A WAY HOME for Tulsa

Coordinated by
Housing Solutions

Tulsa City and County Continuum of Care
FY 2023 RENEWAL PROJECTS
Scoring Tool

Summary of Factors

Threshold Requirements – **not scored**

1. Outcomes Supporting System Performance Measures[1] – **55 points**
2. Data Quality – **20 points**
3. System Improvement & Priorities– **26 points**
4. Strategy: Priority Project Types (PH) & Population Bonus[2] – **5 points**

TOTAL: **106 points**

Threshold Requirements

These factors are required, but not scored. If the project indicates "no" for any threshold criteria, it is ineligible for CoC funding.

- **Services Standards.** Applicant participated in the A Way Home for Tulsa Services Standards fidelity assessment and action planning process during the spring TA meetings with Homebase and Housing Solutions.

- **HMIS Implementation.** Projects are required to participate in HMIS, unless the project is operated by a victim services provider. Victim service providers must use a comparable database that complies with the federal HMIS data and technical standards.

- **Coordinated Entry.** Projects are required to participate in Coordinated Entry (when it is available for the project type) in compliance with the CoC's Coordinated Entry standards and HUD's Coordinated Entry Notice.

- **HUD Threshold.** Projects will be reviewed for compliance with the eligibility requirements of the CoC Interim Rule and Subsequent Notices and must meet the threshold requirements outlined in the 2023 Notice of Funding Availability.

---

[1] All of the scoring factors in this tool measure projects' contribution to improving Tulsa City and County's System Performance by strengthening the overall system of care through data collection, coordination, prioritization and increasing resources available to end homelessness in Tulsa City and County. Certain scoring factors relate to specific Performance Measures, as enumerated in each factor. 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 the victim service provider's comparable database.

[2] Bonus points help ensure fairness and equal footing across scoring tools – which otherwise strongly advantage projects without data – and support prioritization of proven strong performers while encouraging reallocation of projects not advancing system performance.

- **HUD Policies.** Projects are required to have policies regarding termination of assistance, client grievances, Equal Access, ADA and fair housing requirements, VAWA protection, and confidentiality that are compliant with HUD CoC Program requirements.

1. Outcomes Supporting System Performance Measures – 55 points

Overall, has the project been performing satisfactorily and effectively addressing the need(s) for which it was designed? Keep in mind that outcomes will naturally be lower in a population with more complex needs. Such populations include refugees or immigrants, persons with current or past substance abuse or serious mental illness, a history of victimization (e.g., domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, human trafficking), criminal histories, and chronic homelessness.

1A. Utilization[3]

- Scored in Presto

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data

- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Is the project serving the number of people it was designed to serve?

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to historic performance, time in operation for recently funded programs applying for their first renewal with APR data, average annual occupancy HMIS or comparable database data provided by the applicant, occupancy rate trending up or down, project size, population served, and facility status issues beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Calculation: Average Number of Households Served Across Four Points in Time ÷ Units Funded

[(APR 8b January Total + APR 8b April Total + APR 8b July Total + APR 8b October Total) ÷ 4] ÷ Project Application 4B Total Units OR 5A Total Households

Community Benchmark: 90%

Scale:

- 90-100%   10 points
- 78.9-89.9%   8 points
- 67.6-78.8%   6 points
- 56.4-67.5%   4 points
- 45.1-56.3%   2 points
- 0-45%   0 points

1B. Housing Stability

- Scored in Presto

- Scoring is dependent on project component type

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data

- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

---

[3] *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3*

Permanent Supportive Housing[4]

Criteria: Do project participants remain housed in the project or exit to other permanent housing (excluding participants who pass away and persons who exit to Foster Care Home or Foster Care Group Home, Hospital or Other Residential Non-Psychiatric Medical Facility, or Long-term Care Facility or Nursing Home)?

