

FY21 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Applicant Debriefing

Applicant:

Applicant Score:

	All Applications	Rural Applications
Highest Score	98.17	89
Lowest Score	41.67	45.5
Median Score	80.50	72

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	15	13	12.33	
Community Need	20	15.67	13	
Collaboration	15	13.33	12.33	
Youth Collaboration	30	23.33	21.33	
Data and Evaluation Capacity	20	16.33	13.67	
Total				
Rural Bonus for FY2021 funds	10			

Competition Summary:

- On March 24, 2022, HUD published the YHDP Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) [FY 2021] which allocated \$72 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 53 of 66 applications submitted. Applications HUD did not score were not submitted by the Collaborative Applicant, as required in section III.A. of the NOFO, or were duplicate application submissions.
- The NOFO required complete answers to all questions and Section IV.B.1. of the NOFO listed all required attachments. HUD deducted points for applications that did not completely answer all questions.
- The lowest score for a selected non-rural community was 91.33 and the lowest score for a selected rural community was 90.33.

FY21 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Applicant Debriefing

- GA-501 was funded with FY2022 funding in order to correct an error made during the evaluation process for the FY2019/FY2020 YHDP NOFO competition
-

On October 24, 2022, HUD announced the selection of the following 17 communities for funding:

Selected Communities: Round 6

Community	State	Rural	Total Award
Balance of State Washington	WA	Yes	\$5,290,560
Cuyahoga County	OH	No	\$3,977,869
Tulsa County	OK	No	\$5,380,192
Philadelphia	PA	No	\$8,779,924
Northeastern South Carolina	SC	Yes	\$3,159,750
Balance of State Colorado	CO	Yes	\$2,975,969
Lynn	MA	No	\$2,372,347
Orlando, Orange, Osceola, and Seminole Counties	FL	No	\$8,377,776
County of Santa Barbara	CA	No	\$5,167,564
Kent County	MI	No	\$2,477,852
Worcester County	MA	No	\$2,608,992
Sacramento	CA	No	\$6,509,295
Barnstable County	MA	No	\$1,357,556
Richmond	VA	No	\$4,478,877
Jackson/West Tennessee	TN	Yes	\$2,228,208

FY21 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Applicant Debriefing

Balance of State Missouri	MO	Yes	\$6,857,269
Balance of State Georgia* *FY 2019/FY 2020 additional selected community	GA	Yes	\$11,699,223

Below is an overview of the NOFO 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 one-half point within the scoring criteria. See [Section V.A.1. of the NOFO](#) for specific information on scoring criteria and to review the questions identified in the tables below.

Rating Factor I: Leadership Capacity–15 points

HUD awarded up to 15 points to applicants that demonstrate they had the necessary leadership in place to effectively manage the development of a Coordinated Community Plan to prevent and end youth homelessness. In general, applicants did well on this section. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

Question 1.3	<p><i>Demonstrate how the YAB decision-making process is integrated into the larger CoC and how recommendations or decisions from the YAB are implemented.</i></p> <p>Applicants mainly lost point on this question due to lack of specific details on how the YAB and its decisions/recommendations are truly integrated into the larger CoC. Reviewers noted answers being vague or addressing future processes. It was also noted that several applicants applied this question to just a specific task, such as the PIT and not to overall CoC functions.</p>
Question 1.5	<p><i>Describe the CoC’s current written plan OR strategy to prevent and end youth homelessness. If a part of a plan to prevent and end all forms of homelessness, to get maximum points under these criteria, there must be a dedicated Section OR set of youth-specific strategies and objectives. The narrative should include the organizations or agencies that helped to develop, signed, or adopted the plan.</i></p> <p>Applicants mainly lost points on this question for the following reasons. The first issue was applicants not having current strategic plans. Applicants lost points when they discussed creating future plans or revising current plans. The second issue was not including the organizations/agencies that helped to develop and adopt plans. Applicants also lost points for strategic plans that had general</p>

FY21 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Applicant Debriefing

	objectives not specifically addressing youth homelessness.
Question 1.9	<p><i>Describe how youth are prepared, debriefed, and otherwise supported for participation in committee meetings and other planning and feedback events.</i></p> <p>Applicants mainly lost points on this question for not including details on onboarding processes for youth CoC involvement.</p>
Rating Factor 1: Youth Review Perspective	<p><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intentional about youth involvement • Vision for structure and committees is very ambitious and requires a lot of YAB engagement • Training offers for youth are prioritized when needed. • Intentional about creating opportunities for youth to participate and share their youth voice • really cool to use art and media as a form of advocacy <p><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YAB is not mentioned to be currently involved in meetings or any planning yet • Response does not describe what it means in their community. It is a generic description of authentic youth collaboration • Only having one youth as a voting member on the CoC which does not create space for authentic youth engagement and feels slightly tokenistic • YAB is newly formed, their decision implementation is not yet fully employed • Response did not give the sense that youth are provided any briefing prior to existing in these spaces. It is imperative that youth are given the information necessary to collaborate as equals alongside community stakeholders

Rating Factor 2: Community Need - 20 Points

HUD awarded 20 points to applicants that demonstrated high need in the community based on the number and needs of the community's youth experiencing homelessness. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

