2021 Central MN CoC NOFO Ranking Process and Procedures

The Central MN Continuum of Care Performance and Ranking Committee is charged with directing this community's annual HUD CoC Program funding of over $1.6 million to meet federal requirements and local needs in its efforts to address and end homelessness. To accomplish this goal, the Committee sets priorities for new project funding, and ranks renewal and new applications based on project and CoC performance criteria, as well as local and HUD priorities.

I. HUD McKinney-Vento Application Values

In developing its overall strategy to address and end homelessness, and in particular with respect to ranking of renewal projects and solicitation of new project applications, the CoC and its Performance and Ranking Committee are committed to upholding and applying the following values:

1. Maintain as much HUD Continuum of Care Program funding in our CoC as possible.
2. Promote our goal to make homelessness rare, brief, and one time in Central MN CoC and address issues of disproportionality
3. Prioritize projects that:
    a. Actively participate in the Continuum of Care and help advance collective goals
    b. Have movement to permanent housing and subsequent stability as the primary focus
    c. Focus on those who are literally homeless (streets, shelter, transitional housing for homeless)
    d. Participate in the HMIS with complete, high-quality data
    e. Demonstrate low barriers to program entry
    f. Perform well against HUD McKinney-Vento Continuum of Care goals and positively impact system performance
    g. Consistently meet and exceed operational standards for spending, match, utilization, and reporting.

II. Ranking for Renewal of Existing Projects

As part of the annual NOFO competition process, HUD requires each Continuum of Care to rank order all McKinney-Vento Funded projects (both new and renewal) included in its CoC Consolidated Application using a documented, objective methodology which considers past project performance, and to further divide this ranked list of projects into two Tiers. The purpose of this tiered system is to indicate to HUD the relative funding priority of projects within a CoC, and thus, the priority order in which projects should receive resources should funding fall short of a CoC's Annual Renewal Demand. Tier 1 projects passing an eligibility and threshold review will be conditionally funded by HUD, beginning with those in the highest-scoring CoC nationwide and proceeding to the lowest-scoring CoC; funding order of Tier 1 projects within a CoC thus depends on that CoC's own project evaluation process. Tier 2 projects are competitively funded and subject to evaluation by HUD using a scoring system which factors in a CoC's overall application score, the score awarded the project by the CoC, and the extent to which a project implements a Housing First approach.

To assist the Central MN Continuum of Care in evaluating and ranking applications for both renewal and new project applications, a NOFO Program Scoring Tool has been developed (see Attachment 1). The Scoring Tool is based on the efforts of CoCs, through collaboration with Minnesota Engagement on Shelter & Housing (MESH), to establish a set of criteria on which to base NOFO project evaluations and builds upon previous scoring tools used by other CoCs. Central CoC modified the Tool based upon Central CoC needs.

A. Scoring Tool Description

The Scoring Tool evaluates renewal projects along three general performance dimensions – HUD/Local Priorities, Grant Administrative Performance, and Performance Measures – each of which includes multiple component measures. There are also sections which will score Criteria Specific to Serving Youth, Family & Children and Criteria Specific to Domestic Violence. For 2021, Equity - New Measures, which has a number of new scoring criteria, which will not be scored this year, but data will be collected and will be considered during the project ranking process. The only specific criteria scored in this section this year is Equal Access. Each performance measure is in turn based on one or more defined data elements drawn from a specific data source, including individual project applications, annual progress reports (APRs), HMIS, and HUD reports. For each individual measure, the Scoring Tool also defines three ranges of performance – Most Desirable, Desirable, and Least Desirable – and identifies for each a number of points awarded to programs whose outcomes fall within that range.

The intent is for each individual measure within the tool to be an objective metric with a defined method of calculation, and which corresponds to one or more data elements from specific reports. This approach reduces variability in assessment between reviewers, as independent reviewers (including projects engaging in self-assessment) using the same, defined data sources should thus be able to reliably arrive at the same value, and the same point score, for a project on any given measure. The overall score of a project is the sum of the points it receives in each of the component performance measures across the four general performance dimensions.

