



Scoring Rubric

Partners Ending Homelessness (PEH) FY2026 Support Services Only (SSO) Street Outreach Updated 06/29/2026

**Applications are due (Wednesday, July 15th by 5 PM).
Single Project Applications must be submitted in a single PDF format to
PEH via email. Please submit applications directly to**

jkeys@letsendhomelessness.org

**E-Snap applications must be submitted at the same date/time.
The Scoring Rubric can be found on the PEH website.**

[CoC Funding – Partners Ending Homelessness](#)

Agency and Project Information

Organization Name:	
Project Name:	

Contact Person	
Phone Number	
Email	

Amount Requesting	Projected Number of People Served (Supportive Services Only-Street Outreach) 2 CFR 200.404
\$	

Threshold Requirements: (3 parts)

All projects are required to meet or agree with threshold requirements to be considered for funding.

**The agency has reviewed all HUD requirements and
provisions outlined on pages 106-108 of the NOFO
and agrees to abide by them.**

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree



The agency also agrees to abide by the following four additional questions outlined in the same area of the NOFO on page 108:	
Awards under this NOFO will not be used to engage in illegal racial discrimination, including racial preferences.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Awards under this NOFO will not be distributed in a way that violates or otherwise is used to interfere with constitutional protections guaranteed for speech and religious beliefs and the free exercise of religion.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Awards made under this NOFO will not be used to fund any project, service provider, or organization that operates illegal drug injection sites of "safe consumption sites" in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 856, knowingly permit the use or distribution of illicit drugs on property under their control in violation of 21 U.S.C. 856(a)(2), or knowingly distribute drug paraphernalia in violation of 21 USC 863. This is not a requirement that program participants must be sober in order to receive assistance, participate in treatment in order to receive assistance, or be evicted or exited from assistance for a first-time violation of a drug-related program policy or lease requirement.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Pursuant to 2 CFR 200.332(b)(2), all agreements or contracts made with subrecipients under this NOFO must contain the same terms and conditions as those in the grant agreement issued by HUD. Any conflicting terms and conditions must be approved by HUD.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Additional CoC Threshold Questions:	
Applicant is a non-profit organization, including a faith-based organization, with active 501(c)3 status, a public housing authority, a local government organization, or another eligible entity as specified in the NOFO. (Please see page 9 of the NOFO for a detailed listing of eligible applicants.)	☐ Yes ☐ No



Applicant agrees to use our Continuum's Homeless Management Information System-HMIS (or comparable database if Domestic Violence-DV)	☐ Yes ☐ No
Applicant agrees to uphold protections of VAWA (§ 5.2005 VAWA protections) including: confidentiality protections, use of emergency transfer plans, and regular staff training regarding VAWA.	☐ Yes ☐ No
PEH Membership: The applicant has a current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with PEH or is submitting an MOU with this application. (Templates will be posted on the PEH website.)	☐ Yes ☐ No
Applicant agrees to using the Coordinated Entry System.	☐ Yes ☐ No
Applicant has attached the management letter from the agency's most recent fiscal audit demonstrating that the agency is in good standing.	☐ Yes ☐ No
Applicant agrees to engage in technical assistance with PEH, when needed, and monthly program meetings to review data errors, case management documentation, services, utilization, spend down, and outcomes.	☐ Yes ☐ No
Does the agency participate in the local Point In Time (PIT) Count?	☐ Yes ☐ No
If no, to the above, will the agency participate in the future if funded by sending the following number of volunteers according to the percentage of funding received by the CoC: 30%-20%= 6 volunteers, 19%-15%=5 volunteers, 14%-10%=4 volunteers, 9%-5%=3 volunteers; and 4% or below =2 volunteers	☐ Yes ☐ No

If the answer is no to any of the above questions, please explain below. (please limit to 250 words)

If agency does not meet threshold requirements, stop scoring. Agency is not eligible for CoC funding.



Narrative Questions

Program Design: 5 points	Please provide a general description of the program including the population served. Please indicate whether the project will serve any specialized populations. (please limit to 250 words)
4-5 points: Provides a clear and thoughtful plan for the program with specific details that demonstrate why it will succeed. Program will serve one or more priority specialized populations. 2-3 points: Provides a description of the program but with limited information. May or may not serve priority specialized populations. 0-1 points: Does not provide a description or description does not make sense. Does not serve any priority specialized populations.	
Community and HUD Federal Need: 5 points	Using local data on homelessness, how does this project support PEH's goal of ending homelessness for all persons? Please include the agency's unique ability to serve the population and share any relevant data to support your response. (please limit to 250 words)
4-5 points: Clearly demonstrates how this project will support the goal of ending homelessness and uses specific data that supports their explanation. Agency shows why they are uniquely qualified to serve the population with specific evidence. 2-3 points: Describes a link between the project and the goal of ending homelessness, but connection is weak, and data is limited. The agency may be able to serve the population well but does not have strong evidence. 0-1 points: Does not demonstrate how this project will support the goal of ending homelessness. Does not provide evidence that the agency is qualified to serve the population.	
Capacity: 5 points	Please describe the success of your agency's current housing program(s) in helping homeless individuals and families exit homelessness within 24-months or describe how your agency's plan to ensure that individuals and families exit homelessness within 24-months. (please limit to 250 words)
4-5 points: Clearly describes a history of current programs consistently helping people exit homelessness within 24 months, supported by objective data. Or, if the agency does not have current street outreach programs, demonstrates a thoughtful plan that would ensure people are able to consistently exit homelessness within 24 months utilizing best practices supported by data. 2-3 points: Describes success of the agency's current housing programs but cannot show consistent exits within 24 months and has limited data to support their performance. Or, if the agency does not have current street outreach programs, describes how they will ensure people are able to exit homelessness but the plan lacks evidence or thorough strategic planning.	



0-1 points: Is unable to describe current success or how they will ensure people are able to exit homelessness within 24 months.	
Knowledge shared from persons who were homeless in the past: 5 points	How does your program currently involve people who were formerly homeless (i.e., employment/volunteer opportunities, peer support, mentorship, members of Board/Advisory Committees, etc.)? (please limit to 250 words)
4-5 points: Clearly demonstrates meaningful involvement of people who were formerly homeless. Explains how contributions from people who were formerly homeless have been intentionally applied to improve the program.	
2-3 points: Shows some involvement of people who were formerly homeless but involvement is limited. Fails to show that input from people who were formerly homeless was practically implemented.	
0-1 points: Has not had any people who were formerly homeless involved or people who were formerly homeless were involved in the past but are no longer given opportunities to contribute.	
Minimizing Trauma Provision: 5 points	Describe how your program minimizes the trauma associated with homelessness. This could include trauma informed care services and ensuring participant safety in programs, especially for youth and survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. (please limit to 250 words)
4-5 points: Agency demonstrates the ability to minimize trauma as described in the question above.	
2-3 points: Agency has plans, and can produce evidence of a plan, to ensure the program will minimize trauma as described in the question above.	
0-1 points: Agency does not have the ability to provide this level of care and does not have a plan in place to provide this level of care.	

Performance Measures

Employment & Income Growth: 10 points	Describe how a minimum of 25% of clients will obtain employment and income resources to maximize their ability to live independently. Has your agency operated a homeless program where at least 50% exited with employment income as reflected in HMIS? Or is there a plan to ensure these same outcomes? (please limit to 250 words)
9-10 points:	Response provides a comprehensive, well-developed strategy for assisting clients in obtaining employment and income resources. Clearly describes services and demonstrates how these services will empower at least 25% of client to obtain employment and income resources. Provides evidence that the agency has operated a program where at least 50% exited with employment income using HMIS data, or describes a thoughtful plan to ensure



this outcome using best practices supported by data. 7-8 points: Response addresses most components of the question with adequate detail. Describes a plan for employment and income assistance but may lack specificity regarding service delivery, partnerships, or evidence of effectiveness. Cannot show a previous program where at least 50% of clients exited with employment income. 4-6 points: Response provides a basic description of strategies to provide employment and income assistance but the relationship to long-term independence is weak or insufficiently explained. Strategies are vague, underdeveloped, or lack a clear implementation plan. Fails to show that at least 25% of client will obtain employment and income resources or that at least 50% will exit with employment income. 0-3 points: Response provides very limited information and fails to address most of the required elements.	
Supportive Service Provision: 10 points	Describe how this project will provide the treatment and services that people need to recover and regain self-sufficiency (including on-site behavioral health treatment, robust wraparound supportive services, and participation requirements for these services). Provide the partnerships and corresponding MOUs for providing this care. (please limit to 250 words)
9-10 points: Response provides a comprehensive, well-developed plan for delivering treatment and services that support recovery and self-sufficiency. Clearly describes on-site services with participation requirements and how services are coordinated. Identifies strong community partnerships and includes corresponding MOUs. 7-8 points: Response provides a comprehensive, well-developed plan for delivering treatment and services that support recovery and self-sufficiency. However, services are not on-site or do not have participation requirements. Identifies strong community partnerships and includes corresponding MOUs. 4-6 points: Response partially addresses the question but provides limited explanation of how recovery and self-sufficiency will be supported. Partnerships and/or MOUs are minimally addressed or absent 0-3 points: Response provides very limited information and fails to address most of the required elements.	
Positive Destinations: 10 points	Does your agency currently, or has it previously operated a homeless project where at least 50% of participants exited to a positive destination within 24 months, or what is your plan for ensuring this happens with your new project?



9-10 points: 7-8 points: 4-6 points: 0-3 points:	Response clearly demonstrates that the agency has successfully operated a homeless assistance project in which at least 50% of participants exited to a positive destination within 24 months, supported by performance data or measurable outcomes. If the agency does not have this experience, it provides a comprehensive, well-developed, and evidence-based plan that clearly explains how the new project will achieve this benchmark through defined strategies, performance monitoring, and continuous quality improvement. Response adequately describes prior experience or presents a reasonable plan for achieving the benchmark but lacks specificity regarding performance measures, implementation strategies, or monitoring. Response partially addresses the question but provides limited evidence of prior success or only a general plan for achieving positive housing outcomes. The likelihood of meeting the benchmark is not well supported. Response provides very limited information and fails to address most of the required elements.
Returns to Homelessness: 10 points	How will projects ensure that clients will not return to homelessness after project exit? (please limit to 250 words)
	9-10 points: Response provides a comprehensive strategy for promoting long-term housing stability and preventing returns to homelessness after project exit. Clearly describes discharge planning, housing stabilization services, ongoing case management or follow-up, connections to employment, income, healthcare, behavioral health, and community resources. Includes measurable outcomes or prior success demonstrating effectiveness in reducing returns to homelessness. 7-8 points: Response addresses most components of the question with adequate detail. Describes housing stabilization strategies and follow-up services but may lack specificity regarding outcomes, partnerships, or long-term monitoring. 4-6 points: Response partially addresses the question but provides limited explanation of how clients will maintain housing after project exit. Long-term supports and prevention strategies are insufficiently described. 0-3 points: Response provides very limited information and fails to address most of the required elements.

