

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care

2022 Funding Competition Process:

Ranking, Project Priority Listing, & New Project Applications

Introduction & Funding Competition Details

The Federal Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act reauthorized the 1987 McKinney-Vento Act with a renewed emphasis on performance and establishing goals and outcomes to end homelessness. To this end, the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Continuum of Care (CoC) program provides funding to support the efforts of local public and private non-profit agencies providing services for individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

The 2022 CoC funding competition [Notification of Funding Opportunity \(NOFO\)](#) was released on August 1, 2022. The funding competition includes the submission of a collaborative application, as well as submissions of renewal and new project applications. This year's NOFO provided the following new project opportunities:

- **Bonus:** CoCs can submit one or more bonus project applications for up to 5 percent of their Final Pro Rata Need (FPRN) (\$334,386 for Washtenaw County). Bonus applications can be for new projects or projects that expand an existing project. The following types of projects are allowable:
 1. **New Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)** that is 100 percent dedicated to chronic homeless individuals and families *OR* meets the requirements of DedicatedPLUS (see Section III.C.2.g of NOFO)
 2. **New Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)** for homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth
 3. **New Joint Transitional Housing and Rapid-Rehousing (Joint TH and PH-RRH)** combining two existing program components to better serve homeless individuals and families
 4. **New Homelessness Management Information System (HMIS)** for HMIS lead agencies
 5. **New Supportive Services Only (SSO)** to develop or operate a centralized or coordinated assessment system
- **DV Bonus:** CoCs can submit one or more applications for a Domestic Violence (DV) bonus for up to 15 percent of its Preliminary Pro Rata Need (PPRN) (\$206,469 for Washtenaw County). The DV Bonus would be funded through a \$52 million appropriation and would provide housing and services to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking within the following types of allowable projects:
 1. **RRH projects**
 2. **Joint TH and RRH projects**
 3. **SSO projects** for coordinated entry to implement policies, procedures, and practices that equip the COC's coordinated entry to better meet the needs of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking
- **Reallocation:** CoCs can shift funds in whole or part from existing eligible renewal projects to create one or more new projects without decreasing the CoC's ARD. The allowable project types are the same as the Bonus projects listed above.

Aside from renewals, new projects created through reallocation, and bonus projects, this year's NOFO allowed CoCs to apply for a non-competitive Planning Grant in the amount of 3 percent of the Annual Renewal Demand (ARD), (\$200,631 for Washtenaw County). This non-competitive grant funds activities related to coordinating the CoC and is not ranked within the tiered system outlined in the next section.

The 2022 NOFO also included the following components:

- **Transition grants:** Through the reallocation process, eligible renewal project applicants can transition an existing project component (e.g. RRH) to another component type. For example, a Transitional Housing project could be transitioned into a RRH project.

- **Consolidation:** Eligible renewal applicants will have the ability to consolidate two or more eligible renewal projects into one project application.

For all renewal project and new project applications, HUD requires that the local CoC Board ensure the review, selection, and ranking of each project. This process is completed each year by the Funding Review Team (FRT), a standing subcommittee of the CoC charged with making funding recommendations. The CoC Board then approves final funding recommendations and ranking.

2022 Funding Process and Tier Details

Washtenaw County receives approximately \$6.6 million in CoC funding annually and conducts a review of all CoC funded applicants every year prior to approving the submission of the CoC community & project applications. Each year, the Washtenaw County Office of Community & Economic Development (OCED)—in its role as the CoC Collaborative Applicant—staffs the Funding Review Team (FRT) in the review and ranking process associated with the annual CoC funding competition. This year, FRT members include:

- Amanda Carlisle - Executive Director, Washtenaw Housing Alliance (WHA); CoC Board member
- Amanda Sternberg - Performance Management Analyst, Homeless Action Network of Detroit
- Jennifer Monahan, Youth Transitions Manager, Washtenaw Intermediate School District; CoC Board member

As in past years, HUD requires renewal projects to be ranked in two tiers with the purpose of CoCs indicating which projects are prioritized for funding. This year’s NOFO mandated the first tier to include 95 percent of the ARD (\$6,353,327 in Washtenaw County), and the second tier to include the remaining 5% of ARD (\$334,386) along with any funds available for bonus projects.

The following describes how HUD awards funding within the two tiers and how scoring from the Collaborative Application is used:

- CoCs’ Collaborative Applications will receive a score based on a 200-point scale;
- HUD will fund all projects in Tier 1 beginning with highest scoring CoC to lowest scoring;
- HUD will select projects in Tier 2, in order of point value, until there are no more funds available;
- Tier 2 will be based on CoC score and project scores. HUD will award a point value to each new and renewal project in Tier 2 using a 100-point scale:
 - CoC Score (up to 50 points directly proportional to the score of the CoC Application)
 - CoC Project Ranking (up to 40 points based on their ranking within Tier 2 according to HUD’s formula)
 - Commitment to Housing First (up to 10 points for how the project demonstrates that it is low barrier and prioritizes rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing)
- DV Bonus projects will be awarded a point value using a 100-point scale:
 - CoC score (up to 50 points directly proportional to the score of the CoC Application)
 - Need for new project (up to 25 points)
 - Quality of Project Applicant (up to 25 points)
- If a project straddles two tiers, HUD will fund the projects separately, first funding the Tier 1 amount and then funding the Tier 2 portion – if it qualifies based on the Tier 2 score defined above. The award announcement of a project that straddles two tiers may not be communicated until the Tier 2 projects are announced.

New and renewal projects are ranked using the CoC Board approved 2022 Ranking Policy (Attachment A).

CoC Renewal Scoring and Ranking Process

A total of 15 projects were up for renewal during this funding competition. Using a standard scoring rubric (Attachment B) to review project outcomes, data quality, and HUD compliance based on HUD audits and expenditure of funds, the FRT was able to score renewal projects and rank them based on scores (see Attachment C for score breakdown).

All renewal projects were recommended for funding by the FRT; one project was identified for reallocation as the current provider chose not to renew.

New Project Scoring and Selection Process

After a review of community data and current resources, as well as system-level discussions about community needs, Washtenaw County CoC determined that bonus or expansion project applications for new permanent housing projects (PSH or RRH) were necessary to meet community need.

On August 25, 2022, OCED released a Request for Letter of Intent (LOI) for those interested in applying for four project types:

- CoC Bonus permanent housing or expansion projects (PSH)
- CoC Bonus supportive services only coordinated entry projects (SSO CE)
- Reallocation permanent housing or expansion projects (PSH)
- DV Bonus permanent housing or expansion projects (RRH)

Interested parties were asked to confirm their intent to apply with some basic details about the project. Applicants then interested in submitting projects after the mandatory meeting then submitted a full application. Bonus and DV Bonus applications were due on September 9, 2022.

One SSO CE project, One PSH bonus/expansion application, one reallocation expansion project, and one DV bonus application were submitted as shown in the chart below. The FRT used a bonus project scoring tool (Attachment D) and a DV bonus scoring tool (Attachment E) to review and score the submitted projects.

CoC Bonus Projects							
Total Funding Available: \$334,386							
Populations Served	Total Units	Rental Assistance	Supportive Services	Admin	Subtotal (Funding Request)	Match	Grand Total
SOS Community Services—Coordinated Entry							
<i>Submitted project would fund staffing for a new coordinated entry system</i>							
All	N/A	N/A	\$304,386	\$30,000	\$334,386	\$83,5967	\$417,983
Michigan Ability Partners—PASS Expansion							
<i>Submitted project would expand a current 22-unit PSH project serving Chronically Homeless Individuals</i>							
Chronic Individuals	12 New (22 existing)	\$75,456	\$43,006	\$11,846	\$130,308	\$32,578	\$162,886

Reallocation Projects							
Total Funding Available: \$56,973							
Populations Served	Total Units	Rental Assistance	Supportive Services	Admin	Subtotal (Funding Request)	Match	Grand Total
Avalon Housing—PSH Families Expansion							
<i>Submitted project would expand a current 13-unit PSH project serving Chronically Homeless Families by 1 unit and fund supportive services for 5 more</i>							

Families	1 new (13 Existing)	\$15,144	\$36,650	\$5,179	\$56,973	\$14,243	\$71,217
-----------------	------------------------	----------	----------	---------	----------	----------	----------

DV RRH Bonus Projects							
Total funding Available: \$206,469							
Populations Served	Total Units	Rental Assistance	Supportive Services	Admin	Subtotal (Funding Request)	Match	Grand Total
SOS Community Services—RRH for Families DV Bonus							
<i>Submitted project would expand a current 14-unit RRH project serving DV Survivors</i>							

DV Survivors	6 New (14 Existing)	\$119,751	\$66,071	\$20,647	\$206,469	\$51,617	\$258,086
---------------------	------------------------	-----------	----------	----------	-----------	----------	-----------

Bonus Project Selection

Following the community prioritization as listed in the ranking policy (Attachment A), the FRT recommended funding the highest scoring Coordinated Entry project, SOC Coordinated Entry. This project will be ranked per the CoC-approved 2022 Ranking Policies and is selected to move forwards at \$334,386. As there are not sufficient remaining bonus funds for another project, it will be the only bonus project for 2022.

