

# CoC New & Renewal Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Purpose of this Document
- II. Application Process
- III. CoC Project Review Procedure
- IV. Project Scoring and Ranking Procedure
- V. Reallocation Process
- VI. Appeal Process

# CoC New & Renewal Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

## I. Purpose of this Document

CoC Projects are reviewed, scored and ranked to ensure Spokane's Continuum of Care is strategically allocating resources across funding sources in a way that aligns with Spokane's Homeless Plan goals and The Federal Plan Opening Door's goals of ending homelessness. The purpose of this document is to detail the procedures for reviewing, scoring and ranking CoC Project applications prior to renewal.

## II. Application Process

All renewal contracts are required to complete a separate renewal application. Agencies receiving multiple grants through the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program will be required to submit individual renewal applications for each grant. Projects will be ranked using two components: (1) Housing First Assessment and (2) Project Performance Report. Applications will be scored (100 points possible) and ranked by members of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board Funding & RFP Committee comprised of non CoC-funded community members.

New project applications will be scored based on project eligibility threshold requirements outlined by the FY 2018 CoC NOFA and the City of Spokane CoC New Project RFP as well as responses to the Housing First Assessment. All applicants will be notified via writing whether their project was rejected, ranked, or reallocated no later than September 3<sup>rd</sup>.

## III. CoC Project Review Procedure

The review process will be split into two components, reviewing three factors. The first component, the Staff Review, encompasses the barriers to entry and housing first philosophy of each project and is worth 45% of the project score. The second component, CoC Project Performance measures, will be reviewed by the RFP & Evaluation CoC Committee, and is worth 55% of the project score. This will also include the vulnerability of the population served by each project which will be measured by the average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the project.

### A. Staff Review

Component One: Housing First Philosophy (45% of total score).

Projects are asked to review the *Housing First Assessment Standards* and provide an explanation of how the projects are implementing each standard. Backup documentation is required to support all narratives explaining how these strategies are put into practice. Staff will review the application and backup documentation provided to determine if the project will receive points for each strategy. Questions are weighted equally for each project type (i.e. PSH, PH-RRH, TH, SSO, SSO-CE).

# CoC New & Renewal Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

## **B. CoC RFP & Evaluation Committee Review**

Component Two: Project Performance (55% of total score).

The following information will be provided for each project to the Funding & RFP CoC Committee for review. Committee members will score the overall performance of the project. Performance data will be pulled from HMIS for the reporting period of 7/1/2017 – 6/30/2018 to ensure that the data is as current as possible and the period of performance is consistent between all projects reviewed.

### **Supportive Services Only Projects-**

#### Project Performance:

Population Served

Number of Households Served

Utilization (emergency shelter typed projects only)

% of Households exiting to a permanent housing destination

% of Households who successfully exit from street outreach (street outreach typed projects only)

Average VI-SPDAT score at project entry

Average length of stay in project (emergency shelter typed projects only)

% of Households that exit to temporary & some institutional destinations (street outreach typed projects only)

Extent to which persons who exit homelessness to PH return to homelessness within 24 months

Costs per household served

Data quality reporting timeliness

#### Financial Management:

Sub-recipient Award Amount

% of budget expended at CoC15 grant close out

% of budget expended at CoC16 grant to date

### **Supportive Services Only Projects- Coordinated Entry –**

#### Project Performance:

Population Served

Number of Households Served

Percentage of successful referral outcomes

Average number of referrals per client during the reporting period

Average length of time between referral start date and successful outcome

Costs per household served

Data quality reporting timeliness

# CoC New & Renewal Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

## Financial Management:

Sub-recipient Award Amount

% of budget expended at CoC15 grant close out

% of budget expended at CoC16 grant to date

## **Transitional Housing Projects-**

### Project Performance:

Population Served

Utilization

Number of Households Served

% of Households exiting to a permanent housing destination

% of Households exiting with income (adult leavers)

Average VI-SPDAT Score

Average Length of Stay in project

Extent to which persons who exit homelessness to PH return to homelessness within 12 months

Costs per household served

### Financial Management:

Sub-recipient Award Amount

% of budget expended at CoC14 grant close out

% of budget expended at CoC15 grant to date

## **Permanent Housing**

### **Rapid Rehousing Projects-**

#### Project Performance:

Population Served

Number of Households Served

Average length between enrollment and move-in

% of Households exiting to a permanent destination

% of Households exiting with increased income (adult leavers)

