



OFFICE OF COMMUNITY &
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Collaborative solutions for a promising future

2022 RUBRIC REVIEW

Washtenaw County
Continuum of Care

3/25 AGENDA

- | | |
|---------|----------------------------|
| 10:00am | Welcome & Introductions |
| 10:15am | Review Current Rubric |
| 10:30am | Review Ranking Policy |
| 10:45am | BREAK |
| 10:55am | Process Update |
| 11:00am | Cost Effectiveness Measure |
| 11:20am | Wrap-up, Next Steps |

INTRODUCTION

The background features a complex, abstract geometric pattern. On the left, a solid blue vertical band contains the word 'INTRODUCTION' in white, uppercase, sans-serif font. The rest of the image is filled with overlapping, semi-transparent polygons in various colors: shades of blue, green, yellow, red, and white. The polygons are arranged in a way that creates a sense of depth and movement, with some shapes appearing to be layered on top of others.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Each year, the Funding Review Team, a CoC subcommittee, reviews program outcomes, compliance, and data quality for CoC Grant Funded programs in order to make recommendations to the CoC board about funding prioritization

To score and rank projects, we use scoring rubrics for renewal projects and applications for new projects

For each competition, we update the rubrics to include community feedback and align our rubrics with federal priorities, such as housing first or improving racial equity

In short, the CoC wants your input into how we make our funding decisions!

2022 RUBRIC REVIEW GOALS

The CoC has established the following priorities for this year's Rubric Review

- Review our **Ranking Policy**
- Update our **process** so providers present to the Funding Review Team
- Finalize a **cost effectiveness measure** (to align with HUD Notice of Funding Opportunity, or NOFO)
 - Should we score this measure?
- Add a **racial equity** section (to align with HUD priorities)
- Update **HMIS Section**
- Develop application materials for **all new project types**
 - PSH Expansion
 - RRH Expansion
 - HMIS Expansion
 - Joint TH-RRH
 - Services Only—Coordinated Entry
- Are there **any other changes needed?**



CURRENT RUBRIC

2021 RUBRIC

CoC RENEWAL PROJECT RUBRIC

AGENCY:	PROGRAM:	PROJECT TYPE:
AGENCY LEVEL THRESHOLD		
Agency Level Threshold requires agencies to meet local funding standards and be an active participant in the CoC based on the criteria below.		
THRESHOLD DESCRIPTION		THRESHOLD MET (YES/NO)
Agency meets the financial audit requirements stipulated under the Coordinated Funding Request for Information (RFI).		
Agency has attended at least 1 of 2 CoC All-Membership Meetings in the past 12 months.		
Agency has representation in at least one of the CoC committees (i.e. WHA Operations Committee, Coordinated Entry Oversight & Evaluation) and has attended at least 75% of meetings convened by the committee.		
Agency has a 75 % attendance rate at Community Housing Prioritization Meetings.		
PROJECT LEVEL THRESHOLD		
Threshold needs to be met as described below for projects to be considered for funding renewal. Projects falling within certain score ranges will need to submit a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), as stated below. Please note: Projects that have not completed a full calendar year will be EXEMPT from this threshold.		
THRESHOLD DESCRIPTION	OUTCOME PERCENTAGE	THRESHOLD MET (YES/NO/EXEMPT)
Program Outcomes: Project attained above 60% of the total score possible. If not, projects scoring between 20-60% will need to submit a CAP and below 20% will not be considered for funding.	%	
Compliance: Project attained above 70% of the total score possible. If not, projects scoring between 50-70% will need to submit a CAP and below 50% will not be considered for funding.	%	
HMIS Compliance & Data Quality: Project attained above 85% of the total score. If not, projects scoring between 55-85% will need to submit a CAP and below 55% will not be considered for funding.	%	
<i>NOTE: For threshold items that are not met, the agency will need to submit an explanatory letter to the CoC Funding Review Team to request a waiver for each threshold item not met before the project application can be considered for funding.</i>		

2021 RUBRIC

SECTION 1 - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROJECT NARRATIVE (INSERT HERE)

The project narrative addresses the entire scope of the proposed project at full operational capacity. The project description should address the entire scope of the project, including:

