

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 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 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 an Ad-Hoc Committee of CoC Advisory Committee Members who do not receive CoC funds, 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 program's respective average SPDAT or VI-SPDAT score of the clients served.

A. Staff Review

Component One: Barriers to Project entry and Housing First Philosophy (45% of total score). Projects were asked to review *Project Accessibility, Client Support and Housing Stability* 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).

B. CoC Ad Hoc Committee Review

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

CoC Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

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 reporting period of 4/1/2015 – 3/31/2016 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

Utilization

Number of Households Served

% of Households exiting to a permanent destination

Serving clients of greatest need (Average VI-SPDAT score)

Average Length of Stay in project

Extent to which persons who exit homelessness to PSH return to homelessness within 6, 12 & 24 months

Financial Management:

Sub-recipient Award Amount

% of budget expended at CoC13 grant close out

% of budget expended at CoC14 grant to date

Transitional Housing Projects-

Project Performance:

Population Served

Utilization

Number of Households Served

% of Households exiting to a permanent destination

% of Households exiting with income

Serving clients of greatest need (Average VI-SPDAT score)

Average Length of Stay in project

Extent to which persons who exit homelessness to PSH return to homelessness within 6, 12 & 24 months

Financial Management:

Sub-recipient Award Amount

% of budget expended at CoC13 grant close out

% of budget expended at CoC14 grant to date

CoC Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

Permanent Housing, Rapid Re Housing Projects-

Project Performance:

Population Served

Number of Households Served

% of Households exiting to a permanent destination

% of Households exiting with income

Average Length of Stay in project

Serving Clients of greatest need (average VI-SPDAT score)

Financial Management:

Sub-recipient Award Amount

% of budget expended at CoC13 grant close out

% of budget expended at CoC14 grant to date

Permanent Supportive Housing Projects-

Project Performance:

Population Served

Utilization

Number of Households Served

% of Households exiting to a permanent destination

% of Households exiting with income

Average Length of Stay in project

Serving Clients of greatest need (average SPDAT score)

Financial Management:

Sub-recipient Award Amount

% of budget expended at CoC13 grant close out

% of budget expended at CoC14 grant to date

IV. Project Scoring and Ranking Procedure

A. Scoring Procedure

The ad hoc committee determined that the scoring criteria would be based on three components, low barriers to entry, if the project uses a housing first model, and project performance measures outlined above. The CoC Program Renewal Ranking Application which encompassed the first

CoC Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

component was worth 45% of total score, the Project Performance Scoring was worth 55% 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%. Zero 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. Fifty percent 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. One hundred percent 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.

B. Ranking Procedure

The average staff score was added to the average of the Committee 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.

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, and project performance measures. The reallocation recommendations are to be 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 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: *(Section updated once the current NOFA is released.)*

Excerpt from Notice of Funding Availability for the 2016 Continuum of Care Program Competition FR-6000-N-25 Additional Overview Information Section G. Local Competition Deadlines

CoC Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

Eligible project applicants that attempted to participate in the CoC planning process in the geographic area in which they operate, that believe they were denied the right to participate in a reasonable manner may submit an application to HUD and may be awarded a grant from HUD by following the procedure found in 24 CFR 578.35. Solo applicants must submit their project application to HUD by **7:59:59 p.m. eastern time, September 14, 2016**, which must include the CoC's notification of rejection of the project in the local competition as an attachment to the Solo Applicant's project application. If the CoC fails to provide written notification, outside of *e-snaps*, the Solo Applicant must attach a statement that the CoC did not provide the Solo Applicant written notification of the CoC rejecting the project in the local CoC competition.

CoC Project Review, Scoring & Ranking Procedures

Addendum

FY2016 HUD Renewal Application Checklist Section