

Applicant: Applicant Number:  
Applicant Score:

	All Applications	Rural Applications
Highest Score	96.10	89.16
Lowest Score	52.60	52.60
Median Score	80.06	73.24

This document summarizes the score your community received in the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) application. It provides two sets of information:

1. The community’s score for each section of the application; and
2. A summary of the common reasons communities lost points in each section of the application.

The chart below indicates the maximum amount of points available for each Rating Factor and the actual score your community received.

Rating Factor	Maximum Available Score	*Score Received
Leadership Capacity	20	
Community Resource Capacity	5	
Community Need	10	
Capacity for Innovation	15	
Collaboration	20	
Financial Resources	10	
Data and Evaluation Capacity	20	
<b>Total Number of Points Available</b>	<b>100</b>	

\* Rating Factor scores are rounded; however, the total score is calculated based on non-rounded numbers

### Competition Summary:

- In August 2016, HUD announced the YHDP Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), allocating \$33 million to fund projects to help communities develop and implement Coordinated Community Plans, in combination with dedicated technical assistance, for ending youth homelessness.
- The NOFA required applicants to submit all required application materials to grants.gov by November 30, 2016. The NOFA also required applicants to have active DUNS numbers and to be entities designated by Continuums of Care (CoC) as Collaborative Applicants or HUD-designated Unified Funding Agencies for CoCs during the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition.
- HUD scored 77 of the 130 applications submitted. Unscored applications did not meet minimum threshold requirements outlined in Section III.C.I. of the NOFA. Applications that did not meet threshold requirements often omitted required assurances or signatures in the Youth Advisory Board (YAB) and Public Child Welfare Agency (PCWA) letters.

- The NOFA required complete answers to all questions and Section IV.B.1. of the NOFA listed all required attachments. HUD deducted points for applications that did not include all required attachments, did not clearly label questions and responses, and did not completely answer all questions.
- The NOFA limited the number of selected communities to 10 with at least four from eligible rural communities. The lowest score for a selected non-rural community was 92.42 and the lowest score for a selected rural community was 73.32.
- On January 16, 2016, HUD selected the following 10 communities for funding:
  - AK-500**–Anchorage, AK–\$1.5 million
  - CA-501**–San Francisco, CA–\$2.9 million
  - CA-508**–Watsonville/Santa Cruz City and County–\$2.2 million
  - CT-505**–Connecticut Balance of State–\$6.6 million
  - KY-500**–Kentucky Balance of State–\$1.9 million
  - MI-512**–Grand Traverse, Antrim, Leelanau Counties–\$1.3 million
  - OH-500**–Cincinnati/Hamilton County–\$3.8 million
  - OH-507**–Ohio Balance of State–\$2.2 million
  - TX-503**–Austin/Travis County–\$5.2 million
  - WA-500**–Seattle/King County–\$5.4 million

Below is an overview of the NOFA rating factors and HUD’s scoring and funding decisionmaking processes, which includes a brief analysis of the questions most frequently associated with a loss of points. See [Section V.A.1. of the NOFA](#) for specific information on scoring criteria and to review the questions identified in the tables below.

---

**Rating Factor I: Leadership Capacity–20 points**

HUD awarded up to 20 points to applicants that demonstrated leadership to effectively coordinate the development of a Coordinated Community Plan to prevent and end youth homelessness.

Most applicants received all available points in this section. The most common reason that communities lost points in this section was they did not fully answer the questions or did not provide enough detail. Common questions where applicants lost points were:

<b>Question 2</b>	Applicants lost points if they did not explicitly indicate that the lead agency would dedicate a full-time position to lead the development and implementation of the coordinated community plan required by the YHDP. To receive full points, applicants needed to clearly identify that the staff member listed would play a leadership role and dedicate full time to the YHDP.
<b>Question 4</b>	Some applicants demonstrated youth participation but lost points because they did not indicate how the CoC used youth to solicit feedback or how the CoC specifically used that feedback to make decisions or affect outcomes. Other applicants detailed a plan to engage youth partners and entities but lost points because they did not include names of specific partners or groups of partners that they would engage.

