

TX-500 San Antonio and Bexar County Continuum of Care Policies and Procedures

CONTINUUM OF CARE PROGRAM GRANT
SOUTH ALAMO REGIONAL ALLIANCE FOR THE HOMELESS



South Alamo Regional Alliance for the Homeless

4100 E. Piedras, Suite 105 | San Antonio, TX 78228 | 210.876.0720 | www.sarahomeless.org

CoC Policies and Procedures: Continuum of Care Program Grant

Continuum of Care (CoC) Program Grant Overview	3
CoC Program Grant Priority Policy.....	3
CoC Program Independent Review Team (IRT)	4
IRT Member Selection and Criteria.....	4
IRT Voting Process	4
CoC Program Application Review and Deficiency Process	5
CoC Project Ranking Policy	5
Scoring Process.....	5
Grievance and Appeals Process.....	6
Grant Reallocation Policy	7
Voluntary Reallocation	7
Involuntary Reallocation.....	7
Significant De-obligated Funds	8
CoC Program Project Performance Evaluation, Monitoring, Reporting, and Requirements	8
Project-Level Performance Management Plan.....	9
eLOCCS Monitoring.....	9
Requirements.....	9
APPENDIX A – CoC Program Application Scoring Rubrics	11
New Project.....	11
New Project – Domestic Violence	15
New Project – Coordinated Entry.....	18
New Project – Homeless Management Information System	20
First-Time Renewal Project.....	22
First-Time Renewal Project – Domestic Violence	25
First-Time Renewal Project – Coordinated Entry	28
First-Time Renewal Project – Homeless Management Information System	30
Renewal Project.....	32
Renewal Project – Domestic Violence	35
Renewal Project – Coordinated Entry	38

Renewal Project – Homeless Management Information System 40

Appendix B – CoC Program MOU 42

Appendix C – CoC Program Performance Scorecards 46

Permanent Supportive Housing Scorecard 46

Rapid Rehousing Scorecard 54

Transitional Housing Scorecard 62

Domestic Violence – Rapid Rehousing Scorecard..... 69

Domestic Violence – Transitional Housing Scorcard 74

Continuum of Care (CoC) Program Grant Overview

The South Alamo Regional Alliance for the Homeless (SARAH) is designated by the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board of Directors as the Collaborative Applicant for the TX-500 San Antonio and Bexar County community. Provisions at [24 CFR 578.9](#) require CoCs to design, operate and follow a collaborative process for the development of an application in response to a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for the CoC Program Grant issued by HUD. CoCs must implement internal competition deadlines to ensure transparency and fairness at the local level. As the Collaborative Applicant, SARAH applies to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for CoC Program Grant funding on behalf of the community. Except for the amount of the HUD CoC allocation available to SARAH and cost eligibility, the CoC Board of Directors is the ultimate decision-maker in the review process.

[For federal policies and procedures related to the CoC Program, refer to the HUD NOFO.](#)

CoC Program Grant Priority Policy

Each year, the Continuum of Care Board of Directors approves priority projects for the CoC Program funding competition. Applicants that qualify as priority given their proposed project type will receive additional points on their application.

The following project types will be considered as highest priority for new, bonus, expansion, and reallocation funding in the 2021 CoC Program NOFO Competition:

- **Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)** – Permanent housing of indefinite duration of rental assistance with intensive, supportive services offered to individuals who have a permanent disabling condition and who have experienced literal homelessness for 12 months continuously *or* experienced literal homelessness 4 times in the last 3 years for a total of 12 months. Site-based PSH will be further prioritized.
- **Long-term (18-24 months) Rapid Rehousing (RRH)** – Permanent housing of 18-24 months duration of rental assistance with a moderate level of supportive services offered to all populations with no specific eligibility requirements.
- **Rapid Rehousing (RRH) or Joint Transitional Housing-Rapid Rehousing (TH-RRH) projects for individuals and/or families fleeing Domestic Violence (includes reallocation from TH)** – Permanent housing of flexible duration of rental assistance with a moderate level of supportive services offered specifically to survivors of Domestic Violence or a joint component project type which allows survivors of domestic violence to be served in Transitional Housing and moved swiftly into a Permanent Housing destination through Rapid Rehousing rental assistance of indefinite duration with a moderate level of supportive services.

- **Coordinated Entry and/or HMIS (expansion only)** – Expansion funds used to increase the capacity of Coordinated Entry and HMIS as core functions of the CoC.
- **Expansion of Renewal Projects** – Expansion funds used to increase the capacity of renewal projects, particularly those in need of increased case management to ensure manageable caseloads and an effective ratio of case manager to clients.

CoC Program Independent Review Team (IRT)

To ensure a fair and partial project ranking process, an Independent Review Team (IRT) is selected to systematically review and score applications and to recommend a final ranking to the CoC Board of Directors. SARAH will coordinate IRT meetings and act as the facilitator of the review process.

IRT MEMBER SELECTION AND CRITERIA

There will be a maximum of seven (7) and a minimum of three (3) IRT members selected annually by the CoC Board Executive Committee for the CoC Program Grant. SARAH staff, with recommendations from the CoC Board of Directors, will recruit participants, with a priority for those employed at Consolidated Plan Jurisdiction agencies and those with lived expertise of homelessness.

An agency can only have one (1) representative on the IRT. IRT members, including members of their immediate families, may not be employees, contractors, or serve in any representative capacity of an applicant, subrecipient agency, or other partner agency as established in a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) party to a funding application.

The CoC Board Executive Committee will appoint an IRT Chair. The IRT Chair will be responsible for speaking on behalf of the IRT regarding the recommended final project ranking.

SARAH will provide a required training for IRT members that is open to the public. The IRT will conduct private meetings as needed, which will include SARAH staff, as part of the project review and selection process. IRT members are required to attend meetings and must coordinate with SARAH if an emergency arises. Signatures of IRT members are required to confirm project rankings and will be archived.

IRT VOTING PROCESS

The IRT will be expected to follow a majority vote process to determine final scores if there is not a consensus. In the event of a tie vote, the CoC Board Executive Committee will determine the outcome. The IRT is allowed to request more information from the applicant before making a final determination in accordance with the annual timeline.

CoC Program Application Review and Deficiency Process

In accordance with the CoC Program Request for Proposals (RFP) and Application Instructions, SARAH will accept applications until the given deadline. Applications submitted after the deadline will receive a two-point (2) deduction from the Application Submission category of the scoring rubric and two (2) points at the start of every hour until the application is submitted or the final score is zero (0) in that category. Applications submitted more than 48 hours after the deadline will not be reviewed.

Prior to the first IRT meeting, SARAH staff will perform a deficiency check on submitted applications. Any applicants with a *deficiency* (defined as anything that would render the application ineligible from receiving funding) will be notified and given three (3) business days to correct the deficiency. An application will lose two (2) points for each deficiency found. If deficiencies are not resolved, the application will be considered ineligible and will not be reviewed by the IRT. Any rejected applications will be notified in writing. SARAH will inform the IRT of deficiencies and any misrepresentations or falsified information discovered in each application.

CoC Project Ranking Policy

SARAH will prepare the project priority ranking list and funding decisions as recommended by the IRT to the CoC Board of Directors for final approval. The Board of Directors may direct SARAH to make minor budgetary corrections, as needed, consistent with HUD application rules and funds allocated to the CoC. SARAH will be charged with communicating budget adjustments to individual applicants and instructing them to make changes before submitting the final CoC application to HUD.

SCORING PROCESS

IRT scores will determine where a project is ranked. The priority project ranking will be included in the Consolidated Application to HUD. Projects with equal scores are ranked by project component type. Projects with equal scores of the same component type will be ranked based on cost per client. Consolidated grant performance will be averaged from previous grants and consolidated into one (1) score for ranking.

Coordinated Entry (CE) and Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) projects will automatically be ranked in Tier 1 as they are essential functions of the CoC.

Domestic Violence (DV) projects are ranked separately as the CoC Program Collaboration requirements for DV projects differ in the following ways: must include specific method for evaluating projects submitted by victim services providers that utilizes data generated from a comparable database; and evaluated these projects on the degree they improve safety for the population served.

In accordance with the FY21 HUD NOFO, Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) renewals will be scored non-competitively.

There are twelve (12) types of applicant scoring rubrics:

- New Project (includes bonus, transition, reallocation, expansion)
- New Project – Domestic Violence (DV)
- New Project – Coordinated Entry (CE)
- New Project – Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)*
- First-Time Renewal Project
- First-Time Renewal Project – DV
- First-Time Renewal Project – CE
- First-Time Renewal Project – HMIS*
- Renewal Project (includes expansion)
- Renewal Project – DV
- Renewal Project – CE
- Renewal Project – HMIS*

*Only the HMIS Lead may apply for HMIS projects.

See **Attachment I** for scoring rubrics associated with each applicant type. Scoring rubrics focus on fiscal management, expenditure rates, policies and procedures, performance metrics, adherence to Written Standards, participation in CE and HMIS, and CoC participation. Bonus points are allocated for certain activities that are desirable for increasing system coordination and/or CoC performance.

Grievance and Appeals Process

The Appeals Process outlined below applies to eligible organizations. SARAH is committed to fairness and openness in the HUD CoC funding process.

- The IRT will review all applications and make project ranking recommendations to the CoC Board of Directors, who will approve the final ranking recommendations.
- SARAH will notify all project applicants no later than fifteen (15) calendar days before the CoC Consolidated Application deadline regarding whether their project applications would be included as part of the CoC Consolidated Application submission and the approved community ranking list.
- If the application was rejected, or if the applicant objects to their ranking position, applicants have three (3) calendar days from the ranking announcement to make a formal appeal. To do so, the applicant must notify the SARAH Executive Director in writing of the appeal with specific reasons why the applicant believes the project was unfairly rejected or ranked.
- The SARAH Executive Director will notify the CoC Board Executive Committee of the appeal and a conference call will be held to discuss if the appeal has merit based on the criteria in [24 CFR 578.35](#). At least two (2) CoC Board Executive Committee members must participate in the call, none of which have vested

interest, financial or otherwise, in the rejected applicant or project. If it is determined that the appeal lacks merit, SARAH staff will notify the applicant in writing on behalf of the CoC Board of Directors.

