



Martha Are <martha.are@hsncfl.org>

Round 3 YHDP debrief

2 messages

Crouse, Caroline P <Caroline.P.Crouse@hud.gov>
To: "martha.are@hsncfl.org" <martha.are@hsncfl.org>

Fri, Oct 11, 2019 at 1:25 PM

Applicant: Homeless Services Network of Central Florida Inc.

Applicant Score: 87.38

	All Applications	Rural Applications
Highest Score	97.07	93.44
Lowest Score	49.83	54.44
Median Score	84.18	72.06

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)	Your CoC
Leadership Capacity	20	17.5	17.5	15.33
Resource Capacity	5	5	5	5.00
Community Need	10	8.67	7	9.75
Capacity for Innovation	15	12.5	10	13.00
Collaboration	20	18	16.83	19.00
Youth Collaboration	10	7.42	7	8.46
Data and Evaluation Capacity	20	16.17	14.17	16.50
Total	100			87.38

Competition Summary:

- On March 14, 2019, HUD published the YHDP Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) [Round 3] which allocated \$75 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 91 of the 111 applications submitted. Applications HUD did not score did not meet minimum threshold requirements outlined in Section III.C.I. of the NOFA and 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, or did not completely answer all questions.
- The lowest score for a selected non-rural community was 91.08 and the lowest score for a selected rural community was 72.08.
- HUD changed the definition of a rural to reflect an area that is more rural than suburban or urban.
- HUD updated the award formula to take high cost markets into consideration.
- HUD clarified rating criteria to emphasize youth voice and leadership.
- On August 29, 2019, HUD announced the selection of the following 23 communities for funding:

NON-RURAL COMMUNITIES

Allegheny County, Pennsylvania	\$3.49 million
Baltimore, Maryland	\$3.70 million
Clackamas County, Oregon	\$1.78 million
Cook County, Illinois	\$6.08 million
Des Moines, Iowa	\$1.87 million
Erie and Niagara Falls Counties, New York	\$3.59 million
Fairfield County, Connecticut	\$3.01 million
Honolulu, Hawaii	\$3.8 million
Indianapolis, Indiana	\$3.88 million
Palm Beach County, Florida	\$4.92 million
Prince George's County, Maryland	\$3.48 million
San Antonio/Bexar County, Texas	\$6.88 million
Springfield, Massachusetts	\$2.43 million
Tucson, Arizona	\$4.56 million
Washington, D.C.	\$4.28 million

RURAL COMMUNITIES

Alaska Balance of State	\$1.65 million
Franklin County, Massachusetts	\$1.96 million

Gulf Coast, Mississippi	\$2.05 million
Northeast Wyoming	\$1.08 million
Ohio Balance of State	\$1.47 million
State of Maine	\$3.35 million
State of Montana	\$3.43 million
Waco County, Texas	\$2.23 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. In general, the specific questions noted below were emphasized because, on average, applicants lost at least one-half point within the scoring criteria. 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 1: Leadership Capacity--20 points

HUD awarded up to 20 points if responses demonstrated leadership to effectively manage the development of a Coordinated Community Plan to prevent and end youth homelessness. In general, most applicants received full points on most questions in this section. Two questions where reviewers deducted points were:

Question 1.4	Demonstrate how the CoC includes direct youth participation. Some applicants lost points by not including how the CoC solicits and receives information from youth regarding youth homelessness.
Question 1.5	Demonstrate the CoC’s willingness and ability to engage organizations that are not currently engaged but will be essential in developing and implementing a coordinated community response to preventing and ending youth homelessness. Some applicants lost points because they did not include specific organizations or types of organizations in their responses.
Rating Factor 1: Youth Review Perspective	<p><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></p> <p>Applicants engaged youth participation.</p> <p>Youth input is in an advisory capacity.</p> <p>Youth participation appears to be relevant to the work being done.</p> <p><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></p> <p>Applicants provides youth little decisionmaking power.</p> <p>YAB is not being prepared to be an equitable partner.</p> <p>Most YAB are newly formed.</p>

Rating Factor 2: Resource Capacity--5 points

HUD awarded up to 5 points based on the current resources available in the community for youth experiencing 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 funding letter.