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to historic performance, time in operation for recently funded programs applying for their first renewal with APR data, project size, population served, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Calculation: (Total Stayers + Total Exits to PH) ÷ (Total Clients - Total Deceased - Total Exits to Foster Care Home or Foster Care Group Home - Total Exits to Hospital or Other Residential Non-Psychiatric Medical Facility - Total Exits to Long-term Care Facility or Nursing Home)

[APR 5a Stayers + APR 23c Permanent Destination Subtotal] ÷ [APR 5a Persons Served - APR Q23c Deceased - APR Q23c Foster Care Home or Foster Care Group Home - APR Q23c Hospital or Other Residential Non-Psychiatric Medical Facility - APR Q23c Long-term Care Facility or Nursing Home]

Community Benchmark: 95%

Scale:

- 95-100%   10 points
- 88.3-94.9%   9 points
- 81.5-88.2%   8 points
- 74.7-81.4%   7 points
- 68.0-74.6%   6 points
- 61.2-67.9%   5 points
- 54.4-61.1%   4 points
- 47.6-54.3%   3 points
- 0-47.5%   0 points

Rapid Rehousing and Transitional Housing[5]

Criteria: Do project participants exit to other permanent housing based on HUD APR performance measures

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to historic performance, time in operation for recently funded programs applying for their first renewal with APR data, project size, the number of persons who exited the project, population served, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Projects with no leavers will receive full points.

Calculation: Total Exits to PH ÷ (Total Leavers - Total Deceased - Total Exits to Foster Care Home or Foster Care Group Home - Total Exits to Hospital or Other Residential Non-Psychiatric Medical Facility - Total Exits to Long-term Care Facility or Nursing Home)

APR 23c Permanent Destinations Subtotal ÷ [APR 5a Leavers - APR 23c Deceased - APR Q23c Foster Care Home or Foster Care Group Home - APR Q23c Hospital or Other Residential Non-Psychiatric Medical Facility - APR Q23c Long-term Care Facility or Nursing Home]

Community Benchmark: 85%

---

[4] *HUD System Performance Measures 3, 7*

[5] *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7*

Scale:

- 85-100%   10 points
- 79-84.9%   9 points
- 73-78.9%   8 points
- 66.9-72.9%   7 points
- 60.8-66.8%   6 points
- 54.7-60.7%   5 points
- 48.7-54.6%   4 points
- 42.6-48.6%   3 points
- 0-42.5%   0 points

1C. Gained/Increased Cash Income[6]

- **Scored in Presto**

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data

- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Do adult project participants gain or increase cash income from entry to latest annual assessment (excluding stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment) or exit?

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to historic performance, time in operation for recently funded programs applying for their first renewal with APR data, project size, population served, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Projects with no leavers and no stayers required to have annual assessments will receive full points.

Calculation: (Adult Leavers Who Gained Income + Adult Stayers Who Gained Income + Adult Leavers Who Increased Amount of Income + Adult Stayers Who Increased Amount of Income) ÷ (Adults - Stayers Not Required to Have Assessment)

[APR19a1 Row 5 Column 4 + APR19a2 Row 5 Column 4 + APR19a1 Row 5 Column 5 + APR19a2 Row 5 Column 5] ÷ [APR5a Adults - APR18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment]

Community Benchmark: 75%

Scale:

- 75-100%   5 points
- 65.7-74.9%   4 points
- 56.4-65.6%   3 points
- 47-56.3%   2 points
- 37.6-46.9%   1 points
- 0-37.5%   0 points

1D. Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits[7]

- **Scored in Presto**

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data

- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

---

[6] *HUD System Performance Measure 4*

[7] *HUD System Performance Measures 2, 7*

Criteria: Do project participants (excluding stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment) receive non-cash mainstream benefits?

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to historic performance, time in operation for recently funded programs applying for their first renewal with APR data, project size, population served, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Projects with no leavers and no stayers required to have annual assessments will receive full points.

Calculation: (Adult Leavers with At Least 1 Benefit + Adult Stayers with At Least 1 Benefit) ÷ (Total Adults - Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment)

[APR 20b 1Plus Sources Leavers + APR 20b 1Plus Sources Stayers] ÷ [APR 5a Adults - APR 18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]

No Community Benchmark

Scale:

- 70-100%   5 points
- 50-69.9%   3 points
- 30-49.9%   1 point
- 0-29.9%   0 points

1E. Health Insurance[8]

- **Scored in Presto**

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data

- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Do project participants (excluding stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment) have health insurance?

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to historic performance, time in operation for recently funded programs applying for their first renewal with APR data, project size, population served, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Projects with no leavers and no stayers required to have annual assessments will receive full points.