- If the appeal has merit, the CoC Board President and an additional Board Director selected by the President will hear the appeal within three business (3) days and make a final determination. The applicant will be notified in writing within three business (3) days of the appeal decision.
- Project applicants whose project was rejected may appeal the local decision to HUD, if the project applicant believes it was denied the opportunity to participate in the local CoC planning process in a reasonable manner, by submitting a Solo Application in e-snaps directly to HUD prior to the application deadline.

Grant Reallocation Policy

VOLUNTARY REALLOCATION

Existing CoC project grantees of any project type may, in part or in whole, voluntarily reallocate a grant(s). Grants may be reallocated to a project type which meets the Funding Priorities established for the competition. SARAH staff offer technical support and approval letters for grantees reallocating to meet HUD and community priorities.

Existing CoC grantees of any project type may also voluntarily reallocate funds to the pool of new project dollars for which community members apply.

Additional points will be awarded to projects voluntarily reallocating to a project type listed in the Funding Priorities established for the competition.

INVOLUNTARY REALLOCATION

If significant deficiencies are found with a renewal project during the review process, the IRT may recommend a project be placed on a Project Quality Improvement Plan (QIP), monitored by SARAH. The agency may choose to participate in the QIP or agree not to renew the grant and reallocate their funding.

The QIP will be customized based on the specific issues of the project with deficiencies. The plan will be drafted by SARAH staff with recommendations from the IRT and approved by the CoC Board of Directors. The renewal applicant will have seven (7) calendar days to appeal participation in the QIP by writing an appeal letter to the CoC Board of Directors, who will make the final determination.

The CoC Board of Directors will review the project's progress either at a regular Board meeting or a separate meeting six (6) months after the close of the CoC Program funding competition. If the project has not shown progress toward the targets outlined in their QIP at a level satisfactory to the CoC Board of Directors, the project will be involuntarily reallocated for the next funding cycle.

SIGNIFICANT DE-OBLIGATED FUNDS

All projects are expected to expend 100% of their project funds. Any project that de-obligates more than 10% of its funds or \$25,000, whichever is greater, in any HUD contract year is considered to have incurred a de-obligation deficiency. Grantees with an unexpended balance that meets or exceeds the threshold specified above will be subject to a reduction in renewal grant amount with the unspent funds being added to the pool of funds available for reallocation.

Projects with a de-obligation deficiency will be required to submit a spending plan to SARAH. The CoC Board of Directors will require a quarterly update on the progress of meeting the spending plan. If, at the end of the grant, a project incurs a second de-obligation deficiency, the project will be reduced to the amount expended at the end of the 12 or 24-month review. An exception to this policy may be made for new projects that could not expend funds due to implementation barriers, as determined by the CoC Board Executive Committee. The CoC Board of Directors reserves the right to place a project on a spending plan at any time if funds are not being drawn down during routine financial monitoring.

CoC Program Project Performance Evaluation, Monitoring, Reporting, and Requirements

CoCs are charged with designing a local system to assist sheltered and unsheltered people experiencing homelessness and providing the services necessary to help them access housing and obtain long-term stability. For the CoC's purposes, the system is defined as the City of San Antonio/Bexar County and the all the homelessness assistance projects therein.

SARAH uses HUD's annual System Performance Measures (SPM) Report to understand how the community's current system is functioning, and if the right combination of strategies and resources have been deployed to meet the community's needs. HUD uses the data in the System Performance Measures Report as selection criteria for awarding grants for the CoC program under future Notices of Funding Available (NOFO).

SARAH's CoC Performance Scorecards outline project specific goals for the CoC. Key measures include:

- Reducing the length of time people experience homelessness;
- Increasing exits to permanent housing;
- Reducing recidivism;
- Increasing participant noncash benefits and earned income

The CoC Performance Scorecards and the HMIS Data Quality Plan should provide the CoC and other key stakeholders charged with monitoring and improving system performance the necessary framework for monitoring the system's performance and

data quality year-round. SARAH staff will review and update project performance measures annually.

PROJECT-LEVEL PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

SARAH has created a CoC Performance Scorecard report for CoC-funded projects that will be monitored throughout the year and serve as part of the selection criteria for awarding funding during the annual NOFO competition. The purpose of the scorecards is to serve as a tool that project staff can use to actively monitor the performance of their projects against the specific performance and data quality requirements established by the CoC and HUD.

There are six (6) different project-level scorecards:

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)
Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)
Rapid Rehousing – DV Specific
Transitional Housing (TH)
Transitional Housing – DV Specific
Joint TH-RRH – DV Specific

The metrics identified within the scorecards are specific to the different project component types, but all the projects are monitored on:

- HMIS Data Quality (or HMIS Comparable Database);
- Coordinated Entry Participation (Increase in DV survivor safety for DV-specific projects); and
- Ending Homelessness (System Performance Metrics)

The scorecards have a total combined value of 100 points and the data captured within the report aligns with the System Performance Measures report.

ELOCCS MONITORING

CoC-funded agencies are required to submit quarterly eLOCCs drawdown summary reports to SARAH. Grantees are responsible for informing SARAH of any changes made to the contract start or end dates and/or if the primary point of contact responsible for documenting the drawdowns for a project changes.

REQUIREMENTS

There are certain requirements CoC-funded agencies must adhere to, which are outlined in the CoC Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) located in Appendix B. Applicants will be expected to enter into an MoU with SARAH.

APPENDIX A – CoC Program Application Scoring Rubrics

NEW PROJECT

San Antonio/Bexar County 2021 CoC Program IRT Scoring Rubric New Project

Agency Name:		Project Type:	
Project Name:		Funding Amount Requested:	
Notes from SARAH Staff on Application Review			

Category	Max Points	Final Score
<p>Application Submission & Funding Priority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant followed instructions to submit the application on time and with all required attachments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applications submitted late will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. ○ Applications with deficiencies will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. • Funding Priority <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applicant project is a funding priority. (5 points) ○ Applicant project is site based PSH. (8 points) ○ Applicant project demonstrates coordination with housing providers and healthcare organizations as described in the NOFO. (5 points) • Applicant attended Bidders' Conference or completed online course. (2 point) 	20	
<p>Applicant Experience (e-SNAPS Part 2, Narrative 16a., Narrative 16b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant has experience effectively utilizing federal funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No experience (0 points) ○ 1 – 3 years (1 point) ○ 3 – 5 years (2 points) ○ 5+ years (3 points) • Applicant has not had grant funding returned or reallocated in the last two years. (2 points) 	7	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant has at least 1 year of experience delivering homeless services. (2 points) 		
<p>Fiscal Management (e-SNAPS Part 6, Fiscal P&P Attachment, Audit Attachment, Narrative 16c., Staffing Attachment, Narrative 16d., Narrative 16e.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides accurate budget. Budget’s ratio of supportive services to operations and cost-per-client analysis is manageable. (2 points) • Applicant provides match documentation. (5 points) • Applicant provides comprehensive fiscal policies and procedures. (4 points) • Audit shows no findings or significant deficiencies. (5 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If no audit is available – applicant explanation is sufficient in addressing the lack of audit. • Applicant uploads relevant job descriptions which meet requirements for managing project. (2 points) • Direct services staffing ratio is within 8-15 for PSH and 15-30 for RRH and direct services staff salaries are, at minimum, consistent with a living wage as outlined by the <u>U.S. Bureau of Labor</u>. (2 points) 	20	
<p>Project Description (e-SNAPS Part 2, 3, 4, and 5, Narrative 16f., Narrative 16g.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides thorough description of project to include need for program, how it aligns with the CoC’s strategy to end homelessness, and specific outcomes. (10 points) • Applicant provides a realistic and comprehensive start-up plan with adequate milestones. (5 points) • Applicant describes barriers to participation faced by persons of different races or those who are over-represented in the local homeless population and identifies strategies to eliminate these barriers. (5 points) • Applicant’s landlord engagement strategy articulates how the project will identify new landlords, retain landlords, and engage landlords to house higher-barrier clients. (5 points) • Applicant confirms participation or commitment to participate in Coordinated Entry, HMIS, CoC monitoring and governance (Membership Council, workgroups, committees), and adherence to HUD Reporting requirements. (4 points) 	29	
<p>Policies and Procedures (P&P Attachment)</p>	24	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant’s Policies and Procedures include the following: intake, confidentiality, termination, and VAWA. (4 points) • Intake policies demonstrate low-barrier, housing first, and trauma-informed service orientation. (4 points) • Confidentiality policies and procedures are robust to ensure client confidentiality is a high priority. (4 points) • Termination policies clearly delineate types of termination and provide clear grounds for termination. These policies outline the process by which participants are notified and informed when termination is the only recourse. (4 points) • VAWA policy aligns with HUD standards outlined in 24 CFR 578.99(j). (4 points) • Policies and Procedures align with local CoC Written Standards and Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures. (4 points) 		
<p>BONUS (Narrative 16i., Narrative 16j, Narrative 16k. Narrative 16l.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant is a current Homelink Network Partner and/or Homelink Hub. (1 points) • Applicant incorporates lived experience in in agency’s policy and/or decision-making structure beyond the HUD requirements. Applicant must describe how lived experience is operationalized to receive points. (2 point) • Applicant actively engages in Point-in-Time Count, CoC Membership Council, workgroups, and/or committees. (1 point) • Applicant strategically engages with other homeless providers in a collaborative, effective way and prioritizes a community-wide focus on ending homelessness rather than agency-specific. (1 point) 	5	
TOTAL	100	

IRT Member Notes	
------------------	--

IRT Member Name	
IRT Member Signature	
Date	

*Note – To reduce length of document, the IRT note and signature section will be left out from the remaining scorecards.

