**Introduction**

**Purpose of Scorecard:** The purpose of the scorecard is to provide a report of an individual agency’s performance throughout its most recent performance in comparison to the Continuum of Care (CoC) as a whole. The scorecard serves as a tool to identify how agencies are performing on established HUD system performance measures and local priorities. An agency’s overall performance will be a determining factor in its ranking among other agencies, and will impact the Continuum of Care’s community application score from HUD. As a result, it is important that each agency scores well locally to increase the overall community score for TX-601. Increasing the total TX-601 CoC score raises the likelihood of funding compared to other CoCs across the nation.

**How the Categorical Percentage is Established:** The percentage range on questions 1-5 was established using an Annual Performance Report (APR) for each program with the date range of June 1, 2016 – May 31, 2017**.** This date range provides a CoC-wide average baseline for the scorecard measures related to APRs. Once the average was calculated for each measure, a +/-5% deviation was established for the range (i.e. Average = 15%; Range = 10%-20%). The range around the actual average percentage is eligible for 5 points; project percentages above the specified average range are eligible for 10 points; and, project percentages below the specified average range are eligible for 0 points. This method allows programs to be compared and scored specifically to other programs of the same type. Please reference Section 7: Score Interpretation for more information. Other question percentage ranges were obtained from information derived from other sources including but not limited to NAEH, HUD, and eSNAPS project applications.

**Section 1**

**Project Performance (40%)**

* 1. **Percentage of chronically homeless households served**
1. **Purpose:** Indicates project success in ending chronic homelessness by measuring the number of chronically homeless participants served in the project during the measured year.
2. **Scoring Metric:** Meets or exceeds performance average for CoC PSH and RRH projects across the continuum.
3. **Calculation:** Measured using the number of clients served from June 1, 2016 – May 31, 2017 who are chronically homeless found on APR Q26a.
	1. **Percentage of participants who remained in PSH or exited to permanent housing**
4. **Purpose:** Indicates project success in ending homelessness by measuring the number of participants with a permanent destination at project exit and those who remained in a permanent supportive housing project compared to the total number of participants active in the project during the measured year.
5. **Scoring Metric:** Meets or exceeds performance average for CoC PSH and RRH projects across the continuum.
6. **PSH Calculation:** Measured using the number of leavers to permanent destinations plus all project stayers compared to the total number of active participants in the measured year. Those who left for reason of “deceased” will be not be included in the overall total.
	1. Example: APR Q5a states that 30 clients were served in the program year; APR Q23a and Q23b states that 10 clients were dismissed from the project, 6 exited to permanent housing. (6+20)/30 = 87%
7. **RRH Calculation:** Calculated by the number of clients reported in APR Q23a and Q23b who exited to permanent destinations divided by the total number of participants active in the project; participants reported as “deceased” will not be included in as a project leaver.
	1. **Percentage of adults at exit or annual assessment who retained, gained or increased employment income**
8. **Purpose:** Indicates that the project is assisting households to increase self-sufficiency and stabilize housing by retaining or gaining employment income.
9. **Scoring Metric**: Meets or exceeds performance average for all projects across the continuum.
10. **Calculation:** Determined by the number of adults who were reported to have retained, gained or increased their earned income as reported on APR Q19a3, line 1, columns “Retained Income w/ Same $ at Exit/Latest”, “Retained Income Category w/ More $ at Exit/Latest”, and “Did Not Have at Entry Gained at Exit/Latest”.
	1. Calculated by adding data reported in APRQ19a3, line 1 and dividing by the total number of adults with an update assessment in the reporting period.
	2. Example: Q19a3 states 2 adults as “Retained Income w/ Same $ at Exit/Latest”, 1 adult “Retained Income Category w/ More $ at Exit/Latest”, and 3 adults “Did Not Have at Entry Gained at Exit/Latest”. There is a total of 10 adults reported. (2+1+3)/10=60%
	3. **Percentage of adults at exit or annual assessment who retained, gained, or increased non-employment cash income**
11. **Purpose:** Indicates that the project is assisting participants toward self-sufficiency through retaining or increasing income by utilizing all possible resources available to participants.
12. **Scoring Metric:** Meets or exceeds prior performance average for all projects across the continuum.
13. **Calculation:** Determined by the number of adults who were reported to have retained, gained or increased their earned income as reported on APR Q19a3, line 3, columns “Retained Income w/ Same $ at Exit/Latest”, “Retained Income Category w/ More $ at Exit/Latest”, and “Did Not Have at Entry Gained at Exit/Latest”.
	1. Calculated by adding data reported in APRQ19a3, line 3 and dividing by the total number of adults with an update assessment in the reporting period.
	2. Example: Q19a3 states 6 adults as “Retained Income w/ Same $ at Exit/Latest”, 2 adults “Retained Income w/ Same $ at Exit/Latest”, and 5 adults “Did Not Have at Entry Gained at Exit/Latest”. There is a total of 20 adults reported. (6+2+5)/20=65%
	3. **Percentage of leavers who exited to shelter, streets, or unknown**
14. **Purpose:** Indicates if clients who exit the program are immediately returning to homelessness.
15. **Scoring Metric:** Meets or exceeds prior performance average for all projects across the continuum.
16. **Calculation:** Measured using the number of leavers reported in APR Q23a and Q23b who exited to emergency shelter, place not meant for human habitation and don’t know/refused and compared to the total number of leavers in the measured year.
	1. Calculated by adding the number of clients who exited to emergency shelter, place not meant for human habitation and don’t know/refused as reported in APR Q23a and Q23b, and divided by the total number of leavers.
	2. Example: APR Q23a and Q23b states that there are 6 participants who have exited to emergency shelter, 3 who exited to a place not meant for human habitation and 1 who’s exit destination was unknown; there were a total of 30 leavers in the project in the year. (6+3+1)/30=33%

