2023 NOFO Project Renewal Scoring Guide and Checklist

This checklist and scorecard will be used for all Renewal Applications, except for the HMIS application.

First or second time renewals must meet threshold requirements and will receive full points for items that are not able to be scored. Items that cannot be scored include if there is not yet 12 months' worth of information.

Applicants with disabilities may contact the Lead Agency of the MO BoS CoC (Community Partnership of Southeast Missouri) by telephone, email, or mail to request and arrange accommodations. Requests for accommodations should be made as soon as possible to ensure adequate time to make accommodations before the application deadline. Please contact Lead Agency Team or the Collaborative Applicant office at

<div align="center">

Lead Agency Team
support@moboscoc.org
Phone: (573)-651-3747
40 S Sprigg
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701

</div>

Checklist

Certifications and attachments should be completed via online form. This scoring guide is for renewal projects only. Contact support if you encounter any issues or need assistance.

Certifications- Should the CoC need to review any of the following, project applicants can produce certification, description or waivers if needed.

- Nonprofit documentation
- Description of organization financial management structure
- Unique Entity Identifier (UIE) Applicants must provide a valid UEI number, registered and active at https://www.sam.gov/SAM. in the application.
- HMIS Participation.
- Organization's board of directors includes at least one homeless or formerly homeless individual or a waiver for this regulatory requirement.
- Point-in-Time Count Participation
- CoC Planning and Operations Participation

Attachments- Project applicants must include the following attachments in application

- Grant Spending Timeliness & Unspent Grant Funds (documentation from eLOCCS)
- Coordinated Entry MOU with signatures from agency representative, CES lead and CoC representative.
- HUD Monitoring Visit: Certification that a HUD monitoring visit has not occurred within the previous two years; OR Certification that HUD monitoring occurred within the previous two year and the monitoring included no findings that resulted in sanctions or required corrective action; OR Description of the HUD monitoring findings that resulted in sanctions or required corrective action AND documentation indicating resolution of findings.
- Financial Audit: Certification that an independent financial audit has occurred within the past two years OR certification that no financial audit occurred during the past two years. When an audit has occurred, certification that the independent financial audit issued an unqualified or "clean" opinion in which the organization's financial statements and practices were prepared and conducted using Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. A description of the audit's

findings in instances when an unqualified opinion was not issued, including the auditor's report.
- Organization's Anti-discrimination Policy for clients receiving services, ensuring that all individuals and families receive supportive services, shelter and housing free of discrimination. Policies should address both BIPOC and LGBTQ+ individuals.
- Organization's Conflict of Interest policy for internal leadership.
- Housing First Assessment Tool, required for all renewals except for HMIS.
- Organizations that use a comparable database must submit a PDF APR for the most recent Federal Fiscal Year (10/1 - 9/30).
- Complete PDF export of ESNAPS Project. (Agencies are not recommended to submit to HUD prior to project review. PDF export alone is used for review purposes.)

Data Collected through other resources:

- Organizations will have performance data reported from HMIS for the last Federal Fiscal Year (10/1 - 9/30).
- Project Narrative scores will refer to Section 3B of the project ESNAPS pdf export.
- Documentation of Minimum Match with exact value of match written in dollar amount. Should be be included in ESNAPS pdf export.
- HMIS Lead Agency may verify HMIS usage and Comparable Database usage and submit that to the panel for review.

Other scoring items will be submitted via response to the online form. Agencies that are not able to use the online form can review a pdf version of the form and submit relevant items via email to CollaborativeApplicant@moboscoc.org.

MAX POINTS	SCORING SECTIONS
HUD Standards	
Pass/Fail	Board of Directors – Lived Experience of Homelessness
Mo BoS CoC Participation	
10	Participation in Coordinated Entry
Pass/Fail	Participation in HMIS or Comparable Database
Pass/Fail	CoC Meeting Attendance
5	Point in Time Count (PIT) Participation
5	CoC Planning and Operations Activities
Descriptions	
3	Outreach Efforts
3	Equity
Attachments	
Pass/Fail	ESNAPS PDF export
10	Grant Spending Timeliness
20	Unspent Grant Funds
Pass/Fail	HUD Monitoring Visit
Pass/Fail	Financial Audit
5	Anti-discrimination and Conflict of Interest Policies
10	Housing First Assessment
Embedded in ESNAPS Export	
Pass/Fail	HUD Eligibility and Threshold Requirements
Pass/Fail	Documentation of Minimum Match
10	Project Narrative Description: Clarity
10	Project Narrative Description: Completeness
Performance Scoring	
30	CoC Performance Review: Performance Improvement
121	**TOTAL SCORE**