- community need
- target population(s)
- the plan for addressing the identified needs/issues of the CoC target population(s)
- projected outcome(s)
- coordination with other source(s)/partner(s) and how participants will be helped to access mainstream services
- reasons why CoC support is needed
- For projects targeting youth ONLY: Information & data about how youth head of households increased life skills and supports system

TARGET POPULATION (check all that apply)

- Chronically Homeless
- Veterans
- Youth (under 25)
- Families with Children
- Domestic Violence
- Substance Abuse
- HIV/AIDS
- Other

PROJECTED HOUSING TYPE (check all that apply)

- Scattered-site apartments:** Total Units ___ # Agency Owned ___
- Clustered apartments:** Total Units ___ # Agency Owned ___
- Single Room Occupancy:** Total Units ___ # Agency Owned ___
- Single-family homes/townhouses/duplexes:**
Total Units ___ # Agency Owned ___
- Other:** _____ Total Units ___ # Agency Owned ___

PROJECTED UNITS/BEDS

Total Units: ___ (total agency-owned) ___
Total Beds: ___

PROJECTED CLIENTS SERVED

Total Households Served: ___
Total Persons Served: ___
Total Adults: ___
Total Accompanied Children (Under 18): ___
Unaccompanied Children (Under 18): ___

2021 RUBRIC

SECTION 2 - PROJECT OUTCOMES				
SEE APPENDIX A: PROJECT OUTCOME CALCULATIONS FOR DETAILS ABOUT DATA SOURCES AND CALCULATING SCORES IN THIS SECTION				
2A – PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING (PSH) PROJECT OUTCOMES				
CRITERIA	STANDARD	AGENCY RATE	SCORING	POINTS/AVAILABLE
A) Retention of Permanent Housing or Movement to Other Permanent Housing $\left[\frac{\text{No. of stayers} + \text{No. of leavers exiting to PH types}}{\text{Total no. of persons served}} \right] \times 100\%$	95%	%	95% or > = 20 91-94% = 18 87-90% = 16 83-86% = 14 79-82%=12 75-78%=10 70-74% = 5 Below 70% = 0	/20
B) Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment with one or more type of Health Insurance (de-duplicated) (includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Insurance) $\left[\frac{\text{Total no. of (L + S) with HI}}{\text{Total no. of Adults with Annual Assessments and Adult Leavers}} \right] \times 100\%$	80%	%	80% or > = 4 60-79% = 3 50-59% = 2 40-49% = 1 Below 40% = 0	/4
C) Employment Rate for Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment $\frac{\text{Total no. of Adult (L + S) with earned Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adults served}} \times 100\%$	20%	%	20% or > = 4 10-19% = 3 5-10% = 2 Below 5% = 0	/4
D) Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment who maintained or increased total income (earned + non-employment income) $\left[\frac{\text{Total no. of Adults (L + S) who maintained or } \uparrow \text{ Total Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adults served}} \right] \times 100\%$	75%	%	60% or > = 6 40-59% = 4 20-39% = 2 Below 20% = 0	/6
E) Cost Effectiveness $\left[\frac{\text{Project Grant } \$ \text{ Total}}{\text{Total Stayers} + \# \text{ of exits to PH}} \right]$	N/A			
SUBTOTAL PSH PROJECT OUTCOMES			/34	

2021 RUBRIC

2B – RAPID RE-HOUSING (RRH) PROJECT OUTCOMES				
CRITERIA	STANDARD	AGENCY RATE	SCORING	POINTS/ AVAILABLE
A) Exit to Permanent Housing Destinations $\left[\frac{\text{No. of leavers exiting to PH types}}{\text{Total no. of leavers served}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	80%	%	80% or > = 20 75-79% = 17 70-74% = 15 50-70% = 10 25-50 = 5 Below 25%= 0	/20
B) Leavers with Health Insurance (includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Insurance) $\left[\frac{\text{No. of leavers with HI}}{\text{Total no. of leavers served}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	80%	%	80% or > = 4 60-79% = 3 40-59% = 2 Below 40% = 0	/4
C) Employment Rate for Leavers $\frac{\text{No. of Adult leavers with earned Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adult leavers served}}$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	40%	%	40% or > = 4 20-39% = 3 10-19% = 2 Below 10% = 0	/4
D) Leavers who maintained or increased total income (earned + non-employment income) $\left[\frac{\text{No. of Adult leavers who maintained or } \uparrow \text{ Total Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adult leavers served}} \right]$ <p style="text-align: center;">X 100%</p>	60%	%	60% or > = 6 40-59% = 4 20-39% = 2 Below 20% = 0	/6
E) Cost Effectiveness $\left[\frac{\text{Project Grant $ Total}}{\# \text{ of exits to PH}} \right]$	N/A			
SUBTOTAL RRH PROJECT OUTCOMES			/34	

