Applicant:
Applicant Score:

	All Applications	Rural Applications
Highest Score	97.42	93.75
Lowest Score	63.83	63.83
Median Score	89.63	83.50

This document summarizes the score your Continuum of Care (CoC) received in the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) application by providing:

1. the CoC's score for each section of the application; and
2. a summary of the common reasons HUD deducted points in each section of the application.

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

Rating Factor	Maximum Available Score	Median Score (All Applications)	Median Score (Rural Applications)	Score Received
Leadership Capacity	20	18.33	18	
Current Resource Capacity	5	5	5	
Community Need	10	8.67	7	
Capacity for Innovation	15	13.75	10.5	
Collaboration	20	18.63	17	
Financial Resources	10	9.5	9.5	
Data and Evaluation Capacity	20	17	17	
Total	**100**	**89.63**	**83.5**	

Competition Summary:

- On July 13, 2018, HUD published the YHDP Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) [Round 2] which allocated $43 million to help Continuums of Care (CoCs) develop and implement Coordinated Community Plans and fund projects to end youth homelessness in their communities.

- HUD scored **86** of the **104** 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 Action 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 11, with at least five from eligible rural communities. The lowest score for a selected non-rural community was **95.76** and the lowest score for a selected rural community was **84.33**.

- HUD changed the definition of a rural community to match the U.S. Census Bureau's definition of "mostly-rural" and to limit the eligibility of large cities in mostly rural states.

- HUD included the term "Youth Action Board" to better represent their active and integral role in YHDP rather than "Youth Advisory Board" used in the FY 2016 NOFA.

- On July 13, 2018, HUD announced the selection of the following 11 communities for funding:

<u>**NON-RURAL COMMUNITIES**</u>
San Diego, California: $7.94 million
Columbus, Ohio: $6.07 million
Boston, Massachusetts: $4.92 million
Nashville, Tennessee: $3.54 million
Louisville, Kentucky: $3.45 million
Snohomish, Washington: $2.39 million

<u>**RURAL COMMUNITIES**</u>
Washington (rural): $4.63 million
Northern New Mexico (rural): $3.37 million
Nebraska (rural): $3.28 million
Vermont (rural): $2 million
NW Minnesota (rural): $1.41 million

Below is an overview of the NOFA rating factors and HUD's scoring and funding decision making processes, which includes a brief analysis of the questions most frequently associated with a loss of points. In general, the specific questions noted below were emphasized because, on average, applicants lost at least a half of point within the scoring criteria. See <u>Section V.A.1. of the NOFA</u> 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 if responses demonstrated leadership to effectively coordinate the development of a Coordinated Community Plan to prevent and end youth homelessness.

Most applications received all available points in this section. The most common reason HUD deducted points in this section was applicants did not fully answer the questions or did not provide sufficient detail. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

Question 1.1	Demonstrate that the CoC has addressed a similar systematic challenge related to homelessness. Examples can include the CoC's efforts to end veteran homelessness, adoption of a comprehensive coordinated entry processes, and

	other innovative community-wide and cross-sector initiatives.
Question 1.2a	Identify the proposed YHDP lead agency.
Question 1.2c	Identify the proposed YHDP lead agency. The narrative should include: The staff member, including the staff member's position who will lead the YHDP. The lead should have a position with enough authority to make critical decisions.
Question 1.2d	Identify the proposed YHDP lead agency. The narrative should include: Whether the lead agency will dedicate a full-time position to lead the YHDP. This can be the same person as identified in 2c.
Question 1.2e	Identify the proposed YHDP lead agency. The narrative should include: A description of the experience of the lead agency in initiatives designed to prevent and end youth homelessness.
Question 1.2f	Identify the proposed YHDP lead agency. The narrative should include: The applicant must attach a description of the YHDP team, including names, organization affiliation, agency titles, and the roles each person will play.
Question 1.3	Demonstrate how the CoC structure will support the lead agency. The applicant must clearly identify the names of committees (and approximate number of members) within the CoC that will be involved in the planning and implementation of a coordinated community approach to prevent and end youth homelessness, each committee objective(s) and youth relevant task(s).
Question 1.4	Demonstrate how the CoC includes direct youth participation, either through a youth action board or youth participation in committee meetings or planning and feedback events. The applicant must clearly describe the extent to which the CoC solicits and receives information from youth regarding youth homelessness.
Question 1.5	Demonstrate the CoC's willingness to engage youth providers that are not currently active participants in the CoC. The applicant must clearly describe the CoC's plan to engage participants.
Question 1.6	Demonstrate the CoC plans to engage partners not currently working on youth homelessness that will be essential in developing and implementing a coordinated community approach to preventing and ending youth homelessness.
Rating Factor 1: Youth Review Perspective	**General Applicant Strengths:** Youth are intentionally and meaningfully engaged. They have authentic power and voice within the CoC and can act as change agents. Applicants adapted surveys to include youth voice as leaders. Youth are present in all aspects of the CoC and facilitates leadership meetings. Applicants had an active Youth Action Board that drives the decisions made and programs created. **General Applicant Weaknesses:** Youth Action Board objectives are limited to identifying barriers, experiences

	related to youth experiencing homelessness, and/or providing input for YHDP projects.
	The YABs seemed underutilized and in some applications, there appeared to be a lack of leadership opportunities.