HUD/Local Priorities
   The Scoring Tool's first dimension captures characteristics of a project's participation in HUD/Local Priorities, and consists of four component measures:
- Chronic Homeless (PSH only) – what percentage of CoC funded units are designated to serve chronically homeless individuals (aligns with HUD NOFO Policy Priorities)
- Veterans – what percentage of CoC funded units or services are for veterans - (aligns with local priorities)
- Housing First - the extent to which projects adopt a Housing First approach (aligns with HUD NOFO Policy Priorities)
- Unmet Need: Geographic Area – the extent to which a projects location and household type align with local Coc priorities

Grant Administrative Performance
   Grant Administrative Performance, the second of the Scoring Tool's three general dimensions, is comprised of five components:
- Bed Utilization - the extent to which a project's beds inventory is occupied over the course of a given year
- Funding Management: Unspent Funds - the percentage of a project's previous grant which was spent
- Funding Management: Drawdowns - the frequency with which a project draws down its funds
- CoC Participation – the extent to which a project participates in the local CoCs Full Membership meetings
- HMIS Data Quality - the percentage of missing data elements within the project's HMIS client records

Performance Measures

The Scoring Tool's third dimension, Performance Measures, contains seven components. This dimension also differs from the other two in that, depending on project type, renewals may not be scored on all seven components. The components within Performance Measures that apply to all programs include:

- Returns to Homelessness (12 months) – What percentage of clients returned to homelessness within 12 months of exit to permanent housing (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 2a and 2b)
- Increase Overall Income - the percent of clients who increased income from all sources, including employment, when compared to total income at project entry (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 4.1- 4.6)

The other five components of the Performance Measures apply to PSH, Rapid Rehousing (RRH) or Transitional Housing (TH) projects and have variable criteria based on the type of program:

- Earned Income - the percent of eligible adults whose income from employment was increased relative to employment income at admission (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 4.1-4.6)
- Maintain or Increase Earned Income - the percent of eligible adults whose income from employment was maintained or increased relative to employment income at admission (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 4.1-4.6)
- Maintain or Increase Non-Employment Income - the percent of eligible adults whose income from sources other than employment was maintained or increased relative to unearned income at admission (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 4.1-4.6)
- Housing Stability (Retention)-Stay more than 12 months - the percentage of PSH who are retained in the project at the time of data collection, or who have exited to permanent destinations in the past year (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 6a.1-6c.2)
- Exits to Permanent Housing – the percentage of participants in a particular project type who exited to permanent destinations (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 6c.1,6c.2and 7a.1-7b.2)

Criteria Specific to Serving Youth, Family & Children

There are two criteria in this section that apply specifically to programs that serve youth and Families with Children:

- Connection to K-12 Education – Program has a written plan with staff qualifications, physical space, partner roles, and evaluation defined.
- Early Childhood Development - Program has a written plan with staff qualifications, physical space, partner roles, and evaluation defined.

Criteria Specific to Domestic Violence

The three criteria in this section apply specifically to programs that serve Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Survivors:

- Domestic Violence Experience – How many years of experience a program has in serving Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Survivors
- Domestic Violence (Specialized Services) – Assess whether a project utilizes a specialized services model specifically tailored to Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Survivors.

- Domestic Violence (Client Perceived Risk) – Measures what percentage of program participants report a reduced level of perceived risk 12 months after program exit. This criterion will not be scored in 2021.

Equity- New Measures

There are six criteria in this section all pertaining to equity for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and LGBTQ+ populations as well as those who have experienced homelessness. The Equal Access criteria is the only one that will be scored in 2021 for this section. The other five criteria require an answer but will not be scored in 2021. The plan is for all of these questions to be scored in 2022.

- Equal Access – Score is based on whether an organization complies with all items listed on the Equal Access Checklist. This is the only criterion in this section that will be scored in 2021.
- Equity – Staff Composition – What percentage of the organization's staff identify as BIPOC and/or as LGBTQ+ and/or have experienced homelessness.
- Equity – Board/Leadership Composition - What percentage of the organization's board, directors, and managers staff identify as BIPOC and/or as LGBTQ+ and/or have experienced homelessness.
- Equity – Increase Overall Income – What percentage of a program's BIPOC participants increased their overall income.
- Equity – Exits to Permanent Housing – What percentage of the program's BIPOC participants exited the program to permanent destinations.
- Equity – Returns to Homelessness (12 months) - What percentage of the program's BIPOC participants returned to homelessness within 12 months of their exit to a permanent destination.

The Scoring Tool provides the CoC Scoring and Ranking Committee an objective point from which to start its ranking process. From this point, the Committee may consider other project characteristics not incorporated in the Scoring Tool, including (but not limited to): project capacity and expected number of individuals served; type and scope of services provided; client subpopulation(s) targeted by the project; extent to which a project meets existing areas of CoC need; changes in project performance over time; project feedback or context provided to the CoC Committee; or other factors it deems relevant, to reorder projects and arrive at the CoC's final project ranking list.

It is also imperative to note that the Scoring Tool is intended to provide a relative, rather than an absolute, ranking of projects. While it is expected that a project's rank will be correlated with its overall performance to some degree, at the same time, a low rank on the Scoring Tool is not necessarily an indicator that a project is performing poorly; similarly, it is possible for a high-ranking project to fall short of expectations in one or more performance areas.

The Scoring Tool, as described above and presented in Attachment 1, was presented to the CoC Governing Board. At that time, the Governing Board elected to approve the tool for use in the 2021 NOFO Program Competition ranking process.

B. Scoring Tool Application and Project Ranking Process

Following the submission of preliminary applications by all renewal projects by the deadline of October 13, 2021, the Scoring Committee will use the NOFO Scoring Tool to calculate each project's provisional score. The Scoring Tool will then be applied to these applications to produce a preliminary project ranking for all renewal projects.

This ranking, along with contextual information drawn from projects' applications, APRs, and narrative responses to regarding projects' performance relative to HUD targets for income, receipt of non-cash benefits, and subpopulations served, will be made available to the CoC Scoring Committee. The Committee will then use this information in its meeting during the week of October 19, 2021, to rank order projects, designate which projects fall into the Tier 1 and Tier 2 ranges, and make any reallocation decisions in order to fund new project(s). Results of the Scoring and Ranking process will be communicated to all applicants on October 20, 2021, via e-mail, and through public posting on the CMHP/Central MN CoC website. At this point, projects rejected by the CoC may appeal the decision to the CoC following the procedure outlined in Section V, below.

IV. Submission and Ranking Process for New Project Proposals

In addition to scoring and ranking renewal projects, the Central MN Continuum of Care Performance and Ranking Committee will also evaluate, score, and rank new project proposals as part of the 2021 CoC NOFO Competition.

A. Scoring Tool Description

In order for new projects to be considered by the Performance and Ranking Committee, new project proposals must meet the following minimum threshold requirements to be considered for funding:

- Project applicants must be a nonprofit organization, state or local government, public housing agency, or instrumentality of a state or local government, without limitation or exclusion
- The population targeted by the project meets current HUD and CoC requirements
- The service model adopted by the project meets current HUD and CoC requirements
- Project application forms are submitted to the CoC Coordinator on or before the **deadline of October 13, 2021**
- Projects have both a plan in place, and the capacity, to participate fully in HMIS and the CoC's Coordinated Entry System
- Applicant organizations have a mission/purpose statement, bylaws to govern operations, an active governing board that includes at least one member who is homeless or formerly homeless (or has a formal plan to recruit such a member), clear policies and procedures to address potential conflicts of interest of board members, and possesses adequate levels of, and expertise in, staffing
- Applicants provide complete financial information which suggests the project is likely to be viable
- Applications include the most recent audited financial and year-to-date financial and management letter, and this letter contains no significant adverse disclosures

Pursuant to the Priority Populations and Activities outlined in Section II, above, for the 2021 CoC Program NOFO competition, the CoC Scoring Committee will limit its consideration of new project applications to either 1.) permanent supportive housing projects for chronic homeless single adults-only households (single individuals 18-plus years of age), 2.) coordinated entry projects for all populations or 3.) rapid re-housing, joint RRH/TH housing, or coordinated entry projects for survivors of domestic violence (DV).

Project applications meeting these requirements will then be evaluated and scored by the CoC Scoring Committee using the New Project Evaluation and Scoring Too1 which considers the following dimensions of a project's application:

- **Innovation and Effectiveness**, including whether the project employs research-based and/or evidence-based practices and has demonstrated experience in using such practices to inform decision making and service provision
- **Performance Measures**, including whether the project has articulated plans for successfully achieving performance measures
- **Applicant Experience for Proposed Activities**, including whether the project applicant or partners have past experience providing housing services, have past experience providing housing services to the population targeted by the proposed project, and have demonstrated objective outcomes of past success in this service provision
- **Employment Services Plan**, including whether the project articulates a plan or partnership to increase employment outcomes for program participants and a plan for increasing participants' income

B. Scoring Tool Application and Project Ranking Process

Approved new project proposals will be included in the ranking process occurring in the Committee's meeting during the week of October 19, 2021, during which they will be assigned an overall rank and Tier 1 or Tier 2 designation alongside renewal project applications, as detailed in Section III, above. Results of this ranking process will be communicated to new and renewal project applicants on October 20, 2021, via e-mail and through public posting on the CMHP/Central MN CoC website. At this point, projects rejected by the CoC may appeal the decision to the CoC following the procedure outlined in Section V below. Following the conclusion of the appeals process, the final rankings will be presented to the CoC Advisory committee and Governance Board for a formal vote of approval.

V. Appeals Process

Once projects have been notified of the preliminary results of the CoC Performance and Ranking Committee's ranking process on October 20, 2021, projects who wish to do so will have the opportunity to formally appeal the Committee's decision before the CoC Board/Appeals Committee which is separate from the CoC Performance and Ranking Committee conducting the original project ranking. Formal appeals may be made for the following reasons:
- A project's application was not ranked
- A project's application did not receive the full funding amount for which it applied

The following are **<u>not</u>** considered to be eligible grounds for submission of a formal appeal:
- Determination that a project has not met threshold requirements
- Ranking of a project in Tier 2 rather than Tier 1

All appeals eligible under the criteria listed above will be read, reviewed, and evaluated by the Board. All notices of appeal must be based on the information submitted as part of a project's draft application by the application due date - no new or additional information will be considered as part of an appeal. Omissions to the application are not eligible grounds for appeal.

A. *Procedure for Appeal*

Appeals must be received in writing, and are due on October 26, 2021, by 4:30 PM Central Time. Appeals should be directed to the CoC Coordinator, and must adhere to the following requirements:

- Appeals should be scanned and submitted as an attachment via e-mail
- The Notice of Appeal must include a written statement specifying, in detail, the grounds asserted for the appeal, and must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the sponsor agency. The Notice of Appeal must be single-spaced, in 12-point font, and may be no longer than one page
- The appeal must include a copy of the project's application and all accompanying materials as submitted to the CoC Scoring Committee for original review and ranking; no additional information may be added to the original application

B. *Constitution of the Appeals Committee*

A single Appeals Committee shall hear and consider all eligible appeals submitted to the CoC. The Appeals Committee will be comprised of four members, subject to the following constraints:

- Two Appeals Committee members must be voting members drawn from the CoC Board
- Two Appeals Committee members must be members of the Scoring Committee who participated in the original project ranking process
- No member of the Appeal Committee may have a conflict of interest with any of the agencies applying for McKinney-Vento funding, and must sign a conflict-of-interest statement to this effect

C. *Activity of the Appeals Committee*

The Appeals Committee will convene to consider each eligible appeal placed before it. Applicants will be invited to make a formal, time-limited statement before the Committee regarding their appeal. Following this statement, the Appeals Committee will review and consider only the following materials associated with the appeal:

- The original project application submitted to the CoC Funding Committee for review and ranking
- The project rankings made by the CoC Scoring Committee
- The one-page Notice of Appeal submitted by the applicant
- The statement(s) of the Applicant made before the Appeals Committee during the appeals process

The Appeals Committee's review will extend only to consideration of those specific portions of the project application being appealed. The decision of the Appeals Committee will formally be determined by a simple majority vote. All decisions of the Appeal Committee will be final.

Eligible project applicants that attempted to participate in the CoC planning process and believe they were denied the right to participate in a reasonable manner may make a further appeal directly to HUD. The process for such a direct appeal is outlined in Section X of the FY2021 Continuum of Care Program Competition NOFO.

Attachment 1

Organization	
Project Name	
CoC Model/Component	
Populations Served	
Project Status	
Date of Review	
Reviewer	

THRESHOLD CRITERIA

Criteria	Eligible	Ineligible	Eligible/ Ineligible	Data Details	Source
Eligible entity	Nonprofits, States, local govs, instrumentalities of State/ local gov, and	Any entity that does not meet criteria identified in earlier column.	ELIGIBLE	Nonprofit	Pre-application
Eligible population	Meets HUD requirements	Does NOT meet HUD requirements	ELIGIBLE	Eligible	Pre-application
Date of Project App	Application is complete and includes all required attachments and is submitted to CoC coordinator before the deadline.	Application is incomplete, does not include all required attachments and/or is submitted to CoC coordinator after the deadline	ELIGIBLE		CoC Coordiantor
HMIS	Project has capacity and plan to participate in HMIS (or other comparable database for DV providers)	Project does not have capacity and plan to participate in HMIS (or other comparable database for DV providers)	ELIGIBLE		Pre-application
Match	25% match for everything but leasing.	No or less than 25% required match.	ELIGIBLE		Project Application
Coordinated Entry	Applicant participates in or agrees to participate in the Central MN CoC Coordinated Entry System, including attending training, completing CES assessments and receiving referrals through Coordinated Entry as outlined in the Central MN CoC Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures (IF NEW APPLICANT, applicant	Applicant does not agree to participate in the Central MN CoC Coordinated Entry System (IF NEW APPLICANT, applicant DOES NOT agree to these expectations)	ELIGIBLE		Pre-application
HUD Monitoring	HUD Monitoring Report is provided as applicable and no unresolved significant findings are identified.	HUD Monitoring Report is not provided (if applicable) or contains unresolved significant findings that should preclude	ELIGIBLE		Pre-application
Admin	Admin costs less than 10%	Admin costs greater than 10%.	ELIGIBLE		Project Application

EVALUATION AND RANKING STANDARDS

HUD/LOCAL PRIORITIES

Criterion	Most Desirable	Desirable	Least Desirable	Possible Points	Data	Score	Data Details	Source
Chronic Homeless (PSH only)	95% of CoC-funded units are designated to serve chronically homeless individuals	80-94% of CoC-funded units are designated to serve chronically homeless individuals	This project designatges fewer than 80% of units to serve chronically homeless individuals	8/4/0		0		esnaps Application
Veterans	50% or more of CoC-funded units or services are for veterans	20-49% of CoC-funded units or services are for veterans	<20% of CoC-funded units or services are for veterans	4/2/0		0		esnaps Application
Housing First	Project scores at least 12 out of 15 on the housing first assessment.	Project scores 10 or 11 out of 15 on the housing first assessment.	Project scores below 10 out of 15 on the housing first assessment.	8/4/0		0		Housing 1st Checklist
Unmet Need: Geographic Area	Location and household type priority match	Location is priority Match (not household type)	No match	4/2/0		0		e-snaps application: Households table and location(s)

EQUITY--NEW MEASURES

Criterion	Most Desirable	Desirable	Least Desirable	Possible Points	Data	Score	Data Details	Source
Equal Access	Comply with all items listed on Equal Access checklist		Fails to comply with all items listed on Equal Access checklist	4/0	YES	4		Equal access checklist

Criterion	Most Desirable	Desirable	Least Desirable	Possible Points	Data	Score	Data Details	Source
Equity--Staff Composition	At least 20% of organization's staff identify as Black, Indigenous, or People of Color (BIPOC), and/or as LGBTQ+, and /or have experienced homelessness	10-19% of organization's staff identify as BIPOC, and/or as LGBTQ+, and /or have experienced homelessness	Less than 10% of organization's staff identify as BIPOC, and/or as LGBTQ+, and /or have experienced homelessness	0/0/0	0%	0		Pre-application
Equity-- Board/Leadership Composition	At least 20% of organization's board, directors, managers identify as BIPOC, and/or as LGBTQ+, and /or have experienced homelessness	10-19% of organization's board, directors, managers identify as BIPOC, and/or as LGBTQ+, and /or have experienced homelessness	Less than 10% of organization's board, directors, managers identify as BIPOC, and/or as LGBTQ+, and /or have experienced homelessness	0/0/0		0		Pre-application
Equity--Increase Overall Income	30% or more of BIPOC households increase overall income	20-29% of BIPOC households increase overall income	Less than 20% of BIPOC households increase overall income	0/0/0	0%	0		ICA report?
Equity--Exits to permanent housing	At least 80% of BIPOC participants exited the program to permanent destinations.	75-80% of BIPOC participants exited the program to permanent destinations.	Less than 75% of BIPOC participants exited the program to permanent destinations.	0/0/0	0%	0		ICA report?
Equity--Returns to Homelessness (12 months)	Less than 10% of BIPOC participants returned to homelessness within 12 months of exit to permanent housing	10-15% of BIPOC participants returned to homelessness within 12 months of exit to permanent housing	15% or more of BIPOC participants returned to homelessness within 12 months of exit to permanent housing	0/0/0	0%	0		ICA report?
CRITERIA SPECIFIC TO SERVING YOUTH, FAMILY & CHILDREN								
Criterion	**Most Desirable**	**Desirable**	**Least Desirable**	**Possible Points**	**Data**	**Score**	**Data Details**	**Source**
Connection to K-12 education	written plan with staff qualifications, physical space, partner roles, and evaluation defined	Partial Plan	No Plan	4/2/0		0		Checklist/plan
Early Childhood Development	Written plan with staff qualifications, physical space, partner roles, and evaluation defined	Partial Plan	No Plan	4/2/0		0		Checklist/plan
CRITERIA SPECIFIC TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE								
Criterion	**Most Desirable**	**Desirable**	**Least Desirable**	**Possible Points**	**Data**	**Score**	**Data Details**	**Source**
Domestic Violence (experience)	Project has at least 5 years experience specifically serving DV/SA survivors	Project has 1-4 years experience specifically serving DV/SA survivors	Project has less than 1 year experience specifically serving DV/SA survivors	4/2/0		0		Pre-application (# of years)
Domestic Violence (specialized services)	Project utilizes specialized services model specifically tailored to DV/SA survivors		Project does not utilize specialized services model specifically tailored to DV/SA survivors	4/0		0		Pre-application
Domestic Violence (client perceived risk)	At least 80% of participants report reduced level of perceived risk at 12 months	50-79% of participants report reduced level of perceived risk at 12 months	Less than 50% of participants report reduced level of perceived risk at 12 months	0/0/0	0%	0		Participant survey
GRANT ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE								
Criterion	**Most Desirable**	**Desirable**	**Least Desirable**	**Possible Points**	**Data**	**Score**	**Data Details**	**Source**
Bed Utilization	More than 90% of project beds	85-90% of project beds	Less than 85% of project beds.	8/4/0		0		APR Q7, APR Q8
Funding management: unspent funds	Spent 95% or more of grant award.	Spent 90-94% of grant award.	Spent 89% or less of grant award.	8/4/0		0		eLOCCS screenshots
Funding management: drawdowns	Grantee has had at least quarterly (4+)		Grantee has had less than quarterly (4+)	4/2/0		0		eLOCCS screenshots

Criterion				Possible Points	Data	Score	Data Details	Source
CoC Participation	Project repesentatives attend at least 75% of CoC meetings	Project repesentatives attend 50-74% of CoC meetings	Project repesentatives attend less than 50% of CoC meetings	2/1/0		0		Meeting sign-in sheets
Data Quality (NA for SSO and HMIS projects)	At least 75% of data quality points possible	65-74% of data quality points possible	Less than 65% of data quality points possible	8/4/0		0		APR Q6a-6e or APR Upload tool?

PERFORMANCE MEASURES								
Criterion	**Most Desirable**	**Desirable**	**Least Desirable**	**Possible Points**	**Data**	**Score**	**Data Details**	**Source**
Returns to Homelessness (12 months)	Less than 10% of participants returned to homelessness within 12 months of exit to permanent housing	10-15% of participants returned to homelessness within 12 months of exit to permanent housing	15% or more of participants returned to homelessness within 12 months of exit to permanent housing	8/4/0		0		SEC 054 Returns to Homelessness Report
Earned Income--Increase	10% or more increase for PSH, **35%** or more for TH, RRH	5-9% for PSH, 20-34% for TH, RRH	Less than 5% for PSH, Less than 20% for TH/RRH	2/1/0		0		APR Q19a1, APR Q19a2
Earned Income--Maintain/Increase	20% or more for PSH, 50% or more for TH, RRH	10-19% for PSH, 40-49% for TH, RRH	Less than 10% for PSH, Less than 40% for TH/RRH	2/1/0		0		APR Q19a1, APR Q19a2
Non-Employment Income--Maintain/Increase	75% or more for PSH, 50% or more for RRH, 10% or more for TH	50-74% for PSH, 40-49% for RRH, 5-9% for TH	Less than 50% for PSH, Less than 40% for RRH, Less than 5% for TH	2/1/0		0		APR Q19a1, APR Q19a2
Increase Overall Income	30% or more	20-29%	Less than 20%	2/1/0		0		APR Q19a1, APR Q19a2
Housing Stability (Retention)—stay more than 12 months (PSH ONLY)	Over 90%	85-90%	Under 85%	8/4/0		0		APR upload tool/Length of participation in Project
Exits to permanent housing	At least 90% of participants exited the program to permanent destinations.	75-89% of PSH participants or 80-89% of TH/RRH participants exited the program to permanent destinations.	Less than 75% of PSH participants or less than 80% of TH/RRH participants exited the program to permanent destinations.	8/4/0		0		APR Q23a & Q23b

TOTAL POINTS RECEIVED	4	