



Help Hope Home

Ending Homelessness In Southern Nevada

Continuum of Care Project Performance Program Eligibility Monitoring Tool 2016

Developed by:
Southern Nevada Homeless Continuum of Care (SNH CoC) Board
Monitoring Working Group

Date Range for Monitoring: 5/1/15-4/30/16	
Name of Recipient or Subrecipient:	
Project Name:	
Project Type:	<input type="checkbox"/> Permanent Supportive Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Rapid Rehousing <input type="checkbox"/> Transitional Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Safe Haven
Staff Consulted:	
Name of Reviewer(s):	
Date of Review:	

Performance Monitoring Report Results					
Standards (and Reference)	Response			Comments (Basis for Conclusion)	Score
1. What is the total of points on the program’s Performance Monitoring Report? Enter the score based on the parameters below. <i>Scoring: >90 = 50 points, 70-89 = 35 points, 51-69 = 20 points, <50 = 0 points. (50 points possible)</i>					
Participant Eligibility					
Standards (and Reference)	Response			Comments (Basis for Conclusion)	Score
2. Do the records demonstrate that the recipient or subrecipient had written intake procedures in place to ensure that documentation of program participants’ homeless status is maintained in accordance with the program requirements? [24 CFR 578.103(a)(3)-(4); 24 CFR 76.500(b); 24 CFR 576.500(c)] <i>Scoring: Yes = 5 points; No = 0 points (5 points possible)</i>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>		
3. Does the recipient or subrecipient ensure that program participants’ eligibility is adequately documented in terms of their homeless status upon entry into the program? [24 CFR 578.103] <i>Scoring: Yes = 5 points; No = 0 points (5 points possible)</i>					
4. Were the reviewed case files complete regarding participant eligibility, to include being positive for program eligibility AND containing proper documentation? (10% case files sampled) <i>Scoring: Determine % of complete case files out of sample reviewed. >90% = 10 points, 70%-89% = 7 points, 51%-69% = 4 points, <50% = 0 points. (10 points possible)</i>					
Utilization Rates					
Standards (and Reference)	Response			Comments (Basis for Conclusion)	Score
5. Does the program operate at full capacity, with low vacancy rate, and quickly fills vacancies? (refer to report) <i>Scoring: >90% = 10 points, 70%-89% = 7 points, 51%-69% = 4 points, <50% = 0 points. (10 points possible)</i>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>		

Drawdown Rates

Standards (and Reference)	Response			Comments (Basis for Conclusion)	Score
6. What was the unspent funds rate for the monitoring period? (refer to HUD eLOCCS/drawdown rate report) <i>Scoring: 0% = 10 points, 1-5% = 7 points, 5-10% = 5 points, >10% = 0 points (10 points possible)</i> <i>(If Drawdown Rate report is not available from HUD at the time of monitoring, leave this blank.)</i>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>		

Frequency of HUD Funds Recaptured

Standards (and Reference)	Response			Comments (Basis for Conclusion)	Score
7. Have any funds been recaptured by HUD during the monitoring period? (refer to HUD recapture report) <i>Scoring: No = 10 points; Yes = 0 points (10 points possible)</i> <i>(If Funds Recaptured report is not available from HUD at the time of monitoring, leave this blank.)</i>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>		

TOTAL SCORE

Standards (and Reference)	Response			Comments (Basis for Conclusion)	Score
8. What is the total of all points on this monitoring tool? <i>Scoring: (100 points possible)</i>					

Miscellaneous

Please use this space to list any additional comments, concerns, or observations.

Resources that were referenced in the development of this monitoring tool include select Exhibits from the HUD Community Planning and Development Monitoring Handbook 6509.2 REV-6 CHG-2. Other resources include the "CoC Review and Ranking Process" from City of New Bedford's Homeless Service Provider's Network.