

2023 Coordinated Entry New Project Scoring Tool (Approved)

| Summary of Factors & Point Allocations | |
|--|------------|
| 1. Threshold Factors | N/A |
| 2. Coordinated Entry Project Design | 32 points |
| 3. Services | 13 points |
| 4. Agency Capacity | 25 points |
| 5. Prioritization, option of: a. Prioritization for New Projects Except for DV Bonus b. Prioritization for DV Bonus | 25 points |
| 6. Community | 10 points |
| TOTAL | 105 points |

1. THRESHOLD FACTORS

| Name | Description | Met/Not Met |
|---|---|-------------|
| Coordinated Entry Understanding | The applicant has communicated and coordinated with the current Coordinated Entry (CE) Lead to learn about how the current CE system operates and submits a proposed project that demonstrates integration with the current CE system [to be confirmed by CE Lead]. The applicant also understands the HUD requirements for Coordinated Entry, as demonstrated in this application. | Met/Not Met |
| Housing First | The project's policies will include a commitment to identifying and lowering its barriers to housing and provide housing and services in line with a Housing First approach. | Met/Not Met |
| HMIS | The project will enter data for all CoC-funded beds into HMIS (or parallel database for domestic violence services). | Met/Not Met |
| Formerly Homeless Input | The agency includes homeless or formerly homeless individual in feedback and decision-making processes. | Met/Not Met |
| Basic Compliance with HUD Policies | The agency has adequate internal financial controls, adequate record maintenance and management, and adequate policies regarding termination of assistance, client appeals, ADA requirements, and confidentiality. | Met/Not Met |
| Eligible Applicant | Neither the applicant nor the sub-recipients (if any) are for-profit entities. | Met/Not Met |

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE

| | | |
|---|---|-------------|
| Equal Access | The project will provide equal access and fair housing without regard to sexual orientation, gender identity, or local residency status. | Met/Not Met |
| Match | Agency will be able to provide 25% match per grant. | Met/Not Met |
| Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing | Agency will actively prevent discrimination by affirmatively accommodating people based on differences in: race, color, ancestry, or national origin; religion; mental or physical disability; sex, gender, or sexual orientation; marital or familial status, including pregnancy, children, and custody arrangements; genetic information; source of income; other arbitrary characteristics not relevant to a person's need or suitability for housing | Met/Not Met |
| Budget | Project has made a good faith effort to complete the budget template provided, showing both CoC and non-CoC funding sources for the project. | Met/Not Met |
| For DV Bonus Projects Only: Serving DV | Project is 100% dedicated to serving victims who are fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, including dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking who came from sheltered or unsheltered situations. The project must follow a Housing First model and utilize trauma-informed and client-centered approaches. | Met/Not Met |

2. COORDINATED ENTRY PROJECT DESIGN (32 pts.)

| Name | Description | Sources | Score |
|--|---|---------|-----------------------|
| 2.A. Connections to Current CE System | <p>Award points if the proposed project will align with HUD requirements and local coordinated entry design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project demonstrate knowledge and understanding of current Coordinated Entry System including processes and policies around eligibility, assessment, prioritization and match, placement, and the circumstances under which a Coordinated Entry referral can be denied? | RFI | Up to 8 points |

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE

| | | | |
|---|---|------------|------------------------------|
| <p>2.B. Capacity Building</p> | <p>Award points if the proposed project will align with HUD requirements and local coordinated entry design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project demonstrate why and how it meets an existing need within the current Coordinated Entry system? • Will the households served by this project be new to Coordinated Entry or receive additional (targeted) services through the proposed project beyond what is currently available? • Does the project provide a connection to housing and/or services not currently available through the existing Coordinated Entry System? | <p>RFI</p> | <p>Up to 8 points</p> |
| <p>2.C. Alignment with Local Process</p> | <p>Award points if the proposed project demonstrates how it will connect into the current Coordinated Entry System:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project demonstrate it will use community-approved assessment tools such as the VI-SPDAT? • Does the project demonstrate how it will ensure that Coordinated Entry eligible households are document ready? • Does the project demonstrate how it will work with the Coordinated Entry Lead to ensure clients are identified and connected to appropriate housing vacancies quickly including using processes such as by-name list and case conferencing? • Does the project demonstrate how it will adequately protect the safety of DV survivors during assessment and referral? | <p>RFI</p> | <p>Up to 8 points</p> |
| <p>2.D. Ready to Start</p> | <p>Award points if the proposed project will be ready to begin serving clients within 3 months of receiving HUD funding. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the agency has demonstrated communication/coordination with the CE Lead in developing the proposed projects (via letter of support or email correspondence); | <p>RFI</p> | <p>Up to 8 points</p> |

