

# CoC 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 Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

## I. Purpose of this Document

The purpose of reviewing, scoring and ranking CoC Projects is 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 these two components: Project accessibility & services provided and the Project Performance Report. Applications will be scored (100 points possible) and ranked by members of the Community, Housing and Human Services (CHHS) Board Evaluation and Review Committee supplemented with non-funded CoC Advisory Committee members. Renewal applicants will be notified via email once the final renewal rankings have been approved by members of the CHHS Board.

## III. CoC Project Review Procedure

The review process will be split into three components, reviewing four factors. The first component, the Staff Review, encompasses the barriers to entry and housing first philosophy of each project and is worth 36% of the project score. The second component, CoC Project Performance measures, will be reviewed by an Ad-Hoc Committee of CoC Advisory Committee Members who do not receive CoC funds, and is worth 44% of the project score. Finally the vulnerability of the population served by each project will be worth 20% and will be measured by the average SPDAT score of the clients served. The first two components were completed in the local competition prior to the release of the CoC15 NOFA, the third component was completed once the NOFA was released to ensure the ranking encompassed all of the necessary considerations.

### A. Staff Review

Component One: Barriers to Project entry and Housing First Philosophy (38% of total score). Projects were asked to review the following questions and provide backup documentation to staff explaining how they are putting these strategies into practice. Staff reviewed this application and the backup documentation provided to determine if project will receive points for each strategy. Questions are weighted equally for each project type (i.e. PSH, PH-RRH, TH, SSO).

ALL PROJECTS (SSO/TH/PH-RRH/PSH):

Project Accessibility:

## CoC Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

Admission / tenant screening and selection practices promote the acceptance of applicants regardless of their sobriety or use of substances, competition of treatment and participation in services.

### Client Support and Housing Stability:

Supportive services emphasize engagement and problem-solving over therapeutic goals. Service plans are highly tenant-driven without predetermined goals.

Case managers/service coordinators are trained in and actively employ evidence-based practices for client/tenant engagement such as motivational interviewing and client-centered counseling.

### HOUSING PROVIDERS ONLY (TH/PH-RRH/PSH):

### Project Accessibility:

Applicants are seldom rejected on the basis of poor credit or financial history, poor or lack of rental history.

Applicants are seldom rejected on the basis of minor criminal convictions.

Applicants are seldom rejected on the basis of behaviors that indicate lack of “housing readiness.”

Applicants are not rejected because of lack of resources to pay application, deposit or other fees and/or applicants are given reasonable flexibility to pay required program entry fees.

### Client Support and Housing Stability:

Participation in services or program compliance is not a condition of permanent supportive or transitional housing tenancy.

Use of alcohol or drugs in itself (without other lease violations) is not considered a reason for eviction.

Tenants in permanent supportive housing and transitional housing are given reasonable flexibility in paying their tenant share or program fee (after subsidy) on time and offered special payment arrangements (e.g. payment plan) for rent arrears and/or assistance with financial management.

## CoC Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

Services are informed by a harm reduction philosophy that recognizes that drug and alcohol use and addiction are a part of the tenants' lives, where tenants are engage in non-judgmental communication regarding drug and alcohol use, and where tenants are offered education regarding how to avoid risky behaviors and engage in safer practices.

TH ONLY:

### Client Support and Housing Stability:

Transitional housing programs serving the prioritized populations of fleeing DV, exiting an institution and/ or unaccompanied/ independent youth

### **B. CoC Ad Hoc Committee Review**

Component Two: Project Performance (44% of total score).

The following information will be provided for each project to the RFP evaluation committee for review. Committee members will score the overall performance of the project. Performance data was pulled from HMIS for the calendar year of 2014 to ensure that the data was as current as possible and the period of performance was consistent between all projects reviewed.

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

##### Project Performance:

Population Served

Number of Households Served in 2014

Number of Exits

% of Households exiting to a permanent destination

% of Households exiting project with income

##### Financial Management:

Sub-recipient Award Amount

% of budget expended at CoC12 grant close out

Cost per household served

#### **Transitional Housing Projects-**

##### Project Performance:

Population Served

Number of Households Served in 2014

Number of Exits

% of Households exiting to a permanent destination

% of Households who remain stably housed

# CoC Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

% of Households exiting with income  
Average Length of Stay in project

Financial Management:

Sub-recipient Award Amount  
% of budget expended at CoC12 grant close out  
Cost per household served

**Permanent Housing, Rapid Re Housing Projects-**

Project Performance:

Population Served  
Number of Households Served in 2014  
Number of Exits  
% of Households exiting to a permanent destination  
% of Households who remain stably housed  
% of Households exiting with income  
Average Length of Stay in project

Financial Management:

Sub-recipient Award Amount  
% of budget expended at CoC12 grant close out  
Cost per household served

**Permanent Supportive Housing Projects-**

Project Performance:

Population Served  
Number of Households Served in 2014  
% of Chronic Homeless units designated in project  
Number of Exits  
% of Households exiting to a permanent destination  
% of Households who remain stably housed  
% of Households exiting with income  
Average Length of Stay in project

Financial Management:

Sub-recipient Award Amount  
% of budget expended at CoC12 grant close out  
Cost per household served

**C. Population Served by Project & Level of Vulnerability**

---

# CoC Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

Component Three: Level of Client Service Need served by Project (20% of total score).

To determine the level of service need of the clients served by each project, the SPDAT scores of the clients enrolled in each project were averaged to giving each project an overall vulnerability score. Because SPDAT is the universal assessment tool used by CoC projects as a way to assess each client's vulnerability and level of service need, the average score was used as a way to factor the project's population into the review. This review was completed after the NOFA was released, to ensure the ranking of projects fairly considered the vulnerability of the population served by the projects.

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

### **A. Scoring Procedure**

The ad hoc committee determined that the scoring criteria would be based on four components, low barriers to entry, if the project uses a housing first model, performance measures and level of service need of the clients served. The CoC Program Renewal Ranking Application which encompassed the first two components was worth 36% of total score, the Project Performance Scoring was worth 44% of the total score and the level of service need (as measured by the average SPDAT score of the enrolled clients) was worth 20% of the total score.

Two staff members scored 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 was scored at 0%, 50% or 100%. 0 points were awarded for any strategy where the box was not checked, indicating that the project does not implement this practice OR for a box that was checked where there was no supporting documentation or contradictory supporting documentation. 50% of the points were awarded for a box that was checked where supporting documentation was provided, but did not clearly show how the statement was being implemented. 100% of the points were awarded for a checked box and clear supporting documentation was provided showing how the strategy was being implemented.

Committee members were provided the project performance and financial management data listed above in Section III-B. Staff provided the data and color coded the performance measures to indicate how close the project was to meeting HUD's goals of project performance. Committee members scored the performance measures between 0-55.

The average SPDAT score for each project was converted into a percentage of the total SPDAT score, then applied to the 25 points possible for this component. For example, if the project's average SPDAT score was 45 out of the total 60 points possible on the SPDAT, the project's SPDAT score would equal 75% ( $45/60=.75$ ). That project would then get 75% of the possible 25 points or 18.75 points.

### **B. Ranking Procedure**

The average staff score was added to the average of the Committee score and the Project's Vulnerability Score to get the overall score of the project. Projects were then ranked by the combined score for the initial ranking, not considering the re-allocated or bonus projects.

# CoC Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

---

## V. Reallocation Process

The committee reviewed the ranking and recommended projects for reallocation based on timeliness of submitted application, if the project was low barrier and practicing a housing first model, the performance measures and the vulnerability of the population served by each project. The reallocation recommendations were approved first by the CoC Advisory Committee and the final approval of the recommendations was completed by the Community Housing and Human Services Board.

## VI. Appeal Process

Projects that were recommended for reallocation were notified by letter on October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2015 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 2015 Continuum of Care Program Competition FR-5900-N-25 **Additional Overview Information Section G. Local Competition Deadlines**

Project applicants whose project was rejected may appeal the local CoC competition decision to HUD if the project applicant believes it was denied the opportunity to participate in the local CoC planning process in a reasonable manner by submitting a Solo Application in *e-snaps* directly to HUD prior to the application deadline of **7:59:59 p.m. eastern time on November 20, 2015**. The CoC's notification of rejection of the project in the local competition must be attached to the Solo Application. If the CoC fails to provide written notification outside of *e-snaps*, the Solo Applicant must attach evidence that it attempted to participate in the local CoC planning process and submitted a project application that met the local deadlines, along with a statement that the CoC did not provide the Solo Applicant written notification of the CoC rejecting the project in the local CoC competition.