Rating Factors

Supplemental Resources: 5 points	Describe how this project intends to be supplemented with resources from other public or private sources (these can include, but are not limited to, mainstream health, social, and
---	--



	employment programs such as Medicaid, Medicaid, SSI, and SNAP). (please limit to 250 words)
5 points: Clearly describes a well-developed and proactive strategy to connect participants with mainstream and community resources. Includes specific programs (e.g., Medicaid, SSI/SSDI, SNAP, TANF, workforce programs), and explains how staff will assist with enrollment, eligibility determination, referrals, and ongoing access. Demonstrates strong coordination with external agencies and may include MOUs or formal partnerships. Shows how leveraging these resources reduces CoC funding reliance and improves housing stability and self-sufficiency. 4 points: Describes a solid plan to connect participants to mainstream benefits and services, with some detail on referral processes or partnerships. May lack specificity on implementation steps or coordination mechanisms. 3 points: Provides a general description of referrals to mainstream services but limited detail on how enrollment or ongoing access will be ensured. Weak explanation of coordination or system integration. 2 points: Mentions mainstream resources but provides minimal explanation of how participants will be connected or supported in accessing them. 1 point: Minimal response with little meaningful description of leveraging external resources. 0 points: No response or does not address the question.	
Participant Engagement: (5 points)	Describe the proposed project's strategy for providing supportive services to eligible program participants, including those with histories of unsheltered homelessness and those who do not traditionally engage with supportive services. (please limit to 250 words)
4-5 points: Provides a comprehensive, well-developed strategy for providing supportive services. Specifically presents a clear strategy for engagement of clients with histories of unsheltered homelessness and those who do not traditionally engage with supportive services. 2-3 points: Provides a strategy for providing supportive services, but the plan lacks specificity or detail. Discusses serving clients with histories of unsheltered homelessness and those who do not traditionally engage with supportive services but fails to specifically show that they have an adequate plan for serving this population.	



0-1 points: Does not provide a strategy and does not address participants with histories of unsheltered homelessness or those who do not traditionally engage with supportive services.	
First Responder and Law Enforcement Engagement: (1 points)	Describe your agency's history of, or plan for, partnering with first responders and law enforcement to engage people living in places not meant for human habitation to access emergency shelter, treatment programs, reunification with family, transitional housing, or independent living. Please describe how your agency intends to cooperate and not interfere or impede with the enforcement of local laws such as public camping and public drug use laws and assist/be willing to assist first responders in their efforts to engage homeless individuals. (please limit to 250 words)
1 point: Demonstrates a history of strong partnership with law enforcement or clearly describes a well-developed plan for partnering with law enforcement to support people living in places not meant for human habitation. Describes how they will cooperate and not interfere with enforcement of local laws. 0 points: Does not demonstrate a history of or a plan to work with law enforcement. Does not indicate how they will not interfere with enforcement of local laws.	
Agency History and Experience with Outreach: (5 points)	Describe your agency's history of experience providing outreach services, or a plan for providing outreach services, consistent with the activity description at 24 CFR 578.53(e)(13) and has a plan for or has demonstrated effectiveness at helping people successfully exit from places not meant for human habitation to emergency shelter, treatment programs, transitional housing, or permanent housing programs. (please limit to 250 words)



4-5 points: Describes a strong history of providing outreach services with clear data to support their success or presents a well-developed and comprehensive plan to provide outreach services, shown to be consistent with 24 CFR 578.53(e)(13). Provides clear evidence of effectiveness at helping people successfully exit from places not meant for human habitation or presents a well-developed and comprehensive plan to do so.

2-3 points: Describes a history of providing outreach services but has limited experience and success or presents a plan that lacks specificity and detail. Discusses prior experience or a plan to exit people from places not meant for human habitation but fails to show evidence that they will be successful.

0-1 points: Has no history of providing outreach services and does not have an adequate plan. Does not address how to help people exit from places not meant for human habitation or describes a plan in contradiction to 24 CFR 578.53 (e)(13).

Cost Effectiveness: (10 points)	Describe the average cost per household, specifically in regard to cost reasonableness per 2 CFR 200.404. (please limit to 250 words)
------------------------------------	---

9-10 points:	Response clearly identifies the average cost per household and provides a comprehensive justification demonstrating that costs are reasonable, necessary, allocable, and consistent with 2 CFR 200.404. Explains how costs were calculated, compares costs to similar programs or market rates when appropriate, demonstrates efficient use of funds, and clearly links expenditures to expected participant outcomes.
7-8 points:	Response adequately describes the average cost per household and provides a reasonable justification for costs but lacks specificity regarding methodology, comparisons, or alignment with federal cost principles.
4-6 points:	Response partially addresses the question but provides limited explanation of average household costs or insufficient justification for why the proposed costs are reasonable and necessary.
0-3 points:	Response provides very limited information and fails to address most of the required elements.

Protecting Public Safety

Encampments: (4 points)	Describe how the applicant will assist with efforts to quickly clear tents and encampments on public property and connect individuals who are camping in public with appropriate services. (please limit to 250 words)
----------------------------	--

4 points:	Response provides a comprehensive, well-developed strategy for assisting with encampment resolution through coordinated outreach and engagement. Clearly describes how individuals will be identified and engaged, connected to housing, emergency shelter, behavioral health, and other supportive services, and transitioned from encampments to
------------------	--



stable housing. Demonstrates strong partnerships with local governments and service providers, includes a participant-centered approach, and provides evidence of organizational capacity or prior success. 2-3 points: Response adequately addresses the question and describes a clear outreach and service connection strategy. Includes coordination with partners and identifies key supportive services, but lacks detail, specificity, or evidence in one or more areas. 0-1 points: Response may partially address the question but provides only a general or limited description of outreach, service coordination, or housing connection strategies. Omits several important elements or lacks a clear implementation plan.	
Illicit Drug Use: (4 points)	Describe how the applicant will assist with efforts to decrease the public use of illicit drugs and quickly connect individuals who are using illicit drugs in public with appropriate services and/or law enforcement. (please limit to 250 words)
4 points: Response provides a comprehensive, well-developed strategy for reducing public illicit drug use through coordinated outreach, engagement, and rapid connection to appropriate services. Clearly describes how individuals will be identified and connected to behavioral health treatment, substance use disorder services, crisis intervention, housing, and other supportive services, as appropriate. Explains coordination with law enforcement, first responders, and community partners when appropriate, while demonstrating a participant-centered, evidence-informed approach and organizational capacity to implement the strategy. 2-3 points: Response adequately addresses the question and describes a clear strategy for connecting individuals to appropriate services and coordinating with law enforcement or community partners. The response is well organized but lacks detail, specificity, or supporting evidence in one or more areas. 0-1 points: Response may partially address the question but provides only a general description of outreach, service coordination, or law enforcement collaboration. Omits several important elements or lacks a clear implementation plan for reducing public illicit drug use and connecting individuals to services.	
Addressing Immediate Danger: (3 points)	Describe how the applicant will assist with efforts to address homeless individuals who are a danger to themselves or others (e.g., involuntary commitment). (please limit to 250 words)



3 points:	Response provides a comprehensive, well-developed strategy for identifying and responding to homeless individuals who may be a danger to themselves or others. Clearly describes coordination with behavioral health providers, crisis response teams, emergency medical services, and/or law enforcement, as appropriate. Explains procedures for crisis intervention, referral to treatment, involuntary commitment when legally appropriate, and connection to ongoing housing and supportive services. Demonstrates organizational capacity and strong partnerships to implement the proposed approach.
2 points:	Response addresses the question but lacks some detail or specificity to their strategy. Describes some coordination with behavioral health providers, crisis responders, or law enforcement but lacks sufficient detail regarding implementation, partnerships, referral processes, or ongoing service coordination.
1 point:	Response provides only a general or partially developed strategy. Fails to describe a meaningful strategy for responding to homeless individuals who may be a danger to themselves or others or does not adequately address coordination, crisis intervention, or connection to appropriate services.
0 points: Response is incomplete, vague, or largely nonresponsive.	
Sharing Information: (3 points)	Describe how the applicant will assist with efforts to comprehensively share information, including location information, in accordance with the Sex Offender Registry and Notification Act (SORNA). (please limit to 250 words)
3 points:	Response provides a comprehensive, well-developed plan for sharing information, including location information, in accordance with SORNA requirements. Clearly describes coordination with law enforcement, corrections, and other relevant agencies; outlines procedures for timely, accurate, and legally compliant information sharing; demonstrates strong interagency collaboration; and provides evidence of organizational capacity to implement the proposed approach.
2 points:	Response adequately addresses the question and describes a clear approach to information sharing and coordination with partner agencies. Demonstrates an understanding of SORNA-related responsibilities but lacks detail, specificity, or supporting evidence in one or more areas.
1 point:	Response partially addresses the question but provides only a general or limited description of information-sharing practices. Omits several important elements, such as implementation procedures, coordination with relevant agencies, or compliance considerations.
0 points:	Response is incomplete, vague, or largely nonresponsive. Fails to describe a meaningful strategy for sharing information in accordance with SORNA or does not adequately address coordination, legal compliance, or implementation.



For Reviewer Use Only

Applicant Budget submitted is feasible, cost effective, and allowable. (5 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes=5 No=0
---	---



Scoring Rubric

Partners Ending Homelessness (PEH) FY2026 New Project Application Support Services Only – Standalone-Updated 06/29/2026

**Applications are due Wednesday, July 15th by 5 pm.
Single Project Applications must be submitted in a single PDF to
PEH via email: jkeys@letsendhomelessness.org
Project applications must also be submitted in E-Snaps by Tuesday,
August 11th by 5pm.
Scoring Rubric will be on our website
[CoC Funding - Partners Ending Homelessness](#)**

Agency and Project Information

Organization Name:	
Project Name:	

Contact Person	
Phone Number	
Email	

Amount Requesting	Projected Number of People Served (Supportive Services Only-SSO) 2 CFR 200.404
\$	

Threshold Requirements: (3 parts)

All projects are required to meet or agree with threshold requirements to be considered for funding.

The agency has reviewed all HUD requirements and provisions outlined on pages 106-108 of the NOFO and agrees to abide by them.

