

2017 Continuum of Care Program Competition PA-603 Ranking Criteria & Process

Review & Ranking Process

A sub-committee of reviewers was developed representing various perspectives of our housing and homeless partners including: local CoC & HUD priorities; regional needs and practices; local housing challenges; victim service needs; effective program management; unique needs of homeless HHs; coordinated entry; and mainstream resources. This sub-committee reviewed and ranked each application including two Rapid Rehousing proposals submitted in response to the Permanent Housing Bonus RFP.

The committee used an objective tool for scoring each of the applications. Our local priorities align with HUD's 2017 priorities and were embedded in these tools with these measures: exit to Permanent Housing rates; collaboration with CoC partners and mainstream resources; cost effectiveness; use of housing first methods; and reducing length of time homeless as measured by return to homelessness rates. In addition to the scoring process, the committee was briefed on the option of reallocation to shift funds from lower performing projects to higher performing projects.

A week before the ranking meeting, the reviewers received packets for each of the applicants. The packets included:

- Project application
- CoC Summary Report that included data from APRs; HMIS; Technical Assistance Review; and meeting attendance sheets
- Project Scoring Tools for each project type

After carefully reviewing the packets, the reviewers scored each project. When the reviewers met they ensured consistent understanding of the measures, and then discussed their scores and rationale. The scores were then averaged to give an overall score for each project. This scoring created the foundation for the ranking. The reviewers discussed the pros and cons of Transitional Housing and the role it serves in our CoC. The reviewers also discussed the unique roles of Coordinated Entry and HMIS and considered their significant impact on the CoC's systemic response. The reviewers then worked as a group to adjust the ranking in accordance with both the scores and while considering HUD and local priorities as well as local needs.

Any questions about the Review & Rank process should be directed to Dina Ciabattone at:

ciabattoneidina@gmail.com

**2017 PA-603 Continuum of Care Program competition
PSH and TH Rating & Ranking Tool**

Program Name: _____

PSH: _____ TH: _____

Measure & Data Source	Point Structure	Pts Given
-----------------------	-----------------	-----------

SEVERITY OF NEED

1. Characteristics of Need (Renewal 3B)	1 point for serving people with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - low or no income - substance abuse - history of victimization - criminal histories - chronic homeless status - poor rental history - no interest in supportive services - mental health 	
2. Evidence of program commitment to addressing severity of need (CoC Summary Report, Table 1 - <i>Policies & Procedures</i>)	2 points for 90% or higher 1 point for 80-89% 0 points for less than 80%	
3. Type of Population Served (Renewal 3B, 5B)	1 point for serving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - chronically homeless - victims of domestic violence - families and youth - veterans - people with substance use 	

RENEWAL APPLICATION DETAILS

4. Provides a clear and concise description of the scope of the project. (Renewal 3B)	Give 1 point each for mentioning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - community need for program - target population - projected outcomes - coordination with partners - why it should be CoC funded - plan for addressing housing and service needs 	
5. Budget includes 25% match & commitment letter (Renewal 6D)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
6. Mentions participating in Coordinated Entry/Assessment (Renewal 3B)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	

2017 PA-603 Continuum of Care Program competition
PSH and TH Rating & Ranking Tool

MONITORING

7. Was project's APR submitted on time? (CoC Summary Report, Table 2)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
8. Did project demonstrate sound fiscal practices including maintaining consistent draw downs? (CoC Summary Report, Table1 - <i>Fiscal Practices</i>)	2 points for 95% or higher 1 point for 90-95% 0 points for less than 90%	
9. Unit Utilization Rate (CoC Summary Report, Table 3)	- 2 points for 90% or higher - 1 point if 80-89% - 0 points for below 80%	
10. Were any project funds recaptured (CoC Summary Report, Table 4)	No – 2 points Yes – 0 points	
11. Cost Effectiveness (CoC Summary Report, Table 5)	<i>For PSH:</i> 2 points if equal or less than \$5,781 (CoC PSH Avg) <i>For PSH:</i> 1 point if within \$1000 of CoC PSH Avg. <i>For TH:</i> 2 points if equal or less than \$16,303 (National Avg*) <i>For TH:</i> 1 point if within \$1,000 of national Avg.	

PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES

12. Access to mainstream resources (Renewal 3B, 4A)	- 1 point for mentioning 3 resources to refer clients to (3B) - 2 points for SOAR trained (4A) - 1 point for annual assessment of needs (4A)	
13. Exited households move onto permanent housing (CoC Summary Report, Table 6)	For PSH: 2 points if equal to or above 81% (2016 Sys PM) For PSH: 1 point if 74%-80% For TH: 2 points if equal to or above 49% (2016 Sys PM) For TH: 1 point if 40%-48%	
14. Rate of return to homelessness within 6 months of exit to PH (CoC Summary Report, Table 7)	For PSH: 2 points for 3% or less rate For PSH: 1 points for 4-6% For TH: 2 points for 12% or less rate For TH: 1 point for 12-20%	
15. Increased income (CoC Summary Report, Table 8)	- 2 points if equal or greater than CoC Average of 27% - 1 point if within 8 points of the CoC Average	

**2017 PA-603 Continuum of Care Program competition
PSH and TH Rating & Ranking Tool**

CoC PARTICIPATION

16. Attended majority of monthly Coalition meetings (CoC Summary Report, Table 9)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
17. Attended majority monthly Supportive Housing Program mtgs (CoC Summary Report, Table 10)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
18. Attended the annual HMIS Refresh (CoC Summary Report, Table 11)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	

Total Points Awarded:

Total Points Available: 51

Reviewer's Comments:

Reviewer: _____

Date: _____

Data Sources

* Housing & Urban Development, *Cost Association with First Time Homelessness For Families and Individuals, 2010*

CoC Summary Report includes data from: HMIS; 2016 Systems Performance Measures Report; program's most recently submitted Annual Progress Reports; 2017 Technical Assistance & Review monitoring; and meeting sign-in sheets

**2017 PA-603 Continuum of Care Program competition
New Project Rating & Ranking Tool**

Program Name: _____

Measure & Data Source	Point Structure	Pts Given
-----------------------	-----------------	-----------

SEVERITY OF NEED

1. Characteristics of Need (Application 3B)	1 point for serving people with: - low or no income - substance abuse - history of victimization - criminal histories - chronic homeless status - poor rental history - no interest in supportive services - mental health	
2. Type of Population Served (Application 3B, 5B)	1 point for serving: - chronically homeless - victims of domestic violence - families and youth - veterans - people with substance use	

RENEWAL APPLICATION DETAILS

3. Provides a clear and concise description of the scope of the project. (Application 3B)	Give 1 point each for mentioning: - community need for program - target population - projected outcomes - coordination with partners - why it should be CoC funded - plan for addressing housing and service needs	
4. Budget includes 25% match & commitment letter (Application 6I)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
5. Mentions participating in Coordinated Entry/Assessment (Application 3B.3)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
6. Does the application provide a timeline for starting the program in a timely manner? (Application 3B.2)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
7. Does the application demonstrate sound fiscal practices including maintaining consistent draw downs? (Application 2B)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
8. Does the agency show	Yes – 2 points	

**2017 PA-603 Continuum of Care Program competition
New Project Rating & Ranking Tool**

capacity to manage a federal grant? (App. 2B)	No – 0 points	
9. Does the agency have sufficient experience with homelessness? (Application 2B)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
10. Cost Effectiveness (CoC Summary Report, Table 5)	- 2 points if equal or less than \$4,100 (National RRH Avg)* - 1 point if within \$1000 of National RRH Avg.	

PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES

11. Access to mainstream resources (Application 3B, 4A)	- 1 point for mentioning 3 resources to refer clients to (3B) - 2 points for SOAR trained (4A) - 1 point for annual assessment of needs (4A)	
12. Does the project have a plan for moving exited households onto permanent housing (Application 3B)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
13. Does the project have a plan for assisting participants with Increasing their income? (Application 3B)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	

CoC PARTICIPATION

14. Does the application mention participating in CoC activities - Coalition and supportive housing partners meetings, HMIS training etc? (Application 3B)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
--	---------------------------------	--

Total Points Available: 43

Total Points Awarded:

Reviewer's Comments

Reviewer: _____

Date: _____

Data Sources

**National Alliance to End Homelessness, "Rapid Re-housing: A History and Core Components", 2014*

CoC Summary Report includes data from: HMIS; 2016 Systems Performance Measures Report; program's most recently submitted Annual Progress Reports; 2017 Technical Assistance & Review monitoring; and meeting sign-in sheets