Question 2.2	Demonstrate how the CoC will obtain additional funding, other than HUD technical assistance (TA), to support the planning process for the Demonstration. HUD reviewed
---------------------	---

	submitted letters for name and type of organization, amount of funding available, and expenditure restrictions.
--	---

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 and needs of the community's homeless youth. The most common reason HUD deducted points in this section was because the community had not recently completed a youth needs assessment or had not involved youth in planning or executing the annual PIT count. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

Question 3.1	Indicate whether a youth specific homelessness needs assessment was completed within the community in the past 5 years prior to the submission of this application.
Question 3.2a	Describe the most recent youth homelessness needs assessment conducted by the CoC, the narrative must include the following: From what specific youth systems, organizations, and agencies the needs assessment originated, including the name of the lead and partnering agencies or organizations.
Question 3.2b	Describe the most recent youth homelessness needs assessment conducted by the CoC, the narrative must include the following: How youth were involved in designing or executing the needs assessment.
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 3.2e	An explanation of the key findings from the youth homelessness needs assessment including the number and types of youth appropriate housing units and the number of youths.
Question 3.3e6	How youth were involved in designing or executing the youth-specific count.
Rating Factor 3: Youth Review Perspective	<p><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></p> <p>Applicants identified several factors that contribute to youth homelessness.</p> <p>Applicants seem to have a clear understanding of the needs of the community.</p> <p>Applicants used a variety of systems to identify community needs.</p> <p><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></p> <p>Some applicants did not provide an in-depth description of how the community needs were identified.</p> <p>Youth of color cause of being homeless was not identified.</p>

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 successfully participating in the Demonstration. 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. A number of applicants lost points on this question because they did not include a specific provider, did not summarize challenges, or say if the experience was successful.
Question 4.2	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. Applicants lost points if they do not currently operate both of these models or are not using a Housing First model.
Question 4.5	Demonstrate willing to learn from failure. Describe a recent innovation or effort undertaken by the CoC or a youth homeless provider in the community. Applicants frequently lost points on this question because they did not indicate what was unsuccessful and what they learned from the experience.

<p>Question 4.7</p>	<p>Demonstrate willingness to question existing models and test new methodologies. Describe the most innovative example of testing a new methodology where the CoC or other youth stakeholders were the key actor and occurred in the past 5 years. Applicants frequently lost points on this question because they did not identify the key stakeholders or did not indicate that the experience was within the previous five years.</p>
<p>Rating Factor 4: Youth Review Perspective</p>	<p><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></p> <p>Applicants collaborated with YAB to identify areas of risk.</p> <p>Applicants Systems Maps were clear, detailed and concise.</p> <p>Applicants focused on gaps in the system.</p> <p><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></p> <p>Though most applicants provided vivid description of failures, they did not offer lessons learned.</p> <p>Best practices seem to be a common theme, instead of finding new solutions.</p> <p>YAB did not appear to be included in the innovation process.</p>

Rating Factor 5: Collaboration – 20 points

HUD awarded up to 20 points to applicants that can demonstrated strong community-wide partnerships that are working to prevent and end youth homelessness. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

<p>Question 5.1</p>	<p>Describe the CoC's current written plan or strategy to prevent and end youth homelessness. Applicants often lost points because they did not include the names of organizations or agencies that helped to develop, signed, or adopted the plan.</p>
<p>Question 5.3d</p>	<p>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. A number of applicants did not indicate which providers not funded by CoC or ESG participate in coordinated entry.</p>
<p>Question 5.4</p>	<p>How does the CoC work with each of the following institutions to ensure that participants in the programs are not released into homelessness?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child welfare (Foster Care) • Justice system (juvenile and adult) • Institutions of mental and physical health <p>A number of applicants lost points because they did not address the discharge strategy from all three institutions.</p>
<p>Rating Factor 5: Youth Review Perspective</p>	<p><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></p> <p>Applicants are working to strengthen community partnerships with multiple systems.</p> <p>Applicants described PCWA involvement.</p> <p>-</p> <p><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></p>

	<p>Many applicants only had YAB Chair as representative on CoC Board.</p> <p>Although applicants prioritize family reunification, they did not describe any metrics to ensure youth return to a safe environment.</p> <p>Institutional discharge strategies lack innovation. The discharge plans seem to be that of the institution.</p>
--	--

