**Onondaga/Oswego/Cayuga County Continuum of Care**

**2023 Local Renewal Application Rubric**

**Applications are due August 11th at 5 pm**

**Single Project Applications must be submitted in a single PDF to**

**The HHC via email:** [**hhc@unitedway-cny.org**](mailto:hhc@unitedway-cny.org)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agency and Project Information** | |
| Agency Name: |  |
| Program Name: |  |
| Application Contact Person: |  |
| Component Type: | RRH  PSH  Th-RRH |
| County Serving: | Cayuga  Onondaga  Oswego  Multi-County |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Narrative Response Questions** | |
| Serving Intersectional Identities:  5 points | Describe how your program will provide consistent help across intersectional identities. (e.g. LGBTQIA+, youth, BIPOC, etc.) (250 words) |
| 4-5 points: Agency has a strategy to provide consistent services for people with intersectional identities. Strategies could include staff training, hiring people who represent the people served, etc.  2-3 points: Agency commits to providing consistent service but does not identify any clear strategies.   * 1. points: Agency does not outline strategies to provide consistent service to people across intersectional identities. | |
| Elevating Lived Experience:  5 points | Describe how your program plans to elevate the voices of and employ people with lived experience of homelessness to create better support for your clients. (250 words) |
| 4-5 points: Agency has actionable practices to employ and elevate people with lived experience, including employment and HR strategies, board representation, and/or intentional feedback.  2-3 points: Agency incorporates feedback from participants in project design or conducts feedback surveys.   * 1. points: Agency does not have a clear strategy for elevating the voices of people with lived experience.   Examples of actionable practices:  - Policies to ensure that all clients are able to access services at the level of their need  - People with lived experience of homelessness, including people from BIPOC communities, are represented on the board of the organization  - Client feedback on the project is requested and a process is in place to examine and improve client satisfaction  - Outcome data is collected, disaggregated for race and ethnicity, and used to inform policy decisions  - Training for frontline staff to provide high-quality services  - Recruiting staff with lived experience of homelessness  - Services include peer support positions  - Mentorship and training for frontline staff interested in management positions) | |
| Person-Centered Supportive Services: 5 points | Describe how your program supports and engages the individuals served throughout their participation in the project. (250 words) |
| 4-5 points: Agency has actionable practices to provide ongoing supportive services throughout the duration of the project. Examples of practices include centering the participant in goal planning, creative engagement strategies, and case management training.   * 1. points: Agency provides supportive services but has limited examples of specific practices.   0-1 points: Agency does not have a clear strategy for providing ongoing services or services described are not person-centered. | |
| Connection to Healthcare Services:  5 points | Describe your strategy to ensure participants are connected with and have ongoing access to appropriate healthcare services. (250 words) |
| 4-5 points: Agency has actionable practices to connect participants to healthcare services. Examples of actionable practices can include partnerships with healthcare organizations through MOU, providing navigation services, addressing transportation barriers to healthcare services, etc.  2-3 points: Agency provides connections to healthcare services, but connection is limited.   * 1. points: Agency does not have a clear strategy for connecting participants with healthcare services. | |
| Racial Disparities:  5 points | How does your project work to eliminate racial disparities in housing outcomes?  (250 words) |
| 4-5 points: Agency has promising goals for promoting racial equity. The answer clearly demonstrates how this project will ensure equity and address racial disparities. This could include practices to assess data and outcomes disaggregately, training program staff in anti-racism and other relevant trainings, agency identifies other practices that eliminate disparities.  2-3 points: Agency is committed to equity but has no clear actionable practices.   * 1. points: Agency does not have clear commitment to racial equity. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Competition Report:** | | |
| All performance data is for FY2022 (10/1/2021 to 9/30/2022). Financial data is for the most recent completed Fiscal Year. Monitoring score is for the most recent monitoring visit. | | |
| Utilization:  5 points | Projected households served during average PIT: \_\_\_  Actual Number households served during PITs (APR Q8):  October 2020 Households:  January 2021 Households:  April 2021 Households:  July 2021 Households:  Households Average Actual \_\_\_ / Projected \_\_\_ = Utilization \_\_\_\_ % | |