2021 RUBRIC

SECTION 3 - CONSUMER FEEDBACK				
CRITERIA	STANDARD	SCORING	AGENCY RATE	POINTS/AVAILABLE
Consumer participation on organization board or other policy making entity. <i>(Mandated by HUD)</i>	Yes, it's currently in place	Yes, it's currently in place = 3 No, but there is an existing plan= 1 No, no plan= 0		/3
Redress and grievance process in place for consumers. <i>(Mandated by HUD)</i>	Yes, it's currently in place	Yes, it's currently in place = 3 No, but there is an existing plan= 1 No, no plan= 0		/3
Feedback collection and response process in place (e.g., clients satisfaction survey, consumer engagement session, etc.).	Yes, it's currently in place	Yes, it's currently in place = 3 No, but there is an existing plan= 1 No, no plan= 0		/3
Client feedback is used to inform service delivery and direct future services	Recent example of utilizing client feedback	Example of utilizing client feedback within past year= 3 No, but there is an existing plan= 1 No, no plan= 0		/3
SUBTOTAL CONSUMER FEEDBACK				/12

2021 RUBRIC

SECTION 4 - COMPLIANCE					
CRITERIA	STANDARD	AGENCY RATE	SCORING	POINTS/AVAILABLE	SOURCE
Agency has one or more unresolved monitoring or audit finding(s) for any HUD grants (including ESG) operated by the applicant or potential subrecipients (if any).	No findings or findings addressed in Corrective Action Plan (CAP)		No findings = 5 Findings with CAP submitted = 3 Findings but no CAP = 0	/5	Agency report
Agency has expended funds on this grant in the last two years.	90%		90-100%=5 85% -89%=3 84% and below = 0	/5	Agency report $\left[\frac{\text{Amount drawn from LOCCS within 90 days end of project}}{\text{Total Grant Amount}} \times 100\% \right]$
Agency has outstanding obligations to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon.	No		No=5 Yes=0	/5	Agency report
Agency has a history of late APR submissions (in the last 3 years or for the duration of this project)	0		0-1 late APRs = 5 2-3 late APRs = 0	/5	Agency report
SUBTOTAL COMPLIANCE				/20	

2021 RUBRIC

SECTION 5 - BUDGET					
CRITERIA	STANDARD	AGENCY RATE	SCORING	POINTS/ POSSIBLE POINTS	SOURCE
Budget submitted is clearly filled out and calculated correctly. Budget requests are clear, logical and consistent with the overall activities proposed in the application. Quantity descriptions clearly identify what is included in the requests and are in line with project requirements.	Yes		Yes = 6 No = 0	/6	Agency report
Optional Narrative:					
SUBTOTAL BUDGET				/6	

2021 RUBRIC

SECTION 6 - HMIS COMPLIANCE & DATA QUALITY					
CRITERIA	STANDARD	AGENCY RATE	SCORING	POINTS/POSSIBLE POINTS	SOURCE
*HMIS - % of Universal Data Elements (UDEs) with No or Null Values in HMIS (left blank) for the following criteria:					
Name	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Date of Birth	5% or < *	«DOB»	5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Gender	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Social Security Number	10% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Race	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Ethnicity	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Veteran Status	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Disabling Condition	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Residence prior to program entry	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Zip code of last residence	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Destination	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Relationship to Head of Household	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
SUBTOTAL HMIS COMPLIANCE & DATA QUALITY				/12	
GRAND TOTAL				/92	

2021 RUBRIC

SECTION 6 - HMIS COMPLIANCE & DATA QUALITY					
CRITERIA	STANDARD	AGENCY RATE	SCORING	POINTS/POSSIBLE POINTS	SOURCE
*HMIS - % of Universal Data Elements (UDEs) with No or Null Values in HMIS (left blank) for the following criteria:					
Name	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Date of Birth	5% or < *	«DOB»	5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Gender	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Social Security Number	10% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Race	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Ethnicity	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Veteran Status	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Disabling Condition	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Residence prior to program entry	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Zip code of last residence	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Destination	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Relationship to Head of Household	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
SUBTOTAL HMIS COMPLIANCE & DATA QUALITY				/12	
GRAND TOTAL				/92	



RANKING POLICY

2021 RANKING POLICY

The following pages show our most recent 2021 ranking policy for CoC Project.