NEW PROJECT – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

San Antonio/Bexar County 2021 CoC Program IRT Scoring Rubric
New Project – Domestic Violence

Agency Name:		Project Type:	
Project Name:		Funding Amount Requested:	
Notes from SARAH Staff on Application Review			

Category	Max Points	Final Score
<p>Application Submission & Funding Priority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant followed instructions to submit the application on time and with all required attachments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applications submitted late will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. ○ Applications with deficiencies will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. • Funding Priority <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applicant project is a funding priority. (5 points) ○ Applicant project is site based PSH. (8 points) ○ Applicant project demonstrates coordination with housing providers and healthcare organizations as described in the NOFO. (5 points) • Applicant attended Bidders' Conference or completed online course. (2 point) 	20	
<p>Applicant Experience (e-SNAPS Part 2, Narrative 16a., Narrative 16b.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant has experience effectively utilizing federal funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No experience (0 points) ○ 1 – 3 years (1 point) ○ 3 – 5 years (2 points) ○ 5+ years (3 points) • Applicant has not had grant funding returned or reallocated in the last two years. (2 points) • Applicant has at least 1 year of experience delivering homeless services. (2 points) 	7	

<p>Fiscal Management (e-SNAPS Part 6, Fiscal P&P Attachment, Narrative 16c., Audit Attachment, Staffing Attachment, Narrative 16d., Narrative 16e., Narrative 16f)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides accurate budget. Budget’s ratio of supportive services to operations and cost-per-client analysis is manageable. (2 points) • Applicant provides match documentation. (5 points) • Applicant provides comprehensive fiscal policies and procedures. (4 points) • Audit shows no findings or significant deficiencies. (5 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If no audit is available – applicant explanation is sufficient in addressing the lack of audit. • Applicant uploads relevant job descriptions which meet requirements for managing project. (2 points) • Direct services staffing ratio is within 8-15 for PSH and 15-30 for RRH and direct services staff salaries are, at minimum, consistent with a living wage as outlined by the <u>U.S. Bureau of Labor</u>. (2 points) 	20	
<p>Project Description (e-SNAPS Part 2, 3, 4, and 5, Narrative 16g, Narrative 16h., Narrative 16i.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides thorough description of project to include need for program, how it aligns with the CoC’s strategy to end homelessness, and specific outcomes. (7 points) • Applicant provides a realistic and comprehensive start-up plan with adequate milestones. (5 points) • Applicant describes barriers to participation faced by persons of different races or those who are over-represented in the local homeless population and identifies strategies to eliminate these barriers. (5 points) • Applicant’s landlord engagement strategy articulates how the project will identify new landlords, retain landlords, and engage landlords to house higher-barrier clients. (4 points) • Applicant adequately explains how the project will improve safety for the population served. (5 points) • Applicant confirms participation or commitment to participate in a comparable database, CoC governance (Membership Council, workgroups, committees), and adherence to HUD Reporting requirements. (3 points) 	29	
<p>Policies and Procedures (P&P Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant’s Policies and Procedures include the following: intake, confidentiality, termination, and VAWA. (4 points) 	24	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intake policies demonstrate low-barrier, housing first, and trauma-informed service orientation. (4 points) • Confidentiality policies and procedures are robust to ensure client confidentiality is a high priority. (4 points) • Termination policies clearly delineate types of termination and provide clear grounds for termination. These policies outline the process by which participants are notified and informed when termination is the only recourse. (4 points) • VAWA policy aligns with HUD standards outlined in 24 CFR 578.99(j). (4 points) • Policies and Procedures align with local CoC Written Standards. (4 points) 		
<p>BONUS (Narrative 16j., Narrative 16k, Narrative 16l. Narrative 16m.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant is a current Homelink Network Partner and/or Homelink Hub. (1 points) • Applicant incorporates lived experience in in agency’s policy and/or decision-making structure beyond the HUD requirements. Applicant must describe how lived experience is operationalized to receive points. (2 point) • Applicant actively engages in Point-in-Time Count, CoC Membership Council, workgroups, and/or committees. (1 point) • Applicant strategically engages with other homeless providers in a collaborative, effective way and prioritizes a community-wide focus on ending homelessness rather than agency-specific. (1 point) 	5	
TOTAL	100	

NEW PROJECT – COORDINATED ENTRY

San Antonio/Bexar County 2021 CoC Program IRT Scoring Rubric
New Project – Coordinated Entry

Agency Name:		Project Type:	
Project Name:		Funding Amount Requested:	
Notes from SARAH Staff on Application Review			

Category	Max Points	Final Score
<p>Application Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant followed instructions to submit the application on time and with all required attachments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applications submitted late will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. ○ Applications with deficiencies will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. • Applicant project is a funding priority. (20 points) • Applicant attended Bidders’ Conference or completed online course. (5 point) 	25	
<p>Applicant Experience (e-SNAPS Part 2, Narrative 12a., Narrative 12b.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant has experience effectively utilizing federal funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No experience (0 points) ○ 1 – 3 years (1 point) ○ 3 – 5 years (2 points) ○ 5+ years (3 points) • Applicant has not had grant funding returned or reallocated in the last two years. (4 points) • Applicant has at least 1 year of experience delivering homeless services at the system level. (3 points) 	10	
<p>Fiscal Management (e-SNAPS Part 6, Narrative 12c., Fiscal P&P Attachment, Audit Attachment, Narrative 12d., Staffing Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides accurate budget. (5 points) 	25	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides match documentation. (5 points) • Applicant provides comprehensive fiscal policies and procedures. (5 points) • Audit shows no findings or significant deficiencies. (5 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If no audit is available – applicant explanation is sufficient in addressing the lack of audit. • Applicant uploads relevant job descriptions which meet requirements for managing project. (5 points) 		
<p>Project Description (e-SNAPS Part 2, 3, 4, and 5, Narrative 12e.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides thorough description of project to include need for program, how it aligns with the CoC’s strategy to end homelessness, and specific outcomes. (10 points) • Applicant provides a realistic and comprehensive start-up plan with adequate milestones. (10 points) • Applicant describes barriers to participation faced by persons of different races or those who are over-represented in the local homeless population and identifies strategies to eliminate these barriers. (10 points) 	30	
<p>Policies and Procedures (P&P Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant uploads Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures. (10 points) 	10	
TOTAL	100	

NEW PROJECT – HOMELESS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

San Antonio/Bexar County 2021 CoC Program IRT Scoring Rubric
New Project – HMIS

Agency Name:		Project Type:	
Project Name:		Funding Amount Requested:	
Notes from SARAH Staff on Application Review			

Category	Max Points	Final Score
<p>Application Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant followed instructions to submit the application on time and with all required attachments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applications submitted late will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. ○ Applications with deficiencies will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. • Applicant project is a funding priority. (20 points) • Applicant attended Bidders’ Conference or completed online course. (5 point) 	25	
<p>Applicant Experience (e-SNAPS Part 2, Narrative 12a., Narrative 12b.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant has experience effectively utilizing federal funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No experience (0 points) ○ 1 – 3 years (1 point) ○ 3 – 5 years (2 points) ○ 5+ years (3 points) • Applicant has not had grant funding returned or reallocated in the last two years. (4 points) • Applicant has at least 1 year of experience delivering homeless services at the system level. (3 points) 	10	
<p>Fiscal Management (e-SNAPS Part 6, Narrative 12c., Fiscal P&P Attachment, Audit Attachment, Narrative 12d., Staffing Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides accurate budget. (5 points) 	25	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides match documentation. (5 points) • Applicant provides comprehensive fiscal policies and procedures. (5 points) • Audit shows no findings or significant deficiencies. (5 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If no audit is available – applicant explanation is sufficient in addressing the lack of audit. • Applicant uploads relevant job descriptions which meet requirements for managing project. (5 points) 		
<p>Project Description (e-SNAPS Part 2, 3, 4, and 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides thorough description of project to include need for program, how it aligns with the CoC’s strategy to end homelessness, and specific outcomes. (15 points) • Applicant provides a realistic and comprehensive start-up plan with adequate milestones. (15 points) 	30	
<p>Policies and Procedures (P&P Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant uploads HMIS Policies and Procedures. (10 points) 	10	
TOTAL	100	

FIRST-TIME RENEWAL PROJECT

San Antonio/Bexar County 2021 CoC Program IRT Scoring Rubric
First-Time Renewal Project

Agency Name:		Project Type:	
Project Name:		Funding Amount Requested:	
Notes from SARAH Staff on Application Review			