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the agency’s current staff has the capacity to begin preparing for this project; • Whether the agency has a plan to train staff in local Coordinated Entry processes and tools (e.g., does the project indicate how many staff will be/are already trained in HMIS or the VI-SPDAT); and • Whether the agency already has policies and procedures that can be used as-is or easily adapted for use in this project. | | |
|--|---|--|--|

3. SERVICES (13 pts.)

| Name | Description | Sources | Score |
|---------------------------------------|--|---------|----------------|
| 3.A. Referrals to Services | <p>Award points if the proposed project’s services assessment process will align with HUD requirements and local Coordinated Entry design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project have a plan for diverting clients who might be able to self-resolve? Evaluate how the project will connect clients to self-help resources when appropriate. • Will the project actively evaluate which services a client would benefit from while waiting to be matched with housing (e.g., on-going case management), taking into account client preference? | RFI | Up to 4 points |
| 3.B. Services in the Community | <p>Award points if the proposed project will have adequate connections to the broader homelessness system of care. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project adequately describe their plan for connecting clients to services in the community? Award fewer points for general statements, more points for concrete descriptions of service linkages and delivery. • Does the project have existing relationships with service providers | RFI | Up to 6 points |

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----|-----------------------|
| | <p>that are not currently available through the existing Coordinated Entry System?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project participate in any unique committees or partnerships that will be beneficial for connecting clients to services? | | |
| 3.C. Agency Resource Training | <p>Award points if the proposed project will conduct or provide access to training for staff on available mainstream resources for which clients may qualify. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agency plans for staff training on benefits eligibility; Agency capacity to provide connections to mainstream benefits, such as SOAR training. | RFI | Up to 3 points |

4. AGENCY CAPACITY (20 pts.)

| Name | Description | Sources | Score |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| 4.A. Budget | <p>Award points based on the bullet points below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project has submitted a budget that is clear, complete, and easy to read. The budget shows that the project will have enough resources to provide high-quality, reliable services to the target population. The budget shows that the project will leverage significant outside resources (funding, staff, building space, volunteers, etc.) rather than rely entirely on CoC funds. The budget shows that the project is taking appropriate measures to contain costs. | Budget RFI | Up to 5 points |
| 4.B. Agency Capacity | <p>Award points if agency: Has successfully handled at least one other federal grant or other major grant of this size and complexity, either in or out of the CoC (or can otherwise demonstrate that it can successfully manage complex reporting requirements).</p> | e- LOCCs E- Snaps | Up to 10 points |