Calculation: (Stayers with 1 or More Sources of Health Insurance + Leavers with 1 or More Sources of Health Insurance) ÷ (Total Clients - Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment)

[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 Total Served - APR 21 Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]

No Community Benchmark

Scale:

- 70-100%   5 points
- 50-69.9%   3 points
- 30-49.9%   1 point
- 0-29.9%   0 points

---

[8] *HUD System Performance Measures 2, 7*

1F. Alignment with Housing First Principles & Exits to PH Destinations[9]

- Based on narrative responses submitted as part of the proposal

- System Performance Measures - Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations

Criteria:

5 points: The agency will enroll individuals or households referred through coordinated entry regardless of the following circumstances. Panelists should take into account any legal requirements explained by the applicant. Based on the Housing First Chart completed in the RFI, to what extent does the program provide low barrier housing first services through eligibility at program entry and ongoing eligibility of services throughout duration of program participation – including ensuring persons are not exited based on specific criteria listed in the chart.

- Would not disqualify is marked for all items   5 points
- Might disqualify is marked for 2 or less items   3 points
- Would disqualify is marked for any items   0 points

Review panel may provide exceptions to scoring based on narrative response indicating that the qualifications are outside of the program policies and control.

5 Points: The agency works with participants to avoid involuntary project exit and program terminations, in compliance with the CoC's Policy for Participant Termination, through client-centered case management, robust support and resources, and a no-fail approach.

5 Points: The agency and/or programming provides clear strategies, services and assistance to reduce barriers to housing relevant to the population being served. The program has a clear understanding of their data and performance surrounding returns to homelessness and has strategies in place to reduce returns to homelessness.

1G. Improving Safety[10]

Projects Dedicated to Serving Survivors of Domestic Violence

- Calculated based on comparable database data

- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Percentage of survivors for whom a safety plan was completed or offered.

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to project size and the number of households served.

Calculation: Number of Survivors with Completed/Offered Safety Plans ÷ Number of Households Served

Number of Completed/Offered Safety Plans Reported by Project ÷ APR 8 Households Served

Scale:

- 100%   5 points
- 90-99.9%   2 points
- 0-89.9%   0 points

---

[9] *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7*

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

- Based on Yes/No responses submitted as part of the RFI application response

Criteria: Does the agency have a process in place to assess clients for risk of domestic violence AND provide warm hand-offs to a victim services provider?

Scale:

- Agency does not have a process to assess risk of domestic violence or to provide warm hand-offs to a victim services provider   0 points

- Has a process in place to assess risk of domestic violence   and to provide warm handoffs to victim service providers   2 points

-
- Bonus: Project has added VAWA eligible costs to support emergency transfers to budget by either shifting less than 10% of existing budget to line item or by requesting an expansion.
                                                                        3 points

2. Data Quality – 20 points
2A. Complete Data

- **Scored in Presto**

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data

- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Percentage of complete data (not null/missing, "don't know" or "refused" data, "data issues," or "error"), as reported in APR 6a, 6b, and 6c, except for Social Security numbers.

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to limited project exits and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Calculation: 1 - [(Sum of Client Doesn't Know/Refused + Information Missing + Data Issues + Error Count for 14 data elements in APR Questions 6a-6c, excluding SSN) ÷ (14 * Total Served)]

1 - [(APR6a Client Don't Know Refused for Name, Date of Birth, Race, Ethnicity, Gender + APR6a Information Missing for Name, Date of Birth, Race, Ethnicity, Gender + APR6a Data Issues for Name, Date of Birth, Race, Ethnicity, Gender + APR 6b Error Count for Veteran Status, Project Start Date, Relationship to Head of Household, Client Location, Disabling Condition + APR 6c Error Count for Destination, Income and Sources at Start, Income and Sources at Annual Assessment, Income and Sources at Exit) ÷ (14 * APR5a Total Served)]

No Community Benchmark

Scale:

- 99-100%   5 points
- 95-98.9%   3 points
- 90-94.9%   1 point
- 0-89.9%   0 points

2B. Exits to Known Destinations

- **Scored in Presto**

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data

- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Percentage of clients who exit to known destinations.

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to limited project exits and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

PSH projects with no leavers receive full points.