Category	Max Points	Final Score
<p>Application Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant followed instructions to submit the application on time and with all required attachments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applications submitted late will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. ○ Applications with deficiencies will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. • Applicant attended Bidders' Conference or completed online course. (1 point) 	1	
<p>Fiscal Management (e-SNAPS Part 6, Narrative 18a., Fiscal P&P Attachment, eLOCCS Draws Attachment, Audit Attachment, Narrative 18b., Narrative 18c., Narrative 18d.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides accurate budget. Budget's ratio of supportive services to operations and cost-per-client analysis is manageable. (10 points) • Applicant provides match documentation. (10 points) • Applicant provides comprehensive fiscal policies and procedures. (10 points) • eLOCCS draws show appropriate grant spending. If no eLOCCS draws, applicant made adequate effort to draw down and re-authorize access, if applicable. (15 points) • Audit show no significant deficiencies or findings. (10 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If no audit is available – applicant explanation is sufficient in addressing the lack of audit. 	65	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct services staffing ratio is within 8-15 for PSH and 15-30 for RRH and direct services staff salaries are, at minimum, consistent with a living wage as outlined by the <u>U.S. Bureau of Labor</u>. (10 points) 		
<p>Project Description (e-SNAPS Part 2, 3, 4, and 5; Narrative 18e., Narrative 18f.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provided thorough description of project to include need of the project and specific outcomes. (8 points) • Applicant provided realistic and comprehensive milestones. (8 points) • Applicant describes barriers to participation faced by persons of different races or those who are over-represented in the local homeless population and identifies strategies to eliminate these barriers. (8 points) • Applicant’s landlord engagement strategy articulates how the project will identify new landlords, retain landlords, and engage landlords to house higher-barrier clients. (5 points) 	29	
<p>Policies and Procedures (P&P Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant’s Policies and Procedures include the following: intake, confidentiality, termination, and VAWA. (4 points) • Intake policies demonstrate low-barrier, housing first, and trauma-informed service orientation. (5 points) • Confidentiality policies and procedures are robust to ensure client confidentiality is a high priority. (5 points) • Termination policies clearly delineate types of termination and provide clear grounds for termination. These policies outline the process by which participants are notified and informed when termination is the only recourse. (5 points) • VAWA policy aligns with HUD standards outlined in 24 CFR 578.99(j). (5 points) • Policies and Procedures align with local CoC Written Standards and Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures. (6 points) 	30	
<p>CoC Participation (Narrative 18h., Narrative 18hi., Narrative 18j., Narrative 18k.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant adhered to local Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures from last grant year or has a detailed plan to adhere. (10 points) 	25	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant adhered to local HUD reporting deadlines from last grant year or has a detailed plan to adhere. (5 points) • Applicant adhered to local HMIS reporting from last grant year or has a detailed plan to adhere. (5 points) • Applicant participated in the CoC Membership Council, workgroups, or committees from last grant year or has a detailed plan to participate. (5 points) 		
<p>BONUS (Narratives 18l., Narrative 18m., Narrative 18n., Narrative 18o.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is voluntarily reallocating to a project type listed as a funding priority. (1 point) • Applicant incorporates lived experience in in agency’s policy and/or decision-making structure beyond the HUD requirements. (1 point) • Applicant is a Homelink Network Partner and/or Homelink Hub. (2 point) • Applicant strategically engages with other homeless providers in a collaborative, effective way and prioritizes a community-wide focus on ending homelessness as opposed to agency-specific. (1 point) 	5	
TOTAL	150	

FIRST-TIME RENEWAL PROJECT – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

San Antonio/Bexar County 2021 CoC Program IRT Scoring Rubric
First-Time Renewal Project – Domestic Violence

Agency Name:		Project Type:	
Project Name:		Funding Amount Requested:	
Notes from SARAH Staff on Application Review			

Category	Max Points	Final Score
<p>Application Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant followed instructions to submit the application on time and with all required attachments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applications submitted late will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. ○ Applications with deficiencies will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. • Applicant attended Bidders’ Conference or completed online course. (1 point) 	1	
<p>Fiscal Management (e-SNAPS Part 6, Narrative 18a., Fiscal P&P Attachment, eLOCCS Draws Attachment, Audit Attachment, Narrative 18b., Narrative 18c., Narrative 18d.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides accurate budget. Budget’s ratio of supportive services to operations and cost-per-client analysis is manageable. (10 points) • Applicant provides match documentation. (10 points) • Applicant provides comprehensive fiscal policies and procedures. (10 points) • eLOCCS draws show appropriate grant spending. If no eLOCCS draws, applicant made adequate effort to draw down and re-authorize access, if applicable. (15 points) • HUD Monitoring and/or Audit show no significant deficiencies or findings. (10 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If no audit is available – applicant explanation is sufficient in addressing the lack of audit. 	65	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct services staffing ratio is within 8-15 for PSH and 15-30 for RRH and direct services staff salaries are, at minimum, consistent with a living wage as outlined by the <u>U.S. Bureau of Labor</u>. (10 points) 		
<p>Project Description (e-SNAPS Part 2, 3, 4, and 5; Narrative 18e., Narrative 18f. Narrative 18g.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provided thorough description of project to include need of the project and specific outcomes. (6 points) • Applicant provided realistic and comprehensive milestones. (6 points) • Applicant describes barriers to participation faced by persons of different races or those who are over-represented in the local homeless population and identifies strategies to eliminate these barriers. (6 points) • Applicant’s landlord engagement strategy articulates how the project will identify new landlords, retain landlords, and engage landlords to house higher-barrier clients. (5 points) • Applicant adequately explains how the project will improve safety for the population served. (6 points) 	29	
<p>Policies and Procedures (P&P Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant’s Policies and Procedures include the following: intake, confidentiality, termination, and VAWA. (4 points) • Intake policies demonstrate low-barrier, housing first, and trauma-informed service orientation. (5 points) • Confidentiality policies and procedures are robust to ensure client confidentiality is a high priority. (5 points) • Termination policies clearly delineate types of termination and provide clear grounds for termination. These policies outline the process by which participants are notified and informed when termination is the only recourse. (5 points) • VAWA policy aligns with HUD standards outlined in 24 CFR 578.99(j). (5 points) • Policies and Procedures align with local CoC Written Standards. (6 points) 	30	
<p>CoC Participation (Narrative 18i., Narrative 18j., Narrative 18k.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant adhered to local HUD reporting deadlines from last grant year or has a detailed plan to adhere. (8.5 points) 	25	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant describes adequate comparable database to HMIS. (8.5 points) • Applicant participated in the CoC Membership Council, workgroups, or committees from last grant year or has a detailed plan to participate. (8 points) 		
<p>BONUS (Narratives 18l., Narrative 18m., Narrative 18n., Narrative 18o.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is voluntarily reallocating to a project type listed as a funding priority. (1 point) • Applicant incorporates lived experience in in agency’s policy and/or decision-making structure beyond the HUD requirements. (1 point) • Applicant is a Homelink Network Partner and/or Homelink Hub. (2 point) • Applicant strategically engages with other homeless providers in a collaborative, effective way and prioritizes a community-wide focus on ending homelessness as opposed to agency-specific. (1 point) 	5	
TOTAL	150	

FIRST-TIME RENEWAL PROJECT – COORDINATED ENTRY

San Antonio/Bexar County 2021 CoC Program IRT Scoring Rubric
First-Time Renewal Project – Coordinated Entry

Agency Name:		Project Type:	
Project Name:		Funding Amount Requested:	
Notes from SARAH Staff on Application Review			

Category	Max Points	Final Score
<p>Application Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant followed instructions to submit the application on time and with all required attachments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applications submitted late will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. ○ Applications with deficiencies will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. • Applicant attended Bidders’ Conference or completed online course. (5 point) 	5	
<p>Fiscal Management (e-SNAPS Part 6, Fiscal P&P Attachment, Narrative 14a., eLOCCS Draws Attachment, Audit Attachment, Narrative 14b.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides accurate budget. (12 points) • Applicant provides match documentation. (12 points) • Applicant provides comprehensive fiscal policies and procedures. (12 points) • eLOCCS draws show appropriate grant spending. If no eLOCCS draws, applicant made adequate effort to draw down and re-authorize access, if applicable. (17 points) • HUD Monitoring and/or Audit show no significant deficiencies or findings. (12 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If no audit is available – applicant explanation is sufficient in addressing the lack of audit. 	65	
<p>Project Description (e-SNAPS Part 2, 3, 4, and 5, Narrative 14c.)</p>	40	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provided thorough description of project to include need of the project and specific outcomes. (15 points) • Applicant provided realistic and comprehensive milestones. (15 points) • Applicant describes barriers to participation faced by persons of different races or those who are over-represented in the local homeless population and identifies strategies to eliminate these barriers. (10 points) 		
<p>Policies and Procedures (P&P Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant uploads Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures. (40 points) 	40	
TOTAL	150	

FIRST-TIME RENEWAL PROJECT – HOMELESS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

San Antonio/Bexar County 2021 CoC Program IRT Scoring Rubric
First-Time Renewal Project – HMIS

Agency Name:		Project Type:	
Project Name:		Funding Amount Requested:	
Notes from SARAH Staff on Application Review			

Category	Max Points	Final Score
<p>Application Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant followed instructions to submit the application on time and with all required attachments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applications submitted late will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. ○ Applications with deficiencies will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. • Applicant attended Bidders’ Conference or completed online course. (5 point) 	5	
<p>Fiscal Management (e-SNAPS Part 6, Narrative 14a., Fiscal P&P Attachment, Audit Attachment, Narrative 14b.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides accurate budget. (12 points) • Applicant provides match documentation. (12 points) • Applicant provides comprehensive fiscal policies and procedures. (12 points) • eLOCCS draws show appropriate grant spending. If no eLOCCS draws, applicant made adequate effort to draw down and re-authorize access, if applicable. (17 points) • HUD Monitoring and/or Audit show no significant deficiencies or findings. (12 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If no audit is available – applicant explanation is sufficient in addressing the lack of audit. 	65	
Project Description (e-SNAPS Part 2, 3, 4, and 5)	40	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provided thorough description of project to include need of the project and specific outcomes. (20 points) • Applicant provided realistic and comprehensive milestones. (20 points) 		
<p>Policies and Procedures (P&P Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant uploads HMIS Policies and Procedures. (40 points) 	40	
TOTAL	150	

RENEWAL PROJECT

San Antonio/Bexar County 2021 CoC Program IRT Scoring Rubric
Renewal Project

Agency Name:		Project Type:	
Project Name:		Funding Amount Requested:	
Notes from SARAH Staff on Application Review			