This policy determines the order projects are funded by HUD

The policy will be updated through another community process later this year

2021 RANKING POLICY

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care (CoC) FY2021 Funding Competition

2021 Ranking Policy

Each year, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires all new and renewal applications submitted as a part of the annual Continuum of Care (CoC) funding competition to be ranked according to a CoC-approved, community ranking policy. The 2021 Ranking Policy was drafted per recommendations from the Washtenaw Housing Alliance Operations Committee (OC), a committee of the CoC, and approved by the CoC Board on November 10, 2021.

Washtenaw County CoC is committed to the below ranking policy for the 2021 CoC Funding Competition.

2021 RANKING POLICY

Projects will be ranked in the following order:

1. Infrastructure projects (HMIS)
2. PSH Renewals ranked by score* (high to low) in the following order:
 - a. Projects with agency-owned units and Leasing Projects
 - b. Project-based rental assistance (PRA)
 - c. Sponsor-based rental assistance (SRA)
 - d. Tenant-based rental assistance (TRA)
3. RRH Renewals ranked by score* (high to low)
4. Renewals that do not have a full 12 months of Annual Performance Report (APR) data**
5. Projects created through reallocation in the following order: PSH for families, PSH for Individuals
6. Bonus projects ranked by score* (high to low) in the following order:
 - a. Projects with agency-owned units and Leasing Projects
 - b. Project-based rental assistance (PRA)
 - c. Sponsor-based rental assistance (SRA)
 - d. Tenant-based rental assistance (TRA)
7. Domestic Violence (DV) Bonus project for RRH serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking
8. HMIS Expansion Projects

*Projects with equal scores are ranked by higher Section 2 Component: *Program Outcome* rubric score. If there is still a tie in score, projects will be ranked by higher Section 3 Component: *Compliance* rubric score.

** Newly implemented projects that do not have a full 12 months of APR data are exempt from outcome scores

2021 RANKING POLICY

Guidance for projects that straddle Tiers:

If a project, once listed in ranked order, straddles the Tier 1/Tier 2 funding line, the following policy will apply:

If a project straddles the line (i.e. a portion of the project budget falls within Tier 1 and a portion within Tier 2), that agency will be asked if the project would still be feasible if only funded for the Tier 1 amount. Agency submits feasibility plan in writing for review by the Funding Review Team (FRT). The FRT reviews this plan and decides whether to accept it based on whether the project would be feasible at the reduced amount.

- IF YES: If project agrees and feasibility plan is accepted by the FRT, the project is submitted straddling the two Tiers.
- IF NO: If project indicates it would not be feasible at a reduced amount or the FRT does not accept the feasibility plan, the project will be dropped so that it wholly fits into Tier 2 and the next ranked project will have the same opportunity to show feasibility straddling the line. This process is continued until a viable project is placed into Tier 1 amount. The FRT will do everything it can to ensure the full amount of Tier 1 funding is utilized.



PROCESS UPDATE

BACKGROUND

Currently, OCED staff gathers information from providers, prepares a packet of information, and present the projects to the FRT.

OCED is proposing we update the process so that:

- OCED still gathers info and presents the packet in advance to the FRT
- When the FRT meets, providers are invited to present their projects and answer questions

DISCUSSION

We think this is a minor change, but we wanted to run it by the community.

Any thoughts, questions, or concerns?

Should we make this change?