Rating Factor 2: Community Resource Capacity–5 points

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

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

Question 2.1	Describe the crisis response system using the chart below. The chart should include interventions and mainstream resources serving unaccompanied or pregnant and parenting homeless youth and youth at risk of homelessness that are currently operating in the community. Applicant must have completed the list of required fields and the descriptions of those fields.

Rating Factor 3: Community Need–10 Points

HUD awarded up to 10 points if the responses demonstrated high need in the community based on the number of youth experiencing homelessness in their community, and their needs. The most common reason HUD deducted points in this section was applicants did not fully answer the questions or did not provide sufficient detail. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

Question 3.2c	Describe the most recent youth homelessness needs assessment conducted by the CoC, the narrative must include the following: The scope of the assessment including the geography, types of providers, and types of housing units and services covered within your CoC.
Question 3.2d	Describe the most recent youth homelessness needs assessment conducted by the CoC, the narrative must include the following: A description of the youth targeted including a typology of youth based on characteristics that the CoC used to define or characterize youth.
Question 3.2e	Describe the most recent youth homelessness needs assessment conducted by the CoC, the narrative must include the following: A description of the youth targeted including a typology of youth based on characteristics that the CoC used to define or characterize youth.
Question 3.3g	The factors that are currently contributing to youth homelessness in the community, including the methodology used to identify which factors are most prominent. Your response should describe how factors have been identified at the

	community level and not how individual factors are identified on a case-by-case basis.
Rating Factor 3: Youth Review Perspective	**General Applicant Strengths:** Applicants worked to build trust with the youth who completed their survey. Applicants description of the rating factors were robust and in-depth giving the reviewer a clear picture of the true struggles of the homeless population. Applicants provided several factors that contribute to youth homelessness in their specific communities and even used the youth board to research the data. Applicants were very aware of the factors contributing to homelessness within community and supported the rating factors with data analysis. **General Applicant Weaknesses:** Application descriptions appear to be unaware of the social issues that plague their communities such as LGBTQ youth, minority youth, youth from the child welfare or juvenile justice system, etc. Applicants did not emphasize placement after discharge from varying institutions. Further, some applicants did not provide information regarding the outcome of the needs assessment.

Rating Factor 4: Capacity for Innovation–15 Points:

HUD awarded up to 15 points based on the CoC's capacity to engage in innovative systems change behaviors essential for participating in the YHDP. The most common reason HUD deducted points in this section was applicants did not fully answer the questions or did not provide sufficient detail. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

Question 4.1	Describe an experience where the CoC successfully adopted a new broad reaching methodology or enacted a major system-wide change in behavior.
Question 4.2	Describe an experience where one or more youth homelessness providers in the community adopted a new innovation or system. Include the motivation for the change, the challenges experienced and whether the adoption was successful.
Question 4.3	Indicate whether the CoC currently operates any rapid rehousing models for youth or any permanent supportive housing for youth that use a Housing First model. If the CoC has rapid rehousing or permanent supportive housing models for youth, describe the community's experience with the relevant models.
Question 4.4	Describe interventions that are not currently operating in the CoC that the community wishes to pursue. Include in your response the barriers that currently prevent you from implementing the interventions.
Question 5	To be successful in the YHDP, communities must be willing to question existing models and test new methodologies. Describe your willingness and the willingness of the youth homelessness stakeholder community to engage in new

	project models and methodologies.
Question 6	Applicants must attach a youth system map, a visual representation of the local youth crisis response system, to submit with the application.
Rating Factor 4: Youth Review Perspective	**General Applicant Strengths:** Applicants noted several intervention options as they adapted community programs and resources. Applicants provided evidence of trying new methods and methodology while including the voice of the youth receiving services. Applicants showcased multiple means of testing new methodology while critiquing current ones. Applicants' system maps included a YAB, identified critical partners, showed how youth move through the system and identifies entry points comprehensive, inclusive, and realistic to navigate tended to score higher. **General Applicant Weaknesses:** Applications showed no apparent evidence of youth inclusion, input, or consensus- rather a logical and practical method from a provider perspective. Applicants tended to lose points on the system map if the YAB clearly operated separate from the CoC; YAB is not yet functioning; map did not show entry points and how youth navigate the system of services; system map does not identify critical partners; or if the applicant attached a map of the geographical depiction pinpointing service provider locations. Overall, applicants will benefit from providing more clear and thorough movement through the system, including re-entry.