Category	Max Points	Final Score
<p>Application Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant followed instructions to submit the application on time and with all required attachments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applications submitted late will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. ○ Applications with deficiencies will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. • Applicant attended Bidders' Conference or completed online course. (1 point) 	1	
<p>Fiscal Management (e-SNAPS Part 6, Narrative 23a., Fiscal P&P Attachment, Audit, Narrative 23b., eLOCCS Draws Attachment, Narrative 23c., Narrative 23d.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides accurate budget. Budget's ratio of supportive services to operations and cost-per-client is manageable. (2 points) • Applicant provides match documentation. (1 points) • Applicant provides comprehensive fiscal policies and procedures. (2 points) • HUD Monitoring and/or Audit show no significant deficiencies or findings. (2 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If no audit is available – applicant explanation is sufficient in addressing the lack of audit. • eLOCCS draws and Final Grant Close-Out show appropriate grant spending. (2 points) • Direct services staffing ratio is within 8-15 for PSH and 15-30 for RRH and direct services staff salaries are, at 	10	

<p>minimum, consistent with a living wage as outlined by the <u>U.S. Bureau of Labor</u>. (1 point)</p>		
<p>Project Description (e-SNAPS Part 2, 3, 4, and 5; Narrative 23e., Narrative 23f.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provided thorough description of project to include need of the project and specific outcomes. (2 points) • Applicant provided realistic and comprehensive milestones. (2 points) • Applicant describes barriers to participation faced by persons of different races or those who are over-represented in the local homeless population and identifies strategies to eliminate these barriers. (2 points) • Applicant’s landlord engagement strategy articulates how the project will identify new landlords, retain landlords, and engage landlords to house higher-barrier clients. (2 points.) 	8	
<p>Policies and Procedures (P&P Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant’s Policies and Procedures include the following: intake, confidentiality, termination, and VAWA. (4 points) • Intake policies demonstrate low-barrier, housing first, and trauma-informed service orientation. (2 points) • Confidentiality policies and procedures are robust to ensure client confidentiality is a high priority. (2 points) • Termination policies clearly delineate types of termination and provide clear grounds for termination. These policies outline the process by which participants are notified and informed when termination is the only recourse. (2 points) • VAWA policy aligns with HUD standards outlined in 24 CFR 578.99(j). (1 points) • Policies and Procedures align with local CoC Written Standards and Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures. (2 points) 	13	
<p>Project Performance (CoC Scorecard Attachment, Annual Performance Review Attachment, Narrative 23h., Narrative 23i.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CoC Scorecard Metrics (100 points) • Applicant can adequately describe project performance on scorecard and APR with plan to improve, if applicable. (5 points) 	105	
<p>CoC Participation (Narrative 23j., Narrative 23k, Narrative 23l, Narrative 23m, Narrative 23n)</p>	13	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant adhered to local Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures from last grant year. (7 points) • Applicant adhered to local HUD reporting deadlines from last grant year. (2 point) • Applicant adhered to local HMIS reporting from last grant year. (2 point) • Applicant participated in the CoC Membership Council, workgroups, or committees from last grant year. (1 point) • Applicant participated in the 2019 Point-in-Time Count. (1 point) 		
<p>BONUS (Narrative 23o., Narrative 23p, Narrative 23q, Narrative 23r)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is voluntarily reallocating to a project type listed as a funding priority. (1 point) • Applicant is a Homelink Network Partner and/or Homelink Hub. (2 points) • Applicant incorporates lived experience in in agency’s policy and/or decision-making structure beyond the HUD requirements. (1 point) • Applicant strategically engages with other homeless providers in a collaborative, effective way and prioritizes a community-wide focus on ending homelessness. (1 point) 	5	
TOTAL	150	

RENEWAL PROJECT – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

San Antonio/Bexar County 2021 CoC Program IRT Scoring Rubric
Renewal Project – Domestic Violence

Agency Name:		Project Type:	
Project Name:		Funding Amount Requested:	
Notes from SARAH Staff on Application Review			

Category	Max Points	Final Score
<p>Application Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant followed instructions to submit the application on time and with all required attachments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applications submitted late will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. ○ Applications with deficiencies will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. • Applicant attended Bidders’ Conference or completed online course. (1 point) 	1	
<p>Fiscal Management (e-SNAPS Part 6, Narrative 23a., Fiscal P&P Attachment, Audit, Narrative 23b., eLOCCS Draws Attachment, Narrative 23c., Narrative 23d.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides accurate budget. Budget’s ratio of supportive services to operations and cost-per-client is manageable. (2 points) • Applicant provides match documentation. (1 points) • Applicant provides comprehensive fiscal policies and procedures. (2 points) • HUD Monitoring and/or Audit show no significant deficiencies or findings. (2 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If no audit is available – applicant explanation is sufficient in addressing the lack of audit. • eLOCCS draws and Final Grant Close-Out show appropriate grant spending. (2 points) • Direct services staffing ratio is within 8-15 for PSH and 15-30 for RRH and direct services staff salaries are, at 	10	

<p>minimum, consistent with a living wage as outlined by the <u>U.S. Bureau of Labor</u>. (1 point)</p>		
<p>Project Description (e-SNAPS Part 2, 3, 4, and 5; Narrative 23e., Narrative 23f., Narrative 23g.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provided thorough description of project to include need of the project and specific outcomes. (2 points) • Applicant provided realistic and comprehensive milestones. (2 points) • Applicant describes barriers to participation faced by persons of different races or those who are over-represented in the local homeless population and identifies strategies to eliminate these barriers. (2 points) • Applicant’s landlord engagement strategy articulates how the project will identify new landlords, retain landlords, and engage landlords to house higher-barrier clients. (2 points.) • Applicant adequately explains how the project will improve safety for the population served. (2 points) 	10	
<p>Policies and Procedures (P&P Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant’s Policies and Procedures include the following: intake, confidentiality, termination, and VAWA. (4 points) • Intake policies demonstrate low-barrier, housing first, and trauma-informed service orientation. (2 points) • Confidentiality policies and procedures are robust to ensure client confidentiality is a high priority. (2 points) • Termination policies clearly delineate types of termination and provide clear grounds for termination. These policies outline the process by which participants are notified and informed when termination is the only recourse. (2 points) • VAWA policy aligns with HUD standards outlined in 24 CFR 578.99(j). (2 points) • Policies and Procedures align with local CoC Written Standards (2 points) 	14	
<p>Project Performance (CoC Scorecard Attachment, Annual Performance Review Attachment, Narrative 23h., Narrative 23i.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CoC Scorecard Metrics (100 points) • Applicant can adequately describe project performance on scorecard and APR with plan to improve, if applicable. (5 points) 	105	

<p>CoC Participation (Narrative 23j., Narrative 23k, Narrative 23l, Narrative 23m, Narrative 23n)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant adhered to local HUD reporting deadlines from last grant year. (3 points) • Applicant describes adequate comparable HMIS. (3 points) • Applicant participated in the CoC Membership Council, workgroups, or committees from last grant year. (2 point) • Applicant participated in the 2019 Point-in-Time Count. (2 point) 	10	
<p>BONUS (Narrative 23o., Narrative 23p, Narrative 23q, Narrative 23r)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is voluntarily reallocating to a project type listed as a funding priority. (1 point) • Applicant is a Homelink Network Partner and/or Homelink Hub. (2 points) • Applicant incorporates lived experience in in agency’s policy and/or decision-making structure beyond the HUD requirements. (1 point) • Applicant strategically engages with other homeless providers in a collaborative, effective way and prioritizes a community-wide focus on ending homelessness. (1 point) 	5	
TOTAL	150	

RENEWAL PROJECT – COORDINATED ENTRY

San Antonio/Bexar County 2021 CoC Program IRT Scoring Rubric
Renewal Project – Coordinated Entry

Agency Name:		Project Type:	
Project Name:		Funding Amount Requested:	
Notes from SARAH Staff on Application Review			

Category	Max Points	Final Score
<p>Application Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant followed instructions to submit the application on time and with all required attachments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applications submitted late will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. ○ Applications with deficiencies will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. • Applicant attended Bidders’ Conference or completed online course. (5 points) 	5	
<p>Fiscal Management (e-SNAPS Part 6, Narrative 18a., Fiscal P&P Attachment, Audit, Narrative 18b., eLOCCS Draws Attachment, Final Grant Close-Out Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides accurate budget. (10 points) • Applicant provides match documentation. (10 points) • Applicant provides comprehensive fiscal policies and procedures. (10 points) • HUD Monitoring and/or Audit show no significant deficiencies or findings. (10 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If no audit is available – applicant explanation is sufficient in addressing the lack of audit. • eLOCCS draws and Final Grant Close-Out show appropriate grant spending. (10 points) 	50	
<p>Project Description (e-SNAPS Part 2, 3, 4, and 5; Narrative 18c.)</p>	40	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provided thorough description of project to include need of the project and specific outcomes. (15 points) • Applicant provided realistic and comprehensive milestones. (15 points) • Applicant describes barriers to participation faced by persons of different races or those who are over-represented in the local homeless population and identifies strategies to eliminate these barriers. (10 points) 		
<p>Policies and Procedures (P&P Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant uploads Coordinated Entry Policies & Procedures. (30 points) 	30	
<p>Project Performance (Annual Performance Review Attachment, Narrative 18d.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant uploads APR and can adequately describe project performance with plan to improve, if applicable. (25 points) 	25	
TOTAL	150	

RENEWAL PROJECT – HOMELESS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

San Antonio/Bexar County 2021 CoC Program IRT Scoring Rubric
Renewal Project – HMIS

Agency Name:		Project Type:	
Project Name:		Funding Amount Requested:	
Notes from SARAH Staff on Application Review			

Category	Max Points	Final Score
<p>Application Submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant followed instructions to submit the application on time and with all required attachments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Applications submitted late will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. ○ Applications with deficiencies will receive a deduction in accordance with the CoC Program Policy. • Applicant attended Bidders’ Conference or completed online course. (5 points) 	5	
<p>Fiscal Management (e-SNAPS Part 6, Narrative 18a., Fiscal P&P Attachment, Audit, Narrative 18b., eLOCCS Draws Attachment, Final Grant Close-Out Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provides accurate budget. (10 points) • Applicant provides match documentation. (10 points) • Applicant provides comprehensive fiscal policies and procedures. (10 points) • HUD Monitoring and/or Audit show no significant deficiencies or findings. (10 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If no audit is available – applicant explanation is sufficient in addressing the lack of audit. • eLOCCS draws and Final Grant Close-Out show appropriate grant spending. (10 points) 	50	
Project Description (e-SNAPS Part 2, 3, 4, and 5)	40	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant provided thorough description of project to include need of the project and specific outcomes. (20 points) • Applicant provided realistic and comprehensive milestones. (20 points) 		
<p>Policies and Procedures (P&P Attachment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant uploads HMIS Policies & Procedures. (30 points) 	30	
<p>Project Performance (Annual Performance Review Attachment, Narrative 18d.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant uploads APR and can adequately describe project performance with plan to improve, if applicable. (25 points) 	25	
TOTAL	150	

Appendix B – CoC Program MOU

TX-500 Continuum of Care Project Agreement

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

Between

The South Alamo Regional Alliance for the Homeless (TX-500 Continuum of Care

[CoC])

and

(Agency Name: _____)

Grant ID: _____)

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is to confirm agreements between the Continuum of Care ("CoC") agencies funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") and the Lead Agency and Collaborative Applicant for the CoC, the South Alamo Regional Alliance for the Homeless ("SARAH"). This MOU defines the roles and specific responsibilities of each party relating to key aspects of the operation of the Continuum of Care.

This MOU is an effort to ensure a mutual understanding and strengthening of our partnership to end homelessness in San Antonio/Bexar County by making it a rare, brief, and nonrecurring event.

DURATION AND RENEWAL

Except for termination, the duration of this MOU will be from _____ through _____. This start date should reflect the grant agreement execution date coordinated with the HUD Field Office for the CoC-funded project. This agreement will renew automatically unless either party gives notification, but should be updated, reviewed, and signed annually prior to contract execution.

GENERAL UNDERSTANDINGS

SARAH, as CoC Lead Agency and Collaborative Applicant will:

1. Complete the Consolidated Application for HUD CoC funds on behalf of the

- community;
2. Submit required federal reports on behalf of the CoC, including the Annual Homeless Assessment Report, Point-in-Time Count, Housing Inventory Count, System Performance Measures, and the Grant Inventory Worksheet;
 3. Coordinate the system of homeless and homelessness prevention services in the TX-500 continuum area;
 4. Implement a Coordinated Entry System that meets HUD's requirements;
 5. Be the voice and advocate for ending and preventing homelessness;
 6. Provide direction and oversight through the development and periodic review and refinement of strategies, goals and objectives to end homelessness;
 7. Support fundraising efforts of CoC-funded agencies;
 8. Provide overall governance processes for the CoC;
 9. Provide HUD policy guidance and technical assistance to service providers;
 10. Serve on committees or workgroups as requested by the Coc Board;
 11. Ensure uniform application of bylaws and adopted guidelines to all members of the CoC;
 12. Monitor Performance of CoC-funded Agencies and act against poor performers through a documented process;
 13. Consider and approve actions regarding Continuum of Care strategies, funding allocations, funding awards, grant management, and grant performance

CoC-Funded Agency will:

1. Submit a Final Grant Agreement and Spending Plan to SARAH upon Grant Contract Execution;
2. Notify SARAH of any Significant Grant Amendments or Project Changes submitted to or approved by HUD;
3. Submit a Quarterly LOCCS Report to SARAH to demonstrate timely drawdown of funds;
4. Attend at least 75% of SARAH Membership Council Meetings;
5. Maintain Membership in at least One CoC Committee or workgroup;
6. Ensure quality project data on federal reports including the Annual Homeless Assessment Report, Point-in-Time Count, Housing Inventory Count, and System Performance Measures;
7. Monitor project performance on an ongoing basis and follow performance Quality Improvement Plans when issued by the CoC Lead Agency and Board of Directors;
8. Ensure 75% of CoC-Funded Program FTE's Participate in the Annual Point-in-Time Count Event;
9. Pay annual CoC dues to SARAH at a rate of 1.75% of each CoC project grant within 90 days of Final Grant Agreement Execution (reminder, HUD CoC funds cannot be used to pay these costs);
10. Utilize Coordinated Entry for all project referrals and follow Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures;
11. Utilize HMIS for all project referrals and follow HMIS Policies & Procedures, including standards for privacy, security, and data quality;
12. Follow Housing First Practices;

13. Maintain compliance with interim and final rules issued by HUD;
14. Follow Continuum of Care Approved Policies & Procedures;
15. Submit a Final Annual Performance Report and HUD Closeout Report to the HUD San Antonio Field Office within the required HUD timelines. Additionally, you will provide SARAH with a copy of these reports;
16. Ensure ELOCCS approving officials maintain oversight of all organization ELOCCS accounts to help prevent security violations and delays in making draws.

SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES

1. CoC Authority

The CoC program is authorized by subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381-11389). The program is designed to:

- Promote communitywide commitment to the goal of ending homelessness;
- Provide funding for efforts by nonprofit providers, States, and local governments to quickly rehouse homeless individuals (including unaccompanied youth) and families, while minimizing the trauma and dislocation caused to homeless individuals, families, and communities by homelessness;
- Promote access to and effective utilization of mainstream programs by homeless individuals and families; and
- Optimize self-sufficiency among individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

A CoC is a geographically based group of representatives that carries out the planning responsibilities of the Continuum of Care program, as set out by regulation. The CoC is designed to address the critical problem of homelessness through a coordinated community-based process of identifying needs and building a system of housing and services to address those needs. The geographic jurisdiction of the South Alamo Regional Alliance is San Antonio/Bexar County.

2. Lead Agency Designation

The CoC designates SARAH as the lead Agency to manage the required HUD processes on its behalf to ensure the maximum amount of funds are received by the jurisdiction and that the CoC is following all applicable HUD rules and regulations. SARAH performs these tasks at the direction of the CoC Board of Directors.

3. HMIS Lead Agency Designation

The CoC designates Haven for Hope as the HMIS Lead Agency to operate the HMIS to ensure high data quality and other HUD HMIS compliance requirements of all HUD CoC Program projects in the CoC.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All parties agree that they shall be bound by and shall abide by all applicable Federal or State statutes or regulations pertaining to the confidentiality of client records or information, including volunteers. The parties shall not use or disclose any information about a recipient of the services provided under this agreement for any purpose connected with the parties' contract responsibilities, except with the written consent of such recipient, recipient's attorney, or recipient's parent of guardian.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

All parties agree to be bound by and abide by all applicable anti-discrimination statutes, regulations, policies, and procedures as may be applicable under any Federal or State contracts, statutes, or regulations, or otherwise as presently or hereinafter adopted by the agency.

TERMS OF AGREEMENT

1. This MOU shall be effective upon adoption by each signatory agency and entity.
2. This MOU shall be reviewed and revised as needed to further implementation of strategic and long-term goals of the project.
3. This MOU can be expanded, modified, or amended, as needed, at any time by the consent of all agencies.
4. This MOU shall be in effect until the end of this project unless terminated by agreement in writing prior to the project end date.

TERMINATION

Either party may terminate this MOU at a date prior to the renewal date specified in this MOU by giving 120 days written notice to the other party. If the funds relied upon to undertake activities described in this MOU are withdrawn or reduced, or if additional conditions are placed on such funding, any party may terminate this MOU within 30 days by providing written notice to the other party. The termination will be effective on the date specified in the notice of termination.

Appendix C – CoC Program Performance Scorecards

PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SCORECARD

#	Metric	Benchmark	Max. Possible Points	Actual Project Score	Metric Value	Metric Population	How is this calculated?
1. HMIS Data Quality							
1.1	Data Completeness	<= 2% = 10 points; <= 4% = 5 points	10	10	%	# missing data elements for # clients	The number of data elements that apply to all clients that are missing, as indicated by a NULL or data not collected, divided by the number of clients times the common UDEs (16).
1.2	Timeliness of Data Entry	<= 3 days = 5 points; > 3 days and <= 5 days = 2 points	5	5	Days	# entry records	The average number of days between enrollment member begin date and created date (for new enrollees) as well as the number of days between enrollment member end date and exit

							time stamp (for leavers).
1.3	Annual Assessment Completeness	0% = 5 points; < 10% = 2 points	5	5	%	# out of # clients due for exit	The percentage of clients that do not have an annual financial assessment WHERE the enrollment anniversary date falls during the reporting time frame. Only clients that are HoH, were over 17 at time of entry, or were over 17 at the enrollment anniversary date with an enrollment length of over a year are included.
Metric 1 Total Project Performance:			20	20			
2. Coordinated Entry							
2.1	CE Participation	100% = 15 points; >= 90% and < 100% = 10 points	15	15	%	# out of # clients with open Homelink enrollment	The percentage of clients enrolled during the reporting time frame where at least one of

							the family members also has an open Homelink enrollment at time of the relevant project start date. Clients enrolled prior to January 1, 2019, or clients added to households enrolled prior to this date, are included but no points will be deducted as Homelink was not operational.
2.2	Referral Acceptance Rate	>= 85% = 5 points	5	5	%	# out of # clients accepted into project	This percentage is calculated by looking at the number of claims that ended with the outcome of either 'Client refused program' or 'Cannot locate client using 2 different means' WHERE the associated client received a

							service FROM an Outreach, CY, or Emergency Shelter project within 7 days of the claim end date divided by the total number of claims that end during the time frame. The number 7 day window looks no further than the end of the time frame and no earlier than when the claim was opened.
Metric 2 Total Project Performance:			20	20			
3. Ending Homelessness Measures							
3.2	Exits to or Retention of Permanent Housing	>= 90% = 15 points; >= 85% = 10 points; >= 80% = 5 points	15	15	%	# clients	The number of clients that are either stayers or have a PH exit (based off of the HUD list of destinations) during the reporting time frame divided by the total number of

							clients with an open enrollment during the time reporting time frame.
3.3	Returns to Homelessness after Permanent Housing Outcome: (6 months)	<= 10%	5	5	%	# clients	This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures' Measure 2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included WHERE recidivism is marked by an ES, TH, Outreach, or CY project enrollment. Clients that returned up to 180 days FROM their PH exit date are included divided by all clients with a PH exit within the two years FROM the reporting start date. Reporting Start Date = Project Start Date

3.4	Returns to Homelessness after Permanent Housing Outcome: (1 year)	<= 15%	5	5	%	# clients	This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures' Measure 2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included WHERE recidivism is marked by an ES, TH, Outreach, or CY project enrollment. Clients that returned up to one year FROM their PH exit date are included divided by all clients with a PH exit within the two years FROM the reporting start date. Reporting Start Date = Project Start Date
-----	---	--------	---	---	---	-----------	--

3.5	Returns to Homelessness after Permanent Housing / TOTAL Returns to Homelessness: (2 years)	<= 20%	5	5	%	# clients	This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures' Measure 2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included WHERE recidivism is marked by an ES, TH, Outreach, or CY project enrollment. All clients returning within the two years FROM the reporting start date are included divided by all PH exit clients within the two years FROM the reporting start date. Reporting Start Date = Project Start Date
3.6	Receipt of Non-Cash Benefits	>= 75%	10	10	%	# clients	The number of adult clients, both leavers and stayers, which have

							either non-cash benefits (HUD Financial assessment) indicated on the most recent assessment.
3.7	Overall Increase Income (Employment + Non-Employment)	>= 27% = 15 points; >= 20% and < 27% = 10 points	15	15	%	# clients	The number of adult clients, both leavers and stayers, which either gained or increased total income as indicated by their most recent HUD Financial assessment.
Metric 3 Total Project Performance:			55	55			
Total Project Performance			100	100			

RAPID REHOUSING SCORECARD

#	Metric	Benchmark	Max. Possible Points	Actual Project Score	Metric Value	Metric Population	How is this calculated?
1. HMIS Data Quality							
1.1	Data Completeness	<= 2% = 10 points; <= 4% = 5 points	10	10	%	# missing data elements for # clients	The number of data elements that apply to all clients that are missing, as indicated by a NULL or data not collected, divided by the number of clients times the common UDEs (16).
1.2	Timeliness of Data Entry	<= 3 days = 5 points; > 3 days and <= 5 days = 2 points	5	5	Days	# entry records	The average number of days between enrollment member begin date and created date (for new enrollees) as well as the number of days between enrollment member end date and exit time stamp (for leavers).

1.3	Annual Assessment Completeness	0% = 5 points; < 10% = 2 points	5	5	%	# out of # clients due for exit	The percentage of clients that do not have an annual financial assessment WHERE the enrollment anniversary date falls during the reporting time frame. Only clients that are HoH, were over 17 at time of entry, or were over 17 at the enrollment anniversary date with an enrollment length of over a year are included.
Metric 1 Total Project Performance:			20	20			
2. Coordinated Entry							
2.1	CE Participation	100% = 10 points; >= 90% and < 100% = 5 points	10	10	%	# out of # clients with open Homelink enrollment	The percentage of clients enrolled during the reporting time frame where at least one of the family members also has an

							open Homelink enrollment at time of the relevant project start date. Clients enrolled prior to January 1, 2019, or clients added to households enrolled prior to this date, are included but no points will be deducted as Homelink was not operational.
2.2	Referral Acceptance Rate	>= 85% = 5 points	5	5	%	# out of # clients accepted into project	This percentage is calculated by looking at the number of claims that ended with the outcome of either 'Client refused program' or 'Cannot locate client using 2 different means' WHERE the associated client received a service

							FROM an Outreach, CY, or Emergency Shelter project within 7 days of the claim end date divided by the total number of claims that end during the time frame. The number 7 day window looks no further than the end of the time frame and no earlier than when the claim was opened.
Metric 2 Total Project Performance:			15	15			
3. Ending Homelessness Measures							
3.1	Rapid Placement into Permanent Housing	< 30 days = 15 points; >= 30 days and < 60 days = 5 points	15	15	days	# clients	The average number of days between project start date and the housing move-in date based off of HoH data for all enrollments active during the reporting time frame. If there is no

							recorded Housing Move-in Date then the project exit date is used WHERE stay is truncated to a maximum of the reporting end date.
3.2	Exits to Permanent Housing	>= 90% = 15 points; >= 85% = 10 points; >= 80% = 5 points	15	15	%	# clients	The number of clients with a PH exit (based off the HUD list of destinations) during the reporting time frame divided by the total number of clients with an exit during the reporting time frame.
3.3	Returns to Homelessness after Permanent Housing Outcome: (6 months)	<= 10%	5	5	%	# clients	This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures' Measure 2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included

							WHERE recidivism is marked by an ES, TH, Outreach, or CY project enrollment. Clients that returned up to 180 days FROM their PH exit date are included divided by all clients with a PH exit within the two years FROM the reporting start date. Reporting Start Date = Project Start Date
3.4	Returns to Homelessness after Permanent Housing Outcome: (1 year)	<= 15%	5	5	%	# clients	This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures' Measure 2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included WHERE recidivism is marked by an ES, TH, Outreach, or CY project enrollment.

							<p>Clients that returned up to one year FROM their PH exit date are included divided by all clients with a PH exit within the two years FROM the reporting start date. Reporting Start Date = Project Start Date</p>
3.5	Returns to Homelessness after Permanent Housing / TOTAL Returns to Homelessness: (2 years)	<= 20%	5	5	%	# clients	<p>This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures' Measure 2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included WHERE recidivism is marked by an ES, TH, Outreach, or CY project enrollment. All clients returning within the two years FROM the reporting start date</p>

							are included divided by all PH exit clients within the two years FROM the reporting start date. Reporting Start Date = Project Start Date
3.6	Receipt of Non-Cash Benefits	>= 70%	5	5	%	# clients	The number of adult client leavers, which have either non-cash benefits (HUD Financial assessment) indicated on their exit assessment.
3.7	Overall Increase Income (Employment + Non-Employment)	>= 50% = 15 points; >= 40% and < 50% = 5 points	15	15	%	# clients	The number of adult clients, both leavers and stayers, which either gained or increased total income as indicated by their most recent HUD Financial assessment.
Metric 3 Total Project Performance:			65	65			
Total Project Performance			100	100			

TRANSITIONAL HOUSING SCORECARD

#	Metric	Benchmark	Max. Possible Points	Actual Project Score	Metric Value	Metric Population	How is this calculated?
1. HMIS Data Quality							
1.1	Data Completeness	<= 2% = 10 points; <= 4% = 5 points	10	10	%	# missing data elements for # clients	The number of data elements that apply to all clients that are missing, as indicated by a NULL or data not collected, divided by the number of clients times the common UDEs (16).
1.2	Timeliness of Data Entry	<= 3 days = 5 points; > 3 days and <= 5 days = 2 points	5	5	Days	# entry records	The average number of days between enrollment member begin date and created date (for new enrollees) as well as the number of days between enrollment member end date and exit time stamp (for leavers).

1.3	Annual Assessment Completeness	0% = 5 points; < 10% = 2 points	5	5	%	# out of # clients due for exit	The percentage of clients that do not have an annual financial assessment WHERE the enrollment anniversary date falls during the reporting time frame. Only clients that are HoH, were over 17 at time of entry, or were over 17 at the enrollment anniversary date with an enrollment length of over a year are included.
Metric 1 Total Project Performance:			20	20			
2. Coordinated Entry							
2.1	CE Participation	100% = 10 points; >= 90% and < 100% = 5 points	10	10	%	# out of # clients with open Homelink enrollment	The percentage of clients enrolled during the reporting time frame where at least one of the family members also has an

							open Homelink enrollment at time of the relevant project start date. Clients enrolled prior to January 1, 2019, or clients added to households enrolled prior to this date, are included but no points will be deducted as Homelink was not operational.
Metric 2 Total Project Performance:			10	10			
3. Ending Homelessness Measures							
3.1	Rapid Placement into Permanent Housing	<= 185 days = 10 points; <= 365 days = 5 points	10	10	days	# clients	The average number of days between project start date and end date based off of HoH data for all PH exits (based off of the HUD list of destinations) during the reporting time frame. Only those enrollments

							with enrollment member end dates between the reporting time frame are included.
3.2	Exits to Permanent Housing	<p>$\geq 90\% = 15$ points; $\geq 85\% = 10$ points; $\geq 80\% = 5$ points</p>	15	15	%	# clients	The number of clients with a PH exit (based off the HUD list of destinations) during the reporting time frame divided by the total number of clients with an exit during the reporting time frame.
3.3	Returns to Homelessness after Permanent Housing Outcome: (6 months)	$\leq 10\%$	5	5	%	# clients	This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures' Measure 2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included WHERE recidivism is marked by an ES, TH, Outreach, or

							CY project enrollment. Clients that returned up to 180 days FROM their PH exit date are included divided by all clients with a PH exit within the two years FROM the reporting start date. Reporting Start Date = Project Start Date
3.4	Returns to Homelessness after Permanent Housing Outcome: (1 year)	<= 15%	5	5	%	# clients	This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures' Measure 2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included WHERE recidivism is marked by an ES, TH, Outreach, or CY project enrollment. Clients that returned up to one year FROM their PH exit date

							are included divided by all clients with a PH exit within the two years FROM the reporting start date. Reporting Start Date = Project Start Date
3.5	Returns to Homelessness after Permanent Housing / TOTAL Returns to Homelessness: (2 years)	<= 20%	5	5	%	# clients	This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures' Measure 2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included WHERE recidivism is marked by an ES, TH, Outreach, or CY project enrollment. All clients returning within the two years FROM the reporting start date are included divided by all PH exit clients within the two

							years FROM the reporting start date. Reporting Start Date = Project Start Date
3.6	Receipt of Non-Cash Benefits	>= 75%	5	5	%	# clients	The number of adult client leavers, which have either non-cash benefits (HUD Financial assessment) indicated on their exit assessment.
3.7	Overall Increase Income (Employment + Non-Employment)	>= 65% = 15 points; >= 50% and < 65% = 10 points	15	15	%	# clients	The number of adult clients, both leavers and stayers, which either gained or increased total income as indicated by their most recent HUD Financial assessment.
3.8	Average Length of Time in Program	<= 365 days	5	5	days	# clients	The average number of days between enrollment member begin and the lesser of end date or reporting end date for

							all HoH clients with an open enrollment during anytime of the reporting time frame.
Metric 3 Total Project Performance:			65	65			
Total Project Performance			100	100			

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE – RAPID REHOUSING SCORECARD

#	Metric	Benchmark	Max Pts	Actual Pts	Metric Value	Metric Population	Metric Description
1. HMIS Comparable Database Data Quality							
1.1	Data Completeness	<= 2% = 10 points; <= 4% = 5 points	5	5	%	# Missing Data Elements for # Clients	The number of data elements that apply to all clients that are missing, as indicated by a null or data not collected, divided by the number of clients times the common Universal Data Elements (16).
1.2a	Timeliness of Data Entry (Program Entry)	<= 2 days = 5 points	5	5	days	# Entry Records	The average number of days between enrollment member begin date and enrollment created date (for new enrollees)
1.2b	Timeliness of Data Entry (Program Exit)	<= 2 days = 5 points	5	5	days	# Exit Records	The average number of dates between enrollment member end date and exit time

							stamp (for leavers).
1.3	Exit Assessment Completeness	0% = 5 points; < 10% = 2 points	5	5	%	# out of # Clients Due for Exit	The percentage of clients that do not have an exit assessment where the enrollment anniversary date falls during the reporting time frame. Only clients that are HoH, were over 17 at time of entry, or were over 17 at the enrollment anniversary date with an enrollment length of a year are included.
Metric 1 Total Project Performance:			20	20			
2. Domestic Violence Safety Assessment							
2.1	DV knowledge base	>90% = 15 points; < 89% and > 80% and = 10 points	15		%	# out of # Clients	The percentage of clients demonstrating their understanding of domestic violence based on the assessment tool administered by the DV case manager at the time of exit. Leavers only.
Metric 2 Total Project Performance:			15	15			
3. Ending Homelessness							
3.1	Rapid Placement into Permanent Housing	<30 days = 15 points; >31 to 60 days = 10 points	15	15	days	# PH Clients (HoH Only)	The average number of days between enrollment start date and housing

							move-in date based off of HoH data for all RRH enrollments during the reporting time frame. Includes leavers and stayers.
3.2	Exits to Permanent Housing	>= 90% = 15 points; >= 85% = 10 points; >= 80% = 5 points	15	15	%	# Clients	The number of clients with a PH exit destination (based off of the HUD list of destinations) during the reporting time frame divided by the total number of clients with a project exit date during the time reporting time frame. Leavers only.
3.3	Returns to DV Project after Permanent Housing Outcome: (6 months)	<= 10%	5	5	%	# Clients	This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures: Measure #2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included where recidivism is marked by project enrollment to this DV project. Clients that returned up to 180 days from their PH exit date are included divided by all clients with a PH exit within the two

							years from the reporting start date.
3.4	Returns to DV Project after Permanent Housing Outcome: (1year)	<= 15%	5		%	# Clients	This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures: Measure #2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included where recidivism is marked by a project enrollment to this DV project. Clients that returned up to one year from their PH exit date are included divided by all clients with a PH exit within the two years from the reporting start date.
3.5	Returns to DV Project after Permanent Housing / TOTAL Returns to Homelessness: (2 years)	<= 20%	5	5	%	# Clients	This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures: Measure #2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included where recidivism is marked by a project enrollment

							to the DV project. All clients returning within the two years from the reporting start date are included divided by all PH exit clients within the two years from the reporting start date.
3.6	Receipt of Non-Cash Benefits or Health Insurance	$\geq 75\%$	5	5	%	# Clients	The number of adult client leavers, which have either non-cash benefits (HUD Financial assessment) or health insurance (HUD Program assessment) indicated on their exit assessment.
3.7	Overall Income Assessment (Earned Income + Cash Entitlements)	$\geq 50\% = 15$ points; $\geq 35\%$ and $< 50\% = 10$ points	10	10	%	# Clients	The number of adult clients, both leavers and stayers, which either maintained or increased total income as indicated by their most recent HUD Financial assessment. Note: 0 = 0 does not count as "maintained income"
Metric 3 Total Project Performance:			60	60			
Total Project Performance			100	100			

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE – TRANSITIONAL HOUSING SCORCARD

#	Metric	Benchmark	Max Pts.	Actual Pts.	Metric Value	Metric Population	Metric Description
1. HMIS Comparable Database Data Quality							
1.1	Data Completeness	<= 2% = 10 points; <= 4% = 5 points	5	5	%	# Missing Data Elements for # Clients	The number of data elements that apply to all clients that are missing, as indicated by a null or data not collected, divided by the number of clients times the common UDEs (16).
1.2	Bed Utilization Rate	>= 95% = 5 points; >= 90% and < 95% = 3 points	5	5	%	Average of # Enrollments over HIC Capacity of #	The average of the number of enrollments with an open enrollment member record divided by the total beds reported on the most recent HIC for each day in the reporting time frame.
1.3a	Timeliness of Data Entry	<= 2 days = 5 points	5	5	days	# Entry Records	The average number of days between

							enrollment member begin date and enrollment created date (for new enrollees)
1.3 b	Timeliness of Data Entry (Program Exit)	<= 2 days = 5 points	5	5	days	# Exit Records	The average number of dates between enrollment member end date and exit time stamp (for leavers).
1.4	Exit Assessment Completene s	0% = 5 points; < 10% = 2 points	5	5	%	# out of # Clients Due for Exit	The percentage of clients that do not have an exit assessment where the enrollment anniversary date falls during the reporting time frame. Only clients that are HoH, were over 17 at time of entry, or were over 17 at the enrollment anniversary date with an enrollment length of a year are included.
Metric 1 Total Project Performance:			25	25			

2. Domestic Violence Safety Assessment							
2.1	DV knowledge base	>90% = 15 points; < 89% and > 80% and = 10 points	15	15	%	# out of # Clients	The percentage of clients demonstrating their understanding of domestic violence based on the assessment tool administered by the DV case manager at the time of exit. Leavers only.
Metric 2 Total Project Performance:			15	15			
3. Ending Homelessness							
3.1	Average Length of Time in Program	<= 365 days = 15 points;	15	15	days	# Clients (HoH Only)	The average number of days between enrollment member begin date and the reporting end date for all HoH clients with an open enrollment during anytime of the reporting time frame. Stayers and leavers.

3.2	Exits to Permanent Housing	<p>>= 90% = 15 points; >= 85% = 10 points; >= 80% = 5 points</p>	15	15	%	# Clients	<p>The number of clients with a PH exit destination (based off of the HUD list of destinations) during the reporting time frame divided by the total number of clients with a project exit date during the time reporting time frame. Leavers only.</p>
3.3	Returns to DV Project after Permanent Housing Outcome: (6 months)	<= 10%	5	5	%	# Clients	<p>This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures: Measure #2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included where recidivism is marked by a project enrollment to this DV Project. Clients that returned up</p>

							to 180 days from their PH exit date are included divided by all clients with a PH exit within the two years from the reporting start date.
3.4	Returns to DV Project after Permanent Housing Outcome: (1 year)	<= 15%	5	5	%	# Clients	This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures: Measure #2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included where recidivism is marked by a project enrollment to this DV Project. Clients that returned up to one year from their PH exit date are included divided by all clients with a PH exit within the two years from the

							reporting start date.
3.5	Returns to DV Project after Permanent Housing / TOTAL Returns to Homelessness: (2 years)	<= 20%	5	5	%	# Clients	This calculation is based off of System Performance Measures: Measure #2 calculations. The most recent PH exit per client for the past 2 years is included where recidivism is marked by a project enrollment to this DV Project. All clients returning within the two years from the reporting start date are included divided by all PH exit clients within the two years from the reporting start date.

3.6	Receipt of Non-Cash Benefits or Health Insurance	>= 75%	5	5	%	# Clients	The number of adult client stayers, which have either non-cash benefits (HUD Financial assessment) or health insurance (HUD Program assessment) indicated on their entry assessment.
3.7	Overall Income Assessment (Earned Income + Cash Entitlements)	>= 25% = 10 points; >= 15% and < 25% = 5 points	10	10	%	# Clients	The number of adult clients, both leavers and stayers, which either maintained or increased total income as indicated by their most recent HUD Financial assessment. Note: 0 = 0 does not count as "maintained income"
Metric 3 Total Project Performance:			60	60			
Total Project Performance:			100	100			