HUD Standards	
Organization's board of directors includes at least one homeless or formerly homeless individual. Material for Review: - Certification of representation of persons with lived experience of homelessness on applicant's board of directors or equivalent decision-making entity. - Attachment of waiver or exemption from regulatory requirement, if applicable. Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider: - The CoC Program Interim Rule (24 CFR Part 578) requires all recipients and subrecipients to provide for the participation of one homeless or formerly homeless individual on the board of directors or other equivalent policy making entity, to the extent that each entity considers and makes policies and decisions regarding any project, supportive services, or assistance provided with CoC Program funding. - Certification response.	**PASS** – Provides certification of at least one homeless or formerly homeless individual on the organization's board of directors or equivalent entity or provides a waiver. **PASS WITH FINDINGS** – Provides information causing concern that the organization does not include at least one homeless or formerly homeless individual on the organization's board of directors or equivalent entity **FAIL** – Provides information that confirms the organization does not include at least one homeless or formerly homeless individual on the organization's board of directors or equivalent entity.

Mo BoS CoC Participation	
Participation in Coordinated Entry and HMIS Material for Review: - Certification that the project will use the coordinated entry system established by the Mo BoS CoC and will follow all coordinated entry policies, procedures, and written standards established by the Mo BoS CoC. - Description of any reasons the project will not use the coordinated entry system. Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider: - Certification of the use of the coordinated entry system. - Mo BoS CoC compliance documentation for coordinated entry and HMIS/comparable database.	**10 -** Applicant is an access point, **and** accepts referrals from the Prioritization List, **and** holds a leadership role in Coordinated Entry (either regionally [primary/secondary] or CoC wide) **5 -** Applicant is an access point, **or** accepts referrals from the Prioritization List, **or** holds a leadership role in Coordinated Entry (either regionally [primary/secondary] or CoC wide) **0 -** Applicant is not an access point, does not accept referrals from the Prioritization list, and is not in leadership for Coordinated Entry. **Project fails eligibility** – Applicant organization does not plan to participate in the Mo BoS CoC coordinated entry system.
Participation in HMIS or Comparable Database Material for Review: - Certification that the organization currently participates in Mo BoS CoC HMIS or, for victim services providers, a comparable database; or - Description of any reasons the project will not use the HMIS or comparable database. Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider: - Certification of current use of the Mo BoS CoC HMIS or comparable database. - Certification of intent to use the Mo BoS CoC HMIS or comparable database.	**PASS** – Project certified participation in the HMIS established by the Mo BoS CoC or a comparable database. **PASS WITH FINDINGS** – Project provided written certification of intent to use the HMIS or comparable database, but project has history of HMIS noncompliance as documented by the Mo BoS CoC. **FAIL** – Project did not provide written certification of intent to use the coordinated entry system or HMIS/comparable database.

CoC Meeting Attendance	
CoC Meeting Attendance Material for Review: - Agency certification of attendance. - CoC meeting records. Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider: - Attendance at the two meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership directly prior to submission of the project application as reflected by CoC attendance records.	**PASS** – Organization staff attended both meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. **PASS WITH FINDINGS** – Organization staff attended only one meeting of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. **FAIL** – Organization staff did not attend either meeting of the full Mo BoS CoC membership.
Point-in-Time (PIT) Count Participation Material for Review: - Certification of participation in the most recent Mo BoS CoC PIT Count. - Description of PIT Count role. Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider: - Degree of participation in the PIT Count.	**5 Points** – Organization staff participated as a leader of one or more counties or in an equivalent leadership and planning role. **2.5 Points** – Organization staff participated in a planning or leadership role other than as a county leader OR participated as a volunteer on the day of the count. **0 Points** – Organization staff did not participate in the PIT Count.
CoC Planning and Operations Activities Material for Review: - Certification of participation in one or more Mo BoS CoC board, committee, workgroup, regional meeting, or other entity. - Description of role and activities in relevant committee(s), workgroup(s), or meetings, including tasks or projects to which organization staff contributed directly. Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider: - Leadership positions and degree of participation in Mo BoS CoC committees or workgroups.	**5 Points** – Organization staff held a leadership role (e.g. chair, co-chair/vice chair, secretary, regional lead) in one or more committee, workgroup, or region. **2.5 Points** – Organization staff participated in the majority of meetings of one or more committee or workgroup. **0 Points** – Organization staff did not participate in the majority of meetings for any committees or workgroups. Participation in regional meetings as a regular member will not be considered for scoring purposes. Regional meetings often occur for coordinated entry purposes, and coordinated entry participation is a requirement of the CoC Program.

