

RENEWAL/EXPANSION PROJECT RATING TOOL

Project Name: √ MUTEH CoC RRH (29)
 Organization Name: MUTEH, Inc.
 Project Type: RRH (General)
 Project Identifier: 29

Print Blank Template

Print Report Card

Renewal/Expansion Projects
 Rating Complete

Met all threshold requirements

100%

RATING FACTOR	PERFORMANCE GOAL	PERFORMANCE	POINTS AWARDED	MAX POINT VALUE
PERFORMANCE MEASURES				
Length of Stay				
Rapid Re-Housing	On average, participants are placed in housing 15 days after referral to RRH	54 days	0	out of 20
Exits to Permanent Housing				
Rapid Re-Housing	90% move to PH	48 %	12	out of 25
Returns to Homelessness				
Within 12 months of exit to permanent housing	≤ 10% of participants return to homelessness within 12 months of exit to PH	15 %	10	out of 15
New or Increased Income and Earned Income				
Earned income for project stayers	8%+ of participants with new or increased income	6.3 %	2.0	out of 2.5
Non-employment income for project stayers	10%+ of participants with new or increased income	19 %	2.5	out of 2.5
Earned income for project leavers	15%+ of participants with new or increased income	13 %	2.2	out of 2.5
Non-employment income for project leavers	25%+ of participants with new or increased income	6.3 %	0.6	out of 2.5
Performance Measures Subtotal			29.27	out of 70
SERVE HIGH NEED POPULATIONS				
Rapid Re-Housing	≥ 95% of participants are chronically homeless	91 %	14.2	out of 20
Serve High Need Populations Subtotal			14.24	out of 20
PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS				
Project has reasonable costs	Costs are within local average cost per positive housing exit for project type	Yes	20	out of 20
Coordinated Entry Participation	≥ 95% of entries to project from CE referrals	100 %	10	out of 10
Housing First and/or Low Barrier Implementation	Commits to applying Housing First model	Yes	10	out of 10
Project Effectiveness Subtotal			40	out of 40
EQUITY FACTORS				
Agency Leadership, Governance, and Policies				
Recipient Management & Leadership Positions	BIPOC, LGBTQIA+, etc representation	Yes	10	out of 10
Recipient Board of Directors	BIPOC, LGBTQIA+, etc representation	Yes	10	out of 10
Process for receiving & incorporating feedback	Process includes persons with lived experience	Yes	10	out of 10
Internal Policies and Procedures	Policies with equitable lense, no undue barriers	Yes	10	out of 10
Program Participant Outcomes				
Outcomes with an equity lens	Data disaggregated by underserved populations	Yes	10	out of 10
Program changes for equitable outcomes	Plan to create more equitable program outcomes	Yes	10	out of 10
HMIS data review with equity lens	Plan to review disaggregated data	Yes	10	out of 10
Equity Factors Subtotal			70	out of 70
OTHER AND LOCAL CRITERIA				
CoC Monitoring Score	Project is operating in conformance to CoC standards	Yes	10	out of 10
Other and Local Criteria Subtotal			10	out of 10
TOTAL SCORE			163.51	out of 210
Weighted Rating Score			78	out of 100

PROJECT FINANCIAL INFORMATION

CoC funding requested	<i>NOTE: Edit on the LIST OF PROJECTS TO BE REVIEWED tab</i>	\$ 588,227
Amount of other public funding (federal, state, county, city)		
Amount of private funding		
TOTAL PROJECT COST		\$ 588,227
CoC Amount Awarded Last Operating Year	<i>NOTE: Edit on the LIST OF PROJECTS TO BE REVIEWED tab</i>	\$ -
CoC Amount Expended Last Operating Year	<i>NOTE: Edit on the LIST OF PROJECTS TO BE REVIEWED tab</i>	\$ -
Percent of CoC funding expended last operating year		0%