Calculation: (Total Leavers - Leavers With Don't Know/Refused Destinations - Leavers With Missing Destinations) ÷ Total Leavers

[APR5a Leavers - APR23c Total Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused - APR23c Total Data Not Collected] ÷ APR5a Leavers

Community Benchmark: 90%

Scale:

- 90-100%   5 points
- 67.6-89.9%   3 points
- 45.1-67.5%   1 point
- 0-45%   0 points

2C. Known Income

- **Scored in Presto**

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data

- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Percentage of adult project participants with known income at latest annual assessment (excluding stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment) or exit.

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to project size and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Calculation: (Adult Stayers With Known Income + Adult Leavers With Known Income) ÷ (Adults – Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment)

[APR18 Adults with Income Information at Annual Assessment + APR18 Adults with Income Information at Exit] ÷ [APR5a Adults - APR18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]

No Community Benchmark

Scale:

- 95-100%   5 points
- 85-94.9%   3 points
- 75-84.9%   1 point
- 0-74.9%   0 points

2D. Known Benefits

- **Scored in Presto**

- Calculated based on HMIS or comparable database data

- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the RFI application

Criteria: Percentage of adult project participants with known benefits at latest annual assessment (excluding stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment) or exit.

Panelists may exercise discretion and adjust from the scaled score by one step based on factors including but not limited to project size and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Calculation: (Adult Stayers With Known Non-Cash Benefits + Adult Leavers With Known Non-Cash Benefits) ÷ (Total Adults – Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have Annual Assessments)

[APR20b Adult Leavers No Sources + APR20b Adult Leavers 1Plus Sources + APR20b Adult Stayers No Sources + APR20b Adult Stayers 1Plus Sources] ÷ [APR 5a Adults - APR18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]

No Community Benchmark

Scale:

- 95-100%   5 points
- 85-94.9%   3 points
- 75-84.9%   1 point
- 0-74.9%   0 points

3. System Improvement & Priorities– 26 points

3A. Compliance

- Based on any financial audit, HUD monitoring report and correspondence, and supplemental information submitted as part of the RFI application materials.

Criteria: To what extent does the agency have:

- Any outstanding financial audit findings or concerns related to HUD-funded programs?

- Any outstanding HUD monitoring findings or concerns and/or any history of HUD-imposed sanctions, including but not limited to suspension of disbursements, required repayment of grant funds, or de-obligation of grant funds due to performance issues?

If yes, what steps is the agency taking to resolve the findings or concerns and to what extent has the project advised the Collaborative Applicant of issues identified by HUD?

If an agency has no outstanding audit or monitoring findings or concerns and no history of sanctions imposed by HUD or has not had a financial audit or HUD monitoring, the agency should receive full points.

Scale: Up to 2 points

Drawdown Compliance

- Based on narrative response submitted as part of the proposal and attachments provided in RFI application.

Criteria: Has the agency completed the required quarterly drawdowns successfully?

- Yes – 3 Points
- No – 0 Points

3B. Grant Spend-Down

- Scored in Presto

Criteria: Has the agency spent down their grant funds in the past three grant cycles?

Consider if the project is running at capacity (at four points during the year), whether spend-down is trending up or down, and whether it receives leasing or rental assistance funding.

Panelists may score projects up or down from the scaled score.

Scale:

- 97-100%   5 points
- 94-96.9%   3 points
- 90-93.9%   1 point
- 0-89.9%   0 points

3C. Alignment with CoC Priorities

- Based on completed Resilience and Equity Checklist

Criteria:

6 points: Resilience and Equity Checklist indicates agency and program staff take a continuous quality improvement approach using data to tailor programming, services, and outreach to ensure equitable outcomes and are clearly active in engaging and collaborating with diverse community based services and interventions.

4 Points: Resilience and Equity Checklist indicates agency has identified any barriers to participation (e.g., lack of outreach) impacting Black or African American, Hispanic/Latinx, and Native American people experiencing homelessness, and has taken steps to eliminate the identified barriers.

2 points: Resilience and Equity Checklist includes steps the agency will take to continue to eliminate racial disparities impacting Black or African American, Hispanic/Latinx, and Native American people experiencing homelessness by ensuring racial equity within its programs (where racial equity is defined as the condition achieved if one's racial identity no longer predicted, in a statistical sense, how one fares).

3D. Client Participation in Project Design and Policymaking

- Based on narrative submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria: Does the agency engage unhoused and formerly unhoused participants and staff in program design and policymaking?

5 Points: Agency utilizes one or more of the following strategies for gathering participant input and/or building participant leadership.

- High-Priority Strategies (eligible for max 5 points)

  - The applicant engages AWH4T lived experience boards (Participant Advisory Group and/or Youth Action Board) on matters of organizational policy/decision-making. This could include the development/revision of policies and procedures, creation/implementation of new programs, determination of hiring/retention strategies, etc. At least 15% of the applicant's board of directors and/or leadership has lived experience of homelessness

  - At least 25% of the applicant's staff OR 25% of staff of this CoC-funded project has lived experience of homelessness (not including temporary, contract, or stipend-based roles)

  - The applicant dedicates resources to support community advocacy by participants (e.g., stipends for participant advocacy work, public speaking skills development, etc.)

  - The applicant's hiring policies and approaches (e.g., job descriptions and/or qualifications, peers support positions, on-the-job-training, outreach/recruitment strategies, etc.) are designed to prioritize hiring and retention of people with lived experience of homelessness, including equitable compensation for peer/lived experience work.

- Additional Strategies (eligible for max 3 points)

  - The applicant has a participant advisory board that has the authority to make recommendations directly to the agency leadership and board of directors

  - This CoC-funded project has at least one staff member with experience of homelessness

- o The applicant has a participant advisory board, but it is not entitled to make recommendations directly to the agency leadership or board of directors
- o The applicant administers satisfaction or feedback surveys to participants in this project
- o The applicant uses client focus groups which include participants in this project
- o Other strategies

5 Points: The applicant must give an example of constructive feedback or input received from participants in the past four years. Feedback can be from participants in this CoC-funded project or in another project operated by the agency if the applicant clearly describes how feedback would impact or affect this CoC-funded project. The applicant must describe how they responded to the feedback, which may include but is not limited to any of the following:

- Exploring feasibility of changes in response to the feedback
- Communicating with agency leadership and/or board of directors about the feedback
- Communicating with participants about follow-up efforts in a feedback loop
- How the decision was made to make changes or not make changes based on the feedback
- Any changes that were made that impacted this CoC-funded project

4. Strategy & Priority Project Type & Population Bonus – up to 5 points

- Based on supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal in the RFI Application (Section 4, item 17)

Criteria:

Projects may receive points for each bullet point item below – up to 5 points total.

- Does the project provide permanent housing (Joint TH-RRH, RRH, PSH)? (2 points)
- Is the project dedicated to serving a priority population, i.e., young adults, domestic violence survivors, families with children, or veterans? (1 point)
- Does the project support HUD priorities by leveraging funding by partnering with the local public housing authority or by partnering with a healthcare system provider (2 points)

FY 2023 CoC NOFO Renewal Project Scoring Rubric Overview

Scoring Factor	Source	Points
1. Outcomes Supporting System Performance Measures: 55 Points		
**Scored based on submission of Sage APR data entered in Presto		
Utilization**	Source: HMIS Data pulled from APR (8b). FY23 Scoring Tool (1A). Notes: Number of total units/beds available is determined by contractual number submitted in original e-snaps application. HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	0-10
Housing Stability: Successful Placement & Retention**	Source: HMIS APR (Q22, Q23) & System Performance Measure (SPM). FY23 Scoring Tool (1B) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	0-10
Gained/Increased Cash Income**	Source: HMIS APR (Q19) and System Performance Measure (SPM). FY23 Scoring Tool (1C) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	0-5
Non-Cash Benefits**	Source: HMIS APR (20b) and System Performance Measure (SPM). FY23 Scoring Tool (1D) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	0-5
Health Insurance**	Source: HMIS APR (Q21). FY23 Scoring Tool (1E) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	0-5
Alignment with Housing First: Eligibility & Lack of Screening Out	Source: RFI (1F)(Q5) narrative response and attachments submitted from RFI. FY23 Scoring Tool (1F) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria, severe barriers	0-5
Alignment with Housing First: Termination P&P	Source: System Performance Measures - exits to Permanent Housing Destinations. RFI (1F)(Q7) narrative response and attachments submitted from RFI. FY23 Scoring Tool (1F) HUD NOFO: Severe barriers	0-5
Housing First: Returns to Homelessness and Barriers	Source: HMIS and System Performance Measures (SPM). RFI (1F)(Q8) narrative response and attachments submitted from RFI. FY23 Scoring Tool (1F) HUD NOFO: Severe Barriers	0-5
Improving Safety	Source: RFI narrative response (section 1G) and attachments. HMIS & VSP Comparable database APR Report (8) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria, Severe barriers	0-5
2. Data Quality: 20 Points		
Complete Data**	Source: HMIS APR (6a, 6b, 6c) & Data Quality Report. FY23 Scoring Tool (2A) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	0-5
	6a – Data Quality: Personally Identifiable Information Overall Score HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	

Exits to Known Destinations**	Source: HMIS APR (6c) & Data Quality Report. FY23 Scoring Tool (2B) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	0-5
	6c – Data Quality: Income and Housing Data Quality → Destination (3.12) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	
Known Income**	Source: HMIS APR (6c) & Data Quality Report. FY23 Scoring Tool (2C) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	0-5
	6c – Data Quality: Income and Housing Data Quality → Income and Sources at Start; Income and Sources at Annual Assessment; Income and Sources at Exit HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	
Known Benefits**	Source: HMIS APR (20b) & Data Quality Report. FY23 Scoring Tool (2D)	0-5
	20b – Number of Non-Cash Benefit Sources HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	
3. System Improvement & Priorities: 26 Points		
Compliance (Financial Audit; Same score across all projects within an agency)	Source: RFI application responses (section 3A) and attachments. FY23 Scoring Tool (3A) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	0-2
Compliance (Drawdown)	Source: RFI application and attachments (eloccs, grant closeout, Sage). FY23 Scoring Tool (3A) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	0-3
Grant Spend-Down**	Source: RFI application response (3B) and attachments (eloccs, grant closeout, Sage). FY23 Scoring Tool (3B) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	0-5
Alignment with CoC Priorities (Resilience & Equity Checklist)	Source: Completion of Equity Checklist (RFI Attachment). FY23 Scoring Tool (3C) HUD NOFO: Severe barriers	0-6
Client Participation in Project Design and Policymaking: Item 1	Source: RFI application narrative responses (3D). FY23 Scoring Tool (3D)	0-5
Client Participation in Design and Policymaking; Item 2	Source: RFI application narrative responses (3D). FY23 Scoring Tool (3D)	0-5
4. Strategy: Priority Project Types & Population Bonus - Up to 5 points		
Priority Project Type and Population Bonus Points	Source: RFI application narrative response (4). FY23 Scoring Tool (4). PH Project Types (2 Points) HUD NOFO: Objective Criteria	0-5

Total Points	**106**

HUD Criteria for Renewal Project Scoring

Establish maximum points for each project type.	Permanent Housing (Joint TH-RRH, RRH, PSH) • 106 out of 106 maximum points (100%) • See Renewal Scoring Tool Section 4 Other Renewal Project Types: • 104 out of 106 maximum points (98%) • See Renewal Scoring Tool Section 4
Maximum points available for objective criteria – 33% are based on objective criteria for the project application	Permanent Housing (Joint TH-RRH, RRH, PSH) • 85 Points out of 106 (80%) Other Renewal Project Types: • 83 Points out of 104 (79%)
Maximum points for system performance criteria with at least 20% of total points based on system performance criteria	Permanent Housing (Joint TH-RRH, RRH, PSH) • 30 out of 106 (28%) Other Renewal Project Types: • 30 out of 104 (29%)
Provided points for addressing specific severe barriers to housing and services	Permanent Housing (Joint TH-RRH, RRH, PSH) • 26 Points (24%) Other Renewal Project Types: • 26 Points (25%)
Data used from comparable database to score projects submitted by Victim Service Providers	Renewal Project Scoring Tool Chart • Items indicated with ** in scoring tool includes Annual Performance Report (APR) data entered into Sage and generated from the local HMIS database or a Victim Service Provider comparable database.