| The average PSH utilization rate is 89%.  5 points: 91%-100% Utilization Rate  3 points: 85%-90%  0 points: <85%  The average RRH utilization rate is 78%.  5 points: 81% -100% Utilization Rate  3 points: 75%- 80%  0 points: <75% | | |
| Vulnerable Populations:  5 points | What percentage of clients served in FY2022 were in the following categories?  Chronically Homeless (Q5a #11 / Q5a # 14): (>75%)  Youth [Q27a Youth Ages 18-24 / Q5a #1 ]: (>75%) | |
| Score 5 points if any were above 75% | | |
| Data Quality:  5 points | Were all of the following error rates below 5% for Q6 of your FY2022 APR?  Personally-Identifying information (6a),  Universal Data Elements (6b),  Income and Housing Data Quality (6c),  Chronic Homelessness (6d) | |
| Yes  No  Score 5 points for Yes. At or above 5% in any category, no points. | | |
| Coordinated Entry Participation:  5 points | | What percentage of new entries to the project during FY2022 were matched to your project through the coordinated entry system? |
| 5 points: 100%  0 points: Less than 100% | | |
| Permanent Housing Placement & Retention:  10 points | | For PSH, what percentage of clients served in FY2022 either stayed in the project or exited to a permanent housing destination (APR Q5a#8 Stayers, Q23c Exiting to housing destinations) (Positive housing destinations + Stayers) / (Total Participants – Persons excluded)  For RRH, of the clients who exited your project, what percentage of clients served in FY2020 exited to a permanent housing destination (APR Q23c)? |
| The CoC-wide percentage of PSH clients retained or exited to permanent housing is 97%  10 points: 98-100%  7 points: 94-97%  4 points: 90-93%  0 points: Less than 90%  The CoC-wide percentage of RRH clients exited to a permanent housing destination is 87%  10 points: 90-100%  7 points: 85-89%  4 points: 80-84%  0 points: Less than 80% | | |
| Employment Growth:  5 points | | What percentage of clients enrolled in your program within the FY2022 year increased their employment income (APR Q19a1 and Q19a2)?  **(**{Within the “Number of Adults with Earned Income” Rows in Q19a1 & 19a2}Adults who Gained or Increased Income from Start to Annual Assessment, Average Gain+ Adults who Gained or Increased Income from Start to Exit, Average Gain)/(Total Adults in Q19a1 + Total Adults in Q19a2) |
| PSH: CoC-wide Average is 7%  5 points: More than 7 %  3 points: Between 4 to 7%  0 points: Less than 4%  RRH: CoC-Wide Average is 13%  5 points: More than 13%  3 points: 10-13%  0 points: Less 10% | | |
| Other Income Growth:  5 points | | What percentage of clients enrolled in your program at the end of FY2022 had increased their total cash income since entering the program (Q19a1 & APR Q19a2)?  ({Within the “Number of Adults with Other Income” Rows in Q19a1 & 19a2}Adults who Gained or Increased Other Income from Start to Annual Assessment, Average Gain+ Adults who Gained or Increased Other Income from Start to Exit, Average Gain)/(Total Adults in Q19a1 + Total Adults in Q19a2) |
| PSH: The CoC-wide percentage for PSH programs was 41%  5 points: More than 43%  3 points: 38-42%  0 points: Less than 38%  RRH: The CoC-wide percentage for RRH programs was 14%  5 points: More than 14%  3 points: 10-13%  0 points: Less than 10% | | |
| Health Insurance:  4 points | | What percentage of participants served in your project had health insurance upon exit or annual assessment from the project (APR Q21 + APR Q5a#1 – APR Q21 “Number of Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment”)  (Number of “1 Source of Health Insurance + Number of “More than 1 Source of Health Insurance” (*add for both Stayers and Leavers*)) / (Total Persons Served (Q5a1) - "Number of Stayers not yet required to have an Annual Assessment" (Q21)) |
| The CoC-Wide Percentage was 88% for PSH  The CoC-Wide Percentage was 82% for RRH  4 points: More than 88%  2 points: 80 to 88%  0 points: Less than 80% | | |
| Non-Cash Benefits:  4 point | | What percentage of participants served in your project had other non-cash benefits upon exit or annual assessment from the project (Q20b, Q5a#1- APR 20B “Data Not Collected/Not Stayed Long Enough for Annual Assessment)?  Number of “1 + Sources” *(add both Stayer and Leavers*) / (Total Adults Served (Q5a2) - Number of Stayers "Data not collected/ not yet stayed long enough for an Annual Assessment" (Q20b)) |
| The CoC-Wide Percentage for PSH was 76%  The CoC-Wide Percentage for RRH was 66%  4 points: More than 70%  2 points: 65-70%  0 points: Less than 65% | | |
| Time to Move-in:  2 point | | For RRH, what was the average time for households to move into housing after enrolling in the project? (Q22c, “Average length of time to housing”)  The CoC-Wide Average Length of time is 47 days |
| 2 points: Less than 30 days  1 points: Between 30-50 days  0 points: Over 50 days | | |
| Fund expenditure:  10 points | | Were all funds expended in the last completed program year? |
| 10 points: 100% spent  5 points: 95-99%  0 points: Less than 94% | | |
| APR Submission:  5 points | | Was the project’s most recent APR submitted on time? |
| Yes  No  Score 5 points for Yes. | | |
| Monitoring:  10 points | | Were there significant findings for your project during CoC monitoring? |
| Yes  No  Score 10 points for No | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total |  |