The FRT is additionally recommending that the unfunded bonus project, MAP PSH Expansion, be ranked on the Special NOFO priority listing if there are remaining funds available after applications for already identified community priorities.

DV Bonus Selection

While only one project was submitted for the DV bonus, it was a strong application that showcased a partnership with local DV survivor experts. The application scored well and met the community need to serve a special population. It was selected to move forward at the full DV bonus funding amount of \$206,469.

Funding Recommendations & Ranking

The project rankings below are listed according to the 2022 Ranking Policy (Attachment A). As seen in the Project Rankings table below, Tier 1 includes 95 percent of the CoC’s ARD, which is the HMIS project renewal and all renewal PSH project, the reallocation PSH project, and most of the RRH project, which is split between tiers as described above. Tier 2 will include the remainder of the RRH project, the CoC Bonus project, and the DV bonus project:

2022 HUD CoC Project Rankings					
Tier	Project Status	Rank	Provider	Project	Amount
1	Renewal	1	OCED	HMIS	\$137,334
		2	MAP	MAP PSH RASS	\$394,856
		3	Avalon	Avalon PSH Singles	\$848,091
		4	Avalon	Avalon PSH Families	\$239,451
		5	Ozone	Ozone Supportive Housing for Youth	\$140,032
		6	MAP	MAP MVP	\$52,073
		7	MAP	MAP Willowpond	\$42,103
		8	Avalon	Avalon/Pontiac Trail	\$99,672
		9	Avalon	Avalon/Ashley	\$102,507
		10	MAP*	MAP SPC SRA	\$500,807
		11	Avalon	SPC Avalon SRA + Bonus 2010 Consolidation	\$351,132
		12	Avalon*	Avalon 2014 Bonus PSH	\$777,449
		13	MAP	MAP PSH PASS	\$215,286
		14	MAP*	MAP SPC TRA	\$443,941
	Reallocation	15	Avalon	Avalon PSH Families Expansion	\$56,973
	Renewal	16	SOS	SOS RRH for Families	\$1,951,620
TIER 1 TOTAL					\$ 6,353,327
2	Renewal	16	SOS	SOS RRH for Families	\$334,386
	COC Bonus	17	SOS	SOS Coordinated Entry	\$334,386
	DV Bonus	18	SOS	RRH for Families DV Bonus	\$206,469
TIER 2 TOTAL					\$ 875,241
Grand Total					\$ 7,228,568

CoC Board Approval of FRT Recommendations

The CoC Board approved the funding and ranking recommendations submitted by the FRT and outlined in this report on September 21, 2022. The CoC Board’s responsibility in this process included:

- Approval of the FRT report and its contents;
- Approval of the FRT funding recommendations and project ranking;
- Affirmation that CoC staff would complete and submit the 2022 CoC Consolidated Application and Priority Rankings and publicly post both by September 28, 2022.

Attachment A: Ranking Policy

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care (CoC) FY2022 Funding Competition

2022 Ranking Policy

Each year, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires all new and renewal applications submitted as a part of the annual Continuum of Care (CoC) funding competition to be ranked according to a CoC-approved, community ranking policy. The 2022 Ranking Policy was drafted per recommendations from the CoC Community from a public meeting held on August 24, 2022. This policy was approved by the CoC Board on 9/21/2022.

Washtenaw County CoC is committed to the below ranking policy for the 2022 CoC Funding Competition.

Projects will be ranked in the following order:

1. Infrastructure projects (HMIS)
2. PSH Renewals ranked by score* (high to low) in the following order:
 - a. Projects with agency-owned units and Leasing Projects
 - b. Project-based rental assistance (PRA)
 - c. Sponsor-based rental assistance (SRA)
 - d. Tenant-based rental assistance (TRA)
3. Projects created through reallocation in the following order: PSH for families, PSH for Individuals
4. RRH Renewals ranked by score* (high to low)
5. Renewals that do not have a full 12 months of Annual Performance Report (APR) data**
6. Bonus projects ranked by score* (high to low) in the following order:
 - a. Supportive Services Only-Coordinated Entry Projects
 - b. PSH for Families in the following order:
 - i. Projects with agency-owned units and Leasing Projects
 - ii. Project-based rental assistance (PRA)
 - iii. Sponsor-based rental assistance (SRA)
 - iv. Tenant-based rental assistance (TRA)
7. Domestic Violence (DV) Bonus project for RRH serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking
8. HMIS Expansion Projects

*Projects with equal scores are ranked by higher Section 2 Component: *Program Outcome* rubric score. If there is still a tie in score, projects will be ranked by higher Section 3 Component: *Compliance* rubric score.

** Newly implemented projects that do not have a full 12 months of APR data are exempt from outcome scores

Guidance for projects that straddle Tiers:

If a project, once listed in ranked order, straddles the Tier 1 /Tier 2 funding line, the following policy will apply:

If a project straddles the line (i.e. a portion of the project budget falls within Tier 1 and a portion within Tier 2), that agency will be asked if the project would still be feasible if only funded for the Tier 1 amount. Agency submits feasibility plan in writing for review by the Funding Review Team (FRT). The FRT reviews this plan and decides whether to accept it based on whether the project would be feasible at the reduced amount.

- IF YES: If project agrees and feasibility plan is accepted by the FRT, the project is submitted straddling the two Tiers.
- IF NO: If project indicates it would not be feasible at a reduced amount or the FRT does not accept the feasibility plan, the project will be dropped so that it wholly fits into Tier 2 and the next ranked project will have the same opportunity to show feasibility straddling the line. This process is continued until a viable project is placed into Tier 1 amount. The FRT will do everything it can to ensure the full amount of Tier 1 funding is utilized.

CoC RENEWAL PROJECT RUBRIC

AGENCY:	PROGRAM:	PROJECT TYPE:
AGENCY LEVEL THRESHOLD		
Agency Level Threshold requires agencies to meet local funding standards and be an active participant in the CoC based on the criteria below.		
THRESHOLD DESCRIPTION	THRESHOLD MET (YES/NO)	
Agency meets the financial audit requirements stipulated under the Human Services Partnership Request for Information (RFI).		
Agency has attended at least 1 of 2 CoC All-Membership Meetings in the past 12 months.		
Agency has representation in at least one of the CoC committees (i.e. WHA Operations Committee, Coordinated Entry Oversight & Evaluation) and has attended at least 75% of meetings convened by the committee.		
Agency has a 75 % attendance rate at Community Housing Prioritization Meetings.		
PROJECT LEVEL THRESHOLD		
Threshold needs to be met as described below for projects to be considered for funding renewal. Projects falling within certain score ranges will need to submit a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), as stated below. <i>Please note: Projects that have not completed a full calendar year will be EXEMPT from this threshold.</i>		
THRESHOLD DESCRIPTION	OUTCOME PERCENTAGE	THRESHOLD MET (YES/NO/EXEMPT)
Program Outcomes: Project attained above 60% of the total score possible. If not, projects scoring between 20-60% will need to submit a CAP and below 20% will not be considered for funding.	%	
Compliance: Project attained above 70% of the total score possible. If not, projects scoring between 50-70% will need to submit a CAP and below 50% will not be considered for funding.	%	
HMIS Compliance & Data Quality: Project attained above 85% of the total score. If not, projects scoring between 55-85% will need to submit a CAP and below 55% will not be considered for funding.	%	
<i>NOTE: For threshold items that are not met, the agency will need to submit an explanatory letter to the CoC Funding Review Team to request a waiver for each threshold item not met before the project application can be considered for funding.</i>		

SECTION 1 - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROJECT NARRATIVE (INSERT HERE)

The project narrative addresses the entire scope of the proposed project at full operational capacity. The project description should address the entire scope of the project, including:

- community need
- target population(s)
- the plan for addressing the identified needs/issues of the CoC target population(s)
- projected outcome(s)
- coordination with other source(s)/partner(s) and how participants will be helped to access mainstream services
- reasons why CoC support is needed
- For projects targeting youth ONLY: Information & data about how youth head of households increased life skills and supports system

