

Southern Nevada Continuum of Care (CoC) Evaluation Working Group (EWG)

2016 SCORING & RANKING PROCESS



For use in 2016 CoC Application Process

2016 Scoring & Ranking Process

Background

Under the HEARTH Act, performance measures are used to evaluate the performance of projects and to determine their ranking priority. As a result, each CoC is required to evaluate the performance of the projects that are applying for CoC funds and prioritize projects for funding by ranking them.

As part of the ranking process, HUD requires that the Collaborative Applicant rank projects, except CoC planning costs, in two tiers: Tier 1 or Tier 2. Tier 1 funding is determined first and is a percentage of the Annual Renewal Demand (ARD), which is determined by HUD. Tier 2 will be determined by HUD based on the availability of funds.

The Southern Nevada Continuum of Care (CoC) Evaluation Working Group (EWG) created a subgroup to facilitate the scoring and ranking process. This scoring and ranking team will use the following criteria in determining which projects will be recommended to the Southern Nevada Homelessness CoC (SNHCoC) Board for inclusion in the CoC Consolidated application:

1. Guidance provided by HUD, United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, and National Alliance to End Homelessness;
2. Scorecard results which consist of:
 - i. Local application scores; and
 - ii. Monitoring scores, which includes performance Measures;
3. Project's alignment with HUD's policies and procedures as determined by desk monitoring; and
4. Project's alignment with HUD's Administration goals as articulated in *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*.

Bonus Projects

The CoC may create new bonus projects through the permanent housing bonus up to the percentage designated in the appropriate year's NOFA, which is based on the CoC's Final Pro-Rata Need (FPRN). The following types of new projects may be created through the permanent housing bonus:

- i. New permanent supportive housing projects that will serve 100 percent chronically homeless individuals and families

- ii. New rapid rehousing projects that will serve homeless individuals and families coming directly from the streets or emergency shelters, and include persons fleeing domestic violence situations and other persons meeting the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homelessness

FY 2016 Appropriations Act added a new requirement for bonus funding. Collaborative Applicants must be able to show the ability to reallocate over the last three (3) years or a robust reallocation plan.

Project Scorecard

The scorecard will be used to determine which applications will move forward in the process and to reduce funding for low-performing projects. Projects will be ranked based on the following factors:

1. Renewal projects with outcomes (12 months or more worth of data)
 - i. Renewal projects will be ranked based on the average of their application score and monitoring score.
2. Renewal projects without outcomes (Less than 12 months' worth of data)
 - i. If a provider has other CoC funded projects, then the average performance monitoring desk audit score for existing projects should be applied to the renewal project without outcomes.
 - ii. If a provider does not have any existing CoC funded programs, then the project will be ranked base their application score.
3. New Projects
 - i. If a provider has other CoC funded projects, then the average performance monitoring desk audit score for existing projects will be applied to the new project without outcomes.
 - ii. If a provider does not have any existing CoC funded programs, then the project will be ranked based on their application score.

Ranking Process

1. General information
 - All new and renewal applications will be scored by a neutral scoring panel, which will consist of unbiased reviewers.
 - All projects are evaluated in accordance with guidance set out in the NOFA.

- The CoC may reallocate funds to new projects when reallocation will improve outcomes and reduce homelessness.
- Funds from renewal projects that are not funded in whole or in part will be reallocated to new projects.
- Tier placement determinations will be based on their application and monitoring scores.
- Any renewal projects that are fully or partially defunded, may participate in the local appeals process.
- Any new projects that are excluded from the local application process may participate in the local appeals process.

2. Methodology

- i. The 2016 Ranking Process is taking place on August 10, 2016.
- ii. The threshold scores will be determined by the committee based on the distribution of scores, which will occur prior to the identification of projects.
- iii. CoC Planning Is not required to be ranked.
- iv. The following projects will be ranked in Tier 1:
 - a. HMIS Expansion
 - b. If the existing Safe Haven project operates within the scope of HUD's definitions and regulations established for Safe Havens, then the existing Safe Haven project will be ranked in Tier 1.
- ii. The committee may deviate from the scores and adjust a project's ranking for the following reasons:
 - a. Due to poor outcomes, scoring is likely to result in programs that service the most vulnerable, hard-to-serve populations (ex: chronically disabled, mentally ill, etc.) automatically bring placed in tier 2 due to poor outcomes.
 - b. Scoring is likely to result in a project that fills a critical service gap and/or community need being placed in Tier 2.
- iii. If a situations arises where two projects are ranked at the same level, then the following criteria will apply:
 - a. First Tie-Breaker: The project's monitoring score
 - b. Second Tie-Breaker: The project's local application score
 - c. Third Tie-Breaker: The project's score on the performance monitoring tool.

Reallocation Process

1. Low performing projects as determined by the application scores and monitoring scores may be reallocated to new projects.
2. Projects that choose not to apply for renewal funding also allows for reallocation.

3. The subgroup may deviate from the scores and adjust a project's ranking for the following reasons:
 - a. Due to poor outcomes, scoring is likely to result in programs that service the most vulnerable, hard-to-serve populations (ex: chronically disabled, mentally ill, etc.) automatically bring placed in tier 2 due to poor outcomes.
 - b. Scoring is likely to result in a project that fills a critical service gap and/or community need being placed in Tier 2.

Notification of Funding Recommendations

The collaborative applicant will notify applicants of funding recommendations within two business days of the closing of the scoring and ranking process. The overall ranking will also be posted on www.HelpHopeHome.org.

Appeals to Subgroup Ranking Decisions

Applicants may submit appeals to the CoC if they disagree with their project's exclusion from the funding recommendations. The process is as follows:

- Applicants must notify the CoC of their intent to appeal by 5:00 pm on August 15th by sending an email to helphopehome@clarkcountynv.gov.
- Applicants with an appeal are required to attend an appeal hearing on August 17th.
- The appeal hearing is facilitated by a group a subgroup of the Evaluation Working Group that did participate in CoC application scoring and ranking process.
- During the appeal, the agency will have a set time to present their case, then participate in discussion/questions with the appeal group.
- The appeal group will render a decision and notify the provider if they uphold or overturn the scoring team's recommendations
- If the provider does not agree with the decision, then they can opt to have their appeal heard by the full CoC board.

Recommendations for Approval by the SNHCoC Board

The recommendations from the CoC Evaluation Working Group will be presented to the Southern Nevada Homelessness Continuum of Care Board on August 22, 2016.

- Board members whose agency is an applicant in the CoC process will recuse themselves from voting so as not to pose a conflict of interest.
- Applicants who are elevating their appeal may present those concerns to the Board.

- The Board will vote to approve or not approve the recommendations, and may allow the CoC Collaborative applicant to move forward on submission of the consolidated application to HUD.

Help Hope Home

www.HelpHopeHome.org

email: HelpHopeHome@ClarkCountyNV.gov

P:RAD/Grants Coordinator – CoC/CoC Working Group/EWG/2016 Ranking Methodology