Average VI-SPDAT score at project entry

Extent to which persons who exit homelessness to PH return to homelessness within 24 months

Costs per household served

Data quality reporting timeliness

# CoC New & Renewal Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

## Financial Management:

Sub-recipient Award Amount

% of budget expended at CoC15 grant close out

% of budget expended at CoC16 grant to date

## **Permanent Supportive Housing Projects-**

### Project Performance:

Population Served

Utilization

Number of Households Served

% of Households exiting to or retaining permanent housing

% of Households exiting with increased income (stayers & leavers)

Average VI-SPDAT score at project entry

Extent to which persons who exit homelessness to PH return to homelessness within 24 months

Costs per household served

### Financial Management:

Sub-recipient Award Amount

% of budget expended at CoC15 grant close out

% of budget expended at CoC16 grant to date

## **IV. Project Scoring and Ranking Procedure**

### **A. Scoring Procedure**

The CoC Program Renewal Ranking Application which encompasses the first component is worth 45% of total score, the Project Performance Scoring is worth 55% of the total score.

Staff members will score the CoC Program Renewal Ranking Application for the barriers to entry and housing first model by the strategy listed. Each housing first and low barrier strategy is scored at 0%, 50% or 100%. Zero points are awarded for any applicable standard where the box “Do It” is not checked, indicating that the project does not implement this standard OR for a box that was checked where there was no supporting documentation or contradictory supporting documentation. Fifty percent of the points are awarded for a box that is checked where supporting documentation is provided, but does not clearly show how the standard is being implemented. One hundred percent of the points are awarded for a checked box and clear supporting documentation is provided showing how the strategy is being implemented via policies and procedures.

# CoC New & Renewal Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

Committee members are provided the project performance and financial management data listed above in Section III-B. Staff will provide the data and color code the performance measures to indicate how close the project is to meeting local averages for similar-typed projects in our local continuum of care services. Committee members will score the performance measures between 0-55.

## **B. Ranking Procedure**

The average of staff scores is added to the average of the committee members' scores to get the overall score of the project. Projects are then ranked by the combined score for the initial ranking, not considering reallocated or bonus projects.

## **V. Reallocation Process**

The committee reviews the ranking based on performance scores and recommends projects for ranking, reduction, or reallocation based on timeliness of submitted application, if the project is low barrier and practicing a housing first model, and project performance measures. The reallocation recommendations are reviewed and/or adjust before approval by the CoC Board.

## **VI. Appeal Process**

Projects that were recommended for reallocation are notified by letter on a date to be determined and given the details on how to appeal the decision of the reallocation. Below is the appeal language each reallocated project was given, ensuring each applicant had the necessary information to appeal the decision:

Excerpt from Notice of Funding Availability for the 2018 Continuum of Care Program Competition FR-6200-N-25 Section X Appeals.

Project applicants that attempted to participate in the CoC planning process for FY 2018 funds in the geographic area in which they operate, that believe they were denied the right to participate in a reasonable manner may appeal the CoC's decision not to include their project application in the CoC Priority Listing for FY 2018 funds. To appeal, the project applicant must have submitted a Solo Application for funding to HUD, in e-snaps by the application submission deadline of September 18, 2018 by 8:00 PM Eastern time.

The appeals process for FY 2018 funds is as follows:

1. Written Notice of Intent to Appeal. With addition to the FY 2018 solo project application that is submitted through e-snaps by the application deadline, the project applicant must also submit a written notice of intent to appeal. At the time the application and notice of intent to appeal are submitted to HUD through e-snaps, the project applicant must also provide a copy of the notice of intent to appeal to the CoC. The copy should be addressed to the authorized representative from the CoC's designated Collaborative Applicant. Additionally, HUD encourages the project

## CoC New & Renewal Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

applicant to share a copy of the notice of intent to appeal to the chair of the CoC Board or the Chair of another CoC leadership committee. Once the project applicant submits an appeal, the project applicant is thereafter known as a Solo Applicant.

2. Evidence Supporting Appeal. Between September 18, 2018 at 8:00 PM Eastern time and October 17, 2018 at 8:00 PM Eastern time, the Solo Applicant must submit any evidence indicating that the CoC did not allow the Solo Applicant to participate in the CoC planning process in a reasonable manner to HUD by email to [snapsappeals@hud.gov](mailto:snapsappeals@hud.gov), including evidence the CoC was notified of the Solo Applicant's intent to appeal. Solo Applicants must submit all evidence by email, from the Solo Applicant's organization's email address, on the Solo Applicant's letterhead to HUD and to the authorized representative from the CoC's designated Collaborative Applicant. Additionally, HUD encourages the project applicant to share a copy of the notice of intent to appeal with the chair of the CoC Board or the Chair of another CoC leadership committee.

HUD will only consider one email submission from the Solo Applicant. If HUD receives more than one email submission from any Solo Applicant, HUD will only consider the first submission it receives and will not review any subsequent submissions; therefore, it is important that the Solo Applicant include all relevant evidence that it intends HUD to consider in its initial submission.

The Solo Applicant should include all evidence that it believes supports its claim that it was not allowed to participate in the CoC planning process in a reasonable manner; however, at a minimum, the evidence submitted to support the appeal request should include the following information:

- a. the notification process used by the CoC to provide public notification of all planning meetings;
- b. the invitation process used by the CoC to invite new members to join the CoC;
- c. the number of CoC planning meetings the Solo Applicant attended between October 1, 2017 and September 1, 2018;
- d. the role the Solo Applicant played as a member of its local CoC;
- e. the portion of the CoC's governance charter containing the collaborative process used to develop and approve the submission of project applications for the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition; and
- f. the selection process used to rate and rank project applications for FY 2018 funds in this NOFA.

In the information submitted to HUD, the Solo Applicant must include documentation that identifies the person to whom within the CoC the evidence was sent and the date on which it was sent.

## CoC New & Renewal Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

3. CoC Response. No later than 30 days after the date the CoC receives the evidence from the Solo Applicant, the CoC must send a response to HUD with a copy to the Solo Applicant. The CoC must submit its written response by email, from the organization's email address on the organization's letterhead and signed by the authorized representative. If HUD receives more than one written response, HUD will only consider the first email response it receives and will not consider any subsequent email responses.

The response must include information and documentation that addresses each of the solo applicant's claims that the Solo Applicant was denied the right to participate in the CoC planning process in a reasonable manner. In the information submitted to HUD, the CoC must include documentation that the response was sent to the Solo Applicant and the date on which it was sent.

4. HUD Decision and Notification of Decision. HUD will review the evidence submitted by the Solo Applicant and the written response from the Collaborative Applicant to determine whether the Solo Applicant was permitted to participate in the CoC's planning process in a reasonable manner.

a. If the CoC fails to submit a written response, then HUD will consider the evidence submitted by the Solo Applicant to make its decision. HUD will also consider whether the Solo Applicant complied with 24 CFR 578.35 and with the requirements and guidance established in this NOFA.

b. If HUD finds that the Solo Applicant was permitted to participate in the CoC's planning process in a reasonable manner, the Solo Applicant will not receive funding for its project application.

c. If HUD finds that the Solo Applicant was not permitted to participate in the CoC's planning process in a reasonable manner, HUD will review the project application to determine whether it meets the quality and eligibility thresholds set forth in this CoC Program NOFA. If the project meets all quality and eligibility thresholds, the Solo Applicant will receive funding directly from HUD for the project. However, because a CoC is prohibited from receiving more total funding than was awarded in the CoC Program Competition, HUD will reduce or eliminate funding for the awarded project(s) listed at the bottom of the CoC's Priority Listing for FY 2018 funds until the CoC's total FY 2018 award amount, including the Solo Applicant's project, is within the total award amount originally approved by HUD.

d. HUD will provide written notification, by email, of its decision to the authorized representative from the CoC's designated Collaborative Applicant and the Solo Applicant within 60 days of the date of the receipt of the Collaborative Applicant's response. Where the CoC failed to submit a response, HUD will provide written notification within 90 days of its receipt of the evidence submitted by the Solo Applicant. The CoC's



## CoC New & Renewal Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

designated Collaborative Applicant should share HUD's written notification with the CoC and the CoC Board or other relevant CoC leadership committee or workgroup. If HUD determines that the Solo Applicant will receive funding, then HUD will consider the project application for funding in the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition in accordance with the review standards set forth in this NOFA. HUD will also provide the project(s) whose funding will be reduced or eliminated to accommodate the Solo Applicant's project in the notification sent to the CoC.