Question 2.4	<i>If identified, how will your community address the disparities, consistent with fair housing and civil rights requirements? If you have not conducted such an assessment, what are your plans to assess the rates of homelessness, outreach</i>
---------------------	--

FY21 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Applicant Debriefing

	<p><i>activities, applications for housing assistance, or rates of housing placement from the homeless response system for populations that have a higher incidence of homelessness?</i></p> <p>Applicants mainly lost point on this question for not fully addressing the assessment of housing assistance applications to the rates of housing placements for populations that have higher incidences of homelessness. Applicants who clearly identified disparities at time lost points due to not describing how disparities would be addressed.</p>
<p>Question 2.5</p>	<p><i>Describe how your community is addressing needs of transgender, gender non-conforming, and non-binary youths to ensure privacy, respect, safety, and access in projects, such as shelters, outreach activities, and permanent housing.</i></p> <p>Applicants mainly lost point on this question due to not addressing privacy and safety. Some applicants lost points as they discussed LBGQTQIA+ training for providers but did not include how the training impacted actual community practice.</p>
<p>Rating Factor 2: Youth Review Perspective</p>	<p><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth Homelessness Committee and YAB conducted the needs assessment • Youth directly participated in designing the survey used for the needs assessment • Racial Equity Plan to address disparities • Youth voice was used to shape goals and objectives of assessment plan <p><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing individual issues and not systemic or community level • Vague responses and not enough direct examples of how organizations are ensuring the safety or privacy of trans, nonbinary or gender non-conforming youth • Providers are being trained but not seeing details on how those trainings are implemented or addressing the issue of access

Rating Factor 3: Collaboration - 15 Points

HUD awarded up to 15 points to applicants that demonstrated strong current communitywide partnerships that are working to prevent and end youth homelessness. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

<p>Question 3.2</p>	<p><i>Describe how youth are prioritized within the coordinated entry process, including factors used to prioritize youth or subpopulations of youth.</i></p> <p>Applicants lost points on this question for either not prioritizing youth at all or for</p>
----------------------------	--

FY21 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Applicant Debriefing

	not including the specific factors used to prioritize youth.
Question 3.3	<p><i>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 LGBTQ+ resource centers, including Public Child Welfare Agency (PCWAs) and other mainstream resource providers) are integrated into the coordinated entry process.</i></p> <p>Applicants lost points on this question for describing future partnerships and not addressing current youth serving agencies integration into CES. Reviewers also noted that some applicants listed partners but did not clearly describe how they worked together.</p>

Rating Factor 4: Youth Collaboration – 30 Points:

HUD awarded up to 30 points to applicants that demonstrated how voices of Youth with lived experience of homelessness are a crucial component to addressing and ending youth homelessness. Successful responses to this Section were clearly be written by Youth Action Board (YAB) members and applicants considered how youth with lived experience will be integrated into system and program design and implementation. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

Question 4.6	<p><i>Describe how the YAB are recruited to ensure the YAB represents the population, including racial, ethnic, and gender identities, of youth experiencing homelessness in your community.</i></p> <p>Applicants mainly lost point on this question for having vague recruitment strategies or for not having strategies to ensure the YAB was diverse in regards to racial, ethnic and gender identities.</p>
Question 4.8	<p><i>If compensation is not provided, how are youth incentivized to participate in the YAB or other aspects of the youth homelessness system? This may include professional development opportunities, access to other resources, etc.</i></p> <p>Applicants lost points on this question for not providing clear details on additional incentives provided to youth.</p>
Question 4.10	<p><i>Attach a letter of support for the application from the Youth Action Board (YAB), signed by all members of the YAB.</i></p> <p>Applicants lost points for not including YAB support letters or for including letter that did not meet the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Signed by at least 3 members of the YAB. - Indicates the age ranges of all YAB members.

FY21 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Applicant Debriefing

	- Certifies that the YAB meets the requirements outlined in Section I.A.4.k of this NOFO. The letter does not need to list each requirement.
Rating Factor 4: Youth Review Perspective	<p><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently hiring youth with lived experience in their partner agencies • Using multiple forms of payment based on youth choice, PayPal, direct cash transfers, electronic gift cards, etc. • Includes quotes from youth <p><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wish they would have included testimonials from youth • The structure of the YAB itself is not described at all • General response. Informal decision-making structure within YAB

Rating Factor 5: Data and Evaluation – 20 points

HUD awarded up to 20 points to applicants that demonstrated the existence of a functioning Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) that facilitates 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 5.5	<p><i>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). If the CoC does gather youth data from other sources, please describe the data collected, the system(s) the data are collected from, and the system(s) in which the data are stored.</i></p> <p>Applicants mainly lost points on this question for not providing information on specific data points that were being collected by other sources.</p>
Question 5.8	<p><i>Describe how youth are currently brought into evaluation and quality improvement conversations in your community, either at the project or system level.</i></p> <p>Applicants lost points on this question for lack of youth involvement in program evaluation and quality improvement.</p>
Rating Factor 5: Youth Review Perspective	<p><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YAB members and youth with lived experience are implemented into project design and grant-writing, and provide input/feedback on program improvement and effectiveness

FY21 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Applicant Debriefing

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Incorporating youth into the design and development of program monitoring tools <p><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A description of how youth and young adults are consulted is missing• No current involvement in decision-making of quality improvement
--	--
