

2018 OR-505 BOS CoC Review and Ranking
Scoring Criteria
Renewal Projects

Project: _____ **Score:** _____

Reviewer: _____

Summary of Factors	2018 Points
Threshold Requirements	
1. Outcomes	45
2. Agency/Collaborative Capacity	45
3. HMIS Data Quality	15
Total	105

I. Threshold Requirements

Threshold Criteria These factors are required but not scored. If the project indicates “no” for any threshold criteria, it is ineligible for CoC funding.	2018 Points
HMIS Implementation: Projects are required to participate in HMIS unless the project is a victim-services agency serving survivors of domestic violence or a legal services agency.	N/A
Coordinated Entry: Projects are required to participate in Coordinated Entry when available in local service area(s).	N/A

II. Detail

1. Outcomes: 45 Points

Overall, has the project been performing satisfactorily and effectively addressing the need(s) for which it was designed? Keep in mind that outcomes will naturally be lower in a more difficult-to-serve population (such as chronically homeless and those with mental and/or addictive illnesses).

Factors:

1A: Capacity	2018 Points
---------------------	--------------------

<p>Is the project serving the number of homeless <u>households</u> it was designed to serve?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on four points during the year - APR dates <p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q8b (households)</i></p> <p><i>To calculate:</i></p> <p><i>Determine %, add 4 points together, divide by 4. This gives an average. Divide that number by the projected HH form the application. Points will be relational, i.e. 90%=9 points, 80%=8 points, etc.</i></p> <p><i>Make notes of overutilization (beyond 105%)</i></p> <p><i>If only one unit/HH is unoccupied, applicant will be given the '80%-85%' points. More than one unoccupied unit/HH will receive 0 while all units/HH occupied will receive '>95% points'. Relates to Q.1A capacity and not exits to permanent housing. Move up to capacity 1A</i></p>	10	
<p>Is the project serving the number of homeless <u>people</u> it was designed to serve?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on four points during the year - APR dates <p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q7b (persons)</i></p> <p><i>To calculate:</i></p> <p><i>Determine %, add 4 points together, divide by 4. This gives an average. Divide that number by the projected HH form the application. Points will be relational, i.e. 90%=9 points, 80%=8 points, etc.</i></p>	10	
<p>1B: Housing Stability (PSH Only) – Exits to Permanent Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculated based on HMIS data • Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal • Panelists may score programs up or down two points from the scaled score below based on factors such as the population served, or services provided <p><i>Question looks at units to determine which scale to use and then looks at APR # of persons to determine the measure.</i></p>	2018 PSH/RRH Scale	2018 Points
<p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Qs 23a and 23b. use subtotals of permanent destination and add together to</i></p>	>95%	10
	90-94%	9
	86-89%	8

<p><i>get the total number.</i></p> <p>For permanent housing (including RRH): For applicants with <u>5 or more</u> units/households (HH), what is the percentage of <u>actual persons</u> who accomplished the HUD national goal for clients to remain in permanent housing.</p>	80-85%	7
	70-79%	4
	65-69%	2
<p><i>NEW Canned APR Qs 23a and 23b. use subtotals of permanent destination and add together to get the total number.</i></p> <p>For permanent housing (including RRH): For applicants with <u>4 or fewer</u> units/households, what is the percentage of actual persons who accomplished the HUD national goal for clients to remain in permanent housing.</p> <p>HUD Goal: 80%</p>	>95%	10
	90-94%	9
	86-89%	8
	80-85%	7
	70-79%	4
	65-69%	2

<p>1B: Housing Stability (SSO Only) <i>Will be updated in future competitions to reflect performance of SSO for CE rather than the former SSO grant for services.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculated based on HMIS data • Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal • Panelists may score programs up or down two points from the scaled score below based on factors such as the population served, or services provided. 	2018 SSO Scale		2018 Points		
<p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Qs 23a and 23b. use subtotals of permanent destination and add together to get the total number.</i></p> <p>For SSO: For applicants with <u>5 or more units/HH</u>, did applicant meet or exceed HUD’s national goal to maximize number of clients exiting into permanent housing?</p> <p>HUD Goal: 65% for SSO</p>	>90%	10			
	80-79%	9			
	70-79%	8			
	65-69%	7			
	60-64%	4			
	<60%	0			
<p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Qs 23a and 23b. use subtotals of permanent destination and add together to get the total number.</i></p> <p>For SSO: For applicants with <u>4 or fewer units/HH</u>, did applicant meet or exceed HUD’s national goal to maximize number of clients exiting into permanent housing? If only one bed is unoccupied, applicant will be given the ‘65%-69% points.’ More than one unoccupied unit/HH will receive a score of 0 while all units/HH occupied will receive the ‘>90% points’ score.</p> <p>HUD Goal: 65% for SSO</p>	>90%	10			
	80-79%	9			
	70-79%	8			
	65-69%	7			
	60-64%	4			
	<60%	0			
<p>1C: Employment Income Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below</p>	2018 PSH Scale	2018 RRH Scale	2018 TH Scale	2018 SSO Scale	2018 Points
<p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q18 Q18 shows adult leavers with earned income. Look at rows 1 and 3.</i></p> <p>The percentage of adult leavers that increase employment income from entry to exit.</p> <p>HUD Goal for PSH: 20%</p>	>35%	>53%	>77%	>40%	5
	20-34.9%	38-52.9%	62-76.9%	25-39.9%	2

For PSH participants unable to increase employment income, has an application for SSI/SSDI or other disability benefit been completed (or submitted)? Submission of client HMIS ID/case notes with identifiers redacted will be requested.					3
1D: Non-Employment Income					
Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below Add new language to this question	2018 PSH Scale	2018 RRH Scale	2018 TH Scale	2018 SSO Scale	2018 Points
<i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q18 Q18 shows adult leavers that increase income from other than employment from entry to exit. Look at rows 2 and 3.</i> HUD Goal: 54%	>61.5%	>61.5%	>61.5%	>61.5%	5
	54-61.4%	54-61.4%	54-61.4%	54-61.4%	4
	49-53.9%	49-53.9%	49-53.9%	49-53.9%	2
	44-48.9%	44-48.9%	44-48.9%	44-48.9%	1
	<44%	<44%	<44%	<44%	0
For PSH participants unable to increase employment income, has an application for SSI/SSDI or other disability benefit been completed (or submitted)? Submission of client HMIS ID/case notes with identifiers redacted will be requested.					3
1E: Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits					
Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below	2018 PSH Scale	2018 RRH Scale	2018 TH Scale	2018 SSO Scale	2018 Points
<i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q20b and I+ sources.</i> The percentage of adult participants that receive non-cash mainstream benefits. <i>See Scoring Outcomes 1A-1E (Packet 2, Threshold Review, and Narratives 2 page 1).</i> HUD Goal: 54%	>90%	>61%	>71%	>82%	5
	80-89.9%	51-60.9%	61-70.9%	72-81.9%	4
	75-79.9%	46-50.9%	56-60.9%	67-71.9%	2

2. Agency/Collaborative Capacity: 45 Points

Factors:

2A: Administrative Capacity	2018 Points
------------------------------------	------------------------

<p>Do the agencies (especially the lead agency)/does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all administrative requirements? Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has been agency response to requests for information, data, reporting, etc.? – <i>provided via attendance/email requests (Jo and Rena)</i> • Does the agency have HEARTH-required policies/procedures in place? (Agencies to complete checklist as part of materials) 	10
2B: HUD Oversight	2018 Points
<p>Does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all grant audit and reporting requirements? Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any outstanding HUD findings or concerns and/or financial audit findings? • Has HUD instituted any sanctions on the grant, including – but not limited to – suspending disbursements (e.g., freezing LOCCS), requiring repayment of grant funds, or de-obligating grant funds due to performance issues? • To what extent has the program advised the Collaborative Applicant of outstanding HUD findings or concerns. 	10

2C: Unspent Grant Funds	2018 Scale	2018 Points
<p>Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the agency left project grant funds unspent in the past 3 years? <i>e-LOCCS doc (2 years completed; current year for draw)</i> • Consider if the program is running at capacity and if the project receives leasing or rental assistance. <i>Reference responses in QIA.</i> • Consider reasons for unspent funds, i.e. vacancy rates, etc. 	0-3%	10
	3.1-9%	6
	9.1-15%	3
	15-100%	0
2D: Alignment with CoC Priorities	2018 Scale	2018 Points
<p>This will be scored on the overall application, but programs can submit an essay answer demonstrating their CoC alignment.</p>		
Does the project and agency align and support CoC priorities including:	100%	10
	91%	8

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance goals • CoC participation 	82%	6
	73%	4
	64%	2

2E: Alignment with Housing First Principles	
Programs may submit an essay response for consideration if fidelity of Housing First principles is less than 100%.	2018 Points
Does the project incorporate Housing First principles into its operations including prioritization of most vulnerable participants; low or no entry barriers; voluntary participation in support services.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project received HUD’s approval during monitoring (vs. finding showing not full HF)? • Is the project moving toward HF but not quite there? • Is the project NOT operating HF? 	<p style="text-align: right;">5</p> <p style="text-align: right;">3</p> <p style="text-align: right;">0</p>

2F: Alignment with Coordinated Entry Standards?	
Programs may submit an essay response if fidelity to Coordinated Entry standards is less than 100%. No Coordinated Entry=No Score.	2018 Points
Does the project incorporate Coordinated Entry standards into its operations, including:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project fully integrating CE and ready for next steps? • Is the project moving toward CE but not quite there? • Is the project NOT operating CE? 	<p style="text-align: right;">5</p> <p style="text-align: right;">3</p> <p style="text-align: right;">0</p>

3. HMIS Data Quality: 15 Points

Factors:

3A: Interim Reviews	2018 Scale	2018 Points
Does the agency utilize interim reviews and are annual interim reviews complete within the required	Prior Inside	5

+/-30 days?	Current Inside	0
Reference ART Report 0703 – SPM Data Quality		

3B: Complete Data Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below	2018 Scale	2018 Points
<i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q6a-c; CoC 'acceptable' error rate = 5% or less.</i>	0% to 1%	10
<i>Add three percentages listed and divide by 3 for overall percentage.</i> <i>NOTE:</i> <i>NEW Canned APR Q6e shows Data Quality Timeliness; this question may be added into next Renewal Scoring Criteria update.</i>	2% to 4%	8
	5%	6
	6% to 8%	4
	9% to 10%	2
	<10%	0