Rating Factor 5: Collaboration – 20 points

HUD awarded up to 20 points if responses demonstrated strong, current, community-wide partnerships within the CoC working to prevent and end youth homelessness. The most common reason HUD deducted points in this section was applicants did not fully answer the questions or did not provide sufficient detail. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

Question 5.3d	Indicate whether the Coordinated Entry Process incorporates youth. Describe the extent to which all other youth homelessness and at-risk providers and other stakeholders providing services to homeless and at-risk youth (including PCWAs and other mainstream resource providers) are integrated into the coordinated entry process.
Question 5.4	Describe the system-level discharge strategy for child welfare (foster care), juvenile and adult justice, and institutions of mental and physical health. The narrative can include the CoC's discharge policy and the discharge policy of the four institutions above. If the CoC does not have a discharge policy, describe how the CoC is working at a systems-level to prevent youth from being discharged from these institutions into homelessness.
Question 5.5	Describe the role of PCWAs in serving homeless children under 18 and in serving homeless youth 18-24.
Rating Factor 5: Youth Review Perspective	**General Applicant Strengths:** Applicants described all PCWA systems in current state and future aspirations. Various applicants created protocols across agencies to inform the discharge process creating separate systems. In addition, applicants described a hybrid approach for certain age groups to ease transitions. Applicants noted robust systems to ensure YYA do not exit systems into homelessness. Plans included very clear discharge strategies and even changes to local legislation. **General Applicant Weaknesses:** The applicant either had no distinction between the youth under 18 versus 18-24 or clumped the two age groups into one assuming a similar approach. In additions, the applicant does not reference a definitive process for under 18 versus 18-24. Some applications did not mention preventative measures taken to avert and reduce the discharges into homelessness. For some applicants, the current role of the PCWA did not service YYA beyond referrals for shelter admittance or the independent living services; as a requirement of the Child Welfare Transition plan. Applicant's policy and procedures did not appear to be evaluated or update to ensure no youth are falling through the cracks. Other issues include:

	1. a lack of awareness of the way youth move through discharge systems, the gaps in services and how they end up in homelessness after various transitioning; 2. applicants specifically stating that they are not providing services through PCWA; or 3. applicant does not give the impression that there is real plan for discharging clients and ensuring that they do not fall into homelessness.

Rating Factor 6: Financial Resources–10 points

HUD awarded up to 10 points if responses demonstrated the CoC's ability to appropriately fund the development of a Coordinated Community Plan and operate a system in their community.

Applications lost points on this rating factor if applicants did not include commitment letters to match their 8-month planning budget. Some letters submitted as commitment letters provided statements of support rather than commitments to specific amounts for local YHDP planning.

Question 6.1	Demonstrate how the CoC will obtain additional funding, other than HUD technical assistance (TA), to support the planning process for the Demonstration
Question 6.2	Describe the CoC's proposed 8-month budget for developing a coordinated community plan to prevent and end youth homelessness.

Rating Factor 7: Data and Evaluation Capacity

HUD awarded up to 20 points if responses demonstrated the existence of a functioning HMIS that collects information on homelessness using residential and other homeless services and effective performance measures. The most common reason HUD deducted points in this section was applicants did not fully answer the questions or did not provide sufficient detail. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

Question 7.1	Indicate the percentage of all types of homeless beds, excluding beds provided by victim service providers that currently participate in HMIS.
Question 7.3	Describe how the CoC actively recruits new homeless projects to HMIS for youth-dedicated projects.
Question 7.7	In addition to gathering youth data in HMIS, indicate whether the CoC gathers youth data from other sources (i.e., education, juvenile justice, child welfare, etc.). If the CoC does gather youth data from other sources, please describe the data collected, the system(s) the data is collected from and the system(s) in which the data is stored.
Question 7.8	Describe the performance measures the CoC has implemented throughout all its homelessness assistance programs.

Rating Factor 7: Youth Review Perspective	**General Applicant Strengths**:
	Applicants describes multiple ways to collect and utilize data. Youth and YAB are incorporated during data collections processes and implementations.
	In some instances, applicants incorporated the YAB vision in determining outcomes and success.
	General Applicant Weaknesses:
	Applicants in general missed the opportunity to describe how data is used to develop prevention methods and programs to end youth homelessness in this community.
	Applicants could have elaborated on the measure of success when considering the reduction of youth experiencing homelessness. Example: Instead of stating "a reduction to functional zero," and applicant may consider providing greater insight by specifying the reduction by stating "a reduction of 30% by 2019".
	When describing proposed outcome measures and how its community would define success, applicants could consider feedback from youth on what success looks like and collaborate with the youth that the CoC serves.