1. ***Objective of the Prioritization & Evaluation Subcommittee.*** The purpose of this committee is to objectively rank all renewal and new (bonus, reallocation and consolidation) projects for the Continuum of Care Consolidated Application.
2. ***Project Ranking.*** Project applications submitted to the CoC for inclusion on the FY 2018 CoC Priority Listing as part of the CoC Consolidated Application must be reviewed and either accepted and ranked or rejected by the CoC. All project applications approved by the CoC must be listed on the CoC Priority Listing in rank order, except project applications for CoC planning and UFA Costs which will not be ranked, to establish the project applications located within Tier 1 and the project applications located within Tier 2. The purpose of this two-tiered approach is for CoCs to indicate to HUD which projects are prioritized for funding.

The P&E subcommittee will rank all projects (excluding Planning and UFA Costs projects) applying for funding in the 2018 Consolidated Application. This is an ordered ranking of all renewal and new projects the CoC is submitting in the application for funding. The project ranking *must* reflect HUD funding priorities, local need, and a data-driven process for evaluating individual project performance.

Prior to the ranking process, the CoC completes a full performance evaluation of all renewal projects and determines whether to include each individual project in the ranking. The Executive Director provides data and pertinent project information to the subcommittee. This information is used during the ranking process. Using this data, the subcommittee meets to rank all new (reallocated and bonus) and renewal project applications in order of priority and to identify any project applications rejected by the CoC.

1. ***Ranking Tiers.*** HUD requires the project ranking consist of a Tier 1 and Tier 2. HUD typically has enough funding to fund all projects that meet threshold criteria and are in Tier
   1. Projects in Tier 2 are considered “at-risk” of not being funded if the overall CoC score and individual project score are not competitive at the national level. For FY2018, the tiers are as follows:

Tier 1: 94% of Annual Renewal Demand

Tier 2: 6% of Annual Renewal Demand + Amount of Eligible Bonus Project Funding

1. ***Projects Straddling Tiers*.** If a project application straddles the Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding line, HUD may conditionally select the amount of funding the project will receive. HUD may fund the Tier 2 portion of the project. If HUD does not fund the Tier 2 portion of the project, HUD may award the project at the reduced amount, provided the project is still feasible with the reduced funding.
2. ***KVCCoC’s FY2018 Available Funds. 2018 ARA*: $1,135,690**

**Tier 1**: 94% of Annual Renewal Demand = **$1,067,549**

**Tier 2**: 6% of Annual Renewal Demand ($68,141) + Amount of Eligible Bonus Project Funding ($89,402) + Eligible DV Bonus ($149,004) **= $306,547**

**TOTAL: $1,374,096**

1. ***HUD’s Policy Priorities.*** This section provides additional context and is included here to help better understand how the selection criteria support the goal of ending homelessness:
   1. *Ending homelessness for all persons.* To end homelessness, CoCs should identify, engage, and effectively serve all persons experiencing homelessness. CoCs should measure their performance based on local data that consider the challenges faced by all subpopulations experiencing homelessness in the geographic area (e.g., veterans, youth, families, or those experiencing chronic homelessness). CoCs should have a comprehensive outreach strategy in place to identify and continuously engage all unsheltered individuals and families. Additionally, CoCs should use local data to determine the characteristics of individuals and families with the highest needs and longest experiences of homelessness to develop housing and supportive services tailored to their needs. Finally, CoCs should use the reallocation process to create new projects that improve their overall performance and better respond to their needs.
   2. *Creating a systemic response to homelessness.* CoCs should be using system performance measures such as the average length of homeless episodes, rates of return to homelessness, and rates of exit to permanent housing destinations to determine how effectively they are serving people experiencing homelessness. Additionally, CoCs should use their Coordinated Entry process to promote participant choice, coordinate homeless assistance and mainstream housing and services to ensure people experiencing homelessness receive assistance quickly, and make homelessness assistance open, inclusive, and transparent.
   3. *Strategically allocating and using resources.* Using cost, performance, and outcome data, CoCs should improve how resources are utilized to end homelessness. CoCs should review project quality, performance, and cost effectiveness. HUD also encourages CoCs to maximize the use of mainstream and other community-based resources when serving persons experiencing homelessness. CoCs should also work to develop partnerships with Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) to work toward helping CoC Program participants exit permanent supportive housing through Housing Choice Vouchers and other available housing options Finally, CoCs should review all projects eligible for renewal in FY 2018 to determine their effectiveness in serving people experiencing homelessness, including cost effectiveness.
   4. *Use a Housing First approach.* Housing First prioritizes rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing and does not have service participation requirements or preconditions. CoC Program funded projects should help individuals and families move quickly into permanent housing, and the CoC should measure and help projects reduce the length of time people experience homelessness. Additionally, CoCs should engage landlords and property owners, remove barriers to entry, and adopt client- centered service methods.
2. ***Project Ranking Process.***
3. **Renewal Project Scoring.** Renewal projects approved by the Prioritization and Evaluation subcommittee (P&E) for inclusion in the CoC project ranking will be scored according to an objective scoring tool based on their individual project performance, alignment with HUD and CoC policy priorities, and compliance. Performance and HMIS elements are heavily weighted measures used by HUD in determining the overall CoC
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score for the NOFA. Data used in the renewal project scoring tool comes largely from an HMIS Annual Performance Report (APR) from the most recently ended grant year for each grant.

Data used for scoring renewal DV projects will be scored using APR data tracked on a spreadsheet (which contains no client names or any other personally identifiable information) and an HMIS comparable databased designed to meet the confidentiality needs of DV projects.

First-time renewal projects that have not yet completed their first operating year will be evaluated with HMIS APR data for the current year (year-to-date) to assess if each project is on track for implementation and anticipated outcomes.

1. **New Project Selection.** New project applicants will be assessed on the following: project design, how the project addresses local priority needs, how the project aligns with local strategies and HUD’s priority to end homelessness, budget appropriateness and accuracy, project match, leveraging, CoC participation, community collaboration, organizational capacity, use of Housing First, and implementation timeline. There may be new projects that fail to score well enough to be included in the NOFA submission, or there may not be enough new project funding to fund all requests.
2. **Ranking Order.** New and renewal projects approved for inclusion in the CoC’s project ranking will be ranked in the following order:
   1. CoC infrastructure projects:
   2. HMIS projects
   3. Coordinated Entry SSO renewal projects
   4. All other SSO renewal projects
   5. Renewal PSH and RRH projects, ranked in order of highest to lowest percentage score.
   6. Renewal SH projects ranked in order of highest to lowest percentage score
   7. New projects approved for inclusion ranked at the discretion of the committee using the elements listed under Section7B of the document.
3. **Tie-Breakers.** Ties within the same project type will be broken in the following order:
   1. Highest % of clients exiting to or retaining permanent housing
   2. Highest utilization rate
   3. Highest percentage of vulnerable populations served

The P&E Subcommittee may adjust individual projects up or down in the ranking or reallocate to fulfill HUD priorities, prevent potential losses of funding, and maximize the overall CoC application score.

Project \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Max Points** | **Scoring Thresholds** | **Awarded Points** |
| **1. Permanent Housing Placements**  The % of persons who remained in the PH program as of the end of the operating year or exited to PH | 20 | 20 Points: 90 – 100%  15 Points: 80 – 89%  10 Points: 60 – 79%  0 Points: 54% or less |  |
| **2. Utilization Rate**  The average % of units that were utilized nightly on all PIT dates over the course of the program year. | 10 | 10 Points: 90% or more  5 Points: 80 – 89%  0 Points: 79% or less |  |
| **3. Total Income (Cash)**  The % of persons age 18 and older that maintained or increased their total cash income by program exit. | 10 | 10 Points: 80% or more  5 Points: 70 – 79%  3 Points: 60– 69%  0 Points: 60% or less |  |
| **4. Mainstream Benefits (Non-Cash)**  The % of households that maintained or increased their non-cash benefits at program exit. | 10 | 10 Points: 80% or more  5 Points: 70 – 79%  3 Points: 60– 69%  0 Points: 60% or less |  |
| **5. Chronic Homelessness**  Percent of clients that entered the project during the operating year that were chronically homeless. | 5 | 5 Points: 65% or more  0 Points: 49% or less |  |
| **6. Dedicated Chronic Homeless Beds**  The % of beds in the project that are dedicated chronic homeless beds (based on data from the HIC) | 5 | 5 Points: 50% or more  0 Points: 49% or less |  |
| **7. Returns to Homelessness**  Percentage of households who exit to PH destinations and return to homelessness within 1 year. | 10 | 10 Points: 5% or less  5 Points: 6 – 10%  0 Points: 11% or more |  |
| **8. Serving Vulnerable Populations**  Percentage of clients served who are: veterans, unaccompanied youth (under 25), parenting youth, fleeing DV, and / or with at least two conditions at entry. | 10 | 10 Points: 90% or more  8 Points: 89 - 80%  6 Points: 79 – 70%  0 Points: 69% - 0% |  |
| **9. HMIS**  The extent to which the project:  HMIS Has satisfactory data quality  Has satisfactory data timeliness | 10 | 10 Points: Both requirements met 10  5 Points: One requirement met  0 Points: Zero requirements met |  |
| **10. VI SPDAT / SPDAT**  Percentage of clients accepted into the program that score 12 or higher on VI-SPDAT | 5 | 5 Points – 90% or more  0 Points – 89% or less |  |
|  | | | |
| **Total Possible Points** | **95** |  |  |

# Total Points Awarded:

Project \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Max Deduction** | **Scoring Thresholds** | **Deducted Points** |
| **1. Housing First Approach**  10 points deducted if a project does not follow a housing first approach. Housing First prioritizes rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing and does not have service participation requirements and preconditions. | -10 | Does the project operate using the Housing First Approach?  -10 Points: No  -0 Points: Yes |  |
| **2. Grant Spending**  Up to 10 points deducted for failure to spend grant funds. | -10 | -10 Points: spent 50% or less   * 5 Points: spent 51 – 75% * 0 Points: spent 76% or more |  |
| **3. APR Submission**  10 points deducted if the APR was submitted late. 10 points deducted if the APR was rejected by HUD and not amended/corrected within 30 days. | -10 | Did the project submit APR in a timely manner?  -10 Points: No  -0 Points: Yes |  |
| **4. Coordinated Entry**  10 points deducted if the program did not coordinate and collaborate with the CoC’s  Coordinated Entry system. | -5 | -10 Points: No  -0 Points: Yes |  |
| **Total Possible Points Deductions** | **35** |  |  |

**Total Points Deducted: --**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **TOTAL** |
| **Points Awarded** |  |
| **Points Deducted** |  |
| **TOTAL SCORE** |  |

**Rapid Rehousing Ranking and Scoring Tool**

Project \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Max Points** | **Scoring Thresholds** | **Awarded Points** |
| **1. Permanent Housing Placements**  The % of persons who remained in the permanent housing program as of the end of the operating year or exited to permanent housing (subsidized or unsubsidized). | 20 | 20 Points: 90 – 100%  15 Points: 80 – 89%  10 Points: 60 – 79%  0 Points: 54% or less |  |
| **2. Length of Time to Move-In**  The average length of time for persons to move into housing. | 10 | 10 Points: 30 days or less  5 Points: 31 – 60 days  0 Points: 61 days or longer |  |
| **3. Total Income (Cash)**  The % of persons age 18 and older that maintained or increased their total cash income by program exit. | 10 | 10 Points: 80% or more  5 Points: 70 – 79%  3 Points: 60– 69%  0 Points: 60% or less |  |
| **4. Mainstream Benefits (Non-Cash)**  The % of households that maintained or increased their non-cash benefits at program exit. | 10 | 10 Points: 80% or more  5 Points: 70 – 79%  3 Points: 60– 69%  0 Points: 60% or less |  |
| **5. Chronic Homelessness**  Percent of clients that entered the project during the operating year that were chronically homeless. | 5 | 5 Points: 65% or more  0 Points: 49% or less |  |
| **6. Dedicated Chronic Homeless Beds**  The % of beds in the project that are dedicated chronic homeless beds (based on data from the HIC) | 5 | 5 Points: 50% or more  0 Points: 49% or less |  |
| **7. Returns to Homelessness**  Percentage of households who exit to PH destinations and return to homelessness within 1 year. | 10 | 10 Points: 5% or less  5 Points: 6 – 10%  0 Points: 11% or more |  |
| **8. Serving Vulnerable Populations**  Percentage of clients served who are: veterans, unaccompanied youth (under 25), parenting youth, fleeing DV, and / or with at least two conditions at entry. | 10 | 10 Points: 90% or more  8 Points: 89 - 80%  6 Points: 79 – 70%  0 Points: 69% - 0% |  |
| **9. HMIS**  The extent to which the project:  HMIS Has satisfactory data quality  Has satisfactory data timeliness | 10 | 10 Points: Both requirements met 10  5 Points: One requirement met  0 Points: Zero requirements met |  |
| **10. VI SPDAT / SPDAT**  Percentage of clients accepted into the program that score 12 or higher on VI-SPDAT | 5 | 5 Points – 90% or more  0 Points – 89% or less |  |

**Total Points Awarded:**

**Rapid Rehousing**

Project \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**KVC Ranking Deductions Tool**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Max Deduction** | **Scoring Thresholds** | **Deducted Points** |
| **1. Housing First Approach**  10 points deducted if a project does not follow a housing first approach. Housing First prioritizes rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing and does not have service participation requirements and  preconditions. | -10 | Does the project operate using the Housing First Approach?  -10 Points: No  -0 Points: Yes |  |
| **2. Grant Spending**  Up to 10 points deducted for failure to spend grant funds. | -10 / -5 | -10 Points: spent 50% or less   * 5 Points: spent 51 – 75% * 0 Points: spent 76% or more |  |
| **3. APR Submission**  10 points deducted if the APR was submitted late. 10 points deducted if the APR was rejected by HUD and not amended/corrected within 30 days. | -10 | Did the project submit APR in a timely manner?  -10 Points: No  -0 Points: Yes |  |
| **4. Coordinated Entry**  10 points deducted if the program did not coordinate and collaborate with the CoC’s  Coordinated Entry system. | -5 | -10 Points: No  -0 Points: Yes |  |
| **Total Possible Points Deductions** | **35** |  |  |

**Total Points Deducted: --**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **TOTAL** |
| **Points Awarded** |  |
| **Points Deducted** |  |
| **TOTAL SCORE** |  |