<p>TARGET POPULATION (check all that apply)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Chronically Homeless <input type="checkbox"/> Veterans <input type="checkbox"/> Youth (under 25) <input type="checkbox"/> Families with Children <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic Violence <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse <input type="checkbox"/> HIV/AIDS 	<p>PROJECTED HOUSING TYPE (check all that apply)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Scattered-site apartments: Total Units ___ # Agency Owned ___ <input type="checkbox"/> Clustered apartments: Total Units ___ # Agency Owned ___ <input type="checkbox"/> Single Room Occupancy: Total Units ___ # Agency Owned ___ <input type="checkbox"/> Single-family homes/townhouses/duplexes: Total Units ___ # Agency Owned ___ 	<p>PROJECTED UNITS/BEDS Total Units: ___ (total agency-owned) ___ Total Beds: ___</p> <p>PROJECTED CLIENTS SERVED Total Households Served: ___ Total Persons Served: ___ Total Adults: ___ Total Accompanied Children (Under 18): ___ Unaccompanied Children (Under 18): ___</p>
--	---	--

SECTION 2 - PROJECT OUTCOMES

SEE APPENDIX A: PROJECT OUTCOME CALCULATIONS FOR DETAILS ABOUT DATA SOURCES AND CALCULATING SCORES IN THIS SECTION

2A – PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING (PSH) PROJECT OUTCOMES

CRITERIA	STANDARD	AGENCY RATE	SCORING	POINTS/AVAILABLE
<p>A) Retention of Permanent Housing or Movement to Other Permanent Housing</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of stayers} + \text{No. of leavers exiting to PH types}}{\text{Total no. of persons served}} \right] \times 100\%$	95%	%	95% or > = 20 91-94% = 18 87-90% = 16 83-86% = 14 79-82% = 12 75-78% = 10 70-74% = 5 Below 70% = 0	/20
<p>B) Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment with one or more type of Health Insurance (deduplicated) (includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Insurance)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Total no. of (L + S) with HI}}{\text{Total no. of Adults with Annual Assessments and Adult Leavers}} \right] \times 100\%$	80%	%	80% or > = 4 60-79% = 3 50-59% = 2 40-49% = 1 Below 40% = 0	/4
<p>C) Employment Rate for Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment*</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Total no. of Adult (L + S) with earned Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adults served} - \text{Adults on Disability} - \text{Adults over 55}} \right] \times 100\%$	20%	%	20% or > = 1 Below 20% = 0	/1
<p>D) Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment who maintained or increased total income (earned + non-employment income)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Total no. of Adults (L + S) who maintained or } \uparrow \text{ Total Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adults served}} \right] \times 100\%$	60%	%	60% or > = 9 40-59% = 6 20-39% = 3 Below 20% = 0	/9
<p>E) Cost Effectiveness</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Supportive Services } \$ \text{ Total}}{\text{Total Stayers} + \# \text{ of exits to PH}} \right]$	N/A			
SUBTOTAL PSH PROJECT OUTCOMES			/34	

2B – RAPID RE-HOUSING (RRH) PROJECT OUTCOMES

CRITERIA	STANDARD	AGENCY RATE	SCORING	POINTS/ AVAILABLE
<p>A) Exit to Permanent Housing Destinations</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of leavers exiting to PH types}}{\text{Total no. of leavers served}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	80%	%	80% or > = 20 75-79% = 17 70-74% = 15 50-70% = 10 25-50 = 5 Below 25%= 0	/20
<p>B) Leavers with Health Insurance (includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Insurance)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of leavers with HI}}{\text{Total no. of leavers served}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	80%	%	80% or > = 4 60-79% = 3 40-59% = 2 Below 40% = 0	/4
<p>C) Employment Rate for Leavers*</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Total no. of Adult (L + S) with earned Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adults served – Adults on Disability – Adults over 55}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	40%	%	40% or > = 1 Below 40% = 0	/1
<p>D) Leavers who maintained or increased total income (earned + non-employment income)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of Adult leavers who maintained or } \uparrow \text{ Total Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adult leavers served}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	60%	%	60% or > = 9 40-59% = 6 20-39% = 3 Below 20% = 0	/9
<p>E) Cost Effectiveness</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Supportive Services $ Total}}{\text{\# of exits to PH}} \right]$	N/A			
SUBTOTAL RRH PROJECT OUTCOMES			/34	

SECTION 3 - CONSUMER FEEDBACK

CRITERIA	STANDARD	SCORING	AGENCY RATE	POINTS/AVAILABLE
Consumer participation on organization board or other policy making entity. <i>(Mandated by HUD)</i>	Yes, it's currently in place	Yes, it's currently in place = 3 No, but there is an existing plan= 1 No, no plan= 0		/3
Redress and grievance process in place for consumers. <i>(Mandated by HUD)</i>	Yes, it's currently in place	Yes, it's currently in place = 3 No, but there is an existing plan= 1 No, no plan= 0		/3
Feedback collection and response process in place (e.g., clients satisfaction survey, consumer engagement session, etc.).	Yes, it's currently in place	Yes, it's currently in place = 3 No, but there is an existing plan= 1 No, no plan= 0		/3
Client feedback is used to inform service delivery and direct future services	Recent example	Example of utilizing client feedback within past year= 3 No, but there is an existing plan= 1 No, no plan= 0		/3
SUBTOTAL CONSUMER FEEDBACK				/12

SECTION 4 - COMPLIANCE

CRITERIA	STANDARD	AGENCY RATE	SCORING	POINTS/AVAILABLE	SOURCE
Agency has one or more unresolved monitoring or audit finding(s) for any HUD grants (including ESG) operated by the applicant or potential subrecipients (if any).	No findings or findings addressed in Corrective Action Plan (CAP)		No findings = 5 Findings with CAP submitted = 3 Findings but no CAP = 0	/5	Agency report
Agency has expended funds on this grant in the last two years.	90%		90-100%=5 85% -89%=3 84% and below = 0	/5	Agency report $\left[\frac{\text{Amount drawn from LOCCS within 90 days end of project}}{\text{Total Grant Amount}} \times 100\% \right]$
Agency has outstanding obligations to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon.	No		No=5 Yes=0	/5	Agency report

Agency has a history of late APR submissions (in the last 3 years or for the duration of this project)	0		0-1 late APRs = 5 2-3 late APRs = 0	/5	Agency report
--	---	--	--	----	---------------

SUBTOTAL COMPLIANCE /20

SECTION 5 - BUDGET

CRITERIA	STANDARD	AGENCY RATE	SCORING	POINTS/ POSSIBLE POINTS	SOURCE
Budget submitted is clearly filled out and calculated correctly. Budget requests are clear, logical and consistent with the overall activities proposed in the application. Quantity descriptions clearly identify what is included in the requests and are in line with project requirements.	Yes		Yes = 6 No = 0	/6	Agency report

Optional Narrative:

SUBTOTAL BUDGET /6

SECTION 6 – RACIAL EQUITY

TO BE COMPLETED ONCE PER AGENCY

CRITERIA	STANDARD	Agency Response	SOURCE
Public written commitment to address/eliminate racial and ethnic inequities in guiding documentation (i.e. mission, vision, goals, etc.)	Yes		Website or other public posting

Organization has a racial equity plan or strategy that is regularly monitored	Yes		Submitted plan or strategy
Ongoing evaluation of policy, service, or program impacts and progress towards racial equity	Yes		Agency narrative or submitted evaluation
Internal structures exist to address issues of racial equity (i.e. a functioning equity committee, formal or informal complaint resolution process, caucusing and community advisory body)	Yes		Agency narrative or submitted materials
Racial equity knowledge, skills, and practices are a part of staff job descriptions and work plans	Yes		Submitted job descriptions or work plans
Staff receive training and support around racial equity and how their role is important in addressing institutional racism (i.e. anti-oppression trainings, etc.)	Yes		Names and dates of trainings attended by staff
Management consistently applies a racial equity lens	Yes		Agency narrative or submitted materials

Optional Narrative--Please describe any additional strategies for addressing and responding to racial inequality, and any significant successes or challenges this year:

Racial Equity Checklist adapted from [A Home for Everyone](#)

SECTION 7 - HMIS COMPLIANCE & DATA QUALITY

CRITERIA	STANDARD	AGENCY RATE	SCORING	POINTS/ POSSIBLE POINTS	SOURCE
*HMIS - % of Universal Data Elements (UDEs) with No or Null Values in HMIS (left blank) for the following criteria:					
Name	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Date of Birth	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Gender	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Social Security Number	10% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Race	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Ethnicity	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report