Attachments	
ESNAPS PDF Export Material for Review: - Completed ESNAPS pdf export - If ESNAPS is not functional the agency must submit documentation that contains the project description, complete budget with details, and households and populations served by the project.	**Pass/Fail** Did the agency submit a complete ESNAPS PDF export for review, or submit relevant documents as requested in the event that ESNAPS is not operating correctly for project entry?
Grant Spending Timeliness Material for Review: - Documentation from eLOCCS showing the past 12 months of grant draw downs, including dates of grant draws. - Evidence demonstrating timely grant draws were not possible due to Department of Housing and Urban Development delays. Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider: - Frequency of project grant draws.	**10 Points** – Project made grant draws at least once per quarter. **0 Points** – Project did not make at least once per quarter.

Unspent Grant Funds
 	
Material for Review:
 	
- Documentation from eLOCCS for the last three completed grant operating years, including:
  - o Total grant award; and
  - o Total grant amount spent.
- Written statements as part of an active CoC Corrective Action Plan or other document of the project's efforts to reduce unspent grant funding.
 	
Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider:
 	
- Project yearly percent and total deobligation amounts.
- Project efforts to reduce unspent grant funding.
	20 Points – Project unspent funds between 0% and 3% of funding.
	
	16 Points – Project unspent funds between 3% 5% of funding OR project reallocated at least 5% of total funding.
	
	12 Points – Project unspent funds between 5% and 7.5% of funding.
	
	8 Points – Project unspent funds between 7.5% and 10% of funding.
	
	4 Points – Project unspent funds between 10% and 15% of funding.
	
	0 Points – Project unspent funds more than 15% of funding.
	
	Projects without three completed grant years will not be scored on this measure, and these projects will be scored on a scale of 90. For example, a project receiving 72 of 90 points will receive a score of 88 ($72 \div 90 \times 110 = 88$).

HUD Monitoring Visit Material for Review: - Certification that a HUD monitoring visit has not occurred within the previous two years; OR - Certification that HUD monitoring occurred within the previous two year and the monitoring included no findings that resulted in sanctions or required corrective action; OR - Description of the HUD monitoring findings that resulted in sanctions or required corrective action AND documentation indicating resolution of findings. Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider: - No monitoring or findings - Findings that were resolved. - Findings that were not resolved within timeframe established by the HUD monitoring letter. - Organization does not provide documentation of resolution through official HUD letter or other notice. - Project did not provide complete attachments.	**PASS** – Project did not receive a monitoring visit in the prior two years or received a monitoring visit in the prior two years that did not result in any findings or the findings were resolved in compliance with HUD requirements. **PASS WITH FINDINGS** – Project received findings through a HUD monitoring visit in the prior two years and organization states findings were resolved but provides no documentation of resolution from HUD. **FAIL** – Project received findings through a HUD monitoring visit in the prior two years but provides no documentation of resolution.
Financial Audit Material for Review: - Certification that an independent financial audit has occurred within the past two years OR certification that no financial audit occurred during the past two years. - When an audit has occurred, certification that the independent financial audit issued an unqualified or "clean" opinion in which the organization's financial statements and practices were prepared and conducted using Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. - A description of the audit's findings in instances when an unqualified opinion was not issued, including the auditor's report. Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider: - Opinion of the independent auditor. - Content of the independent auditor's report. - Audit findings for which a response is overdue or unsatisfactory.	**PASS** – No concerns about project or organizational solvency or capacity. **PASS W/ FINDINGS** – Information provided causes concern that the project lacks capacity to financially administer HUD funds and/or is not eligible for HUD funding. **FAIL** – Information provided confirms that project lacks capacity to financially administer HUD funds and/or is not eligible for HUD funding.

Anti Discrimination and Conflict of Interest Policies	**5 Points** – Policy completely addresses all required items.
Material for Review: - Organization's anti discrimination policy - Organization's Conflict of Interest Policy Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider: - If the policy ensures that BIPOC and LGBTQ+ individuals and families receive supportive services, shelter and housing free of discrimination - Conflict of Interest Policy ensures that the agency operates in an ethical and appropriate manner considering possible self interests.	**3 Points** – Policy addresses some of all required items. **0 Points** – Policy does not address any required items
Housing First Assessment	**Completeness of Tool: Up to 5 Points**
Material for Review: - Completed Housing First Assessment Tool. Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider: - Degree of tool completion including additional notes and responses to all questions and fields. - Tool score.	**5 Points** – Project selected a response for every item. **2.5 Points** – Project selected a response for some but not all items. **0 Points** – Project did not select a response for any item or did not attach tool. **Tool Score: (based off available points)** **5 Points** – 100% of points. **3.5 Points** – 50% of points or more. **2 Points** – 25% of points. or more **1 Point** – 10% of points or more. **0 Points** – less than 10% of available points.

