

# Northwest Minnesota Continuum of Care HUD CoC Project Evaluation, Ranking and Reallocation Policy

*Updated: July 2017*

The Northwest Minnesota Continuum of Care (CoC) requires an annual project review for all HUD Continuum of Care and Emergency Solutions Grant Projects. This policy specifically applies to projects seeking funding under the annual HUD Continuum of Care competition.

These conditions are designed to inform Performance Evaluation and Ranking Committee deliberations and provide all applicants and renewing projects with clarity regarding how ranking and prioritization occur.

## **IMPORTANT PROJECT APPLICATION DATES & DEADLINES:**

Each year, the CoC will publish annual HUD CoC Competition deadlines that include both local and HUD deadlines. Any agency applying for the CoC Competition must comply with the published deadlines or risk point loss and ineligibility for the funding competition. The published dates and deadlines will be published on the CoC website and sent out via email through the CoC email list.

## **ELIGIBILITY**

To be eligible for inclusion in the CoC Evaluation and Ranking process, all projects must pass all facets of the CoC Application process including:

1. Project Application meets HUD eligibility criteria for a new or renewal Transitional Housing, Rapid-Rehousing, HMIS, SSO-CES, Transitional Housing-Rapid Rehousing, or Permanent Supportive Housing project;
2. Project meets all HUD Threshold Requirements including, but not limited to;
  - a. Applicant has a DUNS # and has current SAM registration.
  - b. Applicant is a nonprofit organization, State or local government, instrument of a State or local government or Public housing agency, as such term is defined in 24 CFR 5.100.
  - c. Applicant participates or has ability and willingness to participate in HMIS.
  - d. Applicant demonstrates financial and management capacity and experience to successfully carry out project.
  - e. Applicant submits required certifications as required in the NOFA.
  - f. Applicant agrees to only serve persons who are eligible as defined in Hearth Act regulations.
  - g. Project draws down funds from LOCCS/eLOCCS at least quarterly.
3. Project meets all CoC Eligibility and Threshold Requirements;
  - a. Participation in CoC Membership and Committee meetings;
  - b. Participation in or commitment (if a new project) to participate in Coordinated Entry;
  - c. Project agrees to link households to mainstream services.
  - d. Adherence to CoC Policies
    - i. PSH Prioritization Policies
    - ii. School Enrollment and Connection of Services Policy
    - iii. Family Separation (TH only)
    - iv. Written Standards for ESG and CoC Assistance
  - e. Project agrees to adhere to and document participant eligibility.
  - f. Agreement to provide all necessary documentation and reporting to CoC by designated deadlines.

4. Project adheres to all local CoC Competition deadlines;
  - Project submits an Intent to Apply and Threshold Assessment
  - Initial Project Application submitted in esnaps & via PDF
5. Commit to Housing First and Low Barrier Principals.
6. Participation in or commitment to participate in HMIS if funded.

#### GUIDEANCE ON REQUIRED TIERS

The CoC will review all projects and rank in either Tier 1 or Tier 2. Tier 1 projects are considered more likely to be renewed. Tier 2 projects are conditional and will depend in CoC Scoring, HUD/CoC Priorities, Project Performance and Rank. HUD will award a point value to projects in Tier 2. Projects will be able to straddle Tier 1 and Tier 2. CoC score and project score will determine which projects from Tier 2 will be conditionally selected.

#### NEW PROJECT CRITERIA AND PRIORITY

There are four different types of projects that can be funded as new projects in the 2017 NOFA.

Project Type	Eligibility Type	Priority Level	Justification for Priority
New Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects for centralized or <b>coordinated entry system</b> .	Bonus or Reallocation	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CE is our new homeless response system and a means of monitoring system needs and performance, as well as remaining competitive for future HUD funding. Funding is still needed to support CE implementation</li> </ul>
New <b>rapid re-housing</b> projects for homeless individuals, unaccompanied youth, and families coming directly from the streets or emergency shelter or fleeing domestic violence.	Expansion, Reallocation or Bonus	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rapid rehousing has a higher unmet need than PSH based upon CES data.</li> </ul>
New <b>Transitional Housing-Rapid Rehousing</b> projects that serve	Bonus or Reallocation	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is not sufficient shelter coverage in our rural region.</li> <li>• Fixed site TH, with ability to transition to RRH rapidly, helps address need to have immediate access to housing and gain rental history necessary to find scattered site housing.</li> </ul>
New <b>permanent supportive housing</b> projects that serve chronically homeless individuals, unaccompanied youth, and families.	Expansion, Reallocation or Bonus	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having sufficient PSH is necessary to continue to prioritize serving most vulnerable.</li> <li>• PSH has a lower unmet need. All CH households have been served at times repeatedly on priority list and chronic homelessness is often difficult to document in</li> </ul>

			portions of our region due to the lack of shelter.
<b>HMIS</b> expanded services carried out HMIS Lead.	Expansion or Reallocation	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HMIS is required for CoC, funder and CES compliance, but HMIS is funded at desired level.</li> </ul>

### SCORING & RANKING PROCESS

The following describes the CoC process to score and rank projects for 2017 CoC funding. It should be noted that the CoC uses “scoring”, “reallocation”, and “ranking” as three distinct steps. Scoring informs, but does not dictate, the final ranking decisions. Where ranking and scoring do not correlate, the Ranking Committee may recommend adjustments. The Committee will indicate in comments why the project is ranked in their position versus directly following scoring.

#### RANKING CRITERIA

The CoC Ranking Committee is responsible for developing and distributing Ranking Criteria to the CoC Membership for review and approval each year. The process utilizes non-biased criteria based on the HUD ranking tool, established CoC priorities and project performance. The CoC uses an objective Ranking Score Card that incorporates both self and committee scores.

Specifically, the tool assesses threshold and scores on criteria in the following seven categories:

1. Leverage/Cash Match
2. Project Design & Need
3. HUD Priorities
4. CoC Participation
5. Service Plan
6. Performance
7. HMIS

#### REVIEW AND RANKING PROCESS

1. The CoC solicits Pre-application and Project Threshold Assessments. Solicitation is sent to renewal applicants and an open invite for new projects the CoC email list and at other regional meetings or public notices.
2. Ranking and Application documents are posted on the CoC website once NOFA is released.
3. The CoC Coordinator follows-up with new applicants or renewal applicants interested in or targeted for reallocation.
4. Ranking process, criteria, submitted pre-applications and timeline are presented at first CoC meeting after NOFA release.
5. The CoC hosts a NOFA application lab to provide support to new and renewal applicants.
6. Project applicants must submit application Score Card and supporting documentation to the CoC by deadline to be eligible for ranking.
7. The CoC Ranking Committee Reviews the Score Card, Draft application, and supporting documentation. The Committee Ranking includes:
  - i. Review projects for eligibility.
  - ii. Review and validation of applicant self-score, noting any discrepancies or questions.
  - iii. Identification of specific feedback for applicant (score discrepancies, missing information, or clarifications).

- iv. Recommended score and rank.
  - v. When ties exist, the Committee shall rank with the following preferences: the project with higher housing stability and the project with the lease returns to homelessness. Projects with existing clients shall also be ranked higher if scores are identical or within 1 point.
8. The CoC Coordinator emails individual scores and feedback to each applicant and invites applicants to respond by CoC deadline (usually 4-7 days).
  9. Updated information is then reviewed and scoring may be adjusted if supporting documentation or appropriate clarification is provided. If needed, the CoC Ranking Committee meets to deliberate scores adjustments.
  10. The CoC Ranking Committee presents final applicant scores and 1-2 Tiering options to the CoC membership. Members may propose other options as well. The membership votes on proposed score and rank.
  11. Projects are notified of Rank, Tier, and inclusion/exclusion in the Collaborative Application. Projects not accepted or Ranked in Tier 2 are also notified of their ability to appeal to the CoC and HUD.
  12. Approved Priority Listing placed on CoC website and mailed to CoC mailing list and Project Applicants.

## 2017 Project Applicant Score Card

### OVERVIEW

Annually, CoC program applicants will be ranked and tiered per CoC policy and HUD guidance. The purpose is to ensure that HUD funded programs are providing the highest quality housing and services and that the programs are focused on achieving outcomes to end homelessness.

### PROJECT PERFORMANCE

To provide both project-specific outcome information and CoC-wide contributions, each program will be evaluated based on data entered into HMIS, the HUD Annual Performance Report (APR), the Project Application submitted for the CoC proposal, and other tools as deemed necessary and appropriate to assure quality and accurate evaluation. The APR scoring criteria assess outcomes that directly relate to goals set by the HEARTH Act. The performance measures now comprise HUD's performance measures against which every Continuum will be assessed.

Submit the renewal scorecard and required attachments (APR, Housing First Assessment, etc.) to Carla Solem, Continuum of Care Coordinator, via email at [h2hcoordinator@gmail.com](mailto:h2hcoordinator@gmail.com) no later than Friday, August 25<sup>th</sup> at noon. The APR period is 7/1/16 to 6/30/17.

### NOTES

- 1) The CoC Policy provides each project with information regarding the Evaluation, Ranking and Scoring Policy.
- 2) A Site Review and additional performance considerations may be incorporated into the Performance Score Card Score if deemed appropriate by the Committee to assure a comprehensive and quality evaluation is completed.
- 3) All criteria are scored based on materials submitted by the submission deadline (e.g., accuracy of charts/budgets will be scored based on first submission; not based on corrections made after review).
- 4) Any required information that is incomplete or missing at deadline will likely result in a decreased score.
- 5) CoC-funded HMIS programs and CoC Planning Grant use separate review processes for evaluation and scoring.

Project Name	Type of Program	<input type="checkbox"/> PSH	<input type="checkbox"/> RRH	<input type="checkbox"/> TH	<input type="checkbox"/> THP-RRH
Contact Person	Date				
E-mail	Phone				

THRESHOLD ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA	VERIFICATION AND DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED	SELF-ASSESSMENT	COC SCORE
Eligible Eligibility: - Project Type - Target Population - Certifications - Disclosure of Violations or suspensions - Eligible Applicant Type - DUNS# and SAM Registration - Applicant has no debarments	✓ Project Application was submitted in esnaps and via PDF by 8/24/17 including all required certifications. ✓ Project Applicant submitted required Threshold Assessment		
HMIS Participation	✓ Agency enters (or will if new project) all required program data into HMIS. ✓ Agency is compliant with HMIS policies, including privacy and security standards.		

Financial and Administration Management		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ LOCSS shows a minimum of quarterly draw-downs</li> <li>✓ There are no outstanding audit findings from any funder or audit.</li> <li>✓ There is no history of financial mismanagement – agency or program.</li> <li>✓ There is no history of serving ineligible participants, ineligible costs or failing to expend funds in timeframe.</li> <li>✓ Agency has completed audit as required by MN law.</li> <li>✓ Agency has documented required 25% match.</li> <li>✓ Project is cost effective and comparable to other projects that type.</li> </ul>				
Coordinated Entry Participation		✓ Participation in CES Prioritization and CES Review Process				
Reporting & Deadline Compliance		✓ Agency self-report and CoC Coordinator verification				
Adherence to CoC Policies		✓ Agency certifies and has shown (per review) compliance with CoC policies.				
Eligible Points	SCORING SECTIONS	LOW CRITERIA	MEDIUM CRITERIA	HIGH CRITERIA	SELF-ASSESSMENT	COC SCORE
Leverage: 4 POINTS						
4	Leverage amount	(0) Under 100% (1) 100%-124%	Correct dates on letters & (2) 125%-149% (3) 150%-199%	(4) Over 200% w/ correct dates on letters.	Score: Amount:	
Project Design related to Local Need : 12 POINTS						
4	Project Type/Scale	(0) There is an abundance of services.	(1) There is a low need for this project type in our CoC.	(4) There is a strong need for this project type in our CoC.	Score: Notes:	
4	Geographical Location	(0) There is an abundance of services in the area.	(1) There is a low need for this project in the service area.	(4) There is strong need for this project type in the service area.	Score: Notes:	
4	Target Population	(0) Target population is not a priority and/or design does not fit population.	(1) There is a low need for serving population and design fits population.	(4) There is a strong need for serving population and design fits population.	Score: Notes:	
HUD Priorities: 20 POINTS						
1	Increase dedicated CH Beds (PSH ONLY)	(-1) no increase in dedicated CH beds	(0) maintain dedicated CH Beds	(1) Increase dedicated CH beds	Score: '16 CH Beds: '17 CH Beds:	
6	Housing First Approach (Adapted score for TH)	(-1) Did not demonstrate or complete Housing First documentation	(2) Determined to be Housing First in Application AND (2) demonstration of Housing First approach in practice AND (2) completed USICH tool.		Score: Notes:	
2	Strategic Resource Allocation	(0) Not cost effective & does not collaborate,	(1) Comprehensive & diverse service plan/partnerships + (1) Cost effective		Score: Cost/night/bed:	

		self-evaluate, or integrate.				
6	Removing Barriers to Housing:	(-1) NOT Barrier Free	(3) Self verified low barrier AND (3) demonstrates barriers free entry (attach program policies).		Score: Notes:	
5	Prioritization of need and history of homelessness.	(0) All beds turned over do not use CES and CoC prioritization policy.	(5) 100% beds turned over utilize CoC priority policies.		Score: % beds filled through CH:	
CoC Participation: 10 POINTS						
3	CoC Reporting	(-1) Consistent late reports & outstanding reports (2) 1 late report	(2) CoC reports are completed on time but require extra prompts.	(3) All CoC reports are completed on time and with little prompts	Score: Notes:	
2	Participation in annual CoC Planning & Needs Assessment Process	(-1) did not participate or provide data.	(0) Did not participate, but provided data.	(2) Participated in meetings and provided necessary data.	Score: Notes:	
3	Meeting Attendance	(0) less than 50%	(1) 50% of last 10	(3) over 75% of last 10	Score: Notes:	
2	Agency staff participates in at least 1 CoC committee and regularly attends.	(0) no staff participating on CoC Committee in last year.	(1) Assignment of staff to at least 1 committee	(2) Assignment of staff to CoC Committee and at least 50% attendance	Score: Notes:	
Service Quality Plan (PH, TH, PSH only): 10 POINTS						
3	Understanding of core principles ((harm reduction, person centered care, data informed planning, low barrier, housing first).	(0) No training or plan demonstrated.	(2) Demonstrates partial understanding & plan to train/enhance understanding.	(3) Agency can demonstrate that taff are trained & practice/follow: CoC/CES policies & data requirements & EVP.	Score: Trainings list:	
2	Outreach		(1) At least 85% coming from streets, ES or DV.	(2) 100% coming from ES and Streets or fleeing DV.	Score: %:	
1	Accessibility Plan: Transportation, outreach & non-discrimination	(-1) No plan demonstrated.		(1) Demonstrated in threshold.	Score: Notes:	
2	Collaboration with mainstream and key support services.	(0) Poor service access plan and linkage to mainstream resources.	(2) Utilizes Single mainstream application, regular follow-ups & SOAR. Services Plan.		Score: Notes:	
2	Educational Assurances & Non-separation (Family programs only)	(0) Does not demonstrate compliance w/ CoC Education policy.	(2) Agency demonstrates compliance w/ CoC policy.		Score: Notes:	
PERFORMANCE: 31 POINTS (Assessed on APR)						
					SELF-ASSESSMENT	COC SCORE

3	CoC APR pre-review	(0) No pre-review conducted.	(2) On time. Did not respond to findings prior to esnaps submission.	(3) On time. Corrected issues prior to esnaps submission.	Score: Notes on any delay:	
9	Exits to Permanent Housing	(0) -60% (2) 65%-75%	(3) 76%-80%	(4) 81%-84% (5) 85%-87% (9) 88%+	Score: APR %:	
3	Returns to Homelessness	(-1) More than 25% return to homelessness (0) 15%-25% return to homelessness.	(2) 10%- 15% return to homelessness.	(3) Less than 10% return to homelessness.	Score: HMIS %:	
4	HUD Earned Income Objective	(0) PSH: 0-9% (0) RRH/TH: 0-15%	(3) PSH: 10-20% (3) RRH/TH: 16-25%	(4) PSH: 20% or higher (4) RRH/TH: 26% +	Score: APR %:	
4	HUD Maintain or Increase Income Objective	(-1) 0-24% (1) 25%-50%	(3) PSH: 51-54% (3) RRH/TH: 51-74%	(4) PSH: 55% or higher (4) RRH/TH: 75% +	Score: APR %:	
3	HUD Mainstream Objective	(0) 0-24% (1) 25%-49%	(2) 50%-56%	(3) 57%-79% (4) 80%+	Score: APR %:	
4	Budget Expenditure	(-1) 49-74% (0) 75%-85%	(1) 85-90% (2) 90-95%	(3) 96-99% (4) 100%	Score: Last APR %:	
4	Utilization	(-1) -50% (0) 50%-74%	(2) 75%-85% (3) 86%-99%	(4) 101%+	Score: APR%:	
HMIS: 13 POINTS					SELF-ASSESSMENT	COO SCORE
4	Data Privacy and Security	(-3) Demonstrate data privacy or security issues		(4) Demonstrate compliance	Score: Notes:	
4	Bed Coverage	(-3) NOT all beds in HMIS		(4) All beds in HMIS	Score: %:	
5	Data Quality	(-1) under 90% data quality rate (over 10% null/missing/refused/unknown)	(3) 90-95% rate (between 10% and 5% are null/missing/refused or unknown)	(5) Above 95% rate (less than 5% are null/missing/refused/unknown)	Score: %:	
100	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>					

Please include any notes to explain low score or other items you wish review team to know.