

CoC Board
Ad-Hoc Review and Ranking Policy Committee
Policy and Procedure
Posted 7/28/16
Updated July 2018

Policy: The CoC will develop and implement only those programs that meet local needs and are operated efficiently and effectively. As part of the annual CoC application process, the CoC Board Ad-Hoc Review and Ranking committee is charged with reviewing all programs eligible and applying for CoC funding. The Committee will review and rank all existing and new programs using objective criteria that focuses on performance and program ability to meet local needs. In order to promote transparency of the review and ranking process, review and ranking meeting notes, as well as the review and ranking tool will be made available to the CoC General Partnership and the general public. The timeline for review and ranking will be established annually by HUD, with dates determined locally by the CoC Board and will be made available to all interested parties.

Procedure:

Formation of the Committee – The Review and Ranking Committee will be formed by the CoC Board on an ad-hoc basis in order to fulfill HUD CoC NOFA Review and Ranking requirements.

Committee Composition - The Committee shall be comprised of CoC Board members who are not directly receiving CoC funding. Members of the CoC’s various subcommittees and the General partnership may also serve on the Review and Ranking Committee provided that they do not directly receive CoC funding.

Committee Charge – The committee shall meet a minimum of one time for the process of Reviewing and Ranking all eligible program applications. The committee shall review all available data, as listed below and shall rank all programs in order of funding priority, with the number “1” being the highest priority. Rankings will be used to determine placement in the Tier 1/Tier 2 format as described by HUD in the CoC NOFA. It is not automatically assumed that a new program should be ranked lowest by default. The committee can rank a new project higher than an existing one if its members believe that the new project will better meet the needs of the community.

Additional meetings may be warranted to complete the committee’s tasks. The committee shall elect a member to serve as secretary and shall submit written meeting minutes to the Board at the conclusion of their task.

Review of existing programs shall consist of a thorough review of the Program Application and the most recent Annual Performance Report (APR) of the applicant agency as applicable. These steps are necessary to complete the Review and Ranking Document. This document assigns point values to various program performance points. Points are added and/or deducted from a projects score based upon information provided in the Program Application and the APR.

Review of new project applications shall consist of a thorough review of the Project Application and the agency’s most recent audited financial statements. These steps are necessary to complete the Review and Ranking Document. Protocol for Review and Ranking of programs serving victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking are described later in this document. While there are many similarities between these and other types of projects, there are also some key differences that (may) impact scoring and therefore justify an adjustment to the Ranking and Review tool.

The CoC may elect to add additional materials to the committee's review and ranking process such as program monitoring findings and program specific performance measures.

Renewal Projects:

For existing program re-applying for continued funding, the Review and Ranking Committee Members shall consider, at a minimum, the following objective factors as part of their review:

Fiscal management –

- E-LOCCS drawdown are completed quarterly at a minimum
- All available CoC funds have been expended.

Past Program Performance –

- During its most recent completed program year, did the program serve eligible applicants as proposed in its application?
- Did the program have acceptable utilization rates? (>80%)
- During its most recently completed program year, did the program meet its annual outcomes as stated in the APR?
- How did program performance compare with other applicants' performance? (Performance measures as shown on review and ranking tool)
- If the program was monitored in the preceding 12 months, were there significant monitoring findings, and if so, were those issues addressed to HUD's or the CoC's satisfaction?
- Does the program use a Housing First low barrier program model?
- Does the program conform to HUD program priorities as listed in the CoC NOFA?

In addition to the above, committee members will consider the severity of the needs of the program's population served and will consider the severity of needs and vulnerability of the target population when examining program outcomes. Needs of the target population may have a direct impact on program outcomes and should be considered. When considering the needs of the target population the committee will consider the following: low or no income, current or past substance abuse, criminal records (with the exception of restrictions imposed by other laws), chronic homelessness, history of domestic violence, disabling condition (including mental health).

It is expected that scoring, and subsequent ranking of each project will reflect the data points listed in the preceding paragraphs and that there will be a clear link between scoring and past program performance.

New Programs:

For new programs, the committee shall review the project application and the applicants most recent audited financial statement. It is expected that the committee will consult the CoC NOFA for guidance on program requirements.

Threshold standards:

- Is the applicant eligible to apply for funding?
- Is the applicant's application complete; does it meet HUD funding thresholds as described in the CoC NOFA?
- For PSH programs – are 100% of the beds dedicated to serving Chronically Homeless?

- For RRH programs – does the target population meet the Categories 1 or 4 definitions of homelessness?
- Does the proposed program provide required matching funds?
- Does the applicant demonstrate the ability to manage the fiscal and programmatic responsibilities of operating a HUD funded program?
- Does the program propose to participate in HMIS and Coordinated Entry? (This requirement does not apply to programs serving victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.
- Does the program use a Housing First program model?

Program Design Elements:

- Does the project leverage additional funding?
- Is there the need for the proposed program clearly documented in the application?
- Will the proposed program add to the CoC's ability to meet the needs of the local homeless population?
- Are costs allowable and reasonable for the service provided?

It is expected that scoring, and subsequent ranking of each project will reflect the data points listed in the preceding paragraphs and that there will be a clear link between scoring and past program performance.

Projects Proposing to Serve Victims of Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault or Stalking

VAWA (Violence Against Women Act) funded projects are prohibited from participating in HMIS and may participate in CE if able to do so in a manner that does not compromise the safety of the client served (shares no Personal Identifying Information or PII) VAWA funded projects that apply for or receive CoC monies are required to maintain all HUD required data elements in a separate data base.

For new projects, serving victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking the Committee will use all the criteria above, with the **exception** of the question “Does the program propose to participate in HMIS and CE?” In lieu of that question, the committee will search for evidence that the Program proposes to keep its data in a separate secure database capable of capturing all required data sets. If the answer is “yes” the committee will award points equaling the value of those assigned to a project that will participate in HMIS and CE.

Reallocation

Reallocation is the process of reducing or eliminating one grant in favor of funding a new grant. Examples of times that the Review and Ranking Process may result in reallocation of CoC dollars include, but are limited to:

- The CoC receives new project applications that score high enough in the Review and Ranking Process to warrant funding.
- The CoC has a lower performing project or a project serving a non-priority population and believes that the needs of the homeless population are better served by a newly proposed project design.

Reallocation process –

- The Review and Ranking Committee shall complete the review and ranking process as outlined herein. This will result in a Tier One and Tier Two ranking. Tier One programs will be listed on that Tier in descending order according to review and ranking score until the maximum Tier One funding level is reached. Remaining projects will be listed on Tier Two in descending order.
- If new project application scores higher than existing project applications, and the review and ranking committee believes that the CoC's interests are best served by funding a new project rather than an old one, the lowest scoring project (listed at the bottom of Tier Two) will be reallocated.
- Reallocation can consist of partial or full reallocation of the lowest scoring project budget.

The Review and Ranking Committee is responsible for completing the review and ranking process as described herein and reporting the results of same to the CoC Board. The CoC Board is solely responsible for notifying project applicants that their projects have been reallocated and must do so outside of ESNAPS a minimum of 14 days prior to the CoC Application submission deadline as established by HUD. Project applicants whose projects are partially reallocated will be given the opportunity to revise applications to reflect reduced funding levels.

Review and Ranking Tool

See attached.

Measure	Where found	Points	Project A	Project B	Project C	Proj. A Score	Proj. B. Score	Project C. Score
Does the program serve an eligible population? (All existing CoC funded programs are PSH with an eligible population of literally homeless with a disabling condition)	Project application - 3b	Yes = 5 pts No = 0 pts						
Occupancy- average daily utilization rate	APR- Q02- Utilization Rates	≥90%=10 pts; 80-89%=5 pts; 70-79%=2 pts; <70%= 0 pts						
Did the program meet or exceed its outcomes as stated in the APR?	APR Q29	Met = 5pts Exceeded = 8 pts Partial = 3pts No = 0 pts						
Housing Stability- % who remained or exited to PH	APR- Q29	≥90%=10 pts; 80-89%=5 pts; 70-79%=2 pts; <70%= 0 pts						
Total Income- % who maintained or increase total income	APR- Q29	≥20%=10 pts; 15-19=5 pts; 10-14%=2; <10=0						
Earned Income- % who maintained or increased earned income	APR- Q29	≥20%=10 pts; 15-19=5 pts; 10-14%=2; <10=0						
Does the Project <i>focus</i> on a harder to serve population that can account for inability to meet outcomes?	Project application PG 17	Yes = 5 pts No = 0 pts						
Dedicated or Dedicated Plus program model	Project application 3c	Yes = 5 pts No = 0 pts						
Submitted APR on time?	Project Application- Pg 17	10= yes; 0= no						
Unresolved HUD Monitoring and/or OIG Audit findings?	Project Application- Pg 17 plus applicable local monitoring findings and response	0= yes; 10= no						
Does the Project use a Housing First or Low Barrier Model?	Project Application- Q3B, D	Housing First = 10 Low Barrier = 5						
Maintained consistent Quarterly Drawdowns?	Project Application- pg 17 plus ELOCCS drawn down schedule	10= yes; 0= no						
% of used funds	Project Application Q2B4, E- LOCCS- Disbursed /Authorized	≥90%=10 pts; 80-89%=5 pts; 70-79%=2 pts; <70%= 0 pts						
		Total Points - Maximum = 100				0	0	0

Fuller, Jodi:
Sometimes projects who focus on a hard to serve population will show lower outcomes when compared to a project focusing on a less challenging population. Points should be awarded in this area ONLY if the project focuses one on of the harder to serve populations. These populations are: Chronic homeless, persons with addictions, persons with SPMI, domestic violence victims, persons with criminal histories, persons with low or no income.

Measure	Points	Project A	Project B	Project A Score	Project B Score
Threshold requirements - The project is either RRH (serving homeless categories 1&4 or PSH with 100% of population served Chronically homeless; matching funds are provided, Project design is Housing First	Yes/No for each required element. No points assigned. If answer "no" to any part of this question, do NOT proceed - project is not eligible for funding.				
Need for Project clearly documented in project application.	Yes = 10 pts; Somewhat = 5pts; No = 0 pts				
The project adds to the CoC's ability to meet the needs of homeless households.	Yes = 10 pts; Somewhat = 5pts; No = 0 pts				
Program design is suitable for proposed population.	Yes = 10 pts; Somewhat = 5pts; No = 0 pts				
Proposed program has reasonable timeline for implementation.	Yes = 10 pts; Somewhat = 5pts; No = 0 pts				
Proposed program addresses increased housing stability for participants	Yes = 10 pts; Somewhat = 5pts; No = 0 pts				
Proposed program addresses access to mainstream benefits	Yes = 10 pts; Somewhat = 5pts; No = 0 pts				
Proposed program addresses increases in household income - earned or unearned.	Yes = 10 pts; Somewhat = 5pts; No = 0 pts				
Proposed costs are reasonable for the program type and population served	Yes = 10 pts; Somewhat = 5pts; No = 0 pts				
Applicant is experienced with grant management	Yes = 5 pts; Somewhat = 2 pts; No = 0 pts				
Applicant demonstrates experience serving the proposed population	Yes = 5 pts; Somewhat = 2 pts; No = 0 pts				
Applicant demonstrates fiscal integrity with no findings on most recent audit.	Yes = 5 pts; Somewhat = 2 pts; No = 0 pts				
Applicant proposes to participate fully in HMIS and CE.	Yes = 5 pts; Somewhat = 2 pts; No = 0 pts DO NOT SCORE FOR PROGRAMS SERVING VICTIMS OF DV.				
For applicant serving victims of domestic violence - does the project indicate that it will maintain all required data elements in a separate, secure database?	Yes = 5pts, No = 0 pts.				
The applicant addresses increased safety for victims of domestic violence.	Yes = 5pts No = 0 pts				
	Total Points Maximum Score = 100			0	0