Veteran Status	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Disabling Condition	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Destination	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Relationship to Head of Household	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Annual Assessments Completed/Required	5% or fewer missing assessment		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS APR Q18
SUBTOTAL HMIS COMPLIANCE & DATA QUALITY				/11	
GRAND TOTAL				/91	

REVIEWER COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

Reviewer: _____

APPENDIX A: PROJECT OUTCOMES CALCULATIONS

2A –PSH PROJECT OUTCOMES

CRITERIA	SOURCE & CALCULATION	
<p>A) Retention of Permanent Housing or Movement to Other Permanent Housing</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of stayers} + \text{No. of leavers exiting to PH types}}{\text{Total no. of persons served}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i></p> <p>A. APR Q22a1 Total stayers + B. APR Q23c Permanent Subtotal</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i></p> <p>C. APR Q7a Total persons served (inc. children) - D. APR Q23c Total Deceased</p>	$\frac{A + B}{C - D} \times 100\%$
<p>B) Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment with one or more type of Health Insurance (de-duplicated) (includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Insurance)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Total no. of } (L + S) \text{ with HI}}{\text{Total no. of Adults with Annual Assessments and Adult Leavers}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i></p> <p>A. APR Q21 Total at annual assessment with 1 source + B. APR Q21 Total at annual assessment w/ more than 1 source + C. APR Q21 Total leavers with 1 source + D. APR Q21 Total leavers with more than 1 source</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i></p> <p>E. APR Q7a Total no. of adults - F. APR Q21 # of stayers not yet required to have an assessment</p>	$\frac{A + B + C + D}{E - F} \times 100\%$
<p>C) Employment Rate for Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment</p> $\frac{\text{Total no. of Adult } (L + S) \text{ with earned } Y}{\text{Total no. of Adults served} - \text{Adults on disability} - \text{Adults 55 and over}}$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i></p> <p>A. APR Q18 Total at annual assessment with earned income + B. APR Q18 Total at annual assessment w/both earned and other income + C. APR Q18 Total leavers with earned income + D. APR Q18 Total leavers with both earned and other income</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i></p> <p>E. APR Q18 Total adults + F. APR Q18 Total adult leavers - G. APR Q18 # of stayers not yet required to have an assessment - H. From provider # of adults <55 on disability - I. APR Q11 # of adults 55 or older</p>	$\frac{A + B + C + D}{E + F - G - H - I} \times 100\%$
<p>D) Leavers and Stayers who maintained or increased total income (earned + non-employment income)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Total no. of Adults } (L + S) \text{ who maintained or } \uparrow \text{ Total } Y}{\text{Total no. of Adults served}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i></p> <p>A. APR Q19a1* Retained income category and same \$ + B. APR Q19a1* Retained income category and increased \$ + C. APR Q19a1* Did not have income category and gained income + D. APR Q19a2* Retained income category and same \$ + E. APR Q19a2* Retained income category and increased \$ + F. APR Q19a2* Did not have income category and gained income</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i></p> <p>G. APR Q19a1* Total adults (including those with no income) + H. APR Q19a2* Total adults (including those with not income)</p> <p><i>* Use row "Number of Adults with any Income" in table Q19a3</i></p>	$\frac{A + B + C + D + E + F}{G + H} \times 100\%$

<p>E) Cost Effectiveness</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Supportive Services \$ Total}}{\# \text{ of Stayers} + \# \text{ of exits to PH}} \right]$	<p><i>Numerator:</i> A. Grant Inventory Worksheet Column H Supportive Services Total</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> B. APR Q22a1 Total stayers + C. APR Q23c Permanent Subtotal</p>	$\frac{A}{B + C}$
--	---	-------------------

2A – RRH PROJECT OUTCOMES

CRITERIA	SOURCE & CALCULATION	
<p>A) Exit to Permanent Housing Destinations</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of leavers exiting to PH types}}{\text{Total no. of leavers served}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i> A. APR Q23c Permanent destination subtotal</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> B. APR Q5a Total leavers -C. APR Q23c Total deceased</p>	$\frac{A}{B - C} \times 100\%$
<p>B) Leavers with Health Insurance (includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Insurance)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of leavers with HI}}{\text{Total no. of leavers served}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i> A. APR Q21 Leavers with 1 source of health insurance + B. APR Q21 Leavers with more than 1 source of health insurance</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> C. APR Q5a Total adult leavers</p>	$\frac{A + B}{C} \times 100\%$
<p>C) Employment Rate for Leavers</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of Adult leavers with earned Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adult leavers served} - \text{Adults on disability} - \text{Adults 55 and over}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i> A. APR Q18 Adult leavers with only earned income + B. APR Q18 Adult leavers with both earned and other income</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> C. APR Q5a Total adult leavers D. From provider Total adults <55 on disability E. APR Q11 Total adults 55 or over</p>	$\frac{A + B}{C - D - E} \times 100\%$
<p>D) Leavers who maintained or increased total income (earned + non-employment income)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of Adult leavers who maintained or } \uparrow \text{ Total Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adult leavers served}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i> A. APR Q19a2* Retained income category and same \$ + B. APR Q19a2* Retained income category and increased \$ + C. APR Q19a2* Did not have income category and gained income</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> D. APR Q19a2* Total adults (including those with no income)</p>	$\frac{A + B + C}{D} \times 100\%$

	<p>* Use row "Number of Adults with any Income" in table Q19a2</p>	
<p>A) E) Cost Effectiveness</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Supportive Services \$ Total}}{\text{\# of exits to PH}} \right]$	<p>Numerator: A. Grant Inventory Worksheet Column H Supportive Services Total Denominator: B. APR Q23c Permanent destination subtotal</p>	$\frac{A}{B}$

Attachment C: Renewal Project Scores

2022 HUD CoC Renewal Project Scores

2022 Continuum of Care: Renewal Projects Score Comparison											
PROVIDER	PROJECT	rental assistance type	Agency owned units	PROJECT OUTCOMES (out of 34 points)	CONSUMER FEEDBACK (out of 12 points)	COMPLIANCE (out of 20 points or 15 for exempt)	BUDGET (out of 6 points)	DATA QUALITY (out of 11 points)	TOTAL SCORE (out of 83 points; see below for exempt)	% TOTAL SCORE	ANNUAL RENEWAL
	Average Score			31	12	19	6	11	78	94%	
	Highest Score			34	12	20	6	11	83	100%	
	Lowest Score			25	10	18	6	9	72	87%	
OCED	HMIS	Infrastructure	n/a	EXEMPT	EXEMPT	EXEMPT	EXEMPT	EXEMPT	EXEMPT	EXEMPT	\$ 137,334
MAP	MAP PSH RASS	Leasing	yes	28	12	20	6	11	77	93%	\$ 394,856
Avalon	Avalon PSH Singles	SRA	yes	32	12	18	6	11	79	95%	\$ 848,091
Avalon	Avalon PSH Families	SRA	yes	25	12	18	6	11	72	87%	\$ 239,451
Ozone	Ozone Supportive Housing for Youth	TRA	yes	31	10	20	6	11	78	94%	\$ 140,032
MAP	MAP MVP	N/A	yes	34	12	20	6	11	83	100%	\$ 52,073
MAP	MAP Willowpond	N/A	yes	33	12	20	6	11	82	99%	\$ 42,103
Avalon	Avalon/Pontiac Trail	N/A	yes	31	12	18	6	11	78	94%	\$ 99,672
Avalon	Avalon/Ashley	N/A	yes	30	12	18	6	9	75	90%	\$ 102,507
MAP*	MAP SPC SRA	SRA	mixed	32	12	20	6	11	81	98%	\$ 500,807
Avalon	SPC Avalon SRA	SRA	mixed	31	12	18	6	11	78	94%	\$ 351,132
Avalon*	Avalon 2014 Bonus PSH	TRA	mixed	28	12	18	6	10	74	89%	\$ 777,449
MAP	MAP PSH PASS	TRA	no	32	12	20	6	11	81	98%	\$ 215,286
MAP*	MAP SPC TRA	TRA	no	30	12	20	6	11	79	95%	\$ 443,941
SOS/IHN	SOS RRH for Families 2019	RRH TRA	no	30	12	15	6	11	74	89%	\$ 2,286,006
*Project fiduciary is the Ann Arbor Housing Commission.										Total	\$6,630,740
PROJECT TYPE:		Permanent Supportive Housing				Rapid Re-Housing					

Attachment D: Bonus & Reallocation Scoring Rubrics

WASHTENAW COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE 2022

Reviewer Name: _____

Applicant Agency: _____

Project Title: _____

Total Score (complete this once scoring rubric is completed): _____

SCORING RUBRIC FOR NEW OR EXPANDED PERMANENT HOUSING PROJECT APPLICATIONS

Introduction:

The following rubric is an attempt to operationalize the scoring criteria for new permanent housing project or expansion project applications (i.e. bonus projects) in the FY 2022 CoC Funding Competition. It serves as a descriptive guide for use by the **Funding Review Team**, a *CoC-appointed committee*, when scoring the applications to minimize discrepancies in interpretation between scorers, thereby enhancing consistency and objectivity.

background & eligible projects

The Washtenaw County Continuum of Care (CoC) accepted applications for one or more bonus or expansion projects totaling \$334,386,249 for the 2021 CoC Funding Competition. In addition, the COC is reallocation \$56,973 using the same application. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) allows CoC's to apply for new (bonus) projects or for expansions of current CoC projects. ***This application uses definitions and requirements based on the [2022 NOFO](#).***

Applicants can apply for a new permanent housing bonus project or for an expansion of a current permanent housing project.