**Section 2**

**Utilization & Expenditure (5%)**

* 1. **Quarterly Occupancy Utilization Rate**
1. **Purpose:** Indicates efficient use of community resources. High occupancy indicates system efficiency and community demand for services. Project occupancy data is reported to HUD twice a year via the Housing Inventory Chart (HIC) and the Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR).
2. **Scoring Metric:** Maintains threshold of at least 90-150% of proposed capacity from June 1, 2016 - December 31, 2016 based on the stated goal in the most recent project application. This date range was chosen due to the redesign and implementation of the Coordinated Entry System.
3. **Calculation:** Household units served during June 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016 as reported on APR Q8b and compared to proposed unit capacity in project application, Q4b – Total Units.
	1. Calculated by average of APR Q8b quarterly households served (June – December) divided by Application Q4b proposed households served
	2. Example: Q4b states maximum number of units available is 5 units. Q8b shows an average of 4 units were occupied from June 2016 – December 2016. 4/5=80% occupancy for the specified date range.
	3. **Percentage of total grant funds that were recaptured in the most recent grant closeout**
4. **Purpose:** It is important to HUD that programs show agency capacity to spend funds allocated in a timely manner and in full and allows for potential fund reallocation of unspent funds during the HUD CoC Competition.
5. **Scoring Metric:** Projects with no funds recaptured will be considered as exceeding the minimum requirement.
6. **Calculation:** Project’s most recent project closeout letter (or LOCCS information in the absence of a closeout letter from HUD for most recently closed grant year). The amount unspent will be divided by the total grant funds allocated to establish the rate.

**Section 3**

**Project Financials (5%)**

* 1. **Quarterly eLOCCS draw down rate**
1. **Purpose:** It is important to HUD that programs show agency capacity to quarterly drawdown funds during the HUD CoC Competition.
2. **Scoring Metric:** Projects with three or more quarterly drawdowns will be considered as exceeding the minimum requirement.
3. **Calculation:** Quarterly drawdowns will be self-reported by the project’s corresponding agency. If there are less than three quarterly drawdowns during the project year, the project will not receive any points for this item.
	1. **Annual cost per successful exit or retention of PSH**
4. **Purpose:** It is important to HUD that programs demonstrate cost efficiency in terms of housing clients.
5. **Scoring Metric:** Meets or exceeds performance average for all projects across the continuum. PSH programs will be compared to other PSH programs only and RRH programs will be compared to other RRH programs only.
6. **Calculation:** Total budgets (including match) and proposed number of persons to be served were gathered from FY 2016 eSNAPS applications. The cost per person was established for each project. An average cost per person within PSH projects was calculated. This same method was utilized for RRH projects. If a project’s cost per successful exit or retention of PSH is within the community average, the project will meet minimum requirements. If a project’s cost per successful exit or retention of PSH is more than the community average, the project will fail to meet the threshold for this requirement.

**Section 4**

**HMIS & Data Quality (45%)**

* 1. **Personal Identifying Information Error Rate**
1. **Purpose:** To achieve accurate data collection and to satisfy HUD HMIS data requirements, projects must ensure that data entered into the local HMIS system is complete.
2. **Scoring Metric:** Projects that exceed an error rate of 5% as reported on Q2: Personal Identifying Information on the HUD Data Quality Report will fail to meet threshold for this measurement.
3. **Calculation:** Error rates will be evaluated based on the overall error rate percentage for Q2 on the HUD Data Quality Report. Personal identifying information includes name, social security number, date of birth, race, ethnicity, and gender. The report calculates an error rate for each category and establishes an overall error rate percentage.
	1. **Universal Data Elements Error Rate**
4. **Purpose:** To achieve accurate data collection and to satisfy HUD HMIS data requirements, projects must ensure that data entered into the local HMIS system is complete.
5. **Scoring Metric:** Projects that exceed an error rate of 5% as reported on Q3 and Q4: Universal Data Elements on the HUD Data Quality Report will fail to meet threshold for this measurement.
6. **Calculation:** Error rates will be evaluated based on the overall error rate percentage for Q3 and Q4 on the HUD Data Quality Report. Universal data elements include veteran status, project entry date, relationship to head of household, client location, disabling condition, and destination. The report calculates an error rate for each category and establishes an overall error rate.
	1. **HMIS Site Visit**
7. **Purpose:** HUD HMIS Data Standards requires the HMIS Lead to conduct Annual Site Audits to ensure project compliance in areas of system security protocols, IT assessment and data quality.
8. **Scoring Metric:** Projects will be scored as “In Compliance” or “Action Needed” on each section. Agencies who are not in compliance upon completion of the Site Visit will fail to meet the threshold for this requirement.
9. **Calculation:** Each section on the Site Visit checklist will be evaluated at either 1 point (In Compliance) or no points (Action Needed). There are 12 sections resulting in 12 total possible points. If an agency has 11 sections scored as “In Compliance” and 1 section scored as “Action Needed”, their overall score would be 11/12 = 91.6%.

