2017 OR-505 BOS CoC Review and Ranking
Scoring Criteria
Renewal Projects

Project: _____   **Score**: _____

Reviewer: _____

Summary of Factors	2017 Points
Threshold Requirements	
1. Outcomes	*45*
2. Agency/Collaborative Capacity	*45*
3. HMIS Data Quality	**15**
Total	*105*
4. Prioritization	Up to *5* Per Project

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.	2017 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	2017 Points

Is the project serving the number of homeless ***households*** it was designed to serve? • Report on four points during the year - APR dates *Reference: NEW Canned APR Q8b (households)* *To calculate:* *Determine %, add 4 points together, divide by 4. Points will be relational, i.e. 90%=9 points, 80%=8 points, etc.* *Make notes of overutilization (beyond 105%)*		**10**
Is the project serving the number of homeless ***people*** it was designed to serve? • Report on four points during the year - APR dates *Reference: NEW Canned APR Q7b (persons)* *To calculate:* *Points will be relational, i.e. 90%=9 points, 80%=8 points, etc.*		**10**

1B: Housing Stability (PSH Only)(Exit to PH) • 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 *Question looks at units to determine which scale to use and then looks at APR # of persons to determine the measure*	**2017 PSH/RRH Scale**	**2017 Points**
Reference: NEW Canned APR Qs 23a and 23b. use subtotals of permanent destination and add together to get the total number. **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.	>95%	**10**
	90-94%	**9**
	86-89%	**8**
	80-85%	**7**
	70-79%	**4**
	65-69%	**2**
NEW Canned APR Qs 23a and 23b. use subtotals of permanent destination and add together to get the total number. **For permanent housing (including RRH):** For	>95%	**10**
	90-94%	**9**
	86-89%	**8**
	80-85%	**7**

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. *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'.* HUD Goal: 80%	70-79%	**4**
	65-69%	**2**
1B: Housing Stability (SSO Only) *Will be updated in future competitions to reflect performance of SSO for CE rather than the former SSO grant for services.* • 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	**2017 SSO Scale**	**2017 Points**
Reference: NEW Canned APR Qs 23a and 23b. use subtotals of permanent destination and add together to get the total number. **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? HUD Goal: 65% for SSO	>90%	**10**
	80-79%	**9**
	70-79%	**8**
	65-69%	**7**
	60-64%	**4**
	<60%	**0**
Reference: NEW Canned APR Qs 23a and 23b. use subtotals of permanent destination and add together to get the total number. **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. HUD Goal: 65% for SSO	>90%	**10**
	80-79%	**9**
	70-79%	**8**
	65-69%	**7**
	60-64%	**4**
	<60%	**0**

1C: Employment Income Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below	2017 PSH Scale	2017 RRH Scale	2017 TH Scale	2017 SSO Scale	2017 Points
Reference: NEW Canned APR Q18 Q18 shows adult leavers with earned income. Look at Column 4 Leavers row 1 and 3 (earned and earned plus other). The percentage of adult leavers that increase employment income from entry to exit HUD Goal for PSH: 20%	>35%	>53%	>77%	>40%	5
	20–34.9%	38–52.9%	62–76.9%	25–39.9%	4

1D: Non-Employment Income Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below	2017 PSH Scale	2017 RRH Scale	2017 TH Scale	2017 SSO Scale	2017 Points
Reference: NEW Canned APR Q18 Q18 shows adult leavers that increase income from other than employment from entry to exit. Look at Column 4 Leavers rows 2 and 3 (Other and earned plus other). 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

1E: Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below	2017 PSH Scale	2017 RRH Scale	2017 TH Scale	2017 SSO Scale	2017 Points
Reference: NEW Canned APR Q20b and 1+ sources. The percentage of adult participants that receive non-cash mainstream benefits. *See Scoring Outcomes 1A-1E (Packet 2, Threshold Review, and Narratives 2 page 1).* 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	2017 Points
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: • What has been agency response to requests for information, data, reporting, etc.? – *provided via attendance/email requests (Jo and Rena)* • Does the agency have HEARTH-required policies/procedures in place? (Agencies to complete checklist as part of materials)	**10**
2B: HUD Oversight	**2017 Points**
Does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all grant audit and reporting requirements? Consider: • 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 Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below	2017 Scale	2017 Points
• Has the agency left project grant funds unspent in the past 3 years? *e-LOCCS doc (2 years completed; current year for draw)* • Consider if the program is running at capacity and if the project receives leasing or rental assistance. *Reference responses in Q1A.*	0–3%	**10**
	3.1–9%	**6**
	9.1–15%	**3**
	15–100%	**0**
2D: Alignment with CoC Priorities This will be scored on the overall application, but programs can submit an essay answer demonstrating their CoC alignment.	**2017 Scale**	**2017 Points**
Does the project and agency align and support CoC	100%	**10**

priorities including:	91%	8
• Performance goals	82%	6
• CoC participation	73%	4
	64%	2

2E: Alignment with Housing First Principles	
• This will be scored on the overall application, but programs can submit an essay answer demonstrating their alignment with Housing First principles.	**2017 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 • Other factors	**5**

3. <u>HMIS Data Quality: *15* Points</u>

Factors:

3A: *Interim Reviews*	**2017 Scale**	**2017 Points**
Does the agency utilize interim reviews and are annual interim reviews complete within the required +/-30 days?	*Prior Outside*	*5*
Reference ART Report 0703 – Employment and Income Growth for CoC Projects Tab D.	*Current Outside*	*0*

3B: Complete Data Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below	**2017 Scale**	**2017 Points**
Reference: NEW Canned APR Q6a-c; CoC 'acceptable' error rate = 5% or less.	0% to 1%	**10**
Add three percentages listed and divide by 3 for overall percentage.	2% to 4%	**8**
	5%	**6**
NOTE:	6% to 8%	**4**
NEW Canned APR Q6e shows Data Quality Timeliness; this	9% to 10%	**2**

question may be added into next Renewal Scoring Criteria update.	<10%	**0**

4. **Prioritization: 5 Bonus Points – CoC priority preference**

Factors:

4A: Chronic Homelessness (CH)	**2017 Scale**	**2017 Points**
Out of non-dedicated CH beds, how many are prioritized for CH?	*100%*	*5*
	91%	*4*
Reference: e-snaps Application Q4B.	*82%*	*3*
	73%	*2*
	64%	*0*