- All **new permanent housing projects** can apply for one of two types of projects, including:
 - New **permanent supportive housing (PSH)** projects that meet the requirements of DedicatedPLUS as defined in Section III.B.2.g. of the [NOFO](#) or new PSH projects where 100 percent of the beds are dedicated to chronic homelessness.
 - New **rapid rehousing (RRH)** projects that will serve homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth, who meet the following criteria:
 - (a) residing in a place not meant for human habitation;
 - (b) residing in an emergency shelter;
 - (c) persons meeting the criteria of paragraph (2) of the definition of homeless

(d) persons meeting the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homeless, including persons fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence situations;

(e) receiving services from a VA-funded homeless assistance program and met one of the above criteria at initial intake to the VA's homeless assistance system.

- Project applicants that intend to **expand an eligible renewal project** must:
 - apply within the same component type;
 - provide the eligible renewal grant number that the project applicant requests to expand on the new project application;
 - indicate how the new project application will expand units, beds, services, persons served
 - ensure the funding request for the new expansion project is within the funding parameters allowed under the reallocation process or permanent housing bonus.

Section A: Funding Eligibility and Threshold Criteria (Checklist: tick where applicable)

AGENCY THRESHOLD CRITERIA:

The project meets the eligibility requirements of the CoC Program as defined in 24 CFR part 578 and provides evidence of eligibility required in the application (e.g., nonprofit documentation).

The applicant agency demonstrates the financial and management capacity and experience to carry out the project and to administer Federal funds, as detailed in the project application.

See pages 44-48 of the NOFO for a complete list of threshold criteria.

PROJECT TYPE

Applicants can apply for a new permanent housing bonus project or for an expansion of a current permanent housing project. This project falls under the eligible project type of:

New permanent housing project

PSH serving eligible populations as described above

RRH serving eligible populations as described above

Expansion Project

PSH serving eligible populations as described above

RRH serving eligible populations as described above

PROJECT QUALITY THRESHOLD

New permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing projects must meet at least three out of the four criteria and must meet the third criteria. Projects that do not meet at least three criteria and criteria 3 will be rejected (see pages 45 of the NOFO).

- The type of housing proposed will fit the needs of the program participants
- The type of supportive services that will be offered to program participants will ensure successful retention in or help to obtain permanent housing, including all supportive services regardless of funding source
- The proposed project has a specific plan to coordinate and integrate with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs and ensure that program participants are assisted to obtain benefits from the mainstream programs for which they may be eligible (e.g., Medicare, Medicaid, SSI, Food Stamps, local Workforce office, early childhood education)
- Program participants are assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing in a manner that fits their needs (e.g., provides the participant with some type of transportation to access needed services, safety planning, case management, additional assistance to ensure retention of permanent housing)
- The project must follow a housing first approach (page 9 of the NOFO)

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS:

- Most Recent independent audit and submission of SAS114, and 115, if applicable.
- Current year Board-approved agency budget

Section B: Scoring Sheet

INSTRUCTIONS: FRT members are to review the applications and award points according to the extent to which the scoring criteria are met. A scale with suggested points has been created for each component.

Scoring Components	Criteria for Scoring	Awarded Points
II (A-H): APPLICANT/ SPONSOR EXPERIENCE AND CAPACITY	This component is concerned with the applicant’s level of experience and capacity in delivering housing and supportive services for homeless clients. Suggested scoring scale: For maximum points (=15), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear description (backed with concrete examples) of experience/ expertise with renting units, operating rental assistance and providing supportive services that are aligned with what is proposed in the application. Clear and concrete examples of how applicant has identified and addressed target population’s housing and service needs 	___/15

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If it is a joint application, role of each partner is clearly described and delineated • Applicant agency has a strong management and coordination structure along with an adequate financial accounting system to administer the grant • If a current recipient of CoC or other forms of federal funding, there are no outstanding obligations to HUD, no unexpended funds and no detrimental audit findings. (i.e Answers to questions IIE-H must be 'No') <p>10-14 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate description and demonstration of above criteria with good examples given to support content. • Where applicant answered 'Yes' to any of the questions (1E-H), there must be a clear demonstration of corrective steps taken which led to successful resolution of outstanding concerns. <p>5-9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above criteria are not fully or clearly met. Some attempt to provide examples to demonstrate (i) and (ii) but they are not always aligned with what is proposed in the application. • Where there are outstanding obligations to HUD or audit issues, applicant did not provide an adequate corrective action plan or explanation. <p>0-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in demonstration of most of stated criteria. No concrete examples were provided to support claims. • No clear role / responsibilities when it comes to joint applications • Where there are outstanding obligations to HUD or audit concerns, applicant did not provide <u>any</u> corrective action plan or explanation. <p>Comments:</p>	
<p>III (A-G): PROJECT DESCRIPTION</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the scope of the proposed project, its goals and the means in which the desired outcomes are to be realized.</p> <p><i>Suggested scoring scale:</i> For maximum points (=20), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project description is clear, complete, and concise and addresses the entire scope of the project. 	<p>___/20</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly addresses the target population/ community to be served and how applicant plans to go about meeting assessed needs. All pointers that are highlighted in the application are fully addressed. • Has a sound plan for executing the grant agreement and beginning rental assistance within 12 months of the award. • For expansion projects, application clearly explains why the expanded activity is needed and how it will be implemented. • If project is designated as DedicatedPLUS, application provides clear explanation of the reasoning behind this designation and how the project will use this expanded criteria. • Project has strong capacity for prioritizing persons with the most severe needs. • If applying for rental assistance, project has a comprehensive method for assessing and determining the type and amount of rental assistance that participants can receive. <p>14-19 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project description is generally comprehensive with 1-2 areas that require clarification. • Pointers highlighted in question III(A) are mostly addressed. • Plan for implementing project within 12 months can be clearer. • Project can be more explicit in its description of how chronic and vulnerable homeless persons are prioritized. <p>7-13 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project description can be more comprehensive and there were more than 3 areas requiring further clarification. • Pointers highlighted in question III(a) are not addressed adequately. • Timeline for implementation within 12 months is questionable and it is unlikely that project would be ready within 12 months of receiving award. • Weak demonstration of project’s capacity to prioritize chronic and vulnerable homeless persons. <p>0-6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in overall project description with some pointers not addressed at all. • Responses have little or no consistency with other parts of the application. • There are serious doubts that project would be ready to implement in a timely manner. 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project is not aligned with HUD's goals of prioritizing chronic and vulnerable homeless persons. <p>Comments:</p>	
--	---	--

<p>IV : COMMITMENT TO HOUSING FIRST</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the project’s alignment and commitment to the Housing First approach to homeless assistance.</p> <p><u>Suggested Scoring Scale:</u> For maximum points (=10), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant must clearly describe past experience with the Housing First approach • Current project design is aligned with Housing First Principles (refer to Appendix A of the application (page 18), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Client participation in services is not a prerequisite for housing placement ○ Few, if any, programmatic requirements for entry into housing (e.g. sobriety, minimum income threshold) ○ Services are provided as per client’s choice and discretion <p>4-9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of Housing First approach is weak; no clear indication of past experience in employing this approach. • Project design does not fully incorporate Housing First Principles within its service delivery. Not all of the points highlighted in the criteria are referenced. <p>0-3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No clear evidence that applicant understands or has incorporated Housing First principles within its service delivery approach. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>____/10</p>
---	--	----------------