COST
EFFECTIVENESS

BACKGROUND

HUD requires the use of objective data in the review and ranking of projects. Among the data specifically mentioned in the NOFO is cost effectiveness of projects

In 2020, the CoC established a preliminary measure that was not scored. This measure was presented to the FRT as part of the 2021 CoC Funding Process

The CoC also prepared alternate measures to present for review by the community before settling on a final measure

Our goal:

- **Select a final Cost Effectiveness measure**
- **Decide Whether and how to score**

OPTIONS

There are 3 options currently for a cost effectiveness measure. All use successful outcomes as a factor, defined as clients remaining in housing or moving to another permanent destination:

- **Total Project Amount**
 - This is the total dollar amount of the project divided by the number of successful outcomes
- **Project Amount less Admin**
 - This is the total dollar amount minus the admin portion, divided by the number of successful outcomes
- **Supportive Services Only**
 - This is the supportive services dollar amount divided by the number of successful outcomes

TOTAL PROJECT AMOUNT

$$\left[\frac{\textit{Project Grant \$ Total}}{\# \textit{ of Successful Outcomes}} \right]$$

This is the simplest measure, simply looking at the total project amount

It does not account for differences in administration percentage

Because different projects include different types of rental support, ranging from scattered site vouchers to agency owned or leased buildings, this measure has the widest variance

Because housing costs are higher than service costs, they are overrepresented in this measure

TOTAL PROJECT AMOUNT

$$\frac{\textit{Project Grant \$ Total}}{\textit{\# of Successful Outcomes}}$$

\$ 14,087.44
\$ 4,897.78
\$ 10,570.39
\$ 4,922.70
\$ 6,029.82
\$ 3,559.71
\$ 5,207.30
\$ 15,326.14
\$ 20,054.30
\$ 12,159.20
\$ 10,500.02
\$ 5,262.88
\$ 6,330.33
\$ 10,771.69
\$ 10,679.79

The range for this measure is the largest of the three options, at \$16,494, making it difficult to compare projects

The average is \$9,357

The wide range in costs is reflective of the various types of housing stock across our system

PROJECT AMOUNT LESS ADMIN

$$\left[\frac{\textit{Project Grant \$ Total} - \textit{Admin \$}}{\# \textit{ of Successful Outcomes}} \right]$$

This is very similar to the previous measure, but it removes admin costs from the equation, getting more directly at operating costs

This measure still may over represent housing costs

PROJECT AMOUNT LESS ADMIN

$$\left[\frac{\text{Project Grant \$ Total} - \text{Admin \$}}{\# \text{ of Successful Outcomes}} \right]$$

\$ 13,316.56
\$ 4,613.06
\$ 9,927.78
\$ 4,699.27
\$ 5,690.53
\$ 3,361.32
\$ 4,866.70
\$ 14,447.86
\$ 18,509.95
\$ 11,600.20
\$ 10,029.14
\$ 4,884.25
\$ 6,025.78
\$ 10,319.23
\$ 9,818.38

The average for this measure is \$8,807; only \$550 different from the first measure

The range is also similar at \$15,148

Because admin costs scale with project size, this changes the measure for larger projects more than for smaller projects

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

$$\left[\frac{\textit{Supportive Services \$}}{\# \textit{ of Successful Outcomes}} \right]$$

This measure only looks at supportive services costs for projects, focusing entirely on services provided to residents

It does not account for housing costs in any way

Some projects do not have a supportive service budget (services provided through match)

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

$$\left[\frac{\textit{Supportive Services \$}}{\# \textit{ of Successful Outcomes}} \right]$$

\$ 3,303.76
\$ 2,365.63
\$ 7,130.43
\$ 1,230.68
\$ 3,058.53
\$ 1,715.54
\$ 4,866.70
\$ 3,719.86
\$ 6,175.65
\$ 3,039.80
\$ 2,625.00
\$ 4,884.25
\$ 969.78
\$ 3,441.38
\$ 4,428.17

These numbers are much smaller and more comparable, with an average of \$3,504

The range is \$5,206 so there is still a lot of variance

By removing housing costs, this focuses directly on the services provided to clients

SUMMARY

- **Total Project Amount**

- This is the total dollar amount of the project divided by the number of successful outcomes
- Simplest, but hard to compare projects with different housing stock

- **Project Amount less Admin**

- This is the total dollar amount minus the admin portion, divided by the number of successful outcomes
- Very close to Total Project Amount, also hard to compare different housing stock

- **Supportive Services Only**

- This is the supportive services dollar amount divided by the number of successful outcomes
- Completely ignores housing costs, compares services directly

DISCUSSION/BREAKOUTS

Consider the following questions:

- Which measure makes the most sense to you? Why?
- Is it more important to compare housing costs or service costs? Or both?
- Does it make sense to score these measures? Or should we just compare them year to year?
- What else should we think about for a cost efficiency measure?



RACIAL EQUITY

BACKGROUND

In the 2021 NOFO, HUD asked that as part of our local process, projects are rated and ranked based on the degree to which their project has identified any barriers to participation (e.g., lack of outreach) faced by persons of different races and ethnicities, particularly those over-represented in the local homelessness population, and has taken or will take steps to eliminate the identified barriers.

We have not historically had this section in our rubric, so we will need to add one!

EXAMPLES FROM OTHER COMMUNITIES

For inspiration, CoC Staff gathered examples from the following communities:

- Lake County, OH
- Connecticut
- Boston, MA
- Portland, OR
- North Carolina

LAKE COUNTY, OHIO

- How will you define the project's efforts to promote culturally-inclusive services, including underserved Lake County populations?
- What are the barriers to underserved populations' participation, particularly those over-represented in the homeless population?
- What are your outreach action plan components that will ensure ethnic cultural communication in Lake County?
- What monthly tracking system will be used to evaluate and ensure all community segments are receiving service under this Grant?
- What are your outreach action plan strategies to serve chronically homeless groups, including current minority service gaps?
- What are your % target populations served, and % of each severity needs groups?

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

The State of Connecticut uses data for this section, but does not score it:

Rate of Return to Homelessness Among Latinx, Black, Asian, Native, Multiple Race Groups as compared to White/NonLatinx group (not scored)

BOSTON, MA

- The project applicant assessed whether black, indigenous, and other people of color (BIPOC) face barriers to equitably accessing or receiving services from their organization.
- The applicant addressed the above assessment or made a written commitment to addressing BIPOC barriers identified, OR no barriers were identified in the assessment above.
- The applicant assess whether lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and other people whose genders or sexualities are heteronormative (LGBTQ+) people face barriers to equitably accessing or receiving services from their organization.
- Does the project applicant address or made a written commitment to addressing LGBTQ+ barriers identified above, OR no barriers were identified in the assessment above

PORTLAND, OR

Addressing institutional racism:

Complete the checklist to indicate what methods are used and describe some of the project's most important strategies for addressing and responding to institutional racism, and any significant successes/challenges that the project experienced in this work over the past year.

Public written commitment to address/eliminate racial and ethnic inequities in guiding documentation (i.e. mission, vision, goals, etc.)
Organization has a racial equity plan or strategy that is regularly monitored
Ongoing evaluation of policy, service, or program impacts and progress towards racial equity
Internal structures exist to address issues of racial equity (i.e. a functioning equity committee, formal or informal complaint resolution process, caucusing and community advisory body)
Racial equity knowledge, skills, and practices are a part of staff job descriptions and work plans
Staff receive training and support around racial equity and how their role is important in addressing institutional racism (i.e. anti-oppression trainings, etc.)
Management consistently applies a racial equity lens
Other (please list):

PORTLAND, OR

- Reducing homelessness within communities of color: The 2017 Point-In-Time Count shows a disproportionately high rate (40.5%) of our community's population experiencing homelessness are people of color. For the past several years, we've asked you to describe what actions your project was taking to help reduce homelessness within communities of color. Provide an update on this work.
- Implementing culturally-responsive programming: Complete the checklist to indicate what methods are used, and describe some of the project's most important strategies to ensure culturally-responsive programming and any significant successes that the project experienced providing these services over the past year.
- Addressing barriers faced by people who identify as LGBTQ: For the past few years, we've asked you to describe what actions the project is taking to address specific barriers faced by people experiencing homelessness who identify as LGBTQ. Provide an update on this work.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

- Does the applicant provide guidelines/program rules in other languages besides English
- Does the applicant have client-facing bilingual staff?
- Does the applicant contract with interpreter services?
- Does the applicant have an Antidiscrimination Policy?
- Does the applicant hold annual trainings on its Anti-Discrimination Policy, as required by the CoC Anti-Discrimination Policy?
- Has the agency sent staff to an external training for Racial Equity or AntiDiscrimination in the last 12 months? Please list the date(s) of training(s) and percentage of staff that have attended an external racial equity/anti-discrimination training in the last 12 months).
- Does the applicant have an equal access hiring clause in job postings?
- What percentage of your Board of Directors are non-white?

DISCUSSION/BREAKOUTS

Consider the following questions:

- Which approach made the most sense to you?
- Should we use data, or just narrative questions?
- How should we score this section?
- How should it be weighted compared to other sections of the rubric?