion of people with lived experience
 | 2 | 4f-j6m | 4 |
| Performance plans | * **Exits to PD**: Project has articulated description of how they will assist program participants to obtain and maintain permanent housing that fits their needs
* **LOT homeless**: Project has articulated description of strategy to reduce the length of time people remain homeless (quick connection to housing)
* **RTH**: project defines strategy they will use to assist households served with housing stability beyond program exit, ensuring they do not re-enter homelessness
* **Income**: 1) project describes partnerships with mainstream employment organizations and proposed strategies to help individuals and families increase employment cash income; 2) project describes how they will connect participants to mainstream health, social services, and other programs for which they are eligible to apply and which meet the needs of the program participants
 | 2 | 6a, e-i | 4 |
| Innovation and Effectiveness | * Project employs research-based and/or evidence-based practices
* Applicant has demonstrated experience in using research and/or evidence to inform decision-making and service provision
 | 2 | 6d5a,c | 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
 | 3 | 7a,b | 3 |
| 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
 | 3 | 58.3 | 3 |
| Project readiness | * Is it feasible this project will be up and running in the necessary timeline?
 | 4 | 7c,d | 2 |
| Total Points Possible |  |  |  | 30 |

**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***

Access [CESProviderPerformanceInternal - Power BI (powerbigov.us)](https://app.powerbigov.us/groups/me/reports/711d3b4e-e502-4d8a-b2f6-495924940207/ReportSectione6d3714bb9b79ffcb5c2?ctid=8aefdf9f-8780-46bf-8fb7-4c924653a8be). Select your project(s) ID (gateway projects will select the gateway project ID for your organization) and select quarters 1-4 of 2022. Please share a screen capture of the coordinated entry dashboard for your project.

\*\*Note: for DV providers using alternate CES system, please use your internal records to document the reasons for denied/cancelled referrals and expand on the reasons in the narrative section below\*\*

\*\*Note: for CE projects, instead of CE data, please share demographics of who was served by the program\*\*

\*\*Note: for non-HMIS projects, not applicable\*\*



Please reference the “count and avg # of days from referral to result by reason” table and describe further context and information on client rejected or provider rejected referral outcomes, including reasons for:

1. Unreachable referrals (including efforts made to contact referral participant)

Click or tap here to enter text.

1. Refused service (including specific reasons for service refusal)

Click or tap here to enter text.

1. No longer eligible (including criteria that made participants ineligible for services at your organization)

Click or tap here to enter text.

1. Property management (including reasons for denial)

Click or tap here to enter text.

1. Eligible but provider unable to accept (including reasons provider was unable to accept referral)

Click or tap here to enter text.

1. Unknown outcomes (including reasons for unknown referral result and strategies to close referral)

Click or tap here to enter text.

***Outcomes***

Run a CORE report in HMIS for the calendar year 2022 (January 1- December 31, 2022).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Data Source** | **Location** | **Notes** |
| **CORE Report** | HMISBusiness Objects- Folders- Public Folders- Minnesota\_live\_folder- SSA Report Gallery- 0.Program Evaluation- MIN-01-SAG-030 MN Core Homeless Programs v.2021.2 | Use prompt parameters* Select Providers: Your HMIS provider.
* Effective Date: 1/1/2023
* Start Date: 1/1/2022
* Limit to veterans only: No
* End Date: 1/1/2023
 |

Reference the “Summary Outcomes-All” tab and cut and paste the fourth table, “Exit Destination by Race.” Create “% of exits to permanent destinations” by dividing “exited to permanent destination” by “total leavers” columns. (*example: for ‘white’, 7/13= .54 or 54%).*

\*\*Note: for DV providers, to the extent possible, please share similar information as requested from your alternative database and internal records\*\*

\*\*Note: for CE projects, please share outcomes of those that were served by your program to the best of your ability\*\*

\*\*Note: for HMIS projects, not applicable\*\*



Please describe any variations in exits to permanent destinations rates by race subgroups (e.g. what factors are contributing to only 9% of people identified as multiple races compared to 54% of people identified as white).

Click or tap here to enter text.

What efforts are being implemented to address variation in outcomes?

Click or tap here to enter text.

***Service Provision***

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.