2017 PA-603 Continuum of Care Program competition
Homeless Management Information System Rating & Ranking Tool

Measure & Data Source	Point Structure	Pts Given
-----------------------	-----------------	-----------

RENEWAL APPLICATION DETAILS

1. Provides a clear and concise description of the scope of the project. (Renewal 3B)	Give 1 point each for mentioning: - projected outcomes - coordination with partners - why it should be CoC funded - plan for addressing identified HMIS needs	
2. Budget includes 25% match & commitment letter (Renewal 6D)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
3. Does HMIS collect all Universal Data Elements? (Renewal 4A, 1a)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
4. Does HMIS produce all HUD reports and data as needed for HUD reporting? (Renewal 4A, 2a)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
5. Does HMIS produce an unduplicated count of clients receiving CoC services? (Renewal 4A, 3)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
6. Does HMIS have a staff person responsible for insuring the implementation meets all security standards as required by HUD? (Renewal 4A, 4)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	

MONITORING

7. Was project's APR submitted on time? (CoC Summary Report, Table 2)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
8. Were any project funds recaptured (CoC Summary Report, Table 4)	No – 2 points Yes – 0 points	
9. Does the HMIS grant present as cost Effective? (CoC Summary Report, Table 5)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
10. TAR Score (CoC Summary Report, Table 1)	2 points for 90% or higher 1 point for 80-89% 0 points for less than 80%	

2017 PA-603 Continuum of Care Program competition
Homeless Management Information System Rating & Ranking Tool

CoC PARTICIPATION

11. Attended majority of monthly Coalition meetings (CoC Summary Report, Table 9)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
12. Attended the annual HMIS Refresh (CoC Summary Report, Table 11)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	

Total Points Awarded:

Total Points Available: 26

Reviewer's Comments:

Reviewer: _____

Date: _____

Data Sources

* Housing & Urban Development, *Cost Association with First Time Homelessness For Families and Individuals*, 2010

CoC Summary Report includes data from: HMIS; 2016 Systems Performance Measures Report; program's most recently submitted Annual Progress Reports; 2017 Technical Assistance & Review monitoring; and meeting sign-in sheets

2017 PA-603 Continuum of Care Program competition
Coordinated Entry Rating & Ranking Tool

Measure & Data Source	Point Structure	Pts Given
-----------------------	-----------------	-----------

RENEWAL APPLICATION DETAILS

1. Provides a clear and concise description of the scope of the project. (Renewal 3B)	Give 1 point each for mentioning: - community need for program - target population - projected outcomes - coordination with partners - why it should be CoC funded - plan for addressing housing and service needs	
2. Budget includes 25% match & commitment letter (Renewal 6D)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
3. Does CE follow a Housing First approach? (3B, 3d)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
4. Does CE make efforts to reach those with highest barriers? (3B, 4c)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
5. Does CE use a comprehensive and standardized assessment process? (3B, 4d)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	

MONITORING

6. Was project's APR submitted on time? (CoC Summary Report, Table 2)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
7. Were any project funds recaptured (CoC Summary Report, Table 4)	No – 2 points Yes – 0 points	
8. Does the CE grant present as cost Effective? (CoC Summary Report, Table 5)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
9. TAR Score (CoC Summary Report, Table 1)	2 points for 90% or higher 1 point for 80-89% 0 points for less than 80%	

2017 PA-603 Continuum of Care Program competition
Coordinated Entry Rating & Ranking Tool

CoC PARTICIPATION

10. Attended majority of monthly Coalition meetings (CoC Summary Report, Table 9)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	
11. Attended the annual HMIS Refresh (CoC Summary Report, Table 11)	Yes – 2 points No – 0 points	

Total Points Awarded:

Total Points Available: 26

Reviewer's Comments:

Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Data Sources

* Housing & Urban Development, *Cost Association with First Time Homelessness For Families and Individuals*, 2010

CoC Summary Report includes data from: HMIS; 2016 Systems Performance Measures Report; program's most recently submitted Annual Progress Reports; 2017 Technical Assistance & Review monitoring; and meeting sign-in sheets