--	--	--

<p>V: (A-I) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR PARTICIPANTS</p>	<p>This component is concerned with project’s capacity to render participants with the appropriate supportive services crucial for obtaining and sustaining permanent housing outcomes.</p> <p><u>Suggested Scoring Scale:</u> For maximum points (= 25), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very clear and comprehensive description of how project assists participants in obtaining and remaining in permanent housing. • Project includes a well-thought through plan for individual case management and linkage to mainstream health, social services, and employment resources and benefits where participants meet eligibility criteria. • Supportive services are tailored to the needs of program participants and appropriate measures are in place to reduce barriers to access (e.g. accessible location, relevant type of aid, etc.). • Detailed, coherent and well-thought through “Supportive Services Type and Frequency Chart” that is feasible for implementation. <p>16-24 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate description of how project functions to assist clients in obtaining and maintaining permanent housing. • Overall, project demonstrates ability to meet above criteria to a large extent, however some of the responses are lacking in detail or clarity. • “Supportive Services Type and Frequency” Chart is adequately filled up with some areas of doubt. <p>6-15 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptions and responses to questions are often inadequate and require further clarification. It is not clear the extent to which the applicant has experience or expertise in assisting clients with maintaining housing or increasing income. • Limited description of how applicant has acknowledged clients’ barriers to access and sought to minimize them. • “Supportive Services Type and Frequency” Chart raises doubts for implementation. <p>0-5 points:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">___/25</p>
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Descriptions and responses to questions are severely lacking. There is little or no evidence that the applicant has experience or expertise in assisting clients with maintaining housing or increasing income.• Proposed supportive services do not take into account client’s potential barriers to access.• “Supportive Services Type and Frequency Chart” does not match applicant agency capacity and is not feasible for implementation. <p>Comments:</p>	
--	---	--

<p>VI: LANDLORD ENGAGEMENT (APPLIES TO SCATTERED- SITE PROJECTS ONLY)</p>	<p>This component is concerned with applicant agency’s engagement efforts with landlords towards increasing affordable housing availability. (Applies to scattered-site projects only) Suggested Scoring Scale: For maximum points (=5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear description of applicant’s outreach and engagement efforts with landlords is provided. • There is strong evidence of an ongoing positive relationship and communication with landlords that enhances their participation. <p>2-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in description provided. • Limited evidence of an ongoing positive relationship and communication with landlords. <p>0-1 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no consideration for outreach to and engagement with landlords. • No evidence of relationship and communication with landlords. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>___/5</p>
<p>VII: COMMITMENT TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLAN (APPLIES TO PROJECT- BASED PROJECTS ONLY)</p>	<p>This component is concerned with applicant agency’s commitment to the community’s Affordable Housing Plan – Housing Affordability and Economic Equity – Analysis. (Applies to project-based projects only) Suggested Scoring Scale: For maximum points (=5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and comprehensive description of how the project’s location and design aligns with the <i>Housing Affordability and Economic Equity Analysis</i>. <p>2-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in description provided. • Limited alignment with <i>Housing Affordability and Economic Equity Analysis</i>. <p>0-1 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of alignment with <i>Housing Affordability and Economic Equity Analysis</i>. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>___/5</p>

<p>VIII: PARTNERING AND COMMITMENT TO COORDINATED ENTRY</p>	<p>This component is concerned with applicant agency's commitment to working collaboratively within the Continuum of Care.</p> <p><u>Suggested Scoring Scale:</u> For maximum points (=5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description indicates a strong commitment towards collaboration with CoC partners and concrete efforts to start/maintain this in the proposed project. • Strong indication of commitment to coordinated entry to maximize resources and avoid duplication. <p>2-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in description; there is indication of commitment towards partnership and the coordinated process but it is not fully demonstrated in the past or in current application. <p>0-1 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description is vague and indicates little or no commitment towards partnership or the coordinated entry process. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>/5</p>
---	---	-----------

<p>IX: BUDGET DETAIL</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the budgeting aspects of the proposed project. <u>Suggested scoring scale:</u> For maximum points (=20), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All budget charts are clearly filled out and calculated correctly. Budget requests are clear, logical and consistent with the overall activities proposed in the application. • New projects can request 1 year of funding with up to an 18-month initial grant term. • Quantity descriptions clearly identify what is included in the requests and are in line with project requirements. • Clear indication of potential additional funding sources that are committed to this project. <p>14-19 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget charts are generally filled out in a logical and coherent manner with minor areas requiring clarification. • Quantity descriptions are adequate but may have some inconsistency with overall project requirements. <p>7-13 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some errors in budget charts, including calculation errors. • Quantity descriptions are unclear and most parts are lacking in logic and connection to the overall application. <p>0-6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget charts are unclear on the whole and lacking in logic and connection to the overall application; multiple calculation errors. • Overall responses provided indicate poor adherence to the specific requirements in each section. <p>Comments:</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">___/20</p>
------------------------------	---	---

OVERALL COMMENTS:

WASHTENAW COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE 2022

Reviewer Name: _____

Applicant Agency: _____

Project Title: _____

Total Score (complete this once scoring rubric is completed): _____

SCORING RUBRIC FOR NEW SUPPORTIVE SERVICES ONLY COORDINATED ENTRY PROJECTS

Introduction:

The following rubric is an attempt to operationalize the scoring criteria for new coordinated entry applications (i.e. bonus projects) in the FY 2022 CoC Funding Competition. It serves as a descriptive guide for use by the **Funding Review Team**, a CoC-appointed committee, when scoring the applications to minimize discrepancies in interpretation between scorers, thereby enhancing consistency and objectivity.

background & eligible projects

The Washtenaw County Continuum of Care (CoC) accepted applications for one or more bonus or expansion projects totaling \$334,386 for the 2022 CoC Funding Competition. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) allows CoC's to apply for new (bonus) projects or for expansions of current CoC projects. ***This application uses definitions and requirements based on the [2022 NOFO](#).***

Section A: Funding Eligibility and Threshold Criteria (Checklist: tick where applicable)

AGENCY THRESHOLD CRITERIA:

- The project meets the eligibility requirements of the CoC Program as defined in 24 CFR part 578 and provides evidence of eligibility required in the application (e.g., nonprofit documentation).
- The applicant agency demonstrates the financial and management capacity and experience to carry out the project and to administer Federal funds, as detailed in the project application.

See pages 44-48 of the NOFO for a complete list of threshold criteria.

PROJECT TYPE

Applicants can apply for a new bonus project or for an expansion of a current project. This project falls under the eligible project type of:

- New Supportive Services Only Coordinated Entry**
- Expansion Supportive Services Only Coordinated Entry**

PROJECT QUALITY THRESHOLD

New HMIS projects must meet at least two out of the four criteria or they will be rejected (see pages 52 of the NOFO).

- The centralized or coordinated assessment system is easily available/reachable for all persons within the CoC's geographic area who are seeking homelessness assistance. The system must also be accessible for persons with disabilities within the CoC's geographic area.
- There is a strategy for advertising that is designed specifically to reach homeless persons with the highest barriers within the CoC's geographic area.
- There is a standardized assessment process.
- Ensures program participants are directed to appropriate housing and services that fit their needs.

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS:

- Most Recent independent audit and submission of SAS114, and 115, if applicable.
- Current year Board-approved agency budget

Section B: Scoring Sheet

INSTRUCTIONS: FRT members are to review the applications and award points according to the extent to which the scoring criteria are met. A scale with suggested points has been created for each component.

Scoring Components	Criteria for Scoring	Awarded Points
<p>II (A-H): APPLICANT/ SPONSOR EXPERIENCE AND CAPACITY</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the applicant’s level of experience and capacity in delivering housing and supportive services for homeless clients.</p> <p>Suggested scoring scale: For maximum points (=20), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear description (backed with concrete examples) of experience/ expertise with renting units, operating rental assistance and providing supportive services that are aligned with what is proposed in the application. • Clear and concrete examples of how applicant has identified and addressed target population’s housing and service needs • If it is a joint application, role of each partner is clearly described and delineated • Applicant agency has a strong management and coordination structure along with an adequate financial accounting system to administer the grant • If a current recipient of CoC or other forms of federal funding, there are no outstanding obligations to HUD, no unexpended funds and no detrimental audit findings. (i.e Answers to questions IIE-H must be ‘No’) <p>13-19 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate description and demonstration of above criteria with good examples given to support content. • Where applicant answered ‘Yes’ to any of the questions (1E-H), there must be a clear demonstration of corrective steps taken which led to successful resolution of outstanding concerns. <p>7-12 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above criteria are not fully or clearly met. Some attempt to provide examples to demonstrate (i) and (ii) but they are not always aligned with what is proposed in the application. • Where there are outstanding obligations to HUD or audit issues, applicant did not provide an adequate corrective action plan or explanation. <p>0-6 points:</p>	<p>____/20</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in demonstration of most of stated criteria. No concrete examples were provided to support claims. • No clear role / responsibilities when it comes to joint applications • Where there are outstanding obligations to HUD or audit concerns, applicant did not provide <u>any</u> corrective action plan or explanation. <p>Comments:</p>	
<p>III (A-G): PROJECT DESCRIPTION</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the scope of the proposed project, its goals and the means in which the desired outcomes are to be realized.</p> <p><u>Suggested scoring scale:</u> For maximum points (=40), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project description is clear, complete, and concise and addresses the entire scope of the project. • Clearly addresses the target population/ community to be served and how applicant plans to go about meeting assessed needs. All pointers that are highlighted in the application are fully addressed. • Has a sound plan for executing the grant agreement and beginning rental assistance within 12 months of the award. • Project has strong capacity for prioritizing persons with the most severe needs. • Project has a clear advertisement strategy for reaching those with the highest barriers to assistance <p>30-49 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project description is generally comprehensive with 1-2 areas that require clarification. • Pointers highlighted in question III(A) are mostly addressed. • Plan for implementing project within 12 months can be clearer. • Project can be more explicit in its description of advertisement strategy <p>10-29 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project description can be more comprehensive and there were more than 3 areas requiring further clarification. • Pointers highlighted in question III(a) are not addressed adequately. • Timeline for implementation within 12 months is questionable and it is unlikely that project would be ready within 12 months of receiving award. 	<p>___/40</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Weak demonstration of project's advertisement strategy <p>0-9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lack of clarity in overall project description with some pointers not addressed at all.• Responses have little or no consistency with other parts of the application.• There are serious doubts that project would be ready to implement in a timely manner.• Project is not aligned with HUD's goals advertising to those with the highest barriers to assistance. <p>Comments:</p>	
--	---	--

<p>IV : COMMITMENT TO HOUSING FIRST</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the project’s alignment and commitment to the Housing First approach to homeless assistance.</p> <p><u>Suggested Scoring Scale:</u> For maximum points (=10), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant must clearly describe past experience with the Housing First approach • Current project design is aligned with Housing First Principles (refer to Appendix A of the application (page 18), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Client participation in services is not a prerequisite for housing placement ○ Few, if any, programmatic requirements for entry into housing (e.g. sobriety, minimum income threshold) ○ Services are provided as per client’s choice and discretion <p>4-9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of Housing First approach is weak; no clear indication of past experience in employing this approach. • Project design does not fully incorporate Housing First Principles within its service delivery. Not all of the points highlighted in the criteria are referenced. <p>0-3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No clear evidence that applicant understands or has incorporated Housing First principles within its service delivery approach. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>___/10</p>
---	--	---------------

<p>VIII: PARTNERING AND COMMITMENT TO COORDINATED ENTRY</p>	<p>This component is concerned with applicant agency's commitment to working collaboratively within the Continuum of Care.</p> <p><u>Suggested Scoring Scale:</u> For maximum points (=5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description indicates a strong commitment towards collaboration with CoC partners and concrete efforts to start/maintain this in the proposed project. • Strong indication of commitment to coordinated entry to maximize resources and avoid duplication. <p>2-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in description; there is indication of commitment towards partnership and the coordinated process but it is not fully demonstrated in the past or in current application. <p>0-2 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description is vague and indicates little or no commitment towards partnership or the coordinated entry process. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>/10</p>
---	---	------------

IX: BUDGET DETAIL	<p>This component is concerned with the budgeting aspects of the proposed project.</p> <p><u>Suggested scoring scale:</u> For maximum points (=20), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All budget charts are clearly filled out and calculated correctly. Budget requests are clear, logical and consistent with the overall activities proposed in the application. • New projects can request 1 year of funding with up to an 18-month initial grant term. • Quantity descriptions clearly identify what is included in the requests and are in line with project requirements. • Clear indication of potential additional funding sources that are committed to this project. <p>14-19 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget charts are generally filled out in a logical and coherent manner with minor areas requiring clarification. • Quantity descriptions are adequate but may have some inconsistency with overall project requirements. <p>7-13 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some errors in budget charts, including calculation errors. • Quantity descriptions are unclear and most parts are lacking in logic and connection to the overall application. <p>0-6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget charts are unclear on the whole and lacking in logic and connection to the overall application; multiple calculation errors. • Overall responses provided indicate poor adherence to the specific requirements in each section. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>___/20</p>
----------------------	--	---------------

OVERALL COMMENTS:

WASHTENAW COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE 2022

Reviewer Name: _____

Applicant Agency: _____

Project Title: _____

Total Score (complete this once scoring rubric is completed): _____

SCORING RUBRIC FOR DV BONUS APPLICATIONS

DV Bonus applications are for new permanent housing rapid re-housing (RRH) projects dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that are defined as homeless at 24 CFR 578.3

Introduction:

The following rubric is an attempt to operationalize the scoring criteria for new permanent housing project or expansion project applications (i.e. bonus projects) in the FY 2022 CoC Funding Competition. It serves as a descriptive guide for use by the **Funding Review Team**, a CoC-appointed committee, when scoring the applications to minimize discrepancies in interpretation between scorers, thereby enhancing consistency and objectivity.

background & eligible projects

As allowed under the [2022 Notice of Funding Opportunity](#) (NOFO), the Washtenaw County Continuum of Care (CoC) accepted applications for new Permanent Housing Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) projects serving survivors of domestic violence (DV), dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that are defined as homeless at 24 CFR 578.3 (see page 37 of the NOFO). Applicants are permitted to request up to \$176,407 for a 1-year grant term.

Applicants do not have to be DV providers, but it is *strongly advised* that non-DV providers partner with DV programs to ensure critical program elements are included, such as ongoing safety planning, survivor confidentiality, trauma-informed services and survivor choice.

In the review of applications, reviewers should ensure the following expectations are met:

- Applicants can quantify the need for the project and how the project will fill that gap
- Demonstrated previous performance of applicant in serving survivors of domestic violence (DV), dating violence, sexual assault or stalking, as well as their ability to house survivors and meet safety outcomes

Section A: Funding Eligibility and Threshold Criteria

(CHECKLIST: TICK WHERE APPLICABLE)

AGENCY THRESHOLD CRITERIA:

- The project meets the eligibility requirements of the CoC Program as defined in 24 CFR part 578 and provides evidence of eligibility required in the application (e.g., nonprofit documentation)
- The applicant agency demonstrates the financial and management capacity and experience to carry out the project and to administer Federal funds, as detailed in the project application.
- The applicant and subrecipient (if any) must have the ability to collect required HUD data and generate required reports in HMIS or a comparable data base (for DV agencies)

PROJECT TYPE

Applicants can apply for new permanent housing Rapid Re-Housing projects that follow a housing first approach and are dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that are defined as homeless at 24 CFR 578.3.

- New Rapid Re-Housing Project is dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that are defined as homeless at 24 CFR 578.3.

PROJECT QUALITY THRESHOLD

New permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing projects must meet at least 3 out of the 4 criteria and must meet the 3rd criteria. Projects that do not meet at least three criteria and criteria 3 will be rejected (see pages 44-48 of the NOFO).

- The type of housing proposed will fit the needs of the program participants
- The type of supportive services that will be offered to program participants will ensure successful retention in or help to obtain permanent housing, including all supportive services regardless of funding source
- The proposed project has a specific plan to coordinate and integrate with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs and ensure that program participants are assisted to obtain benefits from the mainstream programs for which they may be eligible (e.g., Medicare, Medicaid, SSI, Food Stamps, local Workforce office, early childhood education)
- Program participants are assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing in a manner that fits their needs (e.g., provides the participant with some type of transportation to access needed services, safety planning, case management, additional assistance to ensure retention of permanent housing)

Additional criteria:

The project must follow a housing first approach (see page 9 of the NOFO).

The applicant must demonstrate that the project will use trauma-informed, victim-centered approaches (see page 16 of the NOFO).

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS:

Most Recent independent audit and submission of SAS114, and 115, if applicable

Current year Board-approved agency budget

Section B: Scoring Sheet

INSTRUCTIONS: FRT members are to review the applications and award points according to the extent to which the scoring criteria are met. A scale with suggested points has been created for each component.