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has sufficient fiscal capacity to manage the grant, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ internal financial controls ○ grant match tracking ○ well-maintained records ○ oversight by a board of directors ○ a strategy for documenting eligible costs ○ a strategy for ensuring adequate grant drawdowns • Is large enough to handle the expected client case load; • Is familiar with innovative or evidence-based practices; • Includes at least one person with formal training and/or education in a relevant social services field | | |
| <p>4.C. Audit and Monitoring Findings</p> | <p>The agency must report all irregularities resolved or unresolved (e.g., a concern or finding from HUD, a recommendation or finding from SSF (sub-recipients only), a significant deficiency or material weakness from a financial audit, or any type of finding from another funding entity ex. City or County) revealed by any audits or monitoring for the agency (including shared common spaces for projects co-located with non-CoC-funded units) in Sacramento County.</p> <p>Upon request, agencies that have irregularities must provide (1) relevant documentation identifying those irregularities (e.g., highlighted sections of a financial report), and (2) the project's plan to rectify program irregularities. If irregularities have been rectified, projects should include any available confirmation letters from relevant oversight entities (e.g. SSF, HUD, Financial entity, Local Jurisdiction);</p> <p>6A1. Audit (2.5 points) Award full points (2.5 points) for the project if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency had a federal audit/single audit conducted every calendar year when required and had no findings | <p>All HUD, SSF, or financial audits from last 2 years.</p> <p>RFI</p> | <p>Up to 5 points</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>Award up to full points (2.5 points) for the project if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the agency was not required to have a federal audit/single audit and provided another type of financial audit to demonstrate financial health, or • If the agency had findings or irregularities in its single audit or other type of financial audit, the agency provides adequate explanation of any irregularities and provides an adequate explanation to show how any irregularities have been or will be addressed. An adequate explanation includes (1) a brief explanation of the steps the project will take to address the irregularities, (2) the timeline these steps will be completed on, and (3) how the project will avoid similar findings in the future AND provides relevant documentation if requested by the review panel. • If a project is currently disputing findings from an audit and submits (1) a brief explanation of the irregularities, and (2) the most updated timeline available for disputing the irregularities. <p>Award up to 1 point if irregularities were found for this agency but the project does not provide an adequate explanation.</p> <p>Award no points if the project does not provide any information regarding audits conducted OR if the project does not submit relevant documentation of reported audit findings upon request of the review panel.</p> <p>6A2. Monitoring (2.5 points) Award full points (2.5 points) for the project if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency was not monitored; or • If no irregularities have been revealed by any monitoring for this agency's projects in Sacramento County. | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>Award up to full points (2.5 points) for the project if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the agency has any monitoring findings or irregularities, the agency provides an adequate explanation to show how these have been or will be addressed. An adequate explanation includes (1) a brief explanation of the steps the project will take to address the irregularities, (2) the timeline these steps will be completed on, and (3) how the project will avoid similar findings in the future AND provides relevant documentation if requested by the review panel. • If a project is currently disputing findings from a and submits (1) a brief explanation of the irregularities, and (2) the most updated timeline available for disputing the irregularities. <p>Award up to 1 point if monitoring findings or irregularities were found for this agency but the project does not provide an adequate explanation.</p> <p>Award no points if the project does not provide any information regarding monitoring OR if the project does not submit relevant documentation of reported monitoring findings upon request of the review panel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | | |
| | <p><u>Identification of Barriers:</u> Based on the degree to which the organization:</p> <p>1) Award up to one point if the organization has identified barriers to housing and services that are specifically faced by BIPOC individuals or that disproportionately affect BIPOC individuals; (1 point) and</p> <p>2) Award up to one point if the organization has taken concrete steps</p> | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------|-----------------------|
| <p>Factor 4D. Organizational Commitment to Racial Equity</p> | <p>to address the identified barriers and lessen their impact on BIPOC individuals. Strategies described should be designed to address the specific experiences of BIPOC individuals.</p> <p><u>BIPOC Representation in Leadership:</u></p> <p>Award up to three points for the organization’s explanation of its commitment to serving Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color (BIPOC) since its founding, as indicated by its original mission statement (or equivalent guiding statement) and the racial and ethnic demographics of its original leadership team.</p> <p>Absent a commitment to serving BIPOC individuals since the organization’s start, awards points based on the extent to which the agency demonstrates a commitment to measuring and improving its response to racial disparities and biases. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Award up to one point if at least 25% of salaried leadership team and board of directors members identify as Black, Indigenous, or other people of color. • Award up to two points to the extent that the organization describes concrete steps that have been taken to build commitment to racial equity practices within the organization’s approach serving individuals experiencing homelessness. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These may include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opportunities for cultural competency and implicit bias trainings; ▪ Policies related to language accessibility; and ▪ Strategies to ensure that the salaried leadership team is representative of the racial and ethnic | <p>RFI</p> | <p>Up to 5 points</p> |
|---|--|------------|-----------------------|

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p style="text-align: center;">populations that the organization serves.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The applicant must also describe the impact or results of their strategies. | | |
|--|--|--|--|

5A. PRIORITIZATION FOR NEW PROJECTS EXCEPT DV BONUS (25 pts.)