Descriptions	
Equity Criteria for meeting expectations: - Answers all parts of the question - Identification of disparities - Methods of improving racial equity	**3 Points** – Description completely addresses all required items. **1 Points** – Description addresses some of all required items. **0 Points** – Description does not address any required items
Outreach Efforts Criteria for meeting expectations: - Answers all parts of the question - Frequency of street outreach - Methods of engagements of persons experiencing homelessness	**3 Points** – Description completely addresses all required items. **1 Points** – Description addresses some of all required items. **0 Points** – Description does not address any required items

Embedded in ENSAPS Export	

HUD Eligibility and Threshold Requirements
 	
HUD establishes eligibility threshold requirements for applicants and projects. Renewal projects may be considered as having met eligibility threshold requirements through the previously approved grant application unless information to the contrary is received.
 	
Material for Review:
 	
- Certification that organization and project meet HUD eligibility and threshold requirements.
 	
- Certification of Annual Performance Report (APR) for most recent completed grant operating year including project operating start and end dates and APR submission date.
 	
- DUNS Number and certification that the number is active.
 	
- Certification of active registration in the System for Award Management (SAM).
 	
Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider:
 	
- Information that may indicate the project is not eligible or does not meet threshold requirements, including but not limited to
 	
   o Information about any internal or external investigations or legal actions and outcomes.
 	
   o Change to organization status (e.g. 501(c)3 incorporation).
 	
   o Timeliness of Annual Performance Report submission.
 	
   o Registration status in SAM with UEI.
	PASS – Meets all criteria established in CoC Program NOFO.
	
	PASS WITH FINDINGS – Information provided that may affect project eligibility, including but not limited to applicant eligibility (e.g. 501(c)3 organizations and states or local governments), evidence of ongoing investigation, investigation results, failure to consistently draw down funding at least once per quarter, late Annual Performance Report submission, or SAM registration is not active.
	
	FAIL - Information provided confirms that project is not eligible for HUD funding.

Minimum Match Material for Review: - Certification of minimum match requirements. Criteria for Rank and Review Committee to consider: - Match certification. - Description of match source(s) and amount.	**PASS** – Project certified it meets minimum match requirements for all grant funds except leasing funds. **PASS WITH FINDINGS** – Project provided incorrect match certification or match description explains lack of match. **FAIL** – Project did not provide certification or description does not explain lack of match.

Project Description Narrative – Clarity and Consistency
 	
Criteria for meeting expectations:
 	
- Description matches other details in project application, including:
    o Budget;
    o Project Type;
    o Housing First Assessment Tool.
- Rationale for funding and service design explain program strengths.
- Use of current data (e.g. PIT Count, system performance measures) for community need.
- Project outcomes are measurable.
- Clear explanation of all activities with specific details.
	5 to 10 Points – Project descriptions with good or exceptional clarity and consistency will be awarded up to 10 points. Exceptionally clear descriptions use direct, specific, and concise language.
	
	Up to 5 Points – Project descriptions with adequate clarity and consistency will be awarded up to 5 points. Adequately clear descriptions lack detail and specificity or may be overly repetitive.
	
	0 Points – Project descriptions that are confusing or incomprehensible may be awarded 0 points.

Project Description Narrative– Completeness Criteria addresses all required items. - Target populations to be served. - Plan for addressing the identified housing and supportive services needs. - Anticipated project outcomes. - Coordination with other organizations. - The reason CoC Program funding is required.	**10 Points** – Project description completely addresses all required items. **5 Points** – Project description addresses some of all required items. **0 Points** – Project description does not address any required items.

Performance Scoring

1. **Performance Improvement**

Renewal projects that were operating prior to the beginning of the reporting period are subject to performance scoring as described below. HMIS and, if determined by the Mo BoS CoC, Supportive Services Only – Coordinated Entry project types are exempted from performance scoring.

Victim Services Providers

Victim services providers that operate permanent supportive housing, rapid rehousing, transitional housing/rapid rehousing joint component project with CoC Program funds must use a comparable database to provide all data necessary to conduct the performance scoring process described below. Improving performance on the exits to permanent destinations, returns to homelessness, and increases to income performance measures is likely to improve safety for victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. The data must be de-identified and provided no later than the project application deadline.

Reporting Period

The reporting period is the complete federal fiscal year (October 1 to September 30) directly prior to scoring.