Rating Factor 6: Youth Collaboration—10 points

HUD awarded up to 10 points if responses demonstrated youth voice to addressing and ending youth homelessness. In order to be successful, applicants must consider how youth with lived experience will be integrated into system and program design and implementation. This was a new section in the Round 3 YHDP NOFA and was the section where applicants most frequently lost points. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

Question 6.1	Describe the mission and vision of the YAB. A number of applicants did not list both a mission and vision for the YAB.
Question 6.2d	How are youth and young adults with lived experience recruited for membership in the YAB? A number of the applicants did not show that the recruitment for youth on the YAB was youth-driven and public.
Question 6.2e	Describe the decisionmaking structure of the YAB. Applicants frequently did not describe a formalized decisionmaking structure.
Question 6.2f	How is the YAB integrated into CoC-wide work (i.e. beyond issues solely dealing with youth homelessness)? Applicants frequently lost points if the YAB did not appear to be well-integrated into CoC work.
Question 6.3	How are youth incentivized to participate in the YAB or other aspects of the youth homelessness system? These may include paid positions, professional development opportunities, access to other resources, etc. Applicants frequently lost points if the incentives for youth did not include professional development opportunities and monetary incentives (beyond food or gift cards).
Question 6.4	From a youth perspective, what are the biggest challenges to integrating youth voice into community decisionmaking structures? Many applicants did not demonstrate how their answer to this question came from a youth perspective.
Question 6.5	From a youth perspective, what are the biggest challenges/barriers to sustaining a YAB? Many applicants did not demonstrate how their answer to this question came from a youth perspective.
Rating Factor 6: Youth Review Perspective	<p><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></p> <p>Some YABs have formal decisionmaking structures.</p> <p>Some YABs Mission and Vision were clearly described.</p> <p>Some applicants provided authentic youth feedback and perspective as youth quote.</p> <p><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></p>

	<p>Mission and Vision did not seem youth generated.</p> <p>Most applicants do not use formal pay structure, instead youth are incentivized with gift cards, food, transportation, etc.</p> <p>Applicants seem to exclude youth in decisionmaking.</p>
--	---

Rating Factor 7: Data and Evaluation Capacity

HUD awarded up to 20 points if responses demonstrated the existence of a functioning HMIS that facilitates in the collection of 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 7.2	Indicate the percentage of all types of youth beds, excluding beds provided by victim service providers, that are covered in HMIS, regardless of funding source.
Question 7.3	Describe how the CoC actively recruits new homeless projects to HMIS for youth-dedicated projects. Applicants lost points if they did not have a recruitment strategy.
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.). Applicants frequently lost points if they did not collect data on youth homelessness from non-HMIS sources or if they did not adequately describe the data.
Question 7.8a	<p>Describe the performance measures the CoC has implemented throughout all its homelessness assistance programs. The description should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The target data point and universe group for each measure. • How the data necessary to determine performance are initially collected and reported • The local evaluation/monitoring process. <p>Applicants most frequently lost points if they did not include the target data point for each measure.</p>
Question 7.9	Demonstrate how the CoC has used data, either data regarding the composition of the local homeless youth population or the effectiveness of various interventions for serving homeless youth, in developing a strategy to prevent and end youth homelessness. Applicants lost points if they did not identify specific data or did not include how those data were used to develop a strategy.
Question 7.10	Describe how youth are brought into evaluation and quality improvement conversation in your community. Applicants lost points if they did not include youth feedback and involvement in the evaluation and quality improvement work in the community.

Rating Factor 7: Youth Review Perspective	<p><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></p> <p>Applicants defined specific outcome measures.</p> <p>-</p> <p><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></p> <p>Applicants lacked youth voice on success.</p> <p>Applicants did not seem to prioritize subpopulations such as LGBTQ, POC, and pregnant and parenting youth.</p>
--	---

Martha Are <martha.are@hsncfl.org>
 To: Brian Postlewait <brian.postlewait@hsncfl.org>

Fri, Oct 11, 2019 at 2:00 PM

[Quoted text hidden]
 [Quoted text hidden]