☐ Agree ☐ Disagree



The agency also agrees to abide by the following four additional questions outlined in the same area of the NOFO on page 108:	
Awards under this NOFO will not be used to engage in illegal racial discrimination, including racial preferences.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Awards under this NOFO will not be distributed in a way that violates or otherwise is used to interfere with constitutional protections guaranteed for speech and religious beliefs and the free exercise of religion.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Awards made under this NOFO will not be used to fund any project, service provider, or organization that operates illegal drug injection sites of “safe consumption sites” in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 856, knowingly permit the use or distribution of illicit drugs on property under their control in violation of 21 U.S.C. 856(a)(2), or knowingly distribute drug paraphernalia in violation of 21 USC 863. This is not a requirement that program participants must be sober in order to receive assistance, participate in treatment in order to receive assistance, or be evicted or exited from assistance for a first-time violation of a drug-related program policy or lease requirement.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Pursuant to 2 CFR 200.332(b)(2), all agreements or contracts made with subrecipients under this NOFO must contain the same terms and conditions as those in the grant agreement issued by HUD. Any conflicting terms and conditions must be approved by HUD.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Additional CoC Threshold Questions:	
Applicant is a non-profit organization, including a faith based organization, with active 501(c)3 status, a public housing authority, a local government organization, or another eligible entity as specified in the NOFO. (Please see page 9 of the NOFO for a detailed listing of eligible applicants.)	☐ Yes ☐ No
Applicant agrees to use our Continuum’s Homeless Management Information System-HMIS (or comparable database if a Domestic Violence-DV provider)	☐ Yes ☐ No
PEH Membership: The applicant has a current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with PEH	☐ Yes ☐ No



or is submitting an MOU with this application. (Templates will be posted on the PEH website.)	
Applicant agrees to using the Coordinated Entry System	☐ Yes ☐ No
Applicant has attached the management letter from the agency's most recent fiscal audit demonstrating that the agency is in good standing.	☐ Yes ☐ No
The agency has reviewed all new HUD priorities outlined in the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO).	☐ Yes ☐ No
Does the agency participate in the local Point in Time (PIT) Count?	☐ Yes ☐ No
If no, to the above, will the agency participate in the future if funded by sending the following number of volunteers according to the percentage of funding received by the CoC: 30%-20%= 6 volunteers, 19%-15%=5 volunteers, 14%-10%=4 volunteers, 9%-5%=3 volunteers; and 4% or below =2 volunteers	☐ Yes ☐ No

If the answer is no to any of the above questions, please explain below. (Please limit to 250 words.)

If agency does not meet threshold requirements, stop scoring. Agency is not eligible for CoC funding.

Narrative Questions

Program Design: 5 points	Please provide a general description of the program including the population served, where applicable. Please indicate whether the project will serve any specialized populations. (Please limit to 250 words)
-----------------------------	--



4-5 points: Provides a clear and thoughtful plan for the program with specific details that demonstrate why it will succeed. Program will serve one or more priority specialized populations.

2-3 points: Provides a description of the program but with limited information. May or may not serve priority specialized populations.

0-1 points: Does not provide a description or description does not make sense. Does not serve any priority specialized populations.

Community and HUD Federal Need:
5 points

Using local data on homelessness, how does this project support PEH's goal of ending homelessness for all persons?

Please include the agency's unique ability to serve the population and share any relevant data to support your response. (please limit to 250 words)

4-5 points: Clearly demonstrates how this project will support the goal of ending homelessness and uses specific data that supports their explanation. Agency shows why they are uniquely qualified to serve the population with specific evidence.

2-3 points: Describes a link between the project and the goal of ending homelessness but connection is weak and data is limited. The agency may be able to serve the population well but does not have strong evidence.

0-1 points: Does not demonstrate how this project will support the goal of ending homelessness. Does not provide evidence that the agency is qualified to serve the population.

Current, or Past Performance:
5 Points

Please describe the success of your agency's current programs. If your agency currently receives, or has received Continuum of Care (CoC) funding in the past, have any of your programs fallen into Tier 2 or been reallocated? If yes, please describe why, and what changes have you implemented or plan to implement to ensure that this project meets the minimum HUD and CoC requirements? (please limit to 250 words)



5 points: Fully answers all parts of the question. Clearly states whether any projects were Tier 2 or reallocated, provides a transparent explanation of why, details specific corrective actions already implemented or planned, and demonstrates how the project will meet HUD and CoC performance and compliance requirements. Or the agency has not received CoC funding in the past.

4 points: Answers all parts of the question with good detail but lacks some specificity, supporting evidence, or measurable outcomes.

3 points: Addresses the question but provides only general explanations or broad improvement plans. Some required details are missing.

2 points: Partially answers the question. Reasons or improvement plans are incomplete, vague, or not clearly tied to HUD/CoC requirements.

1 point: Minimally addresses the question, omits key information, or provides an unclear or unsupported response.

0 points: Does not answer the question, leaves it blank, or provides information unrelated to the question.

Knowledge shared from persons who were homeless in the past
5 points

How does your program currently involve people who were formerly homeless (i.e., employment/volunteer opportunities, peer support, mentorship, members of Board/Advisory Committees, etc.)? (please limit to 250 words)

4-5 points: Clearly demonstrates meaningful involvement of people who were formerly homeless. Explains how contributions from people who were formerly homeless have been intentionally applied to improve the program.

2-3 points: Shows some involvement of people who were formerly homeless but involvement is limited. Fails to show that input from people who were formerly homeless was practically implemented.

0-1 points: Has not had any people who were formerly homeless involved or people who were formerly homeless were involved in the past but are no longer given opportunities to contribute.

Minimizing Trauma Provision
5 points

Describe how your program minimizes the trauma associated with homelessness. This could include trauma informed care services and ensuring participant safety in programs, especially for youth and survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. (please limit to 250 words)



4-5 points: Agency demonstrates the ability to minimize trauma as described in the question above.

2-3 points: Agency has plans, and can produce evidence of a plan, to ensure the program will minimize trauma as described in the question above.

0-1 points: Agency does not have the ability to provide this level of care and does not have a plan in place to provide this level of care.

Support Services Only – Standalone Application Questions

Project need 10 points	Using local data on homelessness and other data, please describe why your agency believes the project is necessary to assist people in exiting homelessness, addressing barriers to stable housing (e.g., substance use disorder, unemployment, childcare, etc.) and increasing self-sufficiency.
9-10 points:	Provides a compelling, data-driven justification using multiple, current local data sources on homelessness and related community needs. Clearly explains why the project is necessary, demonstrates a strong understanding of local gaps, and explains how the project will increase housing stability and self-sufficiency.
7-8 points:	Includes relevant local data and explains the need for the project. Some opportunities exist to strengthen the use of evidence or the connection between identified needs and project activities.
4-6 points:	Addresses the question but uses minimal or outdated local data. Identifies barriers without fully explaining their impact or how the project addresses them.
0-3 points:	Minimal response with vague statements about homelessness. Lacks meaningful data, analysis, or explanation of community need. Does not adequately connect the project to identified barriers.
Relationships 10 points	Describe your relationship with shelters and street outreach providers in Monroe County/City of Rochester and how this relationship would improve your ability to provide support services to the target population to assist them in exiting homelessness. Please provide MOUs.



9-10 points:	Provides a comprehensive description of established relationships with shelters and street outreach providers in Monroe County/City of Rochester. Clearly explains the nature of collaboration and how these partnerships strengthen the agency's ability to help clients exit homelessness and access support services. Includes signed, current MOUs or letters of commitment that clearly define roles and responsibilities.
7-8 points:	Identifies key shelter and outreach partners and explains how collaboration supports the target population. Includes required MOUs, but provides limited detail about coordination, referral processes, or measurable benefits to clients.
4-6 points:	Provides a general description of community relationships without demonstrating how they improve service delivery. MOUs may be outdated, incomplete, or only partially address the proposed project.
0-3 points:	Limited response with little evidence of established relationships or coordination. Few specifics and no meaningful documentation of partnerships. Does not clearly explain how partnerships support clients exiting homelessness.
Assessment 5 points	Please provide a copy of the assessment tool that you intend to use to evaluate the initial and ongoing service needs of program participants. Use this space to provide any details about the assessment.
4-5 points: Provides a copy of an appropriate and relevant assessment tool. Clearly explains how they will use the tool to evaluate initial and ongoing needs and explains how it will benefit staff and participants.	
2-3 points: Provides a copy of an assessment tool but fails to clearly show why the tool is an appropriate choice or how it will effectively support the needs of staff and participants.	
0-1 points: Does not provide an assessment tool or provides a tool that is not related to evaluating the initial and ongoing needs of program participants.	
Strategy 10 points	What is the proposed strategy for providing supportive services to eligible program participants, including those with histories of unsheltered homelessness and those who do not traditionally engage with supportive services? Please include your agency's history of ability to successfully serve this population.
9-10 points:	Response provides a comprehensive, well-developed strategy for supportive services. Describes how the project will specifically be able to support participants with histories of unsheltered homelessness and those who do not traditionally engage with supportive services. Provides a strong history of serving the target population with measurable evidence of success.



7-8	Response addresses most components of the question with adequate detail. Strategy and agency experience are generally well described but may lack depth, evidence, or specificity in one or two areas.
4-6	Response partially addresses the question but lacks sufficient detail regarding supportive services, target populations, or agency experience. Limited evidence of successful implementation is provided.
0-3	Response addresses only a small portion of the question with little explanation or supporting information.
Supplemental Resources: 5 Points	Describe how your project will be supplemented with resources from other public or private sources, that may include mainstream health, social, and employment programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, SSI, and SNAP in order to create self-sufficiency and economic independence. Include MOUs/partnership agreements.
5 points: Clearly describes a well-developed and proactive strategy to connect participants with mainstream and community resources. Includes specific programs (e.g., Medicaid, SSI/SSDI, SNAP, TANF, workforce programs), and explains how staff will assist with enrollment, eligibility determination, referrals, and ongoing access. Demonstrates strong coordination with external agencies and may include MOUs or formal partnerships. Shows how leveraging these resources reduces CoC funding reliance and improves housing stability and self-sufficiency.	
4 points: Describes a solid plan to connect participants to mainstream benefits and services, with some detail on referral processes or partnerships. May lack specificity on implementation steps or coordination mechanisms.	
3 points: Provides a general description of referrals to mainstream services but limited detail on how enrollment or ongoing access will be ensured. Weak explanation of coordination or system integration.	
2 points: Mentions mainstream resources but provides minimal explanation of how participants will be connected or supported in accessing them.	
1 point: Minimal response with little meaningful description of leveraging external resources.	
0 points: No response or does not address the question.	