**Rating Factor 2: Community Resource Capacity–5 points**

HUD awarded up to 5 points to applicants based on the extent to which the CoC is currently making progress towards preventing and ending youth homelessness.

Most applicants received maximum points in this section. The primary reason applicants lost points for this rating factor was because they did not attach a resource capacity chart.

**Rating Factor 3: Community Need–10 Points**

HUD awarded up to 10 points to applicants that demonstrated high need in the community based on the number of youth experiencing homelessness in their community, and their needs. Common questions where applicants lost points were:

<b>Question 2e</b>	Applicants lost points if they did not sufficiently explain key findings of the needs assessment or did not include a detailed assessment of the community’s need for housing for youth, including the need for actual units.
<b>Question 3e</b>	Applicants lost points if they did not demonstrate that they conducted a youth-specific or youth-inclusive count. Applicants that did conduct a youth-specific or youth-inclusive count but did not receive full points often did not describe the methodology used for the count.

**Rating Factor 4: Capacity for Innovation–15 Points:**

HUD awarded up to 15 points to applicants based on the CoC’s capacity to engage in innovative systems change behaviors essential for participating in the YHDP. Common questions where applicants lost points were:

<b>Question 1</b>	Applicants lost points if they did not indicate whether the broad reaching methodology or system-wide change in behavior was successful.
<b>Question 2</b>	Applicants lost points if they did not provide an example of an experience where one or more youth homelessness providers adopted a new innovation or system, including the motivation for change, challenges experienced, and whether the adoption was successful.
<b>Question 4</b>	Applicants lost points if they only requested additional support for existing interventions and did not identify new interventions that the CoC intends to pursue. Applicants also lost points if they did not identify barriers preventing the community from implementing the new interventions.
<b>Question 5</b>	Applicants lost points if they did not include an example of the stakeholders trying a new model or methodology, or if the response only applied to one stakeholder or only one distinct group of stakeholders.
<b>Youth Map</b>	Applicants lost points if they did not include the Youth Advisory Board on their youth system maps.

**Rating Factor 5: Collaboration – 20 points**

HUD awarded up to 20 points to applicants for demonstrating strong, current, community-wide partnerships within the CoC working to prevent and end youth homelessness. Common questions where applicants lost points were:

<b>Question 3</b>	One-third of applicants lost points because they indicated that they did not have a youth-inclusive coordinated entry process or separate access points for youth. Half of applicants lost points because they did not describe the extent to which other youth providers and stakeholders providing services to homeless and at-risk youth are integrated into coordinated entry.
<b>Question 4</b>	Applicants lost points if they did not provide specific detail on the discharge policy for one or more of the required institutions or if they did not indicate that they were actively developing one of the required discharge policies that they did not already have in place.
<b>Question 5</b>	Applicants lost points on this rating factor if they did not describe the role of a Public Child Welfare Agency as it specifically concerns homelessness or did not explain the role for both age groups, under 18 and 18-24.

**Rating Factor 6: Financial Resources–10 points**

HUD awarded up to 10 points to applicants based on the CoC’s ability to appropriately fund the development of a Coordinated Community Plan and operate a system in their community.

Applicants lost points on this rating factor if they did not include commitment letters to match their 6-month planning budget. Some letters submitted as commitment letters provided statements of support rather than commitments to specific amounts for local YHDP planning.

**Rating Factor 7: Data and Evaluation Capacity**

HUD awarded up to 20 points to applicants for demonstrating the existence of a functioning HMIS that collects information on homelessness using residential and other homeless services and effective performance measures. Common questions where applicants lost points were:

<b>Question 2</b>	Applicants lost points based on lower coverage of youth beds in HMIS. HUD awarded full points for 90% HMIS coverage rates.
<b>Question 4</b>	Applicants lost points if they did not include all the types of required support, including financial resources, technical resources, and training, while describing how they actively recruit and transition new homeless projects to HMIS.
<b>Question 7</b>	Applicants lost points if they indicated that they did not gather data from other sources or if they did not describe the type of data collected, the system used to collect the data, or how the data are stored.
<b>Question 8</b>	Applicants lost points if they failed to include a specific target data point or universe group, or did not address each of the four bullets concerning how the CoC monitors the performance of its youth providers.