Question 6.1	Describe the mission and vision of the YAB. A number of applicants did not list both a mission and vision for the YAB.
Question 6.2d	How are youth and young adults with lived experience recruited for membership in the YAB? A number of the applicants did not show that the recruitment for youth on the YAB was youth-driven and public.
Question 6.2e	Describe the decisionmaking structure of the YAB. Applicants frequently did not describe a formalized decisionmaking structure.
Question 6.2f	How is the YAB integrated into CoC-wide work (i.e. beyond issues solely dealing with youth homelessness)? Applicants frequently lost points if the YAB did not appear to be well-integrated into CoC work.
Question 6.3	How are youth incentivized to participate in the YAB or other aspects of the youth homelessness system? These may include paid positions, professional development opportunities, access to other resources, etc. Applicants frequently lost points if the incentives for youth did not include professional development opportunities and monetary incentives (beyond food or gift cards).
Question 6.4	From a youth perspective, what are the biggest challenges to integrating youth voice into community decisionmaking structures? Many applicants did not demonstrate how their answer to this question came from a youth perspective.
Question 6.5	From a youth perspective, what are the biggest challenges/barriers to sustaining a YAB? Many applicants did not demonstrate how their answer to this question came from a youth perspective.
Rating Factor 6: Youth Review Perspective	<p>[Quoted text hidden]</p> <p>General Applicant Weaknesses:</p> <p>Mission and Vision did not seem youth generated.</p> <p>Most applicants do not use formal pay structure, instead youth are incentivized with gift cards, food, transportation, etc.</p> <p>Applicants seem to exclude youth in decisionmaking.</p>

Rating Factor 7: Data and Evaluation Capacity

HUD awarded up to 20 points if responses demonstrated the existence of a functioning HMIS that facilitates in the collection of 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 7.2	Indicate the percentage of all types of youth beds, excluding beds provided by victim service providers, that are covered in HMIS, regardless of funding source.
Question 7.3	Describe how the CoC actively recruits new homeless projects to HMIS for youth-dedicated projects. Applicants lost points if they did not have a recruitment strategy.
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.). Applicants frequently lost points if they did not collect data on youth homelessness from non-HMIS sources or if they did not adequately describe the data.
Question 7.8a	Describe the performance measures the CoC has implemented throughout all its homelessness assistance programs. The description should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The target data point and universe group for each measure. • How the data necessary to determine performance are initially collected and reported • The local evaluation/monitoring process. Applicants most frequently lost points if they did not include the target data point for each measure.
Question 7.9	Demonstrate how the CoC has used data, either data regarding the composition of the local homeless youth population or the effectiveness of various interventions for serving homeless youth, in developing a strategy to prevent and end youth homelessness. Applicants lost points if they did not identify specific data or did not include how those data were used to develop a strategy.
Question 7.10	Describe how youth are brought into evaluation and quality improvement conversation in your community. Applicants lost points if they did not include youth feedback and involvement in the evaluation and quality improvement work in the community.

Rating Factor 7: Youth Review Perspective	<p>General Applicant Strengths:</p> <p>Applicants defined specific outcome measures.</p> <p>-</p> <p>General Applicant Weaknesses:</p> <p>Applicants lacked youth voice on success.</p> <p>Applicants did not seem to prioritize subpopulations such as LGBTQ, POC, and pregnant and parenting youth.</p>
--	---



Martha Are | Executive Director

Ph: (407) 893 - 0133 x602

Cel: (919) 559 - 6193

Fax: (407) 893 - 5299

4065 L.B. McLeod Rd, Suite D

Orlando, FL 32811

www.hsncl.org | www.centralfloridacoc.org

CFCH Youth Workgroup Vision Goals and Objectives 2020

Vision:

Every youth experiencing housing instability should have the opportunity to access the appropriate and unique resource needed in order to successfully prevent and/or transition out of homelessness.

Focus Areas:

Mental Health
Housing Units
Affordable Housing

Mental Health Goals:

Low hanging fruit: Goals within the next 90 days

1. A transparent list of mental health resources and accessibility options
 - a. Identify a resource sharing platform and a person/provider to keep the list updated.