Performance Measures

Employment & Income Growth: 10 points	Describe how clients will be assisted in obtaining employment and income resources to maximize their ability to live independently. (please limit to 250 words)
9-10 points: Response provides a comprehensive, well-developed strategy for assisting clients in obtaining employment and income resources. Clearly describes services and demonstrates how these services promote long-term independence and includes measurable outcomes. 7-8 points: Response addresses most components of the question with adequate detail. Describes employment and income assistance but may lack specificity regarding service delivery, partnerships, or evidence of effectiveness. 4-6 points: Response provides a basic description of employment and income assistance but the relationship to long-term independence is weak or insufficiently explained. Strategies are vague, underdeveloped, or lack a clear implementation plan. 0-3 points: Response provides very limited information and fails to address most of the required elements.	
Supportive Service Provision: 10 points	Describe how this project will provide the treatment and services that people need to recover and regain self-sufficiency (including on-site behavioral health treatment, robust wraparound supportive services, and participation requirements for these services). Provide the partnerships and corresponding MOUs for providing this care. (please limit to 250 words)
9-10 points: Response provides a comprehensive, well-developed plan for delivering treatment and services that support recovery and self-sufficiency. Clearly describes on-site services with participation requirements and how services are coordinated. Identifies strong community partnerships and includes corresponding MOUs.	



7-8 points:	Response provides a comprehensive, well-developed plan for delivering treatment and services that support recovery and self-sufficiency. However, services are not on-site or do not have participation requirements. Identifies strong community partnerships and includes corresponding MOUs.
4-6 points:	Response partially addresses the question but provides limited explanation of how recovery and self-sufficiency will be supported. Partnerships and/or MOUs are minimally addressed or absent.
0-3 points:	Response provides very limited information and fails to address most of the required elements.

Returns to Homelessness: 10 points	How will this project ensure that clients will not return to homelessness within two years after project exit? (please limit to 250 words)
---------------------------------------	--

9-10 points: Response provides a comprehensive strategy for promoting long-term housing stability and preventing returns to homelessness for at least two years after project exit. Clearly describes discharge planning, housing stabilization services, ongoing case management or follow-up, connections to employment, income, healthcare, behavioral health, and community resources. Includes measurable outcomes or prior success demonstrating effectiveness in reducing returns to homelessness.

7-8 points: Response addresses most components of the question with adequate detail. Describes housing stabilization strategies and follow-up services but may lack specificity regarding outcomes, partnerships, or long-term monitoring.

4-6 points: Response partially addresses the question but provides limited explanation of how clients will maintain housing after project exit. Long-term supports and prevention strategies are insufficiently described.

0-3 points: Response provides very limited information and fails to address most of the required elements.

For Reviewer Use Only

Applicant Budget submitted is feasible, cost effective, and allowable. (5 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes=5 points No=0 points
---	---



Scoring Rubric

Partners Ending Homelessness 2026 Coordinated Entry Renewal Ranking Criteria

Applications are due Wednesday, July 15th by 5 pm.
Single Project Applications must be submitted in a single PDF to
PEH via email: jkeys@letsendhomelessness.org
Project applications must also be submitted in E-Snaps by Tuesday,
August 11th by 5pm.
Scoring Rubric will be on our website
[CoC Funding - Partners Ending Homelessness](#)

Organization Name	
Project Name	

Contact Person	
Phone Number	
Email	

Threshold Requirements: All projects are required to meet or agree with threshold requirements to be considered for funding.	
The agency has reviewed all HUD requirements and provisions outlined on pages 106-108 of the NOFO and agrees to abide by them.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
The agency also agrees to abide by the following additional questions outlined in the same area of the NOFO on page 108:	
Awards under this NOFO will not be used to engage in illegal racial discrimination, including racial preferences.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Awards under this NOFO will not be distributed in a way that violates or otherwise is used to interfere with constitutional protections guaranteed for	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree



speech and religious beliefs and the free exercise of religion.	
Awards made under this NOFO will not be used to fund any project, service provider, or organization that operates illegal drug injection sites of “safe consumption sites” in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 856, knowingly permit the use or distribution of illicit drugs on property under their control in violation of 21 U.S.C. 856(a)(2), or knowingly distribute drug paraphernalia in violation of 21 USC 863. This is not a requirement that program participants must be sober in order to receive assistance, participate in treatment in order to receive assistance, or be evicted or exited from assistance for a first-time violation of a drug-related program policy or lease requirement.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Pursuant to 2 CFR 200.332(b)(2), all agreements or contracts made with subrecipients under this NOFO must contain the same terms and conditions as those in the grant agreement issued by HUD. Any conflicting terms and conditions must be approved by HUD.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Applicant is a non-profit organization, including a faith-based organization, with active 501(c)3 status, a public housing authority, a local government organization, or another eligible entity as specified in the NOFO. (Please see page 9 of the NOFO for a detailed listing of eligible applicants.)	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Applicant agrees to uphold protections of VAWA (§ 5.2005 VAWA protections) including: confidentiality protections, use of emergency transfer plans, and regular staff training regarding VAWA.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Applicant agrees to engage in technical assistance with PEH when needed and monthly program meetings to review data errors, case management documentation and services, utilization, spend down, and outcomes.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Applicant has attached the management letter from the agency's most recent fiscal audit demonstrating that the agency is in good standing.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
PEH Membership: The applicant has a current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with PEH or is submitting an MOU with this	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree



application. (Templates will be posted on the PEH website.)	
If agency does not meet threshold requirements, stop scoring. Agency is not eligible for CoC funding.	

Populations Served

Specialty Populations Served:
(See pages 81-83 of the NOFO)

- ☐ Children and youth (3 pts)
- ☐ Families (2 pts)
- ☐ Veterans (2 pts)
- ☐ Survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (2 pts)
- ☐ Justice System Re-entry (2 pts)
- ☐ High utilizers of healthcare systems (2 pts)
- ☐ Aging and elderly (2 pts)
- ☐ Chronically homeless (CH) (2 pts)

Please describe the agency's unique ability to serve the above population(s) and share any relevant data to support your response. (Please limit to 250 words.) (5 pts)
4-5 Points: Demonstrates a history of serving this population. Discussed the population and the ability to best serve this population with the funding. Requested Provides Multiple data points to support response.
2-3 points: Limited description with the limited data provided.
0-1 points: Population served description is not clear or fully thought out. No data is provided.

Narrative Response Questions

Supportive Service Provision (5 points)	Describe how your project provides the treatment and services that people need to recover and regain self-sufficiency (including on-site behavioral health treatment, robust wraparound supportive services, and participation requirements for these services). If not on-site, provide the partnerships and corresponding MOUs for providing this care. (please limit to 250 words)
5 points: The agency clearly discusses how CE will refer into programs that provide these services, including examples of services provided and relevant MOU's.	
4 points: The agency clearly discusses how CE will refer into programs that provide these services, including examples of services provided with no MOU's.	
3 points: The agency offers a vague explanation of how CE will refer into programs that provide services.	



0-2 points: does not address the question.	
Knowledge shared from persons who were homeless in the past (5 points)	How does your program currently involve people who were formerly homeless? i.e., employment/volunteer opportunities, peer support, mentorship, members of Board/Advisory Committees, etc. (please limit to 250 words)
4-5 points: Clearly demonstrates meaningful involvement of people who were formerly homeless. Explains how contributions from people who were formerly homeless have been intentionally applied to improve the program. 2-3 points: Shows some involvement of people who were formerly homeless but involvement is limited. Fails to show that input from people who were formerly homeless was practically implemented. 0-1 points: Has not had any people who were formerly homeless involved or people who were formerly homeless were involved in the past but are no longer given opportunities to contribute.	
Minimizing Trauma (5 points)	Describe how your program minimizes the trauma associated with homelessness. This could include trauma informed care services, ensuring participant safety in programs, especially for youth and survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. (please limit to 250 words)
4-5 points: Agency demonstrates the ability to minimize trauma as described in the question above. 2-3 points: Agency has plans, and can produce evidence of a plan, to ensure the program will minimize trauma as described in the question above. 0-1 points: Agency does not have the ability to provide this level of care and does not have a plan in place to provide this level of care.	
Addressing the Goals of the NOFO (10 points)	How will your project advance the goals described in the NOFO? (Beginning on page 28) This includes optimizing self-sufficiency, reducing homelessness, prioritizing treatment and recovery, advancing public safety, and minimizing the trauma caused to communities as a whole by homelessness.
9–10 Points: Provides a comprehensive, well-supported response that addresses all NOFO goals with specific examples, measurable outcomes, and a clear connection between project activities and expected impacts. 7–8 Points: Addresses most NOFO goals with adequate detail and examples but lacks specificity or measurable outcomes in one or two areas. 5–6 Points: Addresses some NOFO goals but provides limited detail, weak connections to project activities, or few examples. 3–4 Points: Provides a general response that addresses only a few NOFO goals or lacks sufficient explanation of how the project advances them.	



1–2 Points: Response is minimal, vague, or demonstrates little understanding of the NOFO goals.
0 Points: Does not address the question or provides information unrelated to the NOFO goals.

Project Effectiveness

Accessibility (19 points)	The Coordinated Entry system is easily available and reachable for all persons within the CoC's geographic area who are seeking homelessness assistance. The system must also be accessible for persons with disabilities within the CoC's geographic area. (please limit to 250 words)
19 points: Provides a comprehensive, clear, and well-organized explanation of how the Coordinated Entry (CE) system is easily accessible and reachable for all persons seeking homelessness assistance across the CoC geographic area, including people with disabilities. Clearly describes multiple access points (e.g., in-person locations, phone, online, outreach), low-barrier entry practices, language access, disability accommodations, and geographic coverage. Demonstrates strong understanding of equity, accessibility, and inclusive system design. Response is specific, accurate, and within the 250-word limit. 16-18 points: Provides a clear and accurate explanation of system accessibility and reach. Describes key access points and accommodations for persons with disabilities, but may lack some detail, specificity, or coverage of all access methods. Shows good understanding with minor gaps. 10-15 points: Provides a basic description of CE accessibility but is general or incomplete. Mentions access or disability accommodations but does not fully explain how the system is broadly reachable or consistently accessible across the CoC. Limited detail or weak integration of accessibility features. 5-9 points: Provides a minimal or unclear response. Shows limited understanding of system accessibility and reach. Lacks explanation of access points, disability accommodations, or geographic coverage. May be vague or partially inaccurate. 0-4 points: Does not address the question, provides irrelevant or incorrect information, or is incomplete. Demonstrates little or no understanding of Coordinated Entry accessibility requirements for all populations, including persons with disabilities.	
Advertising (19 points)	Describe the strategy for advertising that is designed specifically to reach households experiencing homelessness with the highest needs. (please limit to 250 words)



19 points: Provides a comprehensive, clear, and well-organized description of a targeted outreach and advertising strategy designed to reach households experiencing homelessness with the highest needs. Clearly explains multiple outreach channels (e.g., street outreach, coordinated entry partners, shelters, hospitals, jails, schools, community-based organizations), and demonstrates how messaging, locations, and methods are tailored to high-need populations. Shows strong understanding of equity, accessibility, and engagement barriers. Response includes relevant examples and stays within the 250-word limit. 16-18 points: Provides a clear and accurate description of a targeted advertising or outreach strategy. Identifies key methods for reaching high-need households but may lack some depth, specificity, or variety of outreach channels. Demonstrates good understanding of targeting and engagement with minor omissions. 10-15 points: Provides a basic description of outreach or advertising strategies but is general or incomplete. Mentions some methods for reaching people experiencing homelessness but does not clearly explain how the strategy is targeted to those with the highest needs. Limited detail or weak connection to prioritization. 5-9 points: Provides a minimal or unclear response. Shows limited understanding of targeted outreach to high-need households. Lacks explanation of strategy, channels, or engagement approach, and may be vague or partially inaccurate. 0-4 points: Does not address the question, provides irrelevant or incorrect information, or is incomplete. Demonstrates little or no understanding of targeted outreach or advertising strategies for households experiencing homelessness.	
Standardized Assessment Process (19 points)	Describe the standardized assessment process that is in place. (please limit to 250 words)
19 points: Provides a comprehensive, clear, and well-organized description of the standardized assessment process. Clearly explains how assessments are conducted, what tools or instruments are used, how consistency is ensured across assessors, and how results are used to prioritize or match participants to services. Demonstrates strong understanding of equity, consistency, and data-informed decision-making within Coordinated Entry or related systems. Response is specific, accurate, and within the 250-word limit. 16-18 points: Provides a clear and accurate description of the standardized assessment process. Identifies key components (e.g., tools, procedures, or workflow) and how assessments are used, but may lack some detail about standardization, training, or implementation consistency. 10-15 points: Provides a basic description of the assessment process but is general or incomplete. May mention assessments but does not clearly explain standardization, tools used, or how results inform decisions. Limited depth or specificity. 5-9 points: Provides a minimal or unclear response with limited understanding of standardized assessment. Lacks explanation of how the process works or how consistency is maintained. May be vague, inaccurate, or off-topic. 0-4 points: Does not address the question, provides irrelevant or incorrect information, or is incomplete. Demonstrates little or no understanding of a standardized assessment process.	
Appropriate Housing and Services (19 points)	Describe how the project will ensure that program participants are directed to appropriate housing and services that fit their needs. (please limit to 250 words)



19 points: Provides a thorough, clear, and well-organized explanation of how the project ensures participants are matched to appropriate housing and services based on individualized needs. Clearly describes assessment processes, prioritization methods, referral pathways, and coordination with housing and service providers. Demonstrates strong understanding of person-centered, equitable, and data-informed decision-making. Includes relevant examples.

16-18 points: Provides a clear and accurate explanation of how participants are directed to appropriate housing and services. Describes key processes such as assessment and referrals, but may lack some depth, specificity, or examples. Shows good understanding of aligning participant needs with services, with minor omissions.

10-15 points: Provides a basic description of how participants are matched to housing and services, but explanation is general or incomplete. May reference assessment or referral processes without clearly explaining how needs are matched to appropriate resources. Limited detail or weak connection to individualized placement decisions.

5-9 points: Provides a minimal or unclear response with limited understanding of how participants are directed to appropriate housing and services. Lacks explanation of processes or coordination and may be overly vague, incomplete, or inaccurate.

0-4 points: Does not address the question, provides irrelevant or incorrect information, or is largely incomplete. Demonstrates little or no understanding of how participants are matched to housing and services.

Strategic Utilization (19 points)

Describe how the Coordinated Entry system aligns with other systems of care to strategically utilize other systems of care for eligible populations. (please limit to 250 words)

19 points: Provides a comprehensive, accurate, and well-organized description of how the Coordinated Entry (CE) system aligns with other systems of care. Clearly explains strategic partnerships, referral pathways, and coordination for eligible populations, with specific examples of collaboration (e.g., behavioral health, healthcare, justice, child welfare, veterans, domestic violence, or mainstream benefits). Demonstrates a strong understanding of system integration and strategic resource utilization. Response is concise, within the word limit, and free of significant errors.

16-18 points: Provides a clear and accurate description of CE alignment with other systems of care. Explains coordination and strategic use of partner systems for eligible populations but may lack some specificity, examples, or depth. Demonstrates a solid understanding with only minor omissions or limited detail.

10-15 points: Provides a basic description of CE coordination with other systems of care but addresses the topic only partially. May identify some partner systems without adequately explaining how alignment is strategic or how eligible populations benefit. Response may be vague, incomplete, or lack supporting examples.

5-9 points: Provides a limited or unclear description of CE alignment. Demonstrates minimal understanding of coordination across systems of care, with significant gaps, inaccuracies, or little explanation of strategic utilization or eligible populations.

0-4 points: Does not address the question, provides information that is largely inaccurate or unrelated, or submits an incomplete response. Demonstrates little or no understanding of Coordinated Entry alignment with other systems of care.



APR Submission: 4 points 1 point if “Yes” for 2023 1 point if “Yes” for 2024 1 point if “Yes” for 2025 1 bonus point if “Yes” for all three years	Was the project’s APR submitted on time for the following years? 2023 ☐ Yes ☐ No 2024 ☐ Yes ☐ No 2025 ☐ Yes ☐ No
Drawdown Efficiency: (7 points) 5 points if >= 95% 2 points if “Yes”	What percentage of HUD expenditures were drawn down from the project's APR for the year ending 2025? Did the project draw down funds at least once per quarter for the year ending 2025? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Participation in the CoC: (5 points) • 20% to 30% of total funding = 6 people • 15% to 19% of total funding = 5 people • 10% to 14% of total funding = 4 people • 5% to 9% of total funding = 3 people • 2% to 4% of total funding = 2 People	Did the Agency attend the January 2026 PIT Count in proportion to the percentage of CoC funding as seen on the monitor? ☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 5 No = 0
Percentage of Dedicated ARD 0%-2% = 6 points 2.1% - 3% = 5 points 3.1% - 4% = 4 points 4.1% - 5% = 3 points >5% = 0 points	What % of ARD funds are already dedicated to Coordinated Entry? (PEH will enter this on your behalf).
Required Data Elements (5 points)	Does your currently funded CE project ensure the following required data elements are entered into HMIS? CE Assessment CE Event Element Current Living Situation Element ☐ Yes ☐ No



	Yes = 5 No = 0
Mitigating Factors: Please explain any outcomes that you think do not accurately portray your program or anything you want the reviewers to know about your program not covered in the application questions. (Please be specific and keep the word count total under 500 words) (5 points) 5 points: Provides a clear, specific, and well-supported explanation of outcomes or context not fully reflected in reported data. Effectively explains external factors (e.g. staffing concerns, funding disruptions). Clarifies program performance while outlining a corrective and implemented action plan. Or application demonstrates that the project performed very well and there is no need for mitigating factors. 4 points: Provides a solid explanation of mitigating factors with relevant detail. Addresses discrepancies or missing context and helps reviewers understand performance outcomes. Some minor lack of specificity or limited connection to program strengths. 3 points: Provides a general explanation of mitigating factors but lacks depth, specificity, or clear linkage to outcomes. Some context is given, but it does not fully clarify performance data or program impact. 2 points: Mentions mitigating factors in a vague or limited way. Minimal explanation of how external or internal issues affected outcomes. Does not clearly help interpret program performance. 0 -1 points: No response or entirely off-topic.	



Scoring Rubric

Partners Ending Homelessness 2026 Renewal Project Ranking Criteria

Applications are due Wednesday, July 15th by 5 pm.
Single Project Applications must be submitted in a single PDF to
PEH via email: jkeys@letsendhomelessness.org
Project applications must also be submitted in E-Snaps by Tuesday, August 11th
by 5pm.

Scoring Rubric will be on our website
[CoC Funding - Partners Ending Homelessness](#)

Organization Name:	
Project Name:	
Contact Person	
Phone Number	
Email	

<u>Project Type</u> (check correct box)	
Transitional Housing (TH)	
Safe Haven (SH)	
Transitional housing – Rapid Re-Housing (TH-RRH)	
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)	
Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)	

<u>Threshold Requirements:</u>	
All projects are required to meet or agree with threshold requirements to be considered for funding.	
The agency has reviewed all HUD requirements and provisions outlined on pages 106-108 of the NOFO and agrees to abide by them.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
The agency also agrees to abide by the following additional questions outlined in the same area of the NOFO on page 108:	
Awards under this NOFO will not be used to engage in illegal racial discrimination, including racial preferences.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Awards under this NOFO will not be distributed in a way that violates or otherwise is used to interfere with constitutional protections guaranteed for speech and religious beliefs and the free exercise of religion.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Awards made under this NOFO will not be used to fund any project, service provider, or organization that operates illegal drug injection sites of “safe consumption sites” in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 856, knowingly permit the use or distribution of illicit drugs on property under their control in violation of 21 U.S.C. 856(a)(2), or knowingly distribute drug paraphernalia in violation of 21 USC 863. This is not a requirement that program participants must be sober in order to receive assistance, participate in treatment in order to receive assistance, or be evicted or exited from assistance for a first-time violation of a drug-related program policy or lease requirement.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Pursuant to 2 CFR 200.332(b)(2), all agreements or contracts made with subrecipients under this NOFO must contain the same terms and conditions as those in the grant agreement issued by HUD. Any conflicting terms and conditions must be approved by HUD.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Applicant is a non-profit organization, including a faith based organization, with active 501(c)3 status, a public housing authority, a local government organization, or another eligible entity as specified in the NOFO. (Please see page 9 of the NOFO for a detailed listing of eligible applicants.)	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Applicant agrees to uphold protections of VAWA (§ 5.2005 VAWA protections) including: confidentiality protections, use of emergency transfer plans, and regular staff training regarding VAWA.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Applicant agrees to engage in technical assistance with PEH when needed and monthly program meetings to review data errors, case management documentation and services, utilization, spend down, and outcomes.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree

Applicant has attached the management letter from the agency's most recent fiscal audit demonstrating that the agency is in good standing.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
PEH Membership: The applicant has a current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with PEH or is submitting an MOU with this application. (Templates will be posted on the PEH website.)	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Does this program have a bathroom and kitchen in each unit? If not, do you have or will you request a waiver from HUD? (Please see page 36)	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree

If agency does not meet threshold requirements, stop scoring. Agency is not eligible for CoC funding.

Populations Served

Specialty Populations Served: (See pages 81-83 of the NOFO)	☐ Children and youth (3 pts) ☐ Families (2 pts) ☐ Veterans (2 pts) ☐ Survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (2 pts) ☐ Justice System Re-entry (2 pts) ☐ High utilizers of healthcare systems (2 pts) ☐ Aging and elderly (2 pts) ☐ Chronically homeless (CH) (2 pts)
Please describe the agency's unique ability to serve the above population(s) and share any relevant data to support your response. (Please limit to 250 words.) (5 pts)	
4-5 Points: Demonstrates a history of serving this population. Discussed the population and the ability to best serve this population with the funding. Requested Provides Multiple data points to support response. 2-3 points: Limited description with the limited data provided. 0-1 points: Population served description is not clear or fully thought out. No data is provided.	
Will you have any units in your project that require program participant engagement in substance abuse treatment services as a condition of continued participation in the program? (p 78) (5 pts) If yes, how many units?	☐ Yes + number of units >0 =5 ☐ No =0 Number of Units: _____

Narrative Response Questions

Supportive Service Provision (10 points)	Describe how your project provides the treatment and services that people need to recover and regain self-sufficiency (including on-site behavioral health treatment, robust wraparound supportive services, and participation requirements for these services). If not on-site, provide the partnerships and corresponding MOUs for providing this care. (please limit to 250 words)
8–10 Points: The agency provides a combination of both on-site and off-site comprehensive supportive services, with all relevant policies and Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) included in the application. The narrative clearly describes how these services are integrated into daily operations and demonstrates an established history of delivering participant-centered care. The agency highlights practices such as engaging participants in individualized goal planning, implementing creative strategies to promote engagement and retention, and providing ongoing case management training to ensure high-quality, consistent service delivery. These examples reflect a strong commitment to coordinated, person-centered care and support the agency's capacity to effectively meet participant needs. 5-7 points: The agency provides comprehensive supportive services off-site, but MOUs and partnership agreements are shared with this application. Description of linkages is strong and shows history of care. 3-6 points: Agency provides supportive services but has limited examples of specific practices. 0-2 points: Agency does not have a clear strategy for providing ongoing services.	
Knowledge shared from persons who were homeless in the past (5 points)	How does your program currently involve people who were formerly homeless? i.e., employment/volunteer opportunities, peer support, mentorship, members of Board/Advisory Committees, etc. (please limit to 250 words)
4-5 points: Agency has one or more individual(s) involved with the program who has lived experience 2-3 points: Agency has plans, and can produce evidence of a plan, to ensure one or more individual(s) involved with the program has lived experience 0-1 points: Agency has no individuals involved with the program with lived experience.	
Minimizing Trauma (5 points)	Describe how your program minimizes the trauma associated with homelessness. This could include trauma informed care services, ensuring participant safety in programs, especially for youth and survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

	(please limit to 250 words)
4-5 points: Agency demonstrates the ability to minimize trauma as described in the question above. 2-3 points: Agency has plans, and can produce evidence of a plan, to ensure the program will minimize trauma as described in the question above. 0-1 points: Agency does not have the ability to provide this level of care and does not have a plan in place to provide this level of care.	
Addressing the Goals of the NOFO (10 points)	How will your project advance the goals described in the NOFO? (Beginning on page 28) This includes optimizing self-sufficiency, reducing homelessness, prioritizing treatment and recovery, advancing public safety, and minimizing the trauma caused to communities as a whole by homelessness.
9–10 Points: Provides a comprehensive, well-supported response that addresses all NOFO goals with specific examples, measurable outcomes, and a clear connection between project activities and expected impacts. 7–8 Points: Addresses most NOFO goals with adequate detail and examples but lacks specificity or measurable outcomes in one or two areas. 5–6 Points: Addresses some NOFO goals but provides limited detail, weak connections to project activities, or few examples. 3–4 Points: Provides a general response that addresses only a few NOFO goals or lacks sufficient explanation of how the project advances them. 1–2 Points: Response is minimal, vague, or demonstrates little understanding of the NOFO goals. 0 Points: Does not address the question or provides information unrelated to the NOFO goals.	

All performance data is for 10/1/24-9/30/25.
Financial data is for the most recently completed Fiscal Year.

Utilization: 10 points 3 points for utilization rate ≥85% in 2023 3 points for utilization rate ≥85% in 2024 3 points for utilization rate ≥85% in 2025 1 bonus point if ≥85% all three years	Projected households served during average PIT: ____ Utilization rate from APRs: 2023: 2024: 2025: Households Average Actual/ Projected = Utilization %
Data Quality: 10 points	Were the following error rates below 5% for APR Q6 from 10/1/24-9/30/25?

2 points for each	Personally, Identifying Information (6a) ☐ Yes ☐ No Universal Data Elements (6b) ☐ Yes ☐ No Income and Housing Data Quality (6c) ☐ Yes ☐ No Chronic Homelessness (6d) ☐ Yes ☐ No Were 95% of entries added into HMIS within 72 hours or less? (6e) ☐ Yes ☐ No
Permanent Housing Placement & Retention: 10 points For PSH, 4 points if ≥ 93% For RRH, 4 points if ≥ 50% 6 points if ≥ 20%	For PSH, what percentage of clients served from 10/1/24-9/30/25 either stayed in the project or exited to a permanent housing destination? (APR Q5a#8 Stayers, Q23c Exiting to housing destinations) Equation to use: (Positive housing destinations + Stayers) / (Total Participants – Persons excluded) For RRH, of the clients who exited your project from 10/1/24-9/30/25, what percentage exited to a permanent housing destination? (APR Q23c) For all projects, what percentage of exits from 10/1/24-9/30/25 were to unsubsidized housing? (APR 23c – “Rental by client, no ongoing housing subsidy” or “Owned by client, no ongoing housing subsidy.”)
Employment Income Growth: 10 points 5 points if ≥ 20% 5 points if ≥ 25%	What percentage of clients enrolled in your program from 10/1/24-9/30/25 increased their employment income (APR Q19a1 and Q19a2)? What percentage of clients who exited your program from 10/1/24-9/30/25 exited with an increase in employment income? (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
Returns to Homelessness: (PEH will calculate this and send it to you) 10 points 5 points if ≤ 7%, 2 points if ≤ 11%	Percentage of those exiting to permanent housing between 10/1/22-9/30/2023 that returned to homelessness in two years or less.

5 points if <= 8%, 2 points if <= 16%	Percentage returning to homelessness within 1 year: _____ Percentage returning to homelessness within 2 years: _____
Self-Sufficiency: 5 points (page 61)	Describe assessments that your agency uses with your clients to develop a service plan that helps to increase self-sufficiency and leads to long term economic independence. Describe how these assessments have shown improvement in these areas over time.
5-Provides a thorough description of the assessment tools used with clients, clearly explains how assessment results inform individualized service plans that increase self-sufficiency and support long-term economic independence, and includes measurable outcomes or data demonstrating improvement over time. 4-Describes the assessment tools and explains how they are used to develop service plans. Demonstrates how services promote self-sufficiency and economic independence with some evidence or examples of improvement, though data or detail may be limited. 3-Identifies assessment tools and discusses service planning but provides limited detail on how assessments support self-sufficiency or long-term economic independence. Evidence of improvement is general or anecdotal. 2-Provides a basic description of assessments or services but does not clearly explain how assessments are used to develop service plans or measure progress. Minimal evidence of improvement over time. 1-Response is vague, incomplete, or minimally addresses the question. Little connection between assessments, service planning, and outcomes. 0-No response or the response does not address the question.	

APR Submission: 4 points 1 point if “Yes” for 2023 1 point if “Yes” for 2024 1 point if “Yes” for 2025 1 bonus point if “Yes” for all three years	Was the project’s APR submitted on time for the following years? 2023 ☐ Yes ☐ No 2024 ☐ Yes ☐ No 2025 ☐ Yes ☐ No
Monitoring: Yes=0 points No=5 points	Were there significant findings for your project during CoC monitoring over the last three years? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Drawdown Efficiency: (7 points) 5 points if >= 95% 2 points if “Yes”	What percentage of HUD expenditures were drawn down from the project's APR for the year ending 2025? Did the project draw down funds at least once per quarter for the year ending 2025? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Cost of Success rate: (10 points) 10 points: Equal to or lower than the CoC average cost per household for the specific project type 7 points: Within 10% of the CoC average cost per household for the specific project type 5 points: Within 15% of the CoC average cost per household for the specific project type 3 points: Within 20% of the CoC average cost per household for the specific project type 0 points: Exceeds 20% of the CoC average cost per household for the specific project type	HUD grant amount divided by the number of persons with a successful exit or remained stable in PH from the 10/1/2024 - 9/30/2025 APR:
Participation in the CoC: (5 points) • 20% to 30% of total funding = 6 people • 15% to 19% of total funding = 5 people • 10% to 14% of total funding = 4 people • 5% to 9% of total funding = 3 people • 2% to 4% of total funding = 2 People	Did the Agency attend the January 2026 PIT Count in proportion to the percentage of CoC funding as seen on the monitor? ☐ Yes = 5 ☐ No = 0
The Agency takes 100% of referrals from CE. (5 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No

Yes=5 points No=0 points	
Mitigating Factors: Please explain any outcomes that you think do not accurately portray your program or anything you want the reviewers to know about your program not covered in the application questions. (Please be specific and keep the word count total under 500 words) (5 points) 5= Provides a clear, specific, and well-supported explanation of outcomes or context not fully reflected in reported data. Effectively explains external factors (e.g. staffing concerns, funding disruptions). Clarifies program performance while outlining a corrective and implemented action plan. Or application demonstrates that the project performed very well and there is no need for mitigating factors. 4= Provides a solid explanation of mitigating factors with relevant detail. Addresses discrepancies or missing context and helps reviewers understand performance outcomes. Some minor lack of specificity or limited connection to program strengths. 3= Provides a general explanation of mitigating factors but lacks depth, specificity, or clear linkage to outcomes. Some context is given, but it does not fully clarify performance data or program impact. 2= Mentions mitigating factors in a vague or limited way. Minimal explanation of how external or internal issues affected outcomes. Does not clearly help interpret program performance. 1= Response is minimal, unclear, or largely unrelated to the question. Little to no meaningful context provided for outcomes. 0= No response or entirely off-topic.	



Scoring Rubric

Partners Ending Homelessness 2026 Renewal Project Ranking Criteria

Applications are due Wednesday, July 15th by 5 pm.
Single Project Applications must be submitted in a single PDF to
PEH via email: jkeys@letsendhomelessness.org
Project applications must also be submitted in E-Snaps by Tuesday, August 11th
by 5pm.