Scoring

For each scoring measure, individual project performance will be compared only against the average performance for the same project type, known as the project-type average. For example, permanent supportive housing projects will only be compared against the average score for all other permanent supportive housing projects. Safe Haven projects will be included in the project-type average for rapid rehousing projects. Except for the *Cost Per Successful Outcome* measure, the project-type average will include all projects for which data is available and will not be limited to only CoC-funded projects.

Scoring measures for each project and for the project-type average will be rounded to the nearest whole number. For example, 89.5% on the Housing Stability measure would be rounded to 90%.

For each scoring measure, projects performing at or better than the project-type average will receive the maximum score. Projects will lose 10% of the maximum score for each percentage point they fall short of the project-type average. The score is represented by the equation below.

$$(1 - (|Project\ Type\ Average - Individual\ Project\ Measurement| \times 0.1)) \times Maximum\ Score = Individual\ Proje$$

Depending on the scoring measure, increasing or decreasing the measurement is desirable. For example, *higher* rates of exits to permanent housing are desired while *lower* rates of returns to homelessness are desired. The desired measurement direction is represented by an arrow next to each scoring measure's name.

Example 1:
Project Example Measure: 88% ↑
Example Measure Project-Type Average: 93%
Example Measure Maximum Score: 5
Calculation: $(1 - (|93 - 88| \times 0.1)) \times 5 = 2.5$
Project Example Measure Score = 2.5

Example 2:
Project Example Measure: 17% ↓
Example Measure Project-Type Average: 14%
Example Measure Maximum Score: 2.5
Calculation: $(1 - (|14 - 17| \times 0.1)) \times 2.5 = 1.75$
Project Example Measure Score = 1.75

Cost Per Successful Outcome

The *Cost Per Successful Outcome* scoring measure will compare renewal projects only against other CoC-funded projects rather than projects from all funding sources. Match funding is excluded. Scores will be based on the average cost per successful outcome for all projects, regardless of project type. Projects with costs per successful outcome that are

- More than 25% lower than the average will receive the maximum score;
- 0% to 25% lower than the average will receive 75% of the maximum score;
- 1% to 25% higher than the average will receive 50% of the maximum score;
- 26% to 50% higher than the average will receive 25% of the maximum score;
- More than 50% higher than the average will receive no points.

Performance Improvement – Permanent Supportive Housing		
Scoring Measure	Description	Maximum Score
Permanent Housing Retention and Exits ↑	The percent of persons who remained in all PH projects except PH-RRH projects and exited to permanent housing destinations.	5
Returns to Homelessness ↓	The percent of persons who exited homelessness to permanent housing destinations and returned to	5

	homelessness within 24 months after their date of exit.	
Maintain or Increase Income – Stayers ↑	The percentage of adult participants who have been in HMIS for at least a year and are still in HMIS at the end of the reporting period who maintained or increased their income level over the program year.	2.5
Maintain or Increase Income – Leavers ↑	The percentage of adult participants who exited HMIS who maintained or increased their income level over the program year.	2.5
Bed Utilization ↑	The average number of people served during the reporting period divided by the total number of beds.	5
Cost Per Successful Outcome ↓	The number of people who remained in the project or exited to permanent housing destinations divided by the total award amount pro-rated by the applicable grant year(s).	5
Risk Score at Project Entry ↑	A score from 0 to 100 based on five risk factors: chronic homelessness, coming from a place not meant for human habitation, alcohol or drug use disorder, mental health disorder, and no income in past 30 days. Projects with higher scores served higher risk clients at time of project entry.	5
Performance Improvement – Rapid Rehousing and Safe Haven		
Scoring Measure	Description	Maximum Score
Exits to Permanent Destinations ↑	The percent of persons who exited to permanent housing destinations.	5
Returns to Homelessness ↓	The percent of persons who exited homelessness to permanent housing destinations and returned to homelessness within 24 months after their date of exit.	5
Maintain or Increase Income – Stayers ↑	The percentage of adult participants who have been in HMIS for at least a year and are still in HMIS at the end of the reporting period who maintained or increased their income level over the program year.	2.5
Maintain or Increase Income – Leavers ↑	The percentage of adult participants who exited HMIS who maintained or increased their income level over the program year.	2.5
Bed Utilization ↑	The average number of people served during the reporting period divided by the total number of beds.	5

Cost Per Successful Outcome ↓	The number of people exited to permanent housing destinations divided by the total award amount pro-rated by applicable grant year.	5
Risk Score at Project Entry ↑	A score from 0 to 100 based on five risk factors: chronic homelessness, coming from a place not meant for human habitation, alcohol or drug use disorder, mental health disorder, and no income in past 30 days. Projects with higher scores served higher risk clients at time of project entry.	5