



WA 502 Spokane City-County Continuum of Care Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures FY2023

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

I. Purpose of this Document

All HUD-Funded CoC Projects are reviewed, scored and ranked to ensure the Spokane Regional Continuum of Care is strategically allocating the HUD-funded grant across high-performing projects to meet the critical needs, and highest priorities of the Spokane Regional CoC, in alignment with Federal funding objectives for ending homelessness.

The HUD-funded CoC grants are for one year, and HUD determines the final grant award amount for all CoCs. Funding is not guaranteed. Each Sub-Recipient must apply for a renewal of the grant funding for each project every year. The purpose of this document is to detail the procedures for reviewing, scoring and ranking the Spokane Regional CoC renewal applications.

The collaborative applicant scores the renewal submissions for compliance with Housing First strategies, the CoC RFP and Evaluation Committee reviews and scores projects' performance AND signs off on the staff scores, and then the CoC Board reviews the objective ranking and determines whether to make any changes based on local factors. HUD will determine which projects are funded.

II. Application Process

All renewal contracts are required to complete a separate renewal application. Agencies receiving multiple grants through the CoC Program will be required to submit applications for each grant. Providers may one application packet for the same intervention-typed projects, serving the same population if those projects follow the same policies and procedures.

Projects will be ranked using two components:

- (1) Project's accessibility and adherence to the Housing First philosophy and
- (2) Project Performance Report. Applications will be scored (100 points possible) and ranked by members of the CoC Board RFP & Evaluation Committee composed of non CoC-funded community members. Renewal applicants will be notified via writing whether their project was rejected, ranked, or reallocated.

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 CoC Board RFP & Evaluation Committee, and is worth 55% of the project score.

A. Staff Review

Component One: Barriers to Project entry and Housing First Philosophy (45% of total score). Projects are asked to review Housing First Assessment questions and provide backup documentation to staff explaining how they are putting these strategies into practice.

Documentation should be clearly labeled, relevant sections highlighted, and page numbers noted in the narratives. 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).

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 CoC Board RFP & Evaluation 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 5/1/2022 – 4/30/2023 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:

- Number of Households Served/Projected Households Served (unmeasured)
- Average Number of Days Until Engagement
- Percentage of Adults served with 12+ months homelessness Percentage of Households exiting to a permanent housing destination Percentage of Households who successfully exit from street outreach
- Percentage of Households that exit to temporary & some institutional destinations
- Percentage of Households Exiting to Permanent Destinations Who Return to the System Within 2 Years

Financial Management:

- Sub-recipient Award Amount
- Percentage of budget expended at FY2020 grant close out
- Percentage of budget expended at FY2021 grant to date
- Costs per household served

Data Timeliness

- Data Submitted
- Data Submitted on Time

Supportive Services Only Projects- Coordinated Entry –

Project Performance:

- Number of Households Served/Projected Households Served (unmeasured)
- Average Number of Days to Referral Acceptance
- Exits to Permanent Destinations (unmeasured)
- Percentage of successful referral outcomes

Financial Management:

- Sub-recipient Award Amount
- Percentage of budget expended at FY2020 grant close out
- Percentage of budget expended at FY2021 grant to date
- Costs per household served

Transitional Housing Projects-

Project Performance:

- Average Utilization Rate
- Number of Households Served/Projected Households Served
- Average Length of Time Homeless in Days
- Percentage of Households exiting to a permanent housing destination

- Percentage of Adults exiting with income (adult leavers)
- Percentage of Households Exiting to Permanent Destinations Who Return to the System Within 2 Years

Financial Management:

- Sub-recipient Award Amount
- Percentage of budget expended at FY2020 grant close out
- Percentage of budget expended at FY2021 grant to date
- Costs per household served

Data Timeliness

- Data Submitted
- Data Submitted on Time

Rapid Re Housing Projects-

Project Performance:

- Population Served
- Number of Households Served/Projected Households Served (unmeasured)
- Average Number of Days Until Housing Placement
- Percentage of Households exiting to a permanent destination Percentage of Adults exiting with increased income (adult leavers)
- Percentage of Households Exiting to Permanent Destinations Who Return to the System Within 2 Years

Financial Management:

- Sub-recipient Award Amount
- Percentage of budget expended at FY2020 grant close out
- Percentage of budget expended at FY2021 grant to date
- Costs per household served

Data Timeliness

- Data Submitted
- Data Submitted on Time

Permanent Supportive Housing Projects-

Project Performance:

- Population Served Utilization Rate
- Number of Households Served/Projected Households Served (unmeasured)
- Percentage of Households exiting to or retaining permanent housing
- Percentage of Adults exiting with increased income
- Percentage of Adults with Increased Income at Annual Assessment
- Percentage of Households Exiting to Permanent Destinations Who Return to the system Within 2 Years

Financial Management:

- Sub-recipient Award Amount
- Percentage of budget expended at FY2020 grant close out

- Percentage of budget expended at FY2021 grant to date
- Costs per household served

Data Timeliness

- Data Submitted
- Data Submitted on Time

IV. Project Scoring and Ranking Procedure

A. Scoring Procedure

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

Three staff members 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 worth a total of one point. Points are awarded in increments on 0.25 based on the standards below.

- Zero points are awarded for any strategy where the box is not checked, indicating that the project does not implement this practice OR for a box that was checked where the staff member was unable to clearly identify the supporting documentation, or contradictory supporting documentation was submitted. Documentation should be clearly labeled, relevant sections highlighted, and page numbers noted in the narratives.
- A partial point is awarded for a box that is checked where supporting documentation is provided but does not clearly show how the statement is being implemented.
- A full point is awarded for a checked box and clear supporting documentation is provided clearly demonstrating how the strategy is being implemented.

RFP 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 HUD's goals of project performance. Committee members will score the performance measures between 0-55.

B. Ranking Procedure

The average staff score 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 the re-allocated or bonus projects.

V. Reallocation Process

The committee reviews the ranking and recommends projects for reallocation based on timeliness of submitted application, if the project is low barrier and practicing a housing first model, and project performance measures.

The CoC Board reviews the RFP Committee's recommendation. The CoC Board may vote to amend the recommendations or to accept the recommendations as presented.