| Name | Description | Sources | Score |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 5.A.1. Community Priority | <p>Award points if the project addresses the priority need identified by the Advisory Committee in 2019: Permanent Supportive Housing, with targeted services for either youth or seniors. <u>OR</u></p> <p>Award points if the project addresses the priority need identified by the CoC Board in 2021: Permanent Supportive Housing, with targeted services for those experiencing health conditions identified by the CDC as making someone vulnerable to COVID-19. For a full list of conditions, see <u>here</u>.</p> <p>Please note that HUD may require that Permanent Supportive Housing be dedicated to persons experiencing Chronic Homelessness.</p> <p>Please note, projects can receive points for both the Community Priority (5.A.1) and HUD Priority (5.A.2) factors if they meet the criteria.</p> | <p>E-snaps</p> <p>RFI</p> | <p>Up to 10 points</p> |

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE

| | | | |
|--|--|--------------------|-----------------|
| 5.A.2. HUD Priority | <p>Award points if the project addresses the priority needs identified by HUD in 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing that leverages healthcare resources to support program participants (as documented with a written commitment from a health care organization); <u>OR</u> • Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing, with Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) or other non-CoC funding for rental assistance of leasing. <p>Please note, projects can receive points for both the Community Priority (5.A.1) and HUD Priority (5.A.2) factors if they meet the criteria.</p> | E-snaps RFI | Up to 5 points |
| 5.A.3. Severity of Needs & Special Considerations | <p>Award points to projects that will serve population(s) with severe needs and vulnerabilities (e.g. chronically homeless, history of domestic violence), and will also fill an important gap in housing and services for persons experiencing homelessness in the Sacramento region (e.g., serving a unique population, leveraging certain funding, maintaining site based housing).</p> <p>Applicants should specifically consider the needs and vulnerabilities of youth or seniors or for those experiencing health conditions identified by the CDC as making someone vulnerable to COVID-19. For a full list of conditions, see here.</p> | RFI APR | Up to 10 points |

5B. PRIORITIZATION FOR DV BONUS HOUSING (25 pts.)

*Use this section **instead of the previous page** if the project is applying for DV Bonus funding. For all scoring purposes, “domestic violence” also includes dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or trafficking.*

| Name | Description | Source | Score |
|------|-------------|--------|-------|
|------|-------------|--------|-------|

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE

| | | | |
|---|---|-----|------------------------|
| 5.B.1. How Project will Address Need | <p>Award points for each of the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project provides data describing the CoC’s population of domestic violence survivors. • Project explains how it proposes to meet the unmet needs of domestic violence survivors, especially with survivors who come from unsheltered situations. • The project’s staff has skills that are specifically needed to identify and locate survivors, or to persuade survivors to accept and enter housing. • The project’s staff utilize trauma-informed and client-centered approaches. • The project meets a priority need identified by HUD in 2021: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing that leverages healthcare resources to support program participants (as documented with a written commitment from a health care organization); <u>OR</u> • Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing, with Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) or other non-CoC funding for rental assistance of leasing. | RFI | Up to 5 points |
| 5.B.2. Previous Performa nce | <p>Award points if the agency has experience serving, or demonstrates a plan to serve, victims who are fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, which includes dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking, and that experience, or plan, specifically shows that they can serve victims who come from unsheltered situations.</p> | RFI | Up to 10 points |
| 5.B.3. Ability to Meet Safety Outcomes | <p>Award points for each of the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project articulates a specific plan for ensuring that its residents will be safe from further domestic violence. • The project sets quantitative safety targets that are appropriate and realistic. • The project explains why it is likely to be able to achieve the targeted safety outcomes. | RFI | Up to 10 points |

6. COMMUNITY (10 pts.)

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE

| Name | Description | Sources | Score |
|---|---|----------|-----------------------|
| 6.A. Participation in CoC Activities | Award points for the agency's attendance, participation, and leadership at CoC events, meetings, committees, forums, and projects, with a focus on activities that took place since the last NOFA. Typically, full points should be awarded if the agency meaningfully participated in at least 4 voluntary events over the course of the year, or if the agency led at least 1 successful event, training, or initiative over the course of the year. | RFI | Up to 5 points |
| 6.B. Local Competition Deadlines | <p>Award full points if the project met all local competition deadlines, including deadlines for turning in supporting documents and attachments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Award 3 points if any portion of the local application was turned in <u>up to</u> 24 hours late. • Award no points if any mandatory portion of the local application was <u>more than</u> 24 hours late. • If any mandatory portion of the local application was more than 72 hours late, the project may be disqualified at the discretion of the Panel. | Analysis | Up to 5 points |