Scoring Rubric will be on our website
[CoC Funding - Partners Ending Homelessness](#)

Organization Name:	
Project Name:	
Contact Person	
Phone Number	
Email	

<u>Project Type</u> (check correct box)	
Transitional Housing (TH)	
Safe Haven (SH)	
Transitional housing – Rapid Re-Housing (TH-RRH)	
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)	
Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)	

Threshold Requirements:	
All projects are required to meet or agree with threshold requirements to be considered for funding.	
The agency has reviewed all HUD requirements and provisions outlined on pages 106-108 of the NOFO and agrees to abide by them.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
The agency also agrees to abide by the following additional questions outlined in the same area of the NOFO on page 108:	
Awards under this NOFO will not be used to engage in illegal racial discrimination, including racial preferences.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Awards under this NOFO will not be distributed in a way that violates or otherwise is used to interfere with constitutional protections guaranteed for speech and religious beliefs and the free exercise of religion.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Awards made under this NOFO will not be used to fund any project, service provider, or organization that operates illegal drug injection sites of “safe consumption sites” in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 856, knowingly permit the use or distribution of illicit drugs on property under their control in violation of 21 U.S.C. 856(a)(2), or knowingly distribute drug paraphernalia in violation of 21 USC 863. This is not a requirement that program participants must be sober in order to receive assistance, participate in treatment in order to receive assistance, or be evicted or exited from assistance for a first-time violation of a drug-related program policy or lease requirement.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Pursuant to 2 CFR 200.332(b)(2), all agreements or contracts made with subrecipients under this NOFO must contain the same terms and conditions as those in the grant agreement issued by HUD. Any conflicting terms and conditions must be approved by HUD.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Applicant is a non-profit organization, including a faith based organization, with active 501(c)3 status, a public housing authority, a local government organization, or another eligible entity as specified in the NOFO. (Please see page 9 of the NOFO for a detailed listing of eligible applicants.)	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Applicant agrees to uphold protections of VAWA (§ 5.2005 VAWA protections) including: confidentiality protections, use of emergency transfer plans, and regular staff training regarding VAWA.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Applicant agrees to engage in technical assistance with PEH when needed and monthly program meetings to review data errors, case management documentation and services, utilization, spend down, and outcomes.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree

Applicant has attached the management letter from the agency's most recent fiscal audit demonstrating that the agency is in good standing.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
PEH Membership: The applicant has a current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with PEH or is submitting an MOU with this application. (Templates will be posted on the PEH website.)	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Does this program have a bathroom and kitchen in each unit? If not, do you have or will you request a waiver from HUD? (Please see page 36)	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree

If agency does not meet threshold requirements, stop scoring. Agency is not eligible for CoC funding.

Populations Served

Specialty Populations Served: (See pages 81-83 of the NOFO)	☐ Children and youth (3 pts) ☐ Families (2 pts) ☐ Veterans (2 pts) ☐ Survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (2 pts) ☐ Justice System Re-entry (2 pts) ☐ High utilizers of healthcare systems (2 pts) ☐ Aging and elderly (2 pts) ☐ Chronically homeless (CH) (2 pts)
Please describe the agency's unique ability to serve the above population(s) and share any relevant data to support your response. (Please limit to 250 words.) (5 pts)	
4-5 Points: Demonstrates a history of serving this population. Discussed the population and the ability to best serve this population with the funding. Requested Provides Multiple data points to support response. 2-3 points: Limited description with the limited data provided. 0-1 points: Population served description is not clear or fully thought out. No data is provided.	
Will you have any units in your project that require program participant engagement in substance abuse treatment services as a condition of continued participation in the program? (p 78) (5 pts) If yes, how many units?	☐ Yes + number of units >0 =5 ☐ No =0 Number of Units: _____

Narrative Response Questions

Supportive Service Provision (10 points)	Describe how your project provides the treatment and services that people need to recover and regain self-sufficiency (including on-site behavioral health treatment, robust wraparound supportive services, and participation requirements for these services). If not on-site, provide the partnerships and corresponding MOUs for providing this care. (please limit to 250 words)
8–10 Points: The agency provides a combination of both on-site and off-site comprehensive supportive services, with all relevant policies and Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) included in the application. The narrative clearly describes how these services are integrated into daily operations and demonstrates an established history of delivering participant-centered care. The agency highlights practices such as engaging participants in individualized goal planning, implementing creative strategies to promote engagement and retention, and providing ongoing case management training to ensure high-quality, consistent service delivery. These examples reflect a strong commitment to coordinated, person-centered care and support the agency's capacity to effectively meet participant needs. 5-7 points: The agency provides comprehensive supportive services off-site, but MOUs and partnership agreements are shared with this application. Description of linkages is strong and shows history of care. 3-6 points: Agency provides supportive services but has limited examples of specific practices. 0-2 points: Agency does not have a clear strategy for providing ongoing services.	
Knowledge shared from persons who were homeless in the past (5 points)	How does your program currently involve people who were formerly homeless? i.e., employment/volunteer opportunities, peer support, mentorship, members of Board/Advisory Committees, etc. (please limit to 250 words)
4-5 points: Agency has one or more individual(s) involved with the program who has lived experience 2-3 points: Agency has plans, and can produce evidence of a plan, to ensure one or more individual(s) involved with the program has lived experience 0-1 points: Agency has no individuals involved with the program with lived experience.	
Minimizing Trauma (5 points)	Describe how your program minimizes the trauma associated with homelessness. This could include trauma informed care services, ensuring participant safety in programs, especially for youth and survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

	(please limit to 250 words)
4-5 points: Agency demonstrates the ability to minimize trauma as described in the question above. 2-3 points: Agency has plans, and can produce evidence of a plan, to ensure the program will minimize trauma as described in the question above. 0-1 points: Agency does not have the ability to provide this level of care and does not have a plan in place to provide this level of care.	
Addressing the Goals of the NOFO (10 points)	How will your project advance the goals described in the NOFO? (Beginning on page 28) This includes optimizing self-sufficiency, reducing homelessness, prioritizing treatment and recovery, advancing public safety, and minimizing the trauma caused to communities as a whole by homelessness.
9–10 Points: Provides a comprehensive, well-supported response that addresses all NOFO goals with specific examples, measurable outcomes, and a clear connection between project activities and expected impacts. 7–8 Points: Addresses most NOFO goals with adequate detail and examples but lacks specificity or measurable outcomes in one or two areas. 5–6 Points: Addresses some NOFO goals but provides limited detail, weak connections to project activities, or few examples. 3–4 Points: Provides a general response that addresses only a few NOFO goals or lacks sufficient explanation of how the project advances them. 1–2 Points: Response is minimal, vague, or demonstrates little understanding of the NOFO goals. 0 Points: Does not address the question or provides information unrelated to the NOFO goals.	

All performance data is for 10/1/24-9/30/25.
Financial data is for the most recently completed Fiscal Year.

Utilization: 10 points 3 points for utilization rate ≥85% in 2023 3 points for utilization rate ≥85% in 2024 3 points for utilization rate ≥85% in 2025 1 bonus point if ≥85% all three years	Projected households served during average PIT: ____ Utilization rate from APRs: 2023: 2024: 2025: Households Average Actual/ Projected = Utilization %
Data Quality: 10 points	Were the following error rates below 5% for APR Q6 from 10/1/24-9/30/25?

2 points for each	Personally, Identifying Information (6a) ☐ Yes ☐ No Universal Data Elements (6b) ☐ Yes ☐ No Income and Housing Data Quality (6c) ☐ Yes ☐ No Chronic Homelessness (6d) ☐ Yes ☐ No Were 95% of entries added into HMIS within 72 hours or less? (6e) ☐ Yes ☐ No
Permanent Housing Placement & Retention: 10 points For PSH, 4 points if $\geq 93\%$ For RRH, 4 points if $\geq 50\%$ 6 points if $\geq 20\%$	For PSH, what percentage of clients served from 10/1/24-9/30/25 either stayed in the project or exited to a permanent housing destination? (APR Q5a#8 Stayers, Q23c Exiting to housing destinations) Equation to use: (Positive housing destinations + Stayers) / (Total Participants – Persons excluded) For RRH, of the clients who exited your project from 10/1/24-9/30/25, what percentage exited to a permanent housing destination? (APR Q23c) For all projects, what percentage of exits from 10/1/24-9/30/25 were to unsubsidized housing? (APR 23c – “Rental by client, no ongoing housing subsidy” or “Owned by client, no ongoing housing subsidy.”)
Employment Income Growth: 10 points 5 points if $\geq 20\%$ 5 points if $\geq 25\%$	What percentage of clients enrolled in your program from 10/1/24-9/30/25 increased their employment income (APR Q19a1 and Q19a2)? What percentage of clients who exited your program from 10/1/24-9/30/25 exited with an increase in employment income? (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
Returns to Homelessness: (PEH will calculate this and send it to you) 10 points 5 points if $\leq 7\%$, 2 points if $\leq 11\%$	Percentage of those exiting to permanent housing between 10/1/22-9/30/2023 that returned to homelessness in two years or less.

5 points if <= 8%, 2 points if <= 16%	Percentage returning to homelessness within 1 year: _____ Percentage returning to homelessness within 2 years: _____
Self-Sufficiency: 5 points (page 61)	Describe assessments that your agency uses with your clients to develop a service plan that helps to increase self-sufficiency and leads to long term economic independence. Describe how these assessments have shown improvement in these areas over time.
5-Provides a thorough description of the assessment tools used with clients, clearly explains how assessment results inform individualized service plans that increase self-sufficiency and support long-term economic independence, and includes measurable outcomes or data demonstrating improvement over time. 4-Describes the assessment tools and explains how they are used to develop service plans. Demonstrates how services promote self-sufficiency and economic independence with some evidence or examples of improvement, though data or detail may be limited. 3-Identifies assessment tools and discusses service planning but provides limited detail on how assessments support self-sufficiency or long-term economic independence. Evidence of improvement is general or anecdotal. 2-Provides a basic description of assessments or services but does not clearly explain how assessments are used to develop service plans or measure progress. Minimal evidence of improvement over time. 1-Response is vague, incomplete, or minimally addresses the question. Little connection between assessments, service planning, and outcomes. 0-No response or the response does not address the question.	

APR Submission: 4 points 1 point if “Yes” for 2023 1 point if “Yes” for 2024 1 point if “Yes” for 2025 1 bonus point if “Yes” for all three years	Was the project’s APR submitted on time for the following years? 2023 ☐ Yes ☐ No 2024 ☐ Yes ☐ No 2025 ☐ Yes ☐ No
Monitoring: Yes=0 points No=5 points	Were there significant findings for your project during CoC monitoring over the last three years? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Drawdown Efficiency: (7 points) 5 points if >= 95% 2 points if “Yes”	What percentage of HUD expenditures were drawn down from the project's APR for the year ending 2025? Did the project draw down funds at least once per quarter for the year ending 2025? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Cost of Success rate: (10 points) 10 points: Equal to or lower than the CoC average cost per household for the specific project type 7 points: Within 10% of the CoC average cost per household for the specific project type 5 points: Within 15% of the CoC average cost per household for the specific project type 3 points: Within 20% of the CoC average cost per household for the specific project type 0 points: Exceeds 20% of the CoC average cost per household for the specific project type	HUD grant amount divided by the number of persons with a successful exit or remained stable in PH from the 10/1/2024 - 9/30/2025 APR:
Participation in the CoC: (5 points) • 20% to 30% of total funding = 6 people • 15% to 19% of total funding = 5 people • 10% to 14% of total funding = 4 people • 5% to 9% of total funding = 3 people • 2% to 4% of total funding = 2 People	Did the Agency attend the January 2026 PIT Count in proportion to the percentage of CoC funding as seen on the monitor? ☐ Yes = 5 ☐ No = 0
The Agency takes 100% of referrals from CE. (5 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No

Yes=5 points No=0 points	
Mitigating Factors: Please explain any outcomes that you think do not accurately portray your program or anything you want the reviewers to know about your program not covered in the application questions. (Please be specific and keep the word count total under 500 words) (5 points) 5= Provides a clear, specific, and well-supported explanation of outcomes or context not fully reflected in reported data. Effectively explains external factors (e.g. staffing concerns, funding disruptions). Clarifies program performance while outlining a corrective and implemented action plan. Or application demonstrates that the project performed very well and there is no need for mitigating factors. 4= Provides a solid explanation of mitigating factors with relevant detail. Addresses discrepancies or missing context and helps reviewers understand performance outcomes. Some minor lack of specificity or limited connection to program strengths. 3= Provides a general explanation of mitigating factors but lacks depth, specificity, or clear linkage to outcomes. Some context is given, but it does not fully clarify performance data or program impact. 2= Mentions mitigating factors in a vague or limited way. Minimal explanation of how external or internal issues affected outcomes. Does not clearly help interpret program performance. 1= Response is minimal, unclear, or largely unrelated to the question. Little to no meaningful context provided for outcomes. 0= No response or entirely off-topic.	