Short Term: Goals within 1 year

1. Required mental health education/training for first responders in order to provide quality services.

Long-Term: Goals within the next 3-5 years

1. Tri-County area to provide all free youth mental health services from public and private sources.

Housing Unit Goals:

Low hanging fruit: Goals within the next 90 days

1. Work with YAS to identify and create a list of youth specific needs/barriers for housing by March 2020.
 - a. Establish list of questions for YAS and have a food and focus group at an upcoming YAS meeting.
2. Work with HLT to develop a separate youth focused housing inventory by March 31, 2020.
 - a. With above outcomes of YAS focus group, work with HLT to create youth housing inventory list.
3. Explore other housing models that meet the needs of youth ex. ROPL at Zebra by March 31, 2020.
 - a. Consult Brett (Zebra) and national models (CRN) regards other possible housing models.

Short Term: Goals within 1 year

1. Identify key players who work youth in the area of housing i.e. providers and case managers by January 31, 2021.
 - a. Identify by possible models who are potential providers and the needed resources.
2. Educate and create awareness within community, providers, and stakeholders working with youth for housing on the understanding of the system flow (coming through CES and process flow), while in turn bring awareness of new/available resources.
 - a. Develop a presentation on system training and discussion at the OCPS Summit in summer of 2020.
3. Work with new communication/community staff (to be developed) and CRN staff to create an on-going platform for continued awareness and education with a housing focus.

Long-Term: Goals within the next 3-5 years

1. 1. With YAS input, develop a list of youth specific trainings that will assist youth in maintaining stable housing by December 2023.
 - a. Research best practices and consider YAS feedback.
 - b. Develop a robust training for case managers who specialize in working with youth on youth needs and youth housing needs by December 2023.
 - c. Develop consistent training to be implemented system wide through HSN.

Affordable Housing Goals

Low hanging fruit: Goals within the next 90 days

1. Establish affordable housing rate based on actual wage of unaccompanied homeless youth/young adults.
 - a. Research data around wage and housing affordability, specific to youth.
 - b. Current (annual) number of youth currently stably housed
 - c. Current estimated number of youth needing housing
2. Develop a message around the data focusing on the unique needs of youth and long-term cost of waiting to address.

Short Term: Goals within 1 year

1. Advocate with housing authority for 10 youth specific vouchers form those currently available.
 - a. Identify contacts on housing authorities and present message
2. Advocate with local employers with capacity to house and employ youth.
 - a. Identify the employers and present message.
3. Raise the level of awareness around youth specific homeless issues.
 - a. Send resolution to CFCH Leadership Council expressing the Workgroups desire for more Youth Specific Initiatives along with data collected to support the need.

Long-Term: Goals within the next 3-5 years

1. To secure double (2X the amount of the documented number of unaccompanied homeless youth) in number of affordable housing units available for young adults.

- a. Identify data source and track quarterly.

Group: Mental Health

Chaira Lopez. Lopezcz@scps.k12.fl.us
Erica Astacio. eastacio@covenanthousefl.org
Kimberlee Riley. kriley@cfocf.org
Katrese Hampton. katrese.hampton@hscnfl.org
George Garcia. Garcia.george1094@yahoo.com
Kelsey Williams. kwilliams@covenanthousefl.org
Jasmin Reyes. Jasmin.reyesbaerga@ocps.net
Tina Morgan. Tina.morgan@myflfamilies.com

Group: Housing Units

Jennifer Ortiz. jortiz@seminolecountyfl.gov
Elizabeth Burgess. Elizabeth.burgess@crncfl.org
Gretchelle Soto. gretchellesoto@gmail.com
Heather Thomas. Heather.thomas@ocfl.net
Christine Cleveland Christine.cleveland@ocps.net
Jon Atchison. jon@upcenters.org
Yesmine Prosper. yesmine.prosper@gmail.com

Group: Affordable Housing

Rebecca Leininger. Rebecca.leininger@embracefamilies.org
Leonard Bass. Lbass11@valenciacollege.edu
Christopher Fowler. Christopher.fowler@hscnfl.org
Rashad Haynes. l.rashad.haynes@hscnfl.org
Todd Carr. tc@pavdevco.com
Bret Burlone. bburlone@zebrayouth.org
Miriam Mengistie mmengistie@st.lukes.org

CFCH Youth Work Group

Tuesday, March 10th, 2020

1pm-2:30pm

AGENDA

1. Welcome
2. YAS Update
3. Workgroup Member Updates
4. YHDP 2020 Planning
5. Goals and Objectives: Low Hanging Fruit
6. CFCH "Roadmap Home" Strategic Planning
7. Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 14th, 2020

NOTES: