

Northwest Minnesota Continuum of Care

# 2021 Scoring Criteria

For Notice of Funding Opportunity Application

**Northwest Minnesota Continuum of Care (CoC)  
Northwest Minnesota Collaboration on  
Housing & Homelessness**

**Northwest Minnesota Continuum of Care (NWCoC)  
2021 Project Applicant Scorecard  
(Prepared by Review Committee)**



Annually, CoC program applicants will be ranked and tiered per CoC policy and HUD guidance. The purpose is to ensure that HUD funded programs are providing the highest quality housing and services and that the programs are focused on achieving outcomes to end homelessness.

## **PROJECT PERFORMANCE**

To provide both project-specific outcome information and CoC-wide contributions, each program will be evaluated based on data entered into HMIS, the HUD Annual Performance Report (APR), the Project Application submitted for the CoC proposal, and other requested supporting documentation to assure quality and accurate evaluation. The APR scoring criteria assess outcomes that directly relate to goals set by the HEARTH Act. The performance measures now comprise HUD's performance measures against which every Continuum will be assessed.

The APR period is the last grant period ending in 2019 or 2020, whichever is most recent.

## **NOTES**

CoC-funded HMIS and Coordinated Entry Supportive Services Only projects use separate review processes for evaluation and scoring. The CoC Planning Project is not scored.

## **THRESHOLD INSTRUCTIONS**

For any eligibility criteria not met, please provide notes explaining deficiency. Note that CoC policy states that project applications submitted not meeting the eligibility threshold will not be eligible to be included in the CoC Project Listing.

THRESHOLD ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA		VERIFICATION AND DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED	CoC NOTES	SOURCE
<b>General Eligibility:</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Agency submitted Project Application Threshold Assessment was in e-snaps and via PDF by 10/4/2021 including all required certifications.</li> <li>o Project Applicant completed Intent to Apply form by 9/10/2021.</li> </ul>	Need copy of DUNS in ESnaps Submission	CoC Coordinator Verification based on SAM Registration provided.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Project Type</li> <li>✓ Eligible Applicant Type</li> <li>✓ Target Population</li> <li>✓ DUNs# and SAM Registration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Certifications</li> <li>✓ Applicant has no debarments</li> <li>✓ Disclosure of Violations or suspensions</li> </ul>			
<b>HMIS Participation</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o ICA/CoC verification report from agency visits.</li> </ul>	Need ICA/CoC Verification	CoC Coordinator Verification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ 100% of beds entered into HMIS unless waived DV program</li> <li>✓ Responsive to data clean-up</li> <li>✓ HMIS policy &amp; security assurances</li> </ul>				
<b>Coordinated Entry Participation:</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o CES Staff verification report.</li> </ul>	Need CES Staff Verification	CoC Coordinator Verification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ 100% beds fill through CES</li> <li>✓ All CES agreements signed</li> <li>✓ Required trainings attended</li> </ul>				
<b>CoC Participation &amp; Policy Compliance:</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Project Applicant submitted required Threshold Assessment by 10/4/2021.</li> <li>o CoC Coordinator verification.</li> <li>o Agency completed Housing First assessment</li> <li>o CoC Digital Chalk report and/or other certification.</li> <li>o Housing First questions on Threshold Form answered.</li> </ul>	Need Coordinator Verification Need Housing First Assessment Need CoC Digital Chalk Report or other Certification	CoC Coordinator Verification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Utilizes Housing First principles</li> <li>✓ Membership Agreement</li> <li>✓ Written Standards</li> <li>✓ Provide timely required data</li> <li>✓ Follows Housing First principles</li> <li>✓ Required Trainings completed</li> <li>✓ Educational Policy</li> <li>✓ Service Assurances</li> </ul>				

<p><b>Financial/Administration Management:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ eLoccs draws at least quarterly</li> <li>✓ APR timely submission/pre-review</li> <li>✓ No significant or outstanding findings (APR, site visit, audits)</li> <li>✓ No delinquent depts or arrears</li> <li>✓ Fair Housing/EO compliant</li> <li>✓ Match provided</li> <li>✓ Budget reasonable</li> <li>✓ No history of financial mismanagement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Documentation of Match by 10/4/21.</li> <li>○ Agency submitted Project Application was in eSnaps and via PDF by 10/4/21 including all required certifications.</li> <li>○ Fair Housing/EO training complete &amp; assurance on file with CoC.</li> </ul>	<p>Meets Eligibility pending August submittals</p>	<p>CoC Coordinator Verification</p>
<p><b>NEW PROJECTS ONLY:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Experience effectively operating state/federal grant.</li> <li>✓ Project meets regional need.</li> <li>✓ DV BONUS only: Population/design meet Bonus criteria.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project Applicant submitted required Threshold Assessment by 10/24/21.</li> <li>○ Agency submitted Project Application was in eSnaps and via PDF by 10/4/2021 including all required certification.</li> </ul>	<p>Threshold form.  ESNAPs  Submission.</p>	<p>CoC Coordinator Verification</p>

## **NWCoC 2021 NOFO Eligibility Checklist**

- ✓ E-mail indicating intent to apply submitted to CoC Coordinator
- ✓ NWCoC Project Application submitted to CoC Coordinator
- ✓ APR submitted as PDF and as Zip Drive download to COC Coordinator (Renewal Only)
- ✓ PDF of Complete eSnaps Project Application including all required attachments exported from eSnaps and submitted to CoC Coordinator
- ✓ SF-424 Application for Federal Assistance;
- ✓ SF-424 Supplement, Survey on Ensuring Equal Opportunities for Application required for nonprofit applicants only where completion and submission of this survey is voluntary;
- ✓ Form HUD-2880, Applicant/Recipient Update/Disclosure;
- ✓ SF LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (if applicable);
- ✓ Form HUD-50070, Certification for Drug-Free Workplace;
- ✓ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities; and
- ✓ Applicant Certifications.

- 2021 NWCoC NOFO Application Form submitted.
- PDF and .CSV of Most Recently Submitted HUD APR for the project from SAGE.
- PDF of Completed HUD Project Application from e-snaps. Choose 'Export to PDF' from the submission summary screen.

Anticipating further guidance from HUD will be released, applicants have until October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2021 to finalize e-snaps submissions. This date is subject to change upon the possibility of guidance being released later than this date.

For questions on the scoring criteria, please contact Cory Boushee, NWCoC Coordinator at [coryb@nwmf.org](mailto:coryb@nwmf.org).

**NWCoC - 2021 Project Applicant Scorecard (Prepared by Review Committee)**

**Applicant Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

Renewal  DV Bonus  CoC Traditional Bonus

Expansion  YHDP Expansion  YHDP Replacement

Project Component Type:  TH  RRH  TH-RRH  PSH

<input type="checkbox"/>	Intent to Apply form completed by September 10 <sup>th</sup> , 2021
<input type="checkbox"/>	NWCoC Project Application submitted to CoC Coordinator in accordance with instructions by October 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2021
<input type="checkbox"/>	APR submitted as PDF and as Zip Drive .CSV download to COC Coordinator (Renewal Only) by October 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2021
<input type="checkbox"/>	PDF of Complete eSnaps Project Application including all required attachments exported from eSnaps and submitted to CoC Coordinator by October 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2021

**CoC Need & Priorities and Project  
Budget: 58 POINTS**

<b>ELIGIBLE POINTS</b>	<b>SCORING SECTIONS</b>	<b>LOW CRITERIA</b>	<b>MEDIUM CRITERIA</b>	<b>HIGH CRITERIA</b>	<b>INFORMATION SOURCE</b>	<b>REVIEWER SCORE</b>
2	Project Type/ Scale	NOT ELIGIBLE – Applicant did not justify the need for the project type or scale.	(1) Applicant demonstrated the need for the project type, but not the scale.	(2) Applicant justified the need for the project type and scale to meet community need.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
4	CoC Priorities – NEW PROJECT BONUS ONLY	(2) New THP-RRH	(3) NEW PSH	(4) NEW RRH, NEW SSO CES, NEW DV BONUS, NEW BONUS	Application Project Type	
4	Project Services	NOT ELIGIBLE if services donot provide housing stability or intensity is not appropriate for project.	(1-2) Offered services are adequately described butshould include more description and/or increased supports and linkage.	(3-4) Offered services are well described & include housing stability, linkageto mainstream & community services, income focused, and are at right level of intensity for population.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
4	Geographical Location	NOT ELIGIBLE if applicant does not demonstrate a need.	(1-2) Applicant demonstrates a reasonable need for the project in their community.	(3-4) Applicant demonstrates there is strong need for this project type in the service area.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
4	Target Population	NOT ELIGIBLE if Target population is not a priority and/or design does not fit population.	(1-2) There is a low need forserving population and design fits population.	(3-4) There is a strong need for serving population and design fits population.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
8	Budget Expenditure	(0) Spent 89% or less of grant award.	(4) Spent 90-94% of grant award.	(8) Spent 95% or more of grant award.	Submitted application	



4	Quarterly Drawdowns	(0) Drawdowns not made quarterly		(4) Drawdowns completed quarterly	Attached documentation	
4	Recaptured Funds	(0) HUD Recaptured Funds all three past years	(2) HUD Recaptured funds twice in the last three years	(4) HUD recaptured funds once or less in the last three years	Submitted application	
4	HUD cut Funds	(0) HUD cut funding all three past years.	(2) HUD cut funding two times or less in the last three years.	(4) Funding was not cut in last three years.	Submitted application	
8	Data Quality	(0) Most recent total QDQ Score below 80%	(4) Most recent total QDQ Score Between 81 -90%	(8) Most recent total QDQ Score above 90%	QDQ Reports / CoC Coordinator Verify	
8	Budget Reasonableness and Match Documentation	(0) Budget is unreasonable and match is insufficient.	(1-4) Budget seems unclear and match documentation is insufficient.	(5-8) Budget and match documentation is clear and reasonable. To get maximum points Match needs to be a minimum of 25% of total project.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
8	Leverage Documentation	(0) No leverage documentation was provided.	(4) Applicant meets recommended 200% leverage.	(8) Applicant exceeds 225% leverage documentation.	CoC Coordinator Verify	
8	Bed Utilization	(0) Less than 85% of project beds.	(4) 85-90% of project beds	(8) More than 90% of project beds	CoC Coordinator Verify	

### HUD Priorities: 20 POINTS

ELIGIBLE POINTS	SCORING SECTIONS	LOW CRITERIA	MEDIUM CRITERIA	HIGH CRITERIA	INFORMATION SOURCE	CoC SCORE
2	Increase dedicated CH Beds( <b>PSH ONLY</b> )	NOT ELIGIBLE: 80% of beds are dedicated or dedicated plus	(1) Agency increases dedicated CH beds	(2) 100% of beds are dedicated or dedicated plus CH beds	Project application question.	
4	Housing First Approach	NOT ELIGIBLE: Did not demonstrate or complete Housing First documentation	(2) Applicant agrees to follow Housing First principles in administration of homeless programs.	(3-4) Applicant agrees to follow Housing First principles demonstrates and understanding of housing first and has implemented best practices to best serve clients.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
2	Healthcare Partnerships	(0) Does not partner with healthcare agencies.	(1) Applicant has healthcare partners, but access and coordination are not clear.	(2) Applicant demonstrates a clear pathway for clients to access healthcare.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
4	Removing Barriers to Housing:	NOT ELIGIBLE: NOT Barrier Free	(2) Applicant agrees to follow low barrier principles	(3-4) Applicant demonstrated a clear plan to ensure programs remain low barrier.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
8	Protocols for COVID-19	(0) No changes for COVID-19	(1-4) Agency implemented protocols to protect clients.	(5-8) Agency implemented protocols to protect clients and removed barriers for clients wishing to be vaccinated. .	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	

**CoC Participation: 14 POINTS**

<b>ELIGIBLE POINTS</b>	<b>SCORING SECTIONS</b>	<b>LOW CRITERIA</b>	<b>MEDIUM CRITERIA</b>	<b>HIGH CRITERIA</b>	<b>INFORMATION SOURCE</b>	<b>CoC SCORE</b>
2	General Membership Meeting Attendance	(0) less than 50%	(1) Agency attended 1 meeting in 2021	(2) Agency attended all meetings in 2021	CoC Coordinator Verify	
2	Participation in sub-regional homeless planning	(0) did not participate or provide data.		(2) Participated in meetings		
2	CoC Policies	NOT ELIGIBLE: Agency does not agree to follow NWCoC Guidelines and Written Standards		(2) Agency agrees to Follow Guidelines and Written Standards		
2	Agency staff participation in CoC Committees	(0) no staff participating on CoC Committee in last year.	(1) Assignment of staff to at least 1 committee with 75% attendance	(2) Assignment of staff to more than one COC Committee with 75% attendance		
2	CES Training	(0) Staff did not participate in all required trainings.		(2) Staff participated in required CES trainings by and passed tests.		
2	Participation in Coordinated Entry	(0) Does not agree to participate in coordinated entry.		(1) Agrees to participate in Coordinated Entry		
2	Participate in Case Conferencing	(0) does not agree to attend.		(4) agrees to attend case conferencing		

**Service Quality Plan: 20 POINTS**

<b>ELIGIBLE POINTS</b>	<b>SCORING SECTIONS</b>	<b>LOW CRITERIA</b>	<b>MEDIUM CRITERIA</b>	<b>HIGH CRITERIA</b>	<b>INFORMATION SOURCE</b>	<b>CoC SCORE</b>
4	Understanding of core principles and best practices for case management	(0) No training or plan demonstrated. Repeat concerns reported by partners and/or consumers.	(1-2) Demonstrates partial understanding and usage of best practices	(3-4) Demonstrates clear understanding of principles and has a plan to improve and enhance these services.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
2	Coordination with Public Housing Authorities (PHA)	(0) Agency does not coordinated with PHA.	(1) Agency coordinates with PHA's, but unclear how clients will access vouchers.	(2) Agency has a clear and executable plan to ensure clients have access to Section 8 HCV's to Move On from supportive housing.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
2	Fair housing and Equal Opportunity for Access	(0) No plan to promote housing to everyone identified.	(1) Agency has a clear and executable plan to promote fair housing and equal opportunity	(2) Agency has a clear and executable plan to promote fair housing and equal opportunity and assist persons with limited English.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	

2	Collaboration with mainstream and key support services.	(0) Poor service access plan and linkage to mainstream resources.	(1) Agency has a plan for collaboration but it, is hard to follow.	(2) Agency has a clear and executable plan to utilizes Single mainstream application, or provides regular follow-up and instant referrals.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
2	Reducing barriers for transportation	(0) Does not assist with transportation.	(1) provides services to assist with transportation such as gas vouchers.	(2) identified creative and outside the box solutions to reduce barriers to transportation	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
2	Educational Assurances & Non-separation <b>(Family programs only)</b>	(0) does not comply with policy or coordinate with schools.	(1) Agency complies with NWCoC policy.	(2) Agency demonstrates a clear and executable partnership with school district.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
2	Safety and support for victims' part of services/plan.	(0) Applicant does not have a safely plan.	(2) Service plan includes linkage to safety services	(4) In addition to linkage to safety services the applicant and indicated the usage of client centered approaches and trauma informed practices	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	
4	Increasing Income	(0) Applicant does not have a plan for increasing income.	(1-2) Applicant identifies some key strategies to connect clients to income resources.	(3-4) Applicant identifies creative and outside the box solutions to addressing the challenge of increasing someone's income.	Reviewers Judgement of Project Application	

## SYSTEM PERFORMANCE: 40 POINTS

*(Assessed on APR and Return reports)*

ELIGIBLE POINTS	SCORING SECTIONS	LOW CRITERIA	MEDIUM CRITERIA	HIGH CRITERIA	INFORMATION SOURCE	CoC SCORE
8	Returns to Homelessness	(0) 15% or more of participants returned to homelessness within 12 months of exit to permanent housing	(4) 10-15% of participants returned to homelessness within 12 months of exit to permanent housing	(8) Less than 10% of participants returned to homelessness within 12 months of exit to permanent housing	CoC Coordinator Verify	
2	Earned Income-- Increase	(0) Less than 5% for PSH, Less than 15% for TH/RRH	(1) 5-9% for PSH, 15-19% for TH, RRH	(2) 10% or more increase for PSH, 20% or more for TH, RRH	CoC Coordinator Verify	
2	Earned Income-- Maintain/Increase	(0) Less than 10% for PSH, Less than 40% for TH/RRH	(1) <u>10-19% for PSH, 40-49% for TH, RRH</u>	(2) <u>20% or more for PSH, 50% or more for TH, RRH</u>	CoC Coordinator Verify	
2	Non-Employment Income--Maintain/ Increase	(0) Less than 50% for PSH, Less than 40% for RRH, Less than 5% for THH	(1) 50-74% for PSH, 40-49% for RRH, 5-9% for TH	(2) 75% or more for PSH, 50% or more for RRH, 10% or more for TH	CoC Coordinator Verify	
2	Increase Overall Income	(0) Less than 20%	(1) 20-29%	(2) 30% or more	CoC Coordinator Verify	
8	Entering from Homeless Situation	(0) Less than 75% coming from ES, Streets or Fleeing DV	(4) 75% coming from ES, streets or fleeing DV	(8) 95% coming from ES, and streets or fleeing DV	CoC Coordinator Verify	

8	Retention/Successful exits (PSH only)	(0) Under 85%	(4) 85-90%	(8) Over 90%	CoC Coordinator Verify	
8	Exits to permanent housing (non PSH Only, including RRH-PH)	(0) 80% or less of participants exited the program to permanent destinations.	(4) 81-90% of participants exited the program to permanent destinations.	(8) More than 90% of participants exited the program to permanent destinations.	CoC Coordinator Verify	

**SCORING:**

- CoC Need & Priorities and Project Budget: 56 POINTS = 38%
- HUD Priorities: 20 POINTS = 13%
- CoC Participation: 14 POINTS = 9%
- Service Quality Plan: 20 POINTS = 13%
- SYSTEM PERFORMANCE: 40 POINTS = 27%

**Total points = 150**

<b>150 Possible Points</b>	<b>TOTAL SCORE/POINTS:</b>		
<p><b>Please include any notes to explain low score or other feedback.</b></p>			
<b>Adjustments</b>			
<p><b>Adjustments plus or minus up to twenty percent of the total score may be made to accommodate for agency quality improvement plan, extenuating circumstances affecting program involvement or outcomes.</b> These may include: Only agency serving target population, no other agency available in geographic area but need exits, agency has active performance improvement plan and has shown improvement and/or plan that should yield improvement, disaster, significant administrative staff change affecting organizational capacity. Please list adjustment and reason below.</p>			
<b>20% +/-</b>	<b>Circumstance</b>	<b>Supporting reasons</b>	<b>Adjusted Score</b>