

The Network utilizes a Project Review Committee to annually review, score, and rank all new and renewal projects to be considered for HUD’s Continuum of Care funding competition. The South Shore Network seeks the participation of multiple organizations that serve homeless populations to apply for and operate CoC projects. Recognizing the complexity of HUD CoC program administration, the Network actively assists organizations to become CoC providers. Annually as part of the CoC program competition the following information is provided to all network partners (in advance of the release of the HUD NOFA process).

FORM #1: South Shore Network (CoC MA-511) – New Project Threshold Review Tool – 2023

Project Name: _____ Organization: _____

Evaluator Name: _____ Date: _____

The Project Review Committee will review Concept Papers and Budgets to rate new projects according to the measures below. All threshold requirements must be met for the Project Review Committee to recommend consideration of the project for the CoC application. Follow up or clarifying questions will be posed to the applicant as necessary. Projects moving to the full Project Application phase will be evaluated using the CoC’s “New RRH or PSH Project Scoring Tool”.

New Project Threshold Rating Category	✓ Or “Not Met”
<p>1. Target Population. Concept paper specifies the target population is within either Category 1 or 4 of HUD’s definition of homeless <i>and</i> is a high-need subpopulation as defined by the CoC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Chronically homeless ● Veterans ● Survivors of domestic violence ● Families with children ● Unaccompanied youth ● Unsheltered ● People experiencing chronic mental illness ● People experiencing chronic substance use disorders ● People with more than one disabling condition <p>Note: HMIS or Coordinated Entry projects must show how they will support services to all of the target populations.</p>	
<p>2. Contribution to Systems Performance Goals. Concept paper specifies which Systems Performance Measures to which it will contribute, how it proposes to contribute to them, and presents outcomes data that documents evidence of past success in the proposed area of housing. *Note: HMIS or Coordinated Entry projects must show how they will support improved systems performance.</p>	
<p>3. Service Provision. Concept paper includes a description of the proposed services to be provided that are aligned with the needs of the target population and include, at a minimum, housing placement, stabilization, and access to</p>	

<p>income and benefits. Concept papers for victim-services projects must include a description of how proposed services will improve safety. The concept paper also provides sufficient evidence of the applicant’s experience in providing all proposed services. *Note: HMIS or Coordinated Entry projects must show how they will support improved service provision for the CoC’s housing-based projects.</p>	
<p>4. Performance Measures. Concept paper specifies housing- and service-related performance measures that are in line with local and national standards and provides evidence of experience meeting similar outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing stabilization: at least 96% of participants remain housed 12 months after placement • Earned income: at least 20% have earned income • Unearned income: at least 50% have unearned income • Access to mainstream benefits: at least 50% have mainstream benefits <p>Note: HMIS or Coordinated Entry projects must include a description of how the grant will be effective and also how it will contribute to successful performance of the CoC’s housing-based projects.</p>	
<p>5. Data Collection and Reporting. Concept paper describes the data collection system that will be used and confirms the applicant’s ability to collect and report on HUD-mandated data elements. Non victim-service providers confirm their commitment to using the CoC’s HMIS, and victim-service providers confirm they will use a comparable database.</p>	
<p>6. Project Budget. Project budget has an average cost per person of no more than \$16,000, and includes reasonable staffing levels to provide a caseload appropriate for planned services. The administrative line is limited to 10% of the total budget. HMIS or Coordinated Entry projects must show cost reasonableness based on competitive prices for staffing, software, or other items. The total budget request must be within Bonus or reallocation limits as provided by the CoC. *Note that admin on grants going through City of Quincy must be split 50% with the City.</p>	
<p>7. Racial Equity. Concept paper discusses potential barriers to participation among persons of different races and ethnicities who are overrepresented in the local homeless population and identifies strategies to address them.</p>	
<p>et threshold: Yes or No</p>	

Form #2: South Shore Network (CoC MA-511) – New RRH, Joint TH-RRH, or PSH Project Scoring Tool – 2023

Project Name: _____ Organization: _____

Evaluator Name: _____ Date: _____

Maximum Score = 100 points

New RRH or PSH projects that have passed the CoC’s threshold review based on the submitted Concept Papers will be evaluated with this tool to determine score, inclusion in the final Consolidated Application, and ranking. All scores are based on information submitted in new Project Applications and the Racial Equity self-report survey.

PART 1: EXPERIENCE

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
1. Describe the experience of the applicant and subrecipients in working with the proposed population and in providing housing like that proposed in the application	10 points	
2. Describe the experience using a Housing First approach, including demonstrating there are no preconditions to entry, there are no service requirements, there is a commitment to rapid placement, and participation is terminated only in severe cases.	10 points	
3. Describe experience in effectively using federal funds, including satisfactory draw downs and performance for existing grants as evidenced by timely reimbursement of subrecipients, regular draw downs, timely resolution of monitoring findings, and timely submission of required reporting on exiting grants.	5 points	

PART 2: DESIGN OF HOUSING AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
1. Extent to which the applicant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Demonstrates understanding of the needs of the population to be served 	10 points	

<p>b. Demonstrates type, scale, and location of the housing fits client needs</p> <p>c. Demonstrates the type and scale of all supportive services meet client needs</p> <p>d. Demonstrates how clients will be assisted in obtaining and coordinating mainstream benefits</p> <p>e. Establishes performance measures for housing and income that are objective and measurable, aligned with System Performance Measures, and meet or exceed the following standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • housing stability: at least 96% remain housed after 12 months • earned income: at least 20% of adults have earned income at annual assessment • unearned income: at least 50% of adults have unearned income at annual assessment <p>f. Victim-Services Projects Only – Improving Safety for Survivors. Demonstrates ability to follow VAWA Final Rule, protect confidentiality, integrate housing and DV services, and establish individualized safety plans for each participant that are participant-driven and incorporate multiple facets of well-being.</p>		
2. Describe the plan to assist clients to rapidly secure and maintain permanent housing that is safe, affordable, accessible, and acceptable to their needs	5 points	
3. Describe how clients will be assisted to increase employment and/or income and to maximize their ability to live independently	5 points	

PART 3: TIMELINESS

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
1. Describe plan for rapid implementation of the program, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing the first participant. Provide a detailed schedule of proposed activities for 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days after grant award.	10 points	

PART 4: FINANCIAL

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
1. Project is cost-effective (less than \$16,000 per person served)	10 points	
2. Documented match amount	10 points	
3. Budgeted costs are reasonable, allocable, and allowable	15 points	

PART 5: PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
1. Commitment to fill 100% of entries to the project via Coordinated Entry	5 points	

Part 6: RACIAL EQUITY

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
1. Recipient has leadership that reflects demographics of those overrepresented in homeless population	1 point	
2. Recipient received formal training in past 12 mos. on institutional racism, implicit bias and/or the intersection of racism and homelessness	1 point	
3. Recipient reviews participant outcomes with a racial equity lens at least annually	1 point	
4. Recipient has identified programmatic changes necessary to improve equity	1 point	
5. Recipient has a formal process for incorporating feedback from persons with lived experience	1 point	

TOTAL SCORE: _____ out of 100 points

**FORM #3: MA-511 South Shore CoC FY23 Racial Equity Organizational Capacity Review Tool -
New and Renewal Projects**

In 2021 following HUD guidance, the CoC began evaluating project applicants' ability to identify and respond to actual or potential barriers to participation in the project among persons overrepresented in the CoC's homeless system. The goal is to prioritize projects that are actively evaluating barriers and implementing sound strategies that are designed to ensure racial equity for all participants. Through annual research, the MA-511 CoC continues to identify Black, African-American or African households as well as Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) households as overrepresented in the system. The CoC uses APR data to evaluate equity factors for renewal projects and includes those scores on the Scoring Tool. The CoC asks each project applicant to also complete these narrative questions to complement the client-level outcome data. New projects should respond with their racial equity plans for the proposed project as well as any relevant experience from other existing programs. Please limit your response to 1 page.

- 1.Does the recipient or subrecipient organization have individuals in management or leadership positions that reflect the demographics of those overrepresented in homeless population?
- 2.Has the recipient or subrecipient organization received formal training in the past 12 months regarding institutional racism, implicit bias, and/or the intersection of racism and homelessness?
- 3.Does the recipient or subrecipient organization review participant outcomes with a racial equity lens, including disaggregating data by race and ethnicity, at least annually?
- 4.Has the recipient or subrecipient organization identified programmatic changes needed to make participant outcomes more equitable and has it developed a plan to make those changes? If so, please describe and include information on any steps that have been taken.
- 5.Does the recipient or subrecipient organization have a formal process in place to receive and incorporate feedback from persons with lived experience? If so, please describe.

Form #4: South Shore Network (CoC MA-511) –RRH or PSH Renewal Project Scoring Tool – 2023

Project Name: _____ Organization: _____

Evaluator Name: _____ Date: _____

Maximum Score = 100 points

Problems meeting threshold eligibility could result in deductions.

PART 1: THRESHOLD ELIGIBILITY

Data are from the most recent APR submitted to HUD. Victim service providers must provide data from a comparable database.

Threshold Rating Category	✓ Or Deduction
2. Residence prior to entry. Head of household must meet HEARTH definition of homeless and additional restrictions below. PSH projects with 100% CH dedicated beds, skip to (e)	
1a. 100% came from emergency shelter and/or place not meant for human habitation. If yes, skip to (2). If no, complete (b-d)	
1b. If any participants came from transitional housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Documentation of ES or street immediately prior - Exception if fled DV – documentation - If no documentation of either, deduct 5 points 	
1c. If any participants came from institutional settings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Documentation resided there no more than 90 days and came from shelter or street immediately prior - If no documentation, deduct 5 points 	
1d. If any participants came from other locations, deduct 5 points	
1e. If project is 100% CH dedicated, 100% of participants came from shelter or street, or were in TH or other institutions less than 90 days <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If not, deduct 10 points 	
3. Participates in Coordinated Entry. Confirmation by City of Quincy or CoC Support Entity that 100% of vacancies are filled using the CE system, and the project complies with all CE procedures. If no, deduct 15 points	
4. Confirmation by City of Quincy or HUD* the project meets all expectations noted below (*if project grantee is the applicant)	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No outstanding obligations for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon - Any audit findings have a satisfactory response - No history of inadequate financial management practices - No evidence of untimely expenditures on previous awards - No history of other major capacity challenges impacting performance - No history of not reimbursing subrecipients at least quarterly - No history of serving ineligible participants or ineligible costs <p>If problems, the project has provided a satisfactory explanation. If no or insufficient explanation, deduct 5 points</p>	
<p>5. CoC Participation. Applicant participates in CoC Governance Committee meetings and may participate in additional committees. If no, deduct 5 points</p>	
<p>6. Victim-Services Projects Only – Improving Safety for Survivors. Project follows HUD’s VAWA Final Rule, protects confidentiality, integrates housing and DV services, and establishes individualized safety plans for each participant that are participant-driven and incorporate multiple facets of well-being. If no, deduct 5 points.</p>	
<p>et threshold or total deduction:</p>	

PART 2: HIGH NEED POPULATIONS AND SYSTEM PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES

Scores are based on data from the most recently submitted APR or from data generated from HMIS or a comparable database if renewal review is taking place prior to the first APR due date.

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
<p>1. Serving High Need Populations – Severity of Barriers (Q13a, 14a, 15, 25a, 26a, 27a/b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chronically homeless b. Veterans c. Survivors of domestic violence d. Families with children e. Unaccompanied youth f. Unsheltered g. People experiencing chronic mental illness h. People experiencing chronic substance use disorders i. People with more than one disabling condition 	<p>18 points (award 2 points for each population served)</p>	
<p>2. Exits to Permanent Housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 96% or more remained housed - 20 points 	

Destinations/Retention of Permanent Housing (Q23c – include stayers and leavers with PH exit)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 89-95% remain housed – 15 points • 80-89% remained housed - 10 points • Less than 80% remained housed – 0 points 	
3. Participant Income from Employment (Q19a1; Q19a2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 20% of project stayers have new or increased earned income – 2.5 points • At least 20% of project leavers have new or increased income – 2.5 points 	
4. Participant Unearned Income (Q19a1; Q19a2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 50% of project stayers have new or increased non-employment income – 2.5 points • At least 50% of project leavers have new or increased non-employment income – 2.5 points 	
5. Obtaining Mainstream Benefits (Q20b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% or more have non-cash mainstream benefits – 5 points • 56-74% have non-cash mainstream benefits – 3 points • Less than 56% have non-cash mainstream benefits – 0 points 	

PART 3: OTHER PROJECT INFORMATION

Data from renewal application, APR, Sage, and self-report.

Criteria	Maximum Points	Points Awarded
1. Housing First Approach (Project Application)	Priorities rapid placement and stabilization in housing and does not require service participation or other pre-conditions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – 10 points • No – 0 points 	
2. HMIS Data Quality (Q6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APR data and less than 10% missing/refused data for all data elements – 8 points • APR data had more than 10% missing/refused data for one or more elements – 0 points <p>* projects from victim-service providers will receive 8 points if they can provide de-identified evidence that they collect required data in a comparable database and that it meets the same data quality standard.</p>	

<p>3. APR Submission</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APR was submitted in Sage on time – 2 points • APR was submitted in Sage late – 1 points • APR was not submitted in Sage by the time of the project review – 0 points • 	
<p>4. Racial Equity – Addressing Barriers (self-report) and Participant Demographics (APR Q12a and Q12b; Racial Equity Analysis)</p>	<p>12 total points available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recipient has leadership that reflects demographics of those overrepresented in homeless population – 2 pts. • Recipient received formal training in past 12 mos. on institutional racism, implicit bias and/or the intersection of racism and homelessness – 2 pts. • Recipient reviews participant outcomes with a racial equity lens at least annually – 2 pts. • Recipient has identified programmatic changes necessary to improve equity – 2 pts. • Recipient has a formal process for incorporating feedback from persons with lived experience – 2 pts. • Project demographics are within 10 percentage points when compared to those experiencing homelessness in the CoC – 2 pts. 	
<p>5. Cost Efficiency (Q2a and Q5a)</p>	<p>Reasonable cost per person served (defined as no more than \$16,000 per person).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – 5 points • No – 0 points 	
<p>6. Match (Project Application)</p>	<p>Project has documented that necessary match is secured.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – 5 points • No – 0 points 	
<p>7. Utilization (Q2)</p>	<p>Project is serving the proposed number of participants annually and vacancies are filled within a reasonable timeframe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – 5 points • No – 0 points 	
<p>TOTAL</p>	<p>100 points</p>	

Form #5: South Shore Network (CoC MA-511) –HMIS Renewal Project Scoring Tool – 2023

Project Name: _____ Organization: _____

Evaluator Name: _____ Date: _____

Data are from the most recent APR submitted to HUD, City of Quincy, and the current Project Application. Failure to score highly could result in reallocation as determined by the CoC’s Project Review and Executive Committees.

Rating Category	Score
1. Applicant has active SAM registration Maximum 5 points	
2. HMIS governance documents indicate applicant is the designated HMIS lead Maximum 5 points	
3. Confirmation by City of Quincy or HUD* the project meets all expectations noted below (*if project grantee is the applicant) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No outstanding obligations for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon - Any audit findings have a satisfactory response - No history of inadequate financial management practices - No evidence of untimely expenditures on previous awards - No history of other major capacity challenges impacting performance - No history of not reimbursing subrecipients at least quarterly - No history of serving ineligible participants or ineligible costs Maximum 20 points	
4. CoC Participation. Applicant participates in CoC Governance Committee meetings and may participate in additional committees. Maximum 10 points	
5. Applicant works with HMIS vendor to ensure compliance with current HUD Data Standards Maximum 10 points	
6. APR was submitted in Sage on time. Maximum 5 points	
7. Project has demonstrated adequate match is secured. Maximum 5 points	

8. Applicant provides timely training and support to all end users. Maximum 20 points	
9. Applicant provides timely reporting out of HMIS to HUD and the CoC (including APRs, LSA, SPM, PIT/HIC, and ad hoc data requests) Maximum 20 points	

TOTAL SCORE: _____ out of 100 points

Form #6: South Shore Network (CoC MA-511) – SSO-CE Renewal Project Scoring Tool – 2023

Project Name: _____ Organization: _____

Evaluator Name: _____ Date: _____

Data are from the most recent APR submitted to HUD, City of Quincy, and the current Project Application. Failure to score highly could result in reallocation as determined by the CoC’s Project Review and Executive Committees.

Rating Category	Score
10. Applicant has active SAM registration Maximum 5 points	
11. Confirmation by City of Quincy or HUD* the project meets all expectations noted below (*if project grantee is the applicant) - No outstanding obligations for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon - Any audit findings have a satisfactory response - No history of inadequate financial management practices - No evidence of untimely expenditures on previous awards - No history of other major capacity challenges impacting performance - No history of not reimbursing subrecipients at least quarterly - No history of serving ineligible participants or ineligible costs Maximum 5 points	
12. CoC Participation. Applicant participates in CoC Governance Committee meetings and may participate in additional committees. Maximum 10 points	
13. Applicant provides staffing to oversee the CoC’s coordinated entry system. Maximum 10 points	
14. Applicant conducts an evaluation of the CE system at least annually. Maximum 10 points	
15. Applicant conducts assessor trainings at least annually.\n Maximum 10 points	
16. The CE system includes DV providers. Maximum 10 points	
17. The CE system includes all ESG-funded providers. Maximum 10 points	
18. All CoC-funded housing projects’ vacancies are filled using CE. Maximum 15 points	

19. The CE system uses HMIS for data collection and reporting. Maximum 5 points	
20. APR was submitted in Sage on time. Maximum 5 points	
21. Project has demonstrated adequate match is secured. Maximum 5 points	

TOTAL SCORE: _____ **out of 100 points**