**Section 5**

**CoC Participation (5%)**

* 1. **2017 PIT Count Participation**
1. **Purpose:** Indicates if agency is participating in CoC-related activities
2. **Scoring Metric:** Projects that participated in the 2017 PIT Count will receive full points. Projects that did not participate in the 2017 PIT Count will fail to meet the threshold for this requirement.
3. **Calculation:** PIT registration check-in data will be used to identify agencies that assisted in conducting the count (volunteering with set-up or counting). Emails will be used as documentation for agency’s that submitted data on PIT shelter populations.
	1. **CoC General Meeting Attendance**
4. **Purpose:** Indicates if agency is participating in CoC-related activities
5. **Scoring Metric:** Agencies will be scored according to the number of CoC General Meetings attended from July 2016 – June 2017
6. **Calculation:** Measured through general meeting sign-in sheets from July 2016 – June 2017.There is a total of 10 scheduled CoC General Meetings (excluding the January Annual Luncheon and December Holiday General Meeting). The number of general meetings attended by an agency will be divided by 10 to get the total percentage of general meeting attendance. If an agency has not attended at least 5 out of 10 scheduled CoC General Meetings, the agency will fail to meet the threshold for this measure.

**Section 6**

**Test Items**

**Important Note:** This section is **not** part of the FY2017 total project score. They are test questions to begin evaluating performance in the specified areas. These questions may be scored during future competitions.

1. **Client project enrollment to move-in date**
2. **Purpose:** TX-601 set a community-wide goal to house clients within 60 days of project enrollment. This metric will allow TX-601 to measure progress towards reaching this goal.
3. **Scoring Metric:** Projects will be evaluated based on the length of time from project enrollment to move-in. Projects that meet the 60-day criteria will exceed this measure.
4. **Calculation:** An HMIS Report will be used to calculate the time between project enrollment and move-in.
5. **Participation in case conferencing, monthly meetings, etc**
6. **Purpose:** Each CoC-funded agency is required by HUD to participate in the Coordinated Entry System. This measure indicates if agencies are actively participating in Coordinated Entry.
7. **Scoring Metric:** Agencies that do not attend at least 50% of case conferences and other Coordinated Entry-related meetings will fail to meet the threshold for this measure.
8. **Calculation:** Sign-in sheets will be used to determine the participation by each agency.
9. **Percentage of newly enrolled clients from HomeBase**
10. **Purpose:** TX-601 set a community-wide goal of accepting at least 90% of clients referred from the HomeBase list (no more than 10% denial rate). This metric will allow TX-601 to measure progress towards reaching this goal.
11. **Scoring Metric:** Projects that do not accept at least 90% of clients from HomeBase will fail to meet the threshold for this requirement.
12. **Calculation:** The enrollment of new clients into a project will be calculated using HomeBase reports.
13. **Timeliness of data entry**
14. **Purpose:** To ensure compliance and timely data entry in the HMIS
15. **Scoring Metric:** Projects that enter client data within three days will meet the minimum threshold for this requirement.
16. **Calculation:** Timeliness will be evaluated based on Q6 of the HUD Data Quality Report.

**Section 7**

**Score Interpretation**

**Total Project Score:** The total project score is calculated based on Total Possible Points as compared to Total Achieved Points.

For example, if there are 100 points available on the scorecard, but a project does not participate in HMIS and would otherwise lose 10 points on that category, then that agency is only eligible for 90 Total Possible Points (versus the initial 100 points available). If the project receives 70 points, then the Total Project Score would be 70 Total Achieved Points / 90 Total Possible Points = **78%.**

**Weighted Score:** There are five sections on the scorecard: APR Performance Data (40%), Utilization & Expenditure (5%), Financials (5%), HMIS & Data Quality (45%), and CoC Participation (5%). Each section is given its own score and weighted differently according to local and HUD priorities.

For example, if there are 70 points eligible in the APR category for a project, and the project receives 50 points, then the weighted score would be (40 APR Achieved Points / 50 Possible APR Points) \* 40% = 32% Achieved for APR Performance Data.

**Percentage Achieved Formula = (Total Points Achieved / Total Points Available) \* Category Weight**

The percentage achieved for each category is added together resulting in the Total Project Score.

**Total Project Score = APR Performance Data Weighted Percentage + Utilization & Expenditure Weighted Percentage + Financial Weighted Percentage + HMIS & Data Quality Weighted Percentage + CoC Participation Weighted Percentage**