Scoring Rubric

Partners Ending Homelessness 2026 HMIS Renewal Project Ranking Criteria

Applications are due Wednesday, July 15th by 5 pm.
Single Project Applications must be submitted in a single PDF to
PEH via email: jkeys@letsendhomelessness.org
Project applications must also be submitted in E-Snaps by Tuesday, August 11th
by 5pm.
Scoring Rubric will be on our website.
[CoC Funding - Partners Ending Homelessness](#)

Organization Name:	
Project Name:	
Contact Person	
Phone Number	
Email	

Project Type (check correct box)	
Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)	X

Threshold Requirements: All projects are required to meet or agree with threshold requirements to be considered for funding.	
The agency has reviewed all HUD requirements and provisions outlined on pages 106-108 of the NOFO and agrees to abide by them.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
The agency also agrees to abide by the following additional questions outlined in the same area of the NOFO on page 108:	
Awards under this NOFO will not be used to engage in illegal racial discrimination, including racial preferences.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree

Awards under this NOFO will not be distributed in a way that violates or otherwise is used to interfere with constitutional protections guaranteed for speech and religious beliefs and the free exercise of religion.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Awards made under this NOFO will not be used to fund any project, service provider, or organization that operates illegal drug injection sites of “safe consumption sites” in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 856, knowingly permit the use or distribution of illicit drugs on property under their control in violation of 21 U.S.C. 856(a)(2), or knowingly distribute drug paraphernalia in violation of 21 USC 863. This is not a requirement that program participants must be sober in order to receive assistance, participate in treatment in order to receive assistance, or be evicted or exited from assistance for a first-time violation of a drug-related program policy or lease requirement.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Pursuant to 2 CFR 200.332(b)(2), all agreements or contracts made with subrecipients under this NOFO must contain the same terms and conditions as those in the grant agreement issued by HUD. Any conflicting terms and conditions must be approved by HUD.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Applicant is a non-profit organization, including a faith based organization, with active 501(c)3 status, a public housing authority, a local government organization, or another eligible entity as specified in the NOFO. (Please see page 9 of the NOFO for a detailed listing of eligible applicants.)	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Applicant agrees to uphold protections of VAWA (§ 5.2005 VAWA protections) including: confidentiality protections, use of emergency transfer plans, and regular staff training regarding VAWA.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Applicant has attached the management letter from the agency's most recent fiscal audit demonstrating that the agency is in good standing.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
If agency does not meet threshold requirements, stop scoring. Agency is not eligible for CoC funding.	

Addressing the Goals of the NOFO (10 points)	How will your project advance the goals described in the NOFO? (Beginning on page 28) This includes optimizing self-sufficiency, reducing homelessness, prioritizing treatment and recovery, advancing public safety, and minimizing the trauma caused to communities as a whole by homelessness.
9–10 Points: Provides a comprehensive, well-supported response that addresses all NOFO goals with specific examples, measurable outcomes, and a clear connection between project activities and expected impacts. 7–8 Points: Addresses most NOFO goals with adequate detail and examples but lacks specificity or measurable outcomes in one or two areas. 5–6 Points: Addresses some NOFO goals but provides limited detail, weak connections to project activities, or few examples. 3–4 Points: Provides a general response that addresses only a few NOFO goals or lacks sufficient explanation of how the project advances them. 1–2 Points: Response is minimal, vague, or demonstrates little understanding of the NOFO goals. 0 Points: Does not address the question or provides information unrelated to the NOFO goals.	

APR Submission: (4 points total) 1 point if “Yes” for 2023 1 point if “Yes” for 2024 1 point if “Yes” for 2025 1 bonus point if “Yes” for all three years	Was the project’s APR submitted on time for the following years? 2023 ☐ Yes ☐ No 2024 ☐ Yes ☐ No 2025 ☐ Yes ☐ No
Drawdown Efficiency: (7 points) 5 points if >= 95% 2 points if “Yes”	What percentage of HUD expenditures were drawn down from the project's APR for the year ending 2025? Did the project draw down funds at least once per quarter for the year ending 2025? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Participation in the CoC: (5 points) • 20% to 30% of total funding = 6 people • 15% to 19% of total funding = 5 people • 10% to 14% of total funding = 4 people	Did the Agency attend the January 2026 PIT Count in proportion to the percentage of CoC funding as seen on the monitor? ☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 5 No = 0

• 5% to 9% of total funding = 3 people • 2% to 4% of total funding = 2 People		
What is the coverage rate of HMIS participation for each of the following CoC Project Types as measured in the 2026 Housing Inventory Count (HIC)?	Emergency Shelter	%
	Safe Haven	%
	Transitional Housing	%
	Rapid Re-Housing	%
	Permanent Supportive Housing	%
	Is the coverage rate greater than 95% of the current bed inventory/programs, as measured on the 2026 HIC? (8 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 8 points No = 0 points
If the HMIS participation rate is not 100%, what plans do you have to increase participation? (250 words or less) (10 points) (Note: 10 points automatically awarded if participation is 100% for all housing types.)	10 Points: Automatically awarded if HMIS participation is 100% for all applicable housing/project types. If participation is below 100%, response provides a clear, actionable plan to increase participation, including identification of non-participating providers or project types, outreach and engagement strategies, timeline, responsible parties, technical assistance or training supports, and steps to address barriers to HMIS participation. 8–9 Points: Response provides a strong plan to increase HMIS participation with specific strategies and a reasonable timeline, but lacks detail in one area, such as responsible parties, provider-specific outreach, or how barriers will be addressed. 6–7 Points: Response identifies general steps to increase participation, such as outreach, training, or follow-up with providers, but the plan is only partially developed or lacks a clear timeline and accountability. 3–5 Points: Response acknowledges that participation is below 100% and provides limited or vague plans to improve participation, with little detail on implementation, barriers, or expected progress. 1–2 Points: Response provides minimal information and does not demonstrate a meaningful or actionable plan to increase HMIS participation.	

	0 Points: Does not address the question, provides no plan, or indicates no effort to increase HMIS participation when participation is below 100%.
Does the HMIS system collect all Universal Data Elements as set forth in the 2026 HMIS Data Standards? (5 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 5 points No = 0 points
Does the HMIS system collect all applicable Program Specific Data Elements as set forth in the 2026 HMIS Data Standards and other Federal Program Data Collection Requirements (i.e., RHY and VA programs)? (5 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 5 points No = 0 points
Is HMIS able to un-duplicate client records and to facilitate an unduplicated count of persons experiencing homelessness? (5 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 5 points No = 0 points
Does the HMIS system produce all HUD-required reports and provide data as needed for HUD reporting (i.e. – APR, CAPER, PIT, HIC, LSA and System Performance) and reporting required by local, state, and other federal partners? (5 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 5 points No = 0 points

Were the following reports submitted to HUD on time? (20 points total)	
Longitudinal System Analysis (LSA) (5 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 5 points; No = 0 points
System Performance Measures (SPM) (5 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 5 points; No = 0 points
Point in Time (PIT) and Housing Inventory Count (HIC) (5 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 5 points; No = 0 points
Yes, to all three reports (5 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 5 points; No = 0 points
Does an HMIS staff person actively participate in the Coordinated Entry Oversight Meetings? (10 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 10 points; No = 0 points

What initiatives have you worked on in the past year to improve system performance? (250 words or less) (20 points)	17–20 Points: Response identifies multiple, substantive initiatives completed or significantly advanced in the past year to improve HMIS/system performance. Initiatives are clearly connected to measurable system performance outcomes, such as data quality, timeliness, reporting accuracy, HMIS coverage, workflow efficiency, user support, training, monitoring, or improved HUD reporting. Response includes specific examples, evidence of implementation, and results or progress achieved. 13–16 Points: Response identifies one or more meaningful initiatives and explains how they support system performance, but the response lacks detail in one area, such as measurable outcomes, implementation status, or connection to HUD/system performance reporting. 9–12 Points: Response describes general activities or improvements related to HMIS/system performance, but examples are limited, outcomes are unclear, or the connection to system performance is only partially explained. 5–8 Points: Response provides minimal detail or describes routine maintenance only, with little explanation of how activities improved system performance or addressed identified gaps. 1–4 Points: Response is vague, incomplete, or does not demonstrate meaningful work completed in the past year to improve system performance. 0 Points: Does not address the question or provides information unrelated to HMIS/system performance initiatives.
In the past year, have HMIS staff participated in training to build their skills and capacity? (10 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 10 points; No = 0 points
Have HMIS policies and procedures been reviewed in the past year? (10 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 10 points; No = 0 points
Is HMIS Project Inventory reviewed and updated, as needed, at least Annually? (20 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 20 points; No = 0 points

Do you have an active HMIS Advisory Committee that meets regularly? (15 points)	☐ Yes ☐ No Yes = 15 points; No = 0 points
Knowledge shared from persons who were homeless in the past (5 points) How does your program currently involve people who were formerly homeless? i.e., employment/volunteer opportunities, peer support, mentorship, members of Board/Advisory Committees, etc. (please limit to 250 words)	4-5 points: Clearly demonstrates meaningful involvement of people who were formerly homeless. Explains how contributions from people who were formerly homeless have been intentionally applied to improve the program. 2-3 points: Shows some involvement of people who were formerly homeless, but involvement is limited. Fails to show that input from people who were formerly homeless was practically implemented. 0-1 points: Has not had any people who were formerly homeless involved or people who were formerly homeless were involved in the past but are no longer given opportunities to contribute.

Total Points: 174