

REVIEW, RANK and REALLOCATION PROCESS

CoC Board Approved June 25, 2018

The Review and Rank Process is used to review and evaluate all CoC project applications submitted in the local competition.

GENERAL PROCESS

A. Phase I - Renewal Project Scoring and Ranking

- The Collaborative Applicant (MAG) may receive input from HUD Grantees on the scoring tool (see attachment “Program Performance Report”). The Collaborative Applicant will finalize the scoring tool and review and rank process. The scorecard is based on objective criteria as reported in the project’s Annual Performance Report submitted to HUD. Criteria include points for: serving clients with multiple conditions and those that enter with no income; projects that serve clients entering from a place not meant for human habilitation; projects whose clients increase housing stability and income; effective use of federal funding; and, projects with reliable data measured by data quality measures. In addition, the CoC awards points for participation in Coordinated Entry and the Continuum of Care; cost effectiveness; alignment with Housing First principles; and, exists to homelessness.
- The Collaborative Applicant initiates the first phase of the performance evaluation, communicates expectations and deadlines to project applicants, and collects required materials. The Collaborative Applicant will coordinate the collection of all reports and materials needed for the scoring tool and coordinate the scoring process for renewal projects.
 - HMIS, Coordinated Entry, and renewal housing projects without an APR due to HUD by May 31, 2018 will be held harmless and need not submit any reports or materials for scoring.
 - Projects operated by Victim Service Providers or that do not use HMIS because they serve survivors of domestic violence, human trafficking, or sexual assault will submit data reports from the project’s comparable database.
- The CoC Board will review data sources for community needs and gaps in the CoC program portfolio to make a data-informed decision on funding priorities.
- The CoC Board will review and approve a process and scoring materials, subject to necessary changes due to the NOFA.
- The Collaborative Applicant will recruit a non-conflicted Review and Rank Subcommittee (Subcommittee). The Subcommittee may include at least one non-conflicted provider (ideally a provider with experience administering federal, non-CoC grants), with a focus on having a diverse Subcommittee and some Subcommittee consistency from year to

year. CoC Board members are prohibited from serving on the Subcommittee. Members sign conflict of interest and confidentiality statements.

- The Collaborative Applicant will finalize Subcommittee membership and compile renewal project application packets for Subcommittee review.
- Following release of the CoC Program NOFA, the Collaborative Applicant may collect additional information that is necessary to submit a more competitive Consolidated Application.
- Review and Rank Subcommittee members will be oriented to the process, trained, and receive applications. They will review renewal project application materials over a one- to two- week period. They will review and score renewal project applications using the discretionary points embedded in the scorecard based on the narrative sections provided by applicants in the scorecard (additional details below in attachment “Discretionary Points and Explanatory Narratives”).
- CoC staff will ensure all renewal project applications pass Threshold Review (additional detail below).
- Subcommittee members will meet to jointly discuss each renewal project application and conduct short, mandatory interviews with applicants in person. Teleconference or videoconference accommodations may be requested, if applicant is unable to attend in person. The purpose of the in-person interview is to ask standardized and potentially clarifying questions about projects and/or applications. Projects may receive additional points based on their responses.
 - A Collaborative Applicant representative attends Subcommittee meetings to staff the meetings and act as a resource.
 - In addition to the numeric scores, the Subcommittee will consider qualitative factors such as subpopulation needs, improvement plans, project performance, and potential impact to the community’s system of care when generating recommendations for the CoC Board.
 - HMIS, Coordinated Entry, and renewal housing projects without an APR due to HUD by May 31, 2018 will be held harmless and ranked at the top of Tier I.
- The Review and Rank Subcommittee will develop three ranked list options for presentation to the CoC Board in a public meeting and will articulate the potential pros, cons, and impact of each recommendation. These ranked lists will include only renewal projects.
 - Option One: A ranked list based on raw scorecard scores.
 - Option Two: A ranked list based on scores as adjusted by the Subcommittee using the discretionary points embedded in the scorecard.
 - Option Three: A ranked list reflecting the Subcommittee’s consideration of qualitative factors, as described above and incorporated into standardized interview questions.
- The Subcommittee will review the three options with the CoC Board to allow for explanation, questions, and meaningful dialogue between the members of the

Subcommittee and the CoC Board. The CoC Board will not approve the rank order of renewal projects at this time.

B. Phase II - New and Expansion Project Scoring and Ranking and Project Application Review

- Following release of the CoC Program NOFA, all renewal project applicants and new agencies interested in applying will be invited to attend a NOFA launch session. Public notice will be sent to all agencies with renewal applications, the CoC general distribution list, local governments in the region, and posted on the MAG website. The public notice will seek renewal and new applications. New and expansion project application requirements, process and timeline will be explained.
- The Collaborative Applicant will coordinate the collection of all reports and materials needed for scoring and coordinate the scoring process for new and expansion projects.
- Applicants will prepare and submit project applications.
 - Late applications received after the deadline or incomplete applications will not be accepted.
- The Collaborative Applicant will complete a technical review of HUD e-snaps project applications for completeness and technical errors. Applicants will be notified if technical corrections are needed and must complete technical corrections as directed.
- Emergency Procedure: MAG staff will do everything possible to ensure that an application is submitted to HUD for all funds possibly available to the community. Therefore, if/when all on-time applications have been submitted and it appears that the community is not requesting as much money as is available from HUD, then the CoC staff may solicit additional applications. In addition, if, after the Subcommittee has reviewed applications and made priority determinations, an applicant decides not to submit their application to HUD, MAG staff may solicit and submit further applications for the full available amount, with projects representing HUD priorities.
- CoC staff ensure all new and expansion project applications pass Threshold Review.

Threshold Review

In addition to the scoring criteria, all new and renewal projects must meet a number of threshold criteria. A threshold review will take place prior to the review and rank process to ensure baseline requirements are met. All new and renewal projects must meet the following thresholds. If threshold criteria are not met, the Review and Rank Subcommittee will be notified to determine severity of non-compliance with threshold criteria:

- Project must participate or agree to participate in the Coordinated Entry system to the capacity the Coordinated Entry system is built out in the community.
- Project must meet applicable HUD match requirements (25% for all grant funds except leasing).
- All proposed program participants will be eligible for the program component type selected.
- The information provided in the project application and proposed activities are eligible and consistent with program requirements in 24 CFR part 578.

- Each project narrative is fully responsive to the question being asked and meets all criteria for that questions as required by the NOFA.
 - Data provided in the application are consistent.
 - Required attachments correspond to the list of attachments in e-snaps that must contain accurate and complete information that are dated between May 1, 2018 and September 18, 2018.
- Subcommittee members will review and score new and expansion project application materials over a one- to two- week period based on the scorecard for new projects.
 - The CoC Board will review the CoC Planning Grant funding application.
 - Review and Rank Subcommittee members will meet to jointly discuss each new or expansion project application and conduct short, mandatory interviews. Teleconference or videoconference accommodations may be requested, if applicant is unable to attend in person. The purpose of the in-person interviews is to ask standardized and potentially clarifying questions about projects and/or applications. Projects may receive additional points based on their responses.
 - A Collaborative Applicant representative attends Subcommittee meetings to staff the meetings and act as a resource.
 - In addition to the numeric scores, the Subcommittee will consider qualitative factors such as subpopulation needs and potential impact to the community's system of care when generating recommendations for the CoC Board.
 - Expansion projects will be evaluated using the same scorecard as new projects. If an expansion project receives a score higher than the renewal project it is expanding, the expansion project will be ranked immediately below the renewal project.
 - The Review and Rank Subcommittee will develop three ranked list options for presentation to the CoC Board in a public meeting and will articulate the potential pros, cons, and impact of each recommendation. These ranked lists will include all renewal, new, and expansion projects.
 - Option One: A ranked list based on raw scorecard scores.
 - Option Two: A ranked list based on raw scores for new and expansion projects and on renewal project scores as adjusted by the Subcommittee using the discretionary points embedded in the scorecard.
 - Option Three: A ranked list reflecting the Subcommittee's consideration of qualitative factors, as described above and incorporated into standardized interview questions.
 - The CoC Board meeting will be scheduled to allow for explanation, questions, and meaningful dialogue between the members of the Subcommittee and the CoC Board.
 - The CoC Board will consider the three options presented and approve a rank order of new, expansion, and renewal projects. CoC Board members that have an application for funding must recuse themselves from the vote and will be asked to follow the same

process as other project applicants.

- The CoC Board's ranking decision is delivered to applicants with a reminder of the appeals process. Only projects receiving less funding than they applied for or that are placed in Tier II may appeal, and only on the basis of fact, as described in the "Appeals Process" below. Any projects eligible to appeal will receive a complete breakdown of scores awarded for each factor as well as a complete list of the recommended project ranks and scores. A non-conflicted work group of the CoC Board will hear appeals. To provide information and support, MAG staff and one member of the Review and Rank Subcommittee will attend the Appeal Panel to provide information but will not be members of the Appeal Panel or have a vote.
- The CoC Board will meet to consider the ranked list generated by the appeals process and to approve a final rank order for submission to HUD.

REALLOCATION PLAN

It is possible that funds will be reallocated from projects that will not receive renewal funding, or whose funding will be reduced. This is a recommendation made by the Review and Rank Subcommittee, and approved by the Board, and will be based on HUD priorities and CoC Board priorities. When considering reallocation, the Subcommittee may consider:

1. Unspent funds and the ability to cut grants without cutting service/housing levels
 - Subcommittee members will receive guidance about the limitations related to spending CoC funds.
 - For projects receiving leasing or rental assistance, information about unspent funds will be presented together with information about agency capacity (serving the number of people the project is designed to serve)
2. Projects with consistently low scores
 - Scrutiny will be given to projects that scored in the bottom 10% in the past three years
3. Alternative funding sources available to support either new or renewal project(s) at-risk of not being funded
4. Impact on the community in light of community needs
5. Non-compliance issues identified during the Review and Rank process

The impact of this policy is that both high-scoring and low-scoring projects may be reallocated if these considerations warrant that decision.

APPEALS PROCESS

The Review and Rank Subcommittee reviews all applications and ranks them for funding recommendations for approval by the CoC Board to be forwarded to HUD for funding. The CoC Board's funding recommendation decision is communicated to all applicants by email within 24 hours of the determination. All applicants are hereby directed to contact Kinari Patel at (602) 254-6300 (kpatel@azmag.gov) if no email notice is received.

1. Who May Appeal

An agency may appeal an "appealable ranking decision," defined in the next paragraph, made by the Review and Rank Subcommittee concerning a project application submitted by that agency. If the project was submitted by a collaboration of agencies, only one joint appeal may be made.

2. What May Be Appealed

"An appealable ranking decision" is a decision by the Review and Rank Subcommittee that:

- a. Reduces the budget to a lower amount than applied for;
- b. Ranks the project in Tier 2, or;
- c. Recommends the project for reallocation.

3. Scope of an Appeal

The main questions for the Appeals Panel are:

- a. Was the review process followed consistently?
- b. Were all applicants evaluated in a similar manner?
- c. Did the Ranking Panel or the Continuum of Care make an error?

Disagreement with discretionary point allocations are not grounds for appeal. The Rank and Review Subcommittee will insure that discretionary points are applied consistently across projects.

If an error was made by the Rank and Review Subcommittee, the Board, or applications were not reviewed according to the same process, then an appeal may have merit and an appeal hearing may be granted.

An appeal does not have merit if the agency interprets the information differently or if they provide additional information after the application deadline and/or CoC Board decision.

There are issues that are important that are clearly beyond the scope of this body such as the importance of a program, the special needs of a target population, and the impact on other systems.

If the appeal hearing is not granted, the project remains on the project listing as approved by the Board.

If the hearing and appeal are granted, and project scoring and/or listing changes, the project

listing will be revised accordingly. This would impact other projects and therefore, the Continuum of Care Board will need to establish quorum, meet, and take action on the final project listing. The decision of the CoC Board will be final.

4. Timing

The ranking decision is communicated to all applicants within 24 hours of Board funding decision. The Board funding decision will take place at least 20 days prior to the NOFA due date. Applicants have 48 hours after the CoC Board funding decision to submit their appeal and should contact Kinari Patel at (602) 254-6300 (kpatel@azmag.gov). Applicants who are eligible and decide to appeal should submit a formal written appeal (no longer than 2 pages) to Kinari Patel (kpatel@azmag.gov). If an appeal will be filed, other agencies whose rank may be affected will be notified as a courtesy. Such agencies will not be able to file an appeal after the appeals process is complete. They may file an appeal within the original appeals timeline.

5. Initiating the Formal Appeal

The Formal Appeal must be submitted within 48 hours of the CoC Board funding decision (time countdown begins on the time listed on the agenda when the Board meeting ends). The appeal document must consist of a short, written (no longer than 2 pages) statement of the agency's appeal of the CoC Board's decision. The statement can be in the form of a letter, a memo, or an email transmittal.

The appeal must be transmitted by email to Kinari Patel (kpatel@azmag.gov).

6. Members of the Appeal Panel

A three-member non-conflicted Appeal Panel will be selected from the CoC Board. These individuals will have no conflict of interest in serving, as defined by the existing Review and Rank Subcommittee conflict of interest rules. Voting members of the Appeal Panel shall not serve simultaneously on the Review and Rank Subcommittee; however, a Review and Rank Subcommittee member and MAG staff will participate in the Appeal Panel to inform discussion.

7. The Appeal Process, Including Involvement of Other Affected Agencies

The Appeal Panel will review the written appeal for merit. If the Appeal Panel believes there is merit to the appeal on the basis of facts, then an appeals meeting will be conducted either in person or by telephone with a representative(s) of the agency who filed the appeal. The Panel then will deliberate and inform appealing agencies of its decision.

If an appeals meeting is held, the CoC Board will approve the final project list for submission. If an appeals meeting is not held, the original project list will be upheld. The decision of the CoC Board will be final. Final decisions for projects being rejected or reduced and the reason(s) for the rejection or reduction will be communicated in writing and outside of e-snaps no later than 15 days prior to the FY 2018 NOFA application deadline.

CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION

- The Consolidated Application will be made available to community for inspection on MAG's website at least two days prior to the FY 2018 NOFA application deadline.
- MAG will submit the Consolidated Application to HUD.
- Stakeholders will be advised that the application has been submitted.
- Projects will have opportunity to debrief scores with CoC staff. All projects are welcome to request a debriefing and receive a complete breakdown of their scores within 30 days.

**Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care
Program Performance Report¹
FINAL**

Criteria	Performance Standard	Data	Point Breakdown	Total Points Available
<p><i>IA. Project serves “harder to serve” homeless population.</i></p> <p>PSH Only</p>	<p>A1 - Percentage of persons (or households) served by the program who meet locally defined “harder to serve” conditions at entry, listed on the APR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mental Illness - Alcohol Abuse - Drug Abuse - Chronic Health Conditions - HIV/AIDS - Developmental Disabilities - Physical Disabilities 	<p>APR Qs: 13a2, 5a</p> <p>Calculations: (Q13a2 Two Conditions + Q13a2 Three or More Conditions) ÷ Q5a Total Number of Persons</p> <p>Q13a2 Three or More Conditions ÷ Q5a Total Number of Persons</p> <p>If using households, please submit the Detail Report and spreadsheets used to calculate.</p>	<p>TOTAL 3 pts.</p> <p><u>2 conditions</u> 1 pt = 37% of persons</p> <p><u>3+ conditions</u> 3 pts = 20% of persons</p> <p>PSH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 37% 2 conditions 20% 3+ conditions</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	3
<p><i>IA. Project serves “harder to serve” homeless population.</i></p> <p>RRH Only</p>	<p>A2 - Percentage of persons (or households) served by program that meet locally defined “harder to serve” conditions at entry, listed on the APR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mental Illness - Alcohol Abuse - Drug Abuse - Chronic Health Conditions - HIV/AIDS - Developmental Disabilities - Physical Disabilities 	<p>APR Qs: 13a2, 5a</p> <p>Calculations: (Q13a2 One Condition + Q13a2 Two Conditions + Q13a2 Three or More Conditions) ÷ Q5a Total Number of Persons</p> <p>(Q13a2 Two Conditions + Q13a2 Three or More Conditions) ÷ Q5a Total Number of Persons</p> <p>If using households, please submit the Detail Report and spreadsheets used to calculate.</p>	<p>TOTAL 3 pts.</p> <p><u>1 condition</u> 1 pt = 10% of persons</p> <p><u>2+ conditions</u> 3 pts = 4% of persons</p> <p>RRH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 10% 1 condition 4% 2+ conditions</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	3
<p><i>IB. Project serves “harder to serve” homeless population.</i></p> <p>PSH Only</p>	<p>B1 - Percentage of adults (or households) served by the program who had zero (\$0) income at entry.</p>	<p>APR Qs: 18, 5a</p> <p>Calculations: Q18 Number of Adults with No Income at Entry ÷ Q5a Number of Adults</p> <p>If using households, please submit the Detail Report and spreadsheets used to calculate.</p>	<p>TOTAL 3 pts.</p> <p>1 pt = 30% of adults</p> <p>3 pts = 52% of adults</p> <p>PSH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 52%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	3
<p><i>IB. Project serves “harder to serve” homeless population.</i></p> <p>RRH Only</p>	<p>B2 - Percentage of adults (or households) served by the program who had zero (\$0) income at entry.</p>	<p>APR Qs: 18, 5a</p> <p>Calculations: Q18 Number of Adults with No Income at Entry ÷ Q5a Number of Adults</p> <p>If using households, please submit the Detail Report and spreadsheets used to calculate.</p>	<p>TOTAL 3 pts.</p> <p>1 pt = 30% of adults</p> <p>3 pts = 52% of adults</p> <p>RRH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 52%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	3

<p>IC. Project serves “harder to serve” homeless population.</p> <p>PSH Only</p>	<p>C1 - Percentage of persons (or households) served by the program who entered the project from a place not meant for human habitation.</p>	<p>APR Qs: 15, 5a</p> <p>Calculations: Q15 Total from Place Not Meant for Human Habitation ÷ Q5a Total Number of Persons</p> <p>If using households, please submit the Detail Report and spreadsheets used to calculate.</p>	<p>TOTAL 3 pts.</p> <p>1 pt = 20% of persons 3 pts = 34% of persons</p> <p>PSH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 34%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	3
<p>IC. Project serves “harder to serve” homeless population.</p> <p>RRH Only</p>	<p>C2 - Percentage of persons (or households) served by the program who entered the project from a place not meant for human habitation.</p>	<p>APR Qs: 15, 5a</p> <p>Calculations: Q15 Total from Place Not Meant for Human Habitation ÷ Q5a Total Number of Persons</p> <p>If using households, please submit the Detail Report and spreadsheets used to calculate.</p>	<p>TOTAL 3 pts.</p> <p>1 pt = 4% of persons 3 pts = 8% of persons</p> <p>RRH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 8%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	3
<p>2A: HUD Objective: Increase Housing Stability.</p> <p>PSH Only</p>	<p>PSH Programs: Percentage of persons in PH program who remained in the PSH program or exited to a permanent destination during the year, excluding any participants who passed away. – As reported in the APR.</p>	<p>APR Qs: 23a, 23b, 5a</p> <p>Calculation: (Q23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q5a Number of Stayers) ÷ (Q5a Total Number of Persons – Q23a Deceased – Q23b Deceased)</p>	<p>TOTAL 10 pts.</p> <p>-5 = below 65% -4 pts = 65-69.9% -3 pts = 70-74.9% -2 pts = 75-79.9% -1 pt = 80-84.9% 0 pts = 85-89.9% 2 pts = 90-93.9% 4 pts = 94-95.9% 6 pts = 96-97.9% 8 pts = 98-99.9% 10 pts = 100%</p> <p>PSH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 94%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 3 points</p>	10
<p>2B: HUD Objective: Increase Housing Stability.</p> <p>RRH Only</p>	<p>RRH Programs: Percentage of persons in RRH program who exited the program during the year who exited to a permanent destination, excluding any participants who passed away.. – As reported in the APR.</p>	<p>APR Qs: 23a, 23b, 5a</p> <p>Calculation: (Q23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal) ÷ (Q5a Total Number of Persons – Q23a Deceased – Q23b Deceased)</p>	<p>TOTAL 10 pts.</p> <p>-5 = below 45% -4 pts = 45-49.9% -3 pts = 50-54.9% -2 pts = 55-59.9% -1 pt = 60-64.9% 0 pts = 65-69.9% 2 pts = 70-74.9% 4 pts = 75-79.9% 6 pts = 80-84.9% 8 pts = 85-89.9% 10 pts = 90-100%</p> <p>RRH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 76%</p>	10

			Subcommittee discretion: 3 points	
<p>3A: HUD Objective: Increase project participant's <u>total</u> income.</p> <p>PSH only</p>	<p>A1 - The percentage of persons age 18 and older who increased total income at the end of the operating year or program exit, either by gaining a source of income or by increasing the amount of their total income.</p> <p>PSH only</p>	<p>APR Qs: 19a3, 5a, 18</p> <p>Calculation: (19a3 Row 5 Column 4 + 19a3 Row 5 Column 5) ÷ (Q5a Total Number of Persons – Q18 Number of Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment)</p>	<p>TOTAL 5 pts.</p> <p>5 pts = >70% 4 pts = 60-69.9% 3 pts = 50-59.9% 2 pts = 40-49.9% 1 pt = 30-39.9% 0 pts = <30%</p> <p>PSH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 51%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	5
<p>3A: HUD Objective: Increase project participant's <u>total</u> income.</p> <p>RRH only</p>	<p>A2 - The percentage of persons age 18 and older who increased total income at the end of the operating year or program exit, either by gaining a source of income or by increasing the amount of their total income.</p> <p>RRH only</p>	<p>APR Qs: 19a3, 5a, 18</p> <p>Calculation: (19a3 Row 5 Column 4 + 19a3 Row 5 Column 5) ÷ (Q5a Number of Adults – Q18 Number of Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment)</p>	<p>TOTAL 5 pts.</p> <p>5 pts = >45% 4 pts = 35-44.9% 3 pts = 25-34.9% 2 pts = 20-24.9% 1 pt = 25-19.9% 0 pts = <25%</p> <p>RRH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 25%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	5
<p>3B: HUD Objective: Increase project participant's <u>earned</u> income.</p> <p>PSH only</p>	<p>B1 - The percentage of persons age 18 and older who increased earned income at the end of the operating year or program exit, either by gaining employment or by increasing the amount of their earned income.</p> <p>PSH only</p>	<p>APR Qs: 19a3, 5a, 18</p> <p>Calculation: (19a3 Row 1 Column 4 + 19a3 Row 1 Column 5) ÷ (Q5a Number of Adults – Q18 Number of Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment)</p>	<p>TOTAL 5 pts.</p> <p>5 pts = 12% or more 4 pts = 9-11.9% 3 pts = 6-8.9% 2 pts = 3-5.9% 1 pt = >0-2.9% 0 pts = 0%</p> <p>PSH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 6%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	5
<p>3B: HUD Objective: Increase project participant's <u>earned</u> income.</p> <p>RRH only</p>	<p>B2 - The percentage of persons age 18 and older who increased earned income at the end of the operating year or program exit, either by gaining employment or by increasing the amount of their earned income.</p> <p>RRH only</p>	<p>APR Qs: 19a3, 5a, 18</p> <p>Calculation: (19a3 Row 1 Column 4 + 19a3 Row 1 Column 5) ÷ (Q5a Number of Adults – Q18 Number of Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment)</p>	<p>TOTAL 5 pts.</p> <p>5 pts = 34% or more 4 pts = 28-33.9% 3 pts = 22-27.9% 2 pts = 16-21.9% 0 pts = <16%</p>	5

			RRH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 22% Subcommittee discretion: 1 point	
4: Effective use of federal funding.	Percentage of disbursed HUD funding for the most recent operating year.	APR Q 28, HUD Award List Calculation: APR Q 28 Total Expenditures ÷ Grant Award Amount Note: For any 2-yr grants, the grant award amount will be divided in half.	TOTAL 2 pts. 2 pts = 98-100% 1 pt = 95-97% 0 pts = 90-94% -1 pts = 85-89% -2 pts = 80-84% -3 pts = <80% Subcommittee discretion: 1 point	2
5: HMIS; Data Quality and Training.	5A – Percentage of total HMIS fields, across all persons served, that are missing or in error based on the Data Quality Framework Report: Q2, Q3, Q4, Q5	APR Qs: 5a, 6a, 6b, 6c, 6d Calculation: (Q6a Sum of “Information Missing” + Q6a Sum of “Data Issues” + “Q6b Sum of “Error Count” + Q6c Sum of “Error Count” + Q6d Sum of “Missing Time in Institution” + Q6d Sum of “Missing Time in Housing” + Q6d Sum of “Approx Date DKR/Missing” + Q6d Sum of “Num Times DKR/Missing” + Q6d Sum of “Num Months DKR/Missing”) ÷ (20 * Q5a Total Number of Persons Served)	TOTAL 8 pts. 8 pts = 0% 7 pts = 1-1.9% 6 pts = 2-5.9% 5 pts = 6-8.9% 4 pts = 9-11.9% 2 pts = 12-14.9% 0 pts = 15% or more Subcommittee discretion: 2 points	10
	5B - Percentage of staff that have completed at least one HMIS training course within the past year (June 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018).	HMIS Lead Agency	TOTAL 2 pts. 2 pts = 100% -1 pt = 95-99% -2 pts = 90-94% -3 pts = <90%	
6: Community Priorities and Standards	6A - Participation in Coordinated Entry By project, at least 95% of persons enrolled were referred through the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System.	Report from Coordinated Entry Leads (Number of referrals accepted from the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System June 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018) Self-report (Number of persons who entered the program June 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018) Calculation: Number of accepted referrals from the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System during the operating year ÷	TOTAL 5 pts. 5 pts = 98-100% 4 pts = 95-97% 3 pts = 90-94% 2 pts = 85-89% 1 pts = 80-84% 0 pts = Less than 80%	11

		Total number of persons who entered the program June 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018		
	6B - Participation in Coordinated Entry By project, housing providers accept 85% of eligible referrals from the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System.	Report from Coordinated Entry Leads Calculation:* Number of eligible referrals from the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System <i>accepted by</i> the program June 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018 ÷ Number of eligible referrals <i>made to</i> the project by the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System June 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018	TOTAL 6 pts. 6 pts = 95% or more 5 pts = 90-95% 4 pts = 85-89% 3 pts = 80-84% 2 pts = 75-79% 1 pts = 70-74% 0 pts = Less than 70% Subcommittee discretion: 2 points	
7: CoC Engagement and Participation	4 points for agency having a representative as a current member of the CoC Committee who attended at least 75% of meetings from June 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018.	Self-report in PRESTO/Meeting Minutes	TOTAL 4 pts.	9
	3 points for participation in one of the subcommittees or workgroups (refer to instructions below) from June 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018.	Self-report in PRESTO/Confirmation with workgroup leader	TOTAL 3 pts.	
	2 points for participation in the 2018 unsheltered PIT count	Self-report in PRESTO	TOTAL 2 pts.	
8. Budget Cost Effectiveness	2 pts: Submit HUD Grant Agreement signed by both agency and HUD showing amount awarded and contract dates.	Signed HUD Grant Agreement	2 pts. Signed Grant Agreement was submitted	9 Subcommittee discretion: 2 points
	1 pt: The Total Project Budget includes HMIS and Administration expenses, or Other expenses that cover grant management and reporting, to ensure compliance with HUD's grant management and reporting requirements.	Total Project Budget	1 pt. Total Project Budget includes HMIS and Administration expenses, or Other expenses that cover grant management and reporting.	
	2pts: Proposed supportive services expenditures are within 10% of the average cost per person to be served for projects of a similar type (PSH or RRH).	Calculations: Proposed Supportive Services expenditures ÷ Proposed number of persons to be served	Proposed Services Expenditure Per Person 2 pts = Middle 20% 1 pt = Between 10 and 20% from average 0 pts = Top or bottom 30%	

* This calculation was revised for feasibility. Based on data that is available from the community's Coordinated Entry systems, the calculation to be used for scoring is:

Number of referrals from the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System *accepted by* the agency June 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018 + Number of referrals from the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System June 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018 that are still pending (neither accepted nor denied)

÷

Number of total referrals *made to* the agency by the Family Coordinated Entry System and/or the Singles Coordinated Entry System June 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018

Revision Date: June 13, 2018

	<p>2pts: Proposed housing assistance expenditures (Rental Assistance or Leasing + Operating) are within 10% of the average cost per person to be served for projects of a similar type (RA or Leasing).</p>	<p>Proposed Rental Assistance expenditures ÷ Proposed number of persons to be served OR (Proposed Leasing expenditures + Proposed Operating expenditures) ÷ Proposed number of persons to be served</p>	<p>Proposed Housing Expenditure Per Person 2 pts = Middle 20% 1 pt = Between 10 and 20% from average 0 pts = Top or bottom 30%</p>
	<p>1 pt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rental Assistance or Other Non-Leasing Projects only: Show that at least 30% of total project budget consists of non-HUD funded cash or in-kind sources. - Leasing Projects only: Show that at least 20% of total project budget consists of non-HUD funded cash or in-kind sources. 	<p>Non-CoC Funded Amount ÷ Total Project Budget Amount</p>	<p>1 pt. At least 30% (non-leasing) or 20% (leasing) of total project budget consists of non-HUD funded cash or in-kind sources.</p>
	<p>1 pt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rental Assistance or Other Non-Leasing Projects only: Show that more than 30% of total project budget consists of non-HUD funded cash or in-kind sources. - Leasing Projects only: Show that more than 20% of total project budget consists of non-HUD funded cash or in-kind sources. 	<p>Non-CoC Funded Amount ÷ Total Project Budget Amount</p>	<p>1 pt. More than 30% (non-leasing) or 20% (leasing) of total project budget consists of non-HUD funded cash or in-kind sources.</p>
9. Housing First Alignment	<p>9A - Housing First Project commits to operating according to a Housing First model.</p>	<p>Self-report: USICH Housing First Checklist Core Elements of Housing First at the Program/Project Level</p>	<p>TOTAL 11 pts.</p> <p>Project receives one point. for each box checked in the “Core Elements of Housing First at the Program/Project Level” section of the USICH checklist, indicating that the project meets that criteria.</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 2 points</p>
	<p>9B - Housing First Project takes proactive steps to minimize barriers to entry and retention.</p>	<p>Self-report: Narrative response in PRESTO (400 word limit)</p>	<p>TOTAL 4 pts.</p> <p>Project receives 4 points if they describe two ways in which they proactively take a housing first approach in their project model.</p> <p>This narrative may include detailed explanations of how the project implements any of the 11 boxes they checked on the USICH checklist, or other examples of alignment with the Housing First philosophy.</p>

<p>10. Commitment to Policy Priorities</p>	<p>10A – Housing Cost effectiveness Project is cost effective as compared to other projects funded by CoC funds.</p> <p><u>PSH</u> Measured by average HUD CoC investment per person who stayed in the program or exited to a permanent destination.</p> <p><u>RRH</u> Measured by average HUD CoC investment per person who exited to a permanent destination.</p>	<p>APR Qs: 28, 23a, 23b, 5a</p> <p>Calculations: <u>PSH</u> Q28 Total Expenditures ÷ (Q23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q5a Number of Stayers)</p> <p><u>RRH</u> Q28 Total Expenditures ÷ (Q23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal)</p>	<p>TOTAL 5 pts.</p> <p>Top 25% = 5 pts</p> <p>Middle 50% = 3 pts</p> <p>Bottom 25% = 0 pts</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	
	<p>10B - Exits to Homelessness The percentage of persons who exited the program during the year who exited to temporary destinations.</p>	<p>APR Qs: 23a, 23b, 5a</p> <p>Calculation: (Q23a Temporary Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Temporary Destinations Subtotal) ÷ Q5a Number of Leavers</p>	<p>TOTAL 5 pts.</p> <p>PSH only: 5 pts = Less than 6% 4 pts = 6-9.9% 3 pts = 10-13.9% 2 pts = 14-21.9.9% 1 pt = 22-30% 0 pts = More than 30%</p> <p>RRH only: 5 pts = Less than 7% 4 pts = 7-10.9% 3 pts = 11-14.9% 2 pts = 15-22.9.9% 1 pt = 23-30% 0 pts = More than 30%</p> <p>PSH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 13%</p> <p>RRH System Performance for 5/1/17 - 5/1/18: 14%</p> <p>Subcommittee discretion: 1 point</p>	<p>10</p>
<p>Total Points Available</p>				<p>95</p>

ⁱ Projects operated by victim service providers will be evaluated based on APR and other aggregate data reported out of each agency’s comparable database.

Discretionary Points and Explanatory Narratives

Instructions for Discretionary Points

Provider Instructions

You may enter narrative responses into PRESTO questions 21 -33 for any criteria with discretionary points. These guidelines explain what panelists will and will not consider when using their discretion.

In your narrative responses, please provide rationale that falls within these guidelines and that is **preferably data supported**. If you cite data, you should **provide supporting documentation**.

Instructions to R&R Committee:

Discretionary factors are optional factors to consider. They are the bounds of what you may consider, but you don't have to consider any particular rationale or factor.

You may consider the discretionary factors in relation to how far or close a project performed to the benchmark or threshold for the scorecard metric. (E.g. A project that presents a compelling rationale and is very close to the next step in a scorecard scale, vs a project that presents a compelling rationale but is much farther away from the next step in the scale.)

Guidelines by Criteria

External Market Conditions – no discretionary points

Discretionary points **will not** be awarded on the basis of any of the following:

- Level of rents or amount of FMRs
- Scattered-site v project-based (except Q4)
 - o Project-based housing: relatively quick to get a housing placement.
 - o Scattered site: may be harder to find units to lease up.
- Landlords not willing to engage
- COLA: Federal increase that happens or not and applies to everyone
- Project performance that is very close to but does not reach the benchmark or threshold for receiving additional points

Global Factors – apply to metrics 1A, 1B, 1C, 2, 3A, 3B, 10A, 10B

Discretionary points **may be** awarded based on the following for **all criteria based on client outcomes**:

- Size of households served
- Size of project

Criteria 1A: Conditions at Entry

- Explain target population (e.g. survivors or domestic violence, human trafficking, and sexual assault; people with criminal background)
- Legacy clients that entered the project prior to the community's prioritization of chronically homeless and high-acuity clients
- CE referrals (may not impact everyone the same which potentially achievement of outcomes)

- Families: 1:1 referral
- Singles: multiple options are presented
- Size of households referred

Criteria 1B: Income at Entry

- If you enter client data into HMIS at the lease up date, you can explain how this might impact your data. (Current HMIS Data Standards require client data entry before lease-up date.)
 - For example, a project that enters clients into HMIS at the lease up date might have been working with the client to gain income prior to that date. The client might have had zero income when they started working with the project, but by the time they signed the lease the project had already helped them gain income.
- Cash assistance for families would be considered zero income at entry

Criteria 1C: Place Not Meant for Human Habitation Prior to Entry

- Explain target population. (e.g. survivors of domestic violence, human trafficking, and sexual assault may not come from place not meant for human habitation.)

Criteria 2: Housing Stability

- If you currently enter client data before the date of lease, you can explain how this might impact your data. (Current HMIS Data Standards require client data entry before lease-up date).
 - For example, a project that enters clients into HMIS prior to the lease-up date might have people exit without ever signing a lease. These leavers would be included in the Housing Stability metric.
 - On the other hand, if a project waits to enter clients in HMIS when they sign a lease, then any person who stops working with a program prior to signing a lease would not be included in the Housing Stability metric.

Criteria 3A: Increased Total Income

- Explain target population
 - Youth who are 18 in high school who don't work
 - Disabled, elderly
- Did the project increase income at any point since client entered the project?
 - E.g.: A client that received an entitlement benefit a few years ago may not have additional income
 - The project may have helped them get the income, initially.
- Clients who came in with disability benefits income and the project helped them to maintain that income
- Ways the project has worked with the client to increase their skills and employment opportunities, if the client is not currently working

Question 3B: Increased Earned Income

- Explain target population
 - Youth who are 18 in high school who don't work
 - Disabled, elderly
- Did the project increase employment income at any point since client entered the project?

- E.g.: A client that received an entitlement benefit a few years ago may not have additional income
- The project may have helped them get the income, initially.
- Clients who came in with employment income and the project helped them to maintain that income
- Ways the project has worked with the client to increase their skills and employment opportunities, if the client is not currently working

Question 4: Draw-down of Grant Funds

- Start-up project: Project is still ramping up the first year of a project. Give the start date of the project.
- Scattered-site v project based
 - Leasing Projects: Leasing, operating and services budget. Relatively predictable spending of funds.
 - Rental Assistance Projects: Rental assistance budget. Expenditures are more reliant on rents the project is able to negotiate or find for client. Thus, rental assistance projects may have a harder time spending down the funds than leasing projects.
- What applicants have done or are doing to mitigate the spenddown.

Question 5A: Data Quality

- Explain target population:
 - There are important reasons not to include identifying information for survivors or domestic violence, human trafficking, and sexual assault

Question 5B: HMIS Training

No discretionary points.

Question 6A: Coordinated Entry Participation

No discretionary points.

Question 6B: Coordinated Entry Referral Acceptance Rate

- Clients were denied because of ineligibility
- Applicant may explain how the Coordinated Entry workflow might have impacted its score.

Question 7: CoC Engagement

No discretionary points.

Question 8: Budget

- "Number of Proposed Persons to be Served" is based on the number of persons actually served in a previous grant year. Explain how changes to grant amount, capacity, or program design will change the number of people you expect to serve in the 2019-2020 grant year.
- Proposed cost for RRH may be different than the actual future expenditures. Harder to predict how many people will serve in a RRH, because RRH has built-in turnover.

Question 9A: Housing First

- Applicant may explain why they didn't check a checkbox.

Question 9B: Housing First Implementation No discretionary points.

Question 10A: Housing Cost Effectiveness

- If you currently enter client data before the date of lease, you can explain how this might impact your data. (Current HMIS Data Standards require client data entry before lease-up date.)
 - o For example, a project that enters clients into HMIS prior to the lease-up date might have people exit without ever signing a lease. These leavers would be included in this metric.
 - o On the other hand, if a project waits to enter clients in HMIS when they sign a lease, then any person who stops working with a program prior to signing a lease would not be included in this metric.

Question 10B: Exits to Homelessness

- If you currently enter client data before the date of lease, you can explain how this might impact your data. (Current HMIS Data Standards require client data entry before lease-up date.)
 - o For example, a project that enters clients into HMIS prior to the lease-up date might have people exit without ever signing a lease. These leavers would be included in the Exits to Homelessness metric.
 - o On the other hand, if a project waits to enter clients in HMIS when they sign a lease, then any person who stops working with a program prior to signing a lease would not be included in the Exits to Homelessness metric.
- Number of leavers: A project with a very small number of exits may have a higher rate of exits to homelessness but very strong overall housing stability.