Scoring Components	Criteria for Scoring	Awarded Points
<p>II (A-N): APPLICANT/ SPONSOR EXPERIENCE AND CAPACITY</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the applicant’s level of experience & capacity in delivering housing & supportive services for homeless clients. Suggested scoring scale: For maximum points (=15), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear description (backed with concrete examples) of experience with renting units, operating rental assistance & providing supportive services with concrete examples of how applicant has identified & addressed target population’s housing & service needs. • Concrete example of level of need for this population & description of data sets/sources used to understand the need. • Clear description of experience executing requirements of the Violence Against Women Act (safety planning, confidentiality & record keeping requirements). • Concrete examples of providing holistic services to DV survivors & a description of key partnerships & their role in the success of program participants, especially partnering with DV providers if applicant is not a DV provider. • Clear description of applicant & subrecipient (if any) experience in collecting all required HUD data elements & generating required reports, as well as the infrastructure that ensures these requirements are met. • DV providers must use data from an HMIS-comparable database. 	<p>___/15</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If it is a joint application, role of each partner is clearly described & delineated • Applicant agency has a strong management & coordination structure along with an adequate financial accounting system to administer the grant. • If a current recipient of CoC or other forms of federal funding, there are no outstanding obligations to HUD, no unexpended funds & no detrimental audit findings. (i.e. answers to questions IIK-N must be 'No'). <p>10-14 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate description & demonstration of above criteria with good examples given to support content. • Where applicant answered 'Yes' to any of the questions (IIK-N), there must be a clear demonstration of corrective steps taken which led to successful resolution of outstanding concerns. <p>5-9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above criteria are not fully or clearly met. Some attempt to provide examples to demonstrate (i) & (ii) but they are not always aligned with what is proposed in the application. • Where there are outstanding obligations to HUD or audit issues, applicant did not provide an adequate corrective action plan or explanation. <p>0-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in demonstration of most of stated criteria. No concrete examples were provided to support claims. • No clear role/responsibilities when it comes to joint applications • Where there are outstanding obligations to HUD or audit concerns, applicant did not provide <u>any</u> corrective action plan or explanation. <p>Comments:</p>	
<p>III (A-E): PROJECT DESCRIPTION</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the scope of the proposed project, its goals & the means in which the desired outcomes are to be realized.</p> <p><u>Suggested scoring scale:</u> For maximum points (=20), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project description is clear, complete, concise, & addresses the entire scope of the project. • Clearly addresses the target population/ community to be served & how applicant plans to go about meeting assessed needs. All pointers that are highlighted in the application are fully addressed. 	<p>___/20</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a sound plan for executing the grant agreement & beginning rental assistance within 12 months of the award. • Project has strong capacity for prioritizing persons with the most severe needs. • If applying for rental assistance, project has a comprehensive method for assessing and determining the type and amount of rental assistance that participants can receive. • If not a DV provider, applicant describes a clear partnership with a DV provider <p>14-19 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project description is generally comprehensive with 1-2 areas that require clarification. • Pointers highlighted in question III(A) are mostly addressed. • Plan for implementing project within 12 months can be clearer. • Project can be more explicit in its description of how chronic and vulnerable homeless persons are prioritized. <p>7-13 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project description can be more comprehensive and there were more than 3 areas requiring further clarification. • Pointers highlighted in question III(A) are not addressed adequately. • Timeline for implementation within 12 months is questionable and it is unlikely that project would be ready within 12 months of receiving award. • Weak demonstration of project’s capacity to prioritize chronic and vulnerable homeless persons. <p>0-6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in overall project description with some pointers not addressed at all. • Responses have little or no consistency with other parts of the application. • There are serious doubts that project would be ready to implement in a timely manner. • Project is not aligned with HUD’s goals of prioritizing chronic and vulnerable homeless persons. <p>Comments:</p>	
--	--	--

<p>IV : COMMITMENT TO HOUSING FIRST</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the project’s alignment and commitment to the Housing First approach to homeless assistance.</p> <p><u>Suggested Scoring Scale:</u> For maximum points (=10), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant must clearly describe past experience with the Housing First approach • Current project design is aligned with Housing First Principles (refer to Appendix A of the application, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Client participation in services is not a prerequisite for housing placement ○ Few, if any, programmatic requirements for entry into housing (e.g. sobriety, minimum income threshold) ○ Services are provided as per client’s choice & discretion <p>4-9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of Housing First approach is weak; no clear indication of past experience in employing this approach. • Project design does not fully incorporate Housing First Principles within its service delivery. Not all of the points highlighted in the criteria are referenced. <p>0-3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No clear evidence that applicant understands or has incorporated Housing First principles within its service delivery approach. <p>Comments:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">___/10</p>
---	--	--

--	--	--

<p>V: (A-I) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR PARTICIPANTS</p>	<p>This component is concerned with project’s capacity to render participants with the appropriate supportive services crucial for obtaining & sustaining permanent housing outcomes.</p> <p><u>Suggested Scoring Scale:</u> For maximum points (= 25), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very clear & comprehensive description of how project assists participants in obtaining & remaining in permanent housing. • Project includes a well-thought through plan for individual case management & linkage to mainstream health, social services, and employment resources & benefits where participants meet eligibility criteria. • Supportive services are tailored to the needs of program participants & appropriate measures are in place to reduce barriers to access (e.g. accessible location, relevant type of aid, etc.). • Detailed, coherent & well-thought through “Supportive Services Type & Frequency Chart” that is feasible for implementation. <p>16-24 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate description of how project functions to assist clients in obtaining & maintaining permanent housing. • Overall, project demonstrates ability to meet above criteria to a large extent, however some of the responses are lacking in detail or clarity. • “Supportive Services Type & Frequency” Chart is adequately filled up with some areas of doubt. <p>6-15 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptions & responses to questions are often inadequate & require further clarification. It is not clear the extent to which the applicant has experience or expertise in assisting clients with maintaining housing or increasing income. • Limited description of how applicant has acknowledged clients’ barriers to access & sought to minimize them. • “Supportive Services Type & Frequency” Chart raises doubts for implementation. <p>0-5 points:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">___/25</p>
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Descriptions & responses to questions are severely lacking. There is little or no evidence that the applicant has experience or expertise in assisting clients with maintaining housing or increasing income.• Proposed supportive services do not take into account client's potential barriers to access.• "Supportive Services Type & Frequency Chart" does not match applicant agency capacity & is not feasible for implementation. <p>Comments:</p>	
--	---	--

<p>VI: LANDLORD ENGAGEMENT</p>	<p>This component is concerned with applicant agency's engagement efforts with landlords towards increasing affordable housing availability.</p> <p><u>Suggested Scoring Scale:</u> For maximum points (=5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear description of applicant's outreach & engagement efforts with landlords is provided. • There is strong evidence of an ongoing positive relationship & communication with landlords that enhances their participation. <p>2-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in description provided. • Limited evidence of an ongoing positive relationship & communication with landlords. <p>0-2 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no consideration for outreach to & engagement with landlords. • No evidence of relationship & communication with landlords. <p>Comments:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">___/5</p>
--	---	---

--	--	--

<p>VII: PARTNERING & COMMITMENT TO COORDINATED ENTRY</p>	<p>This component is concerned with applicant agency's commitment to working collaboratively within the Continuum of Care.</p> <p><u>Suggested Scoring Scale:</u> For maximum points (=5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description indicates a strong commitment towards collaboration with CoC partners & concrete efforts to start/maintain this in the proposed project. • Strong indication of commitment to coordinated entry to maximize resources & avoid duplication. <p>2-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in description; there is indication of commitment towards partnership & the coordinated process but it is not fully demonstrated in the past or in current application. <p>0-3 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description is vague & indicates little or no commitment towards partnership or the coordinated entry process. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>/5</p>
--	---	-----------

<p>VIII: BUDGET DETAIL</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the budgeting aspects of the proposed project. <u>Suggested scoring scale:</u> For maximum points (=20), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All budget charts are clearly filled out & calculated correctly. Budget requests are clear, logical & consistent with the overall activities proposed in the application. • Projects must be 1-year grant terms only. • Quantity descriptions clearly identify what is included in the requests & are in line with project requirements. • Clear indication of potential additional funding sources that are committed to this project. <p>14-19 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget charts are generally filled out in a logical & coherent manner with minor areas requiring clarification. • Quantity descriptions are adequate but may have some inconsistency with overall project requirements. <p>7-13 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some errors in budget charts, including calculation errors. • Quantity descriptions are unclear & most parts are lacking in logic & connection to the overall application. <p>0-6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget charts are unclear on the whole & lacking in logic & connection to the overall application; multiple calculation errors. • Overall responses provided indicate poor adherence to the specific requirements in each section. <p>Comments:</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">____/20</p>
--------------------------------	---	--

OVERALL COMMENTS: