

**Southern Nevada Homelessness Continuum of Care
Scoring and Ranking Policies and Procedures
Revised April 2019**

Objective of this Guide

This guide serves as a tool for nonprofit and local government agencies that wish to apply for HUD funding under the local Continuum of Care (CoC) process and outlines policies and procedures for the application, scoring, and ranking, striving to provide a consistent and transparent process for application reviews.

This guide provides information on how the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act (HEARTH) impacts local projects that address homelessness in Southern Nevada. Understanding the importance of creating data-driven projects that align with HUD priorities with a consolidated community plan is an important first step in creating a successful application for funding. The Southern Nevada Homelessness Continuum of Care (SNH CoC) Board's Evaluation Working Group (EWG) and its subgroups follow the process outlined in this guide to evaluate projects submitted through the local Project Application process.

Part I: Background and Overview

The Continuum of Care

In 2009, the HEARTH Act codified into law the CoC planning process, which requires a board consisting of geographically based organizations that represent the interests of and provide services for people experiencing homelessness. The overall CoC goal is to achieve greater coordination in responding to the needs of the homeless population and to adhere to a unified approach in measuring progress. The CoC engages in data collection to measure performance of homeless services; this is critical in developing priorities, which in turn drives HUD's investments in the local community.

The SNH CoC Board carries out CoC required duties as detailed in the HEARTH Act. These duties include community-wide planning for the geographic area, ensuring the strategic use of resources, reviewing and evaluating CoC applications, and scoring and ranking local Project Applications for inclusion in the Consolidated Application.

Clark County's Department of Social Service serves as the Collaborative Applicant for the CoC and applies for funding on behalf of the Las Vegas / Clark County Continuum of Care (NV-500). The SNH CoC Planning Working Group creates a planning budget for the Collaborative Applicant, which is not ranked as an application.

SNH CoC Working Groups Responsible for CoC Scoring, Ranking & Evaluation Process

Evaluation Working Group (EWG). Facilitates and manages planning of the the CoC application, review and selection process.

Scoring & Ranking Team (SRT). EWG subgroup responsible for application review, scoring, ranking, and selection for inclusion in CoC application to HUD.

Monitoring Working Group (MWG). Performs onsite monitoring, desk audits, and Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) reviews to measure and support project compliance and performance around critical data collection and outcome goals, which is systematically reviewed and scored annually and is a specific factor in renewal project scores during the local competition process.

Data & Systems Improvement Working Group (DSIWG). Responsible for using community-based data to determine local priorities and measure collective impact of existing projects, which is used to inform project application scoring tool development and ranking and selection processes.

The Role of the Evaluation Working Group and the Scoring and Ranking Team

The Evaluation Working Group (EWG) is one of many working groups of the SNH CoC Board. The EWG consists of SNH CoC Board members, jurisdictional partners, stakeholder partners, nonprofits members of the CoC. One of the roles of the EWG is to facilitate the scoring and ranking of local Project Applications for the CoC Consolidated Application. This facilitation may be done by an EWG member, a representative of the Collaborative Applicant decided upon by the EWG, or by a third-party facilitator. The EWG does the work of scoring through a subgroup, the Scoring and Ranking Team (SRT). Following HUD regulations and requirements from the current year's Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), the Scoring and Ranking Team make recommendations for local Project Applications to include in the Consolidated Application Priority Listing.

An important role of the SRT is to ensure our CoC is applying for all possible funding opportunities related to the annual competition and providing a recommendation for the most competitive package as possible. This includes, but is not limited to: 1) reviewing options that maximize funding dollars and reviewing all Tier 1, Tier 2 and Bonus calculations as described in the competition NOFA; 2) anticipating potential implications to our system of care with the addition, deletion or reallocation of specific projects; and 3) determining the short and long-term implications of the competition packet submitted.

Recruiting the Scoring and Ranking Team

To ensure fairness in the scoring and ranking process, the EWG has adopted the following process to recruit knowledgeable and neutral members for the Scoring and Ranking Team and will focus recruitment on CoC members, Board members and community partners representing organizations/agencies that are not applicants for CoC funds. Developing and sustaining a broad pool of potential Scoring and Ranking Team members is an important part of the recruitment process, so the EWG should seek strategies for ensuring a sufficient number of CoC members who are interested in homelessness issues, but do not apply for funding. For example, municipalities that have community engagement committee representatives who are a good fit for the Scoring and Ranking Team might ask those individuals to apply to join the CoC through the CoC member application process, which is outlined in the CoC Governance Structure found at: <http://helphopehome.org/southern-nevada-homelessness-continuum-of-care-governance-structure-snh-coc/>.

From members of the CoC, the EWG will recruit a Scoring and Ranking Team of up to 15 individuals. Up to 12 of the members will serve as the main Scoring and Ranking Team, and a remaining 3 members will be asked to serve as an Appeals Committee and will not participate in the initial scoring and ranking process, but will be active only in the event of appeals. (See details about Appeals Committee under section titled *Appeals to Ranking Decisions*.) Using the criteria below, the EWG will recruit individuals who are:

- Knowledgeable about homelessness and housing in the community and who are broadly representative of the relevant sectors, subpopulations, and geographic areas;
- Willing to review applications with the best interest of persons experiencing homelessness in mind;
- Not staff or board members of agencies that are applying for funding in the current grant cycle;
- Committed to neutrality— meaning members shall report actual or perceived conflicts of interest and that no member shall vote upon or discuss any matter which shall have a direct financial bearing on the organization(s) the member represents;

- Familiar with current housing and homeless needs within the SNH CoC;
- Willing to sign a commitment to complete the following activities, which typically take place during the summer for a period of approximately three months: attending a training on application review and the Scoring and Ranking process; reviewing 30-40 applications; attending presentations by applicants (if applicable); participating in scoring and ranking discussions and process.

Prior to the annual scoring and ranking process, the EWG, Collaborative Applicant or third-party facilitator will provide a training overview to the Scoring and Ranking Team regarding the team's role, scoring tools, and resources for the ranking process. EWG Scoring and Ranking Team members will sign a Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Agreement prior to reviewing, ranking and scoring applications. This document is found in Appendix A.

Conflicts of Interest

The SNH CoC Board recognizes that members represent interests of organizations that ultimately receive benefits from the CoC program. To ensure that individuals and organizations that best serve the needs of the community will not be denied funds because of their active participation on the SNH CoC Board, and to confirm that members serve the needs of the community and not the interests of any organization or entity, conflicts of interest will be clearly stated.

The following policies and procedures are based on the CoC Board policies and apply to conflicts of interest with the EWG Scoring and Ranking process:

1. All EWG Scoring and Ranking Team members must sign a Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Agreement.
2. No member shall vote upon or participate in the discussion of any matter, which shall have direct financial bearing on the organizations the member represents. Conflict of interest and even the appearance of a conflict of interest must be avoided. Members shall report a conflict of interest and recuse themselves from voting on issues where a conflict of interest is apparent or identified.
3. As it relates to business and action items, any SNH CoC Board member has an actual or perceived conflict of interest when the member's actions result, or appear to result, in personal, organizational, or professional gain. An actual or perceived conflict of interest occurs when:
 - a. The member is a salaried employee of any organization that receives, or is eligible to receive, CoC funds;
 - b. The member serves on the Board of Directors or as a Trustee of any organization that receives, or is eligible to receive, CoC funds; and/or
 - c. The member has a relative or close personal relationship with a person who is employed, or serves on the Board at any organization that receives, or is eligible to receive, CoC funds.
4. SNH CoC Board members who receive goods and services as a client of an organization that receives, or is eligible to receive, CoC funds is not deemed to have a direct conflict of interest unless the member may receive differential treatment as a result of their position on the SNH CoC Board.

Recusal Procedures

Pursuant to policies around conflicts of interest, any EWG member may recuse himself/herself from speaking, voting, or participating in the scoring and ranking process. Recusal will occur prior to the beginning of the agenda item, and the member will put on the record all reasons that make it inappropriate for him/her to participate on the item. The member should only recuse himself/herself when there is a conflict of interest and/or he or she cannot participate in an impartial manner.

Part II: CoC Local Applications for the Collaborative Application

Application Requirements and Process

1. The community is mandated to follow HUD regulations as they pertain to the CoC NOFA; therefore, applicants must be aware of and adhere to all current NOFA requirements.

Timelines, revisions, and changes may occur suddenly, and the local CoC will communicate with community stakeholders through e-mail and public postings utilizing the Help Hope Home website, in order to provide clear and concise information regarding issues pertaining to the application process. *The CoC is not responsible for late NOFA announcements, short timelines, or additional requests for information from HUD.*

2. Each year, the CoC EWG develops a CoC Local Project Application, which is typically released prior to the release of the NOFA and updated as needed after the release of the current year NOFA. The CoC Local Project Application is mandatory for any agency wishing to submit a project for the current year's Southern Nevada Consolidated Application.
3. Applicants must be a 501(c) (3) nonprofit agency or governmental entity working to address homelessness in Southern Nevada.
4. Project applicants are required to have an active Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number.
5. Project applicants must have an active registration in the Central Contractor Registration (CCR)/System for Award Management (SAM) to apply for funding.
6. Potential applicants are required to attend at least one local application technical assistance training. Technical assistance is designed to:
 - explain the community's needs and priorities, application process and current year's funding opportunities
 - provide training and support for prospective applicants to ensure eligible and competitive applications, and
 - provide an opportunity for new and returning applicants to ask questions and engage around the funding process.

The CoC will publicize dates for the technical assistance training and will post information at <http://helphopehome.org/funding-opportunities/>.

7. Local Project Applications are submitted online, through a designated application portal. The application requires information related to: agency experience in service delivery; project type, scope and description; budget data; connection to consolidated CoC planning; and other pertinent information.
8. Applications for HMIS are submitted and ranked separately from local Project Applications, as the SNH CoC strives to implement system-wide HMIS data collection per HUD requirements and because HMIS participation is required for all projects.

9. Submission of a local Project Application does not guarantee inclusion in the HUD Consolidated Application competition.
10. Opportunities and access to local Project Applications for funding through the CoC can be found at <http://helphopehome.org/funding-opportunities/>. This site will contain more information including funding timelines and application dates. Applicants are encouraged to visit this site regularly during the local application process for updates to guidance and frequently asked questions.

Application Evaluation Process

The SNH CoC Board must be kept apprised of any changes to the review and evaluation process or criteria: 1) prior to the start of the application cycle; 2) once the NOFA is released; 3) when guidance is released by HUD; and 4) prior to the submission of the Consolidated Application and Priority Listing. As the local application process may begin prior to the release of the NOFA, and information contained in the NOFA may impact the review and evaluation process, the SNH CoC Board grants the Monitoring Working Group (MWG) and EWG approval to make edits and modifications as necessary to comply with the annual NOFA changes. The Board must approve edits and modifications prior to the submission of the competition packet

The Scoring and Ranking Policies and Procedures will be posted publicly at <http://helphopehome.org/funding-opportunities/> and the community will be notified of the period of time in which public comment may be made on this document prior to the submission to the Board for approval.

Submitted Local Project Applications are reviewed and evaluated according to the following steps and criteria.

Threshold Criteria

All local Project Applications must meet the following minimum requirements:

1. Applicant Eligibility.
 - a. Applicant is active CoC participant, including attendance at mandatory trainings and meetings.
 - b. Neither applicant, nor sub-recipients (if any) are for-profit entities.
 - c. Agency is not on the HUD Code of Conduct List.
 - d. Application contains valid DUNS number.
 - e. Application contains valid SAM CAGE code.
2. Participant Eligibility. The project will only accept participants that can be documented as eligible for this project's program type based on their housing and disability status.
3. Coordinated Entry. Project participates in coordinated entry to the extent possible for this project type.
4. HMIS & Alternative Databases. Project agrees to enter data for all CoC-funded beds into HMIS or an alternative database for projects serving survivors of domestic violence.
5. Written Policies & Procedures. Project has submitted policies and procedures that are consistent with minimum HUD requirements.
6. Equal Access/Fair Housing. The project provides equal access and fair housing without regard to sexual orientation, gender identity, or local residency status.
7. Feasible for the project to be under grant agreement by September 30th of the following fiscal year
8. Cash Match Forms and Letters.
 - a. Contains a dated cash match letter within timeframe detailed in NOFA.
 - b. Cash match equals 25 percent of the rental, supportive services and admin categories.

Applications that do not meet threshold criteria will not be considered for review.

Presentations

The Scoring and Ranking Team will determine if oral presentations are to be heard for the current application process. When oral presentations are required, each agency will receive written notification of the day, time, and location of the presentations. Applicants will be asked not to include clients or handouts in their presentations. The presentations are open to the public, and all agencies are encouraged to attend.

If applicable, Scoring and Ranking Team members will provide each applicant with a list of questions or comments prior to presentations. Audience members are not to interject comments into the Scoring and Ranking Process. If the EWG Scoring and Ranking Team has a question to pose to an agency, they will seek permission from the group before doing so.

SNH CoC Competition General Process Flow

- Monitoring Working Group Administers annual monitoring and technical assistance for existing projects, which generates a monitoring score comprised of compliance and performance metrics in a publicly available Monitoring Score Card
- Local Application Score Card Development by EWG, MWG, Data Systems Improvement Working Group
- Data & Systems Improvement Working Group development and release of community needs and priorities
- Local process debrief, including Policies & Procedures review
- Scoring and Ranking Team (SRT) selected from nonconflicted SNH CoC member volunteers
- Finalization and SNH CoC Board approval of Scoring and Ranking Policies & Procedures
- Project Applicant presentations, if necessary
- SRT reviews and scores projects based on Monitoring and Local Application scores, generated by Monitoring Score Card and Local Application Score Card
- SRT meets publicly to discuss scores, rank projects on a priority list, and recommends projects for inclusion in the CoC Application for funding from HUD
- Priority Listing is made public and opportunity for appeals begins
- SNH CoC Board meets to address appeals and vote to approve or reject Priority Listing

Overview of the Scoring and Ranking Process

Each year, the EWG develops the local application and will ensure that the criteria for scoring and ranking are made available through the Score Card (a scoring tool), the Scoring and Ranking Team's *Local Application Reviewer's Guide*, and the Application Instructions.

Sources of Information for Project Scoring, Ranking, and Selection

The Scoring and Ranking Team (SRT) uses three sources of information to score, rank, and select projects for inclusion in the CoC application to HUD.

1. Data Systems Improvement Working Group: Local Priorities

Project Applications are evaluated based on a scoring tool called a score card, which is informed by local priorities as determined by the Data Systems Improvement Working Group. That Working Group is responsible for reviewing community-based data, including the community gaps analysis, determining local priorities using that data and regional plans such as *Help Hope Home: Southern Nevada Regional Plan to End Homelessness*, and measuring collective impact using robust system performance measures. Under the HEARTH Act, performance measures are used to evaluate the effectiveness of projects and determine their ranking priority. When developing community priorities, scoring and ranking tools, and

local process policies and procedures EWG, alongside the Monitoring and Data Systems Improvement Working Groups, also review and consider federal policies and priorities from HUD and United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, including *Home, Together: Federal Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*. Projects that best align with HUD and local community needs and priorities are ranked for inclusion in the Consolidated Application Priority Listing.

2. Monitoring Working Group: Compliance and HMIS Data

Monitoring information provides the SRT with valuable information it can use while ranking applications/projects. Monitoring practices include onsite monitoring, desk audits, and HMIS and alternative database (for domestic violence survivors) reviews. In determining consistency of monitoring, SRT works with the Monitoring Working Group (MWG) to determine that the following occurred for every CoC funded organization that is applying for the current year's funding:

- Regular desk monitoring, or
- Onsite monitoring, according to the MWG's established schedule for the year, or
- Ten percent or a minimum of three files were reviewed during each onsite monitoring event.

If SRT and the MWG determine that any aspect of the monitoring has not been consistent among the applicants, then that aspect of the monitoring information will be excluded from the ranking process. For example, if all applicants experienced consistent desk monitoring, but not consistent onsite monitoring, only desk monitoring will be used toward scoring. If all applicants experienced consistent desk and site visit monitoring, both will be used. The Monitoring Score Card can be found online at <http://helphopehome.org/funding-opportunities/>.

3. Applicant Submission of Narrative Questions through Designated Portal

Applicants will use a designated portal to submit narrative responses to questions in the score card. These questions are designed to give project applicants an opportunity to share about the project scope, design, outcomes, applicant experience and capacity, and other significant local factors, including the project's alignment with community priorities. Technical assistance will be available to support project applicants with the provision of this information.

Community Priorities for HUD FY 2019 CoC NOFA Scoring, Ranking and Selection Process

The Data & Systems Improvement Working Group regularly reviews data about the CoC's needs and strengths. To improve the CoC system and enhance the housing and services offered to those most in need, that Working Group meets jointly with EWG and the Monitoring Working Group to develop community priorities for CoC funding which inform scoring, ranking and selection. Those community priorities are included in the process as scored factors for review by SRT.

1. Preserve high performing projects scoring in the top 30% of the independent monitoring process
2. Prioritize DedicatedPLUS projects for any new or reallocated funds to increase Rapid Rehousing for adults without children.

SNH CoC also considers how projects serve persons with severe needs and vulnerabilities, specifically projects serving persons experiencing chronic homelessness, mental illness and/or substance use disorders, and domestic violence survivors.

Scoring Process

Score Card

The Scoring and Ranking Team (SRT) utilizes a score card to rank projects per HUD requirements. The score card is a tool that SRT uses to score project design, capacity, performance or projected goals and outcomes, and the degree to which the project meets local needs. The score card is used to determine an overall score for each application, which determines which applications move forward. The scorecard

also helps identify projects that may be defunded due to substandard performance.

Project scores are based on information and data from three sources of information:

- 1) Performance data provided by the Data Systems Improvement Working Group;
- 2) Compliance and HMIS data from systematized annual reviews of each renewal project based on desk and on-site monitoring conducted by the Monitoring Working Group (MWG); and
- 3) Applicant responses to supplemental narrative questions related to various local factors, including community priorities, organizational capacity and experience, and project design.

The score card also accounts for the severity of needs and vulnerabilities to be addressed by project applicants, specifically projects serving persons experiencing chronic homelessness, mental illness and/or substance use disorders, and domestic violence survivors.

For fairness and transparency, new projects are scored comparatively across those same *projected* factors and outcomes using solely applicant responses to supplemental questions when data is not otherwise available. These factors are listed in the score card and companion *Reviewer's Guide*. A sample scorecard can be viewed at <http://helphome.org/funding-opportunities>.

Scoring Teams

Due to the high volume of applications, SRT may divide the task of reviewing project applications among the SRT members. Members may form teams to review and pre-score sets of applications before meeting as a larger review panel to jointly discuss applications and interview applicants, if necessary. SRT team or individual review and pre-scoring of project applications will be based on the score card.

Ranking Process

During the ranking process, the SRT will evaluate all projects in accordance with the NOFA guidelines. After SRT members have reviewed all application materials from each local Project Application, evaluated the merits of each project, heard presentations (if applicable), and scored applications, the project applications are ranked by score for inclusion in the collaborative application. Projects will be ranked by priority and will be listed in the collaborative application in order of priority. Pursuant to

Tiering System

Pursuant to HUD's CoC NOFA guidelines, HUD uses a two-tier system for ranking projects, which SNH CoC will use when placing scored projects on the priority list for inclusion in the CoC application. This means that all projects will be scored, placed in order of priority onto a Priority List, which will be broken down into two tiers based on available funding for the SNH CoC. Whether a project receives funding from HUD is determined by its placement on the Priority List and into which tier the project falls.

Tier 1: HUD will select new and renewal local projects (via the Project Applications) to fund as a percentage of the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand as determined by HUD in the NOFA.

Tier 2: The CoC Application score and the Project Application scores will determine which projects in Tier 2 will be selected for award, with an amount based on the remaining percentage of funding as determined by HUD in the current year's NOFA.

SNH CoC Ranking and Prioritization Methodology

The following methodology is used to rank projects by priority, and to determine project placement on the tiered Priority Listing:

1. Raw Scores

- a. Scores from the Local Application score card: Consists of narrative responses to locally developed questions, as outlined in the scorecard and the companion SRT *Reviewer's*

Guide

- b. Monitoring scores from the Monitoring score card: Consists of performance and compliance measures data based on HMIS and Monitoring Working Group data, as outlined in the Monitoring Score Card.
 - c. The combined Local Application and Monitoring Score for each project will determine project ranking.
2. Automatic Tier 1 Ranking
- a. *Renewal Projects with less than 12 months of data:* Any renewal projects without 12 months of data will be ranked in tier 1 to give them a fair opportunity to demonstrate their performance and be evaluated based on 12 months of outcome data in subsequent competitions.
 - b. *Projects supporting HUD mandated systems:*
 - *HMIS*
 - *Coordinated Entry Projects*
3. Renewal projects with outcomes (Projects with 12 months or more of data available)
- a. Renewal projects will be ranked based on their combined score.
 - b. Examples of monitoring data include: recidivism rates, rates of spending and utilization, and compliance with HUD monitoring guidelines.
 - c. The EWG and MWG team will determine the weighting of each component of the scorecard.
3. New projects
- a. All new projects will be ranked based on the application score only as no performance or compliance data will be available for the project.
4. Domestic Violence Projects and Projects Serving Those with Severe Needs and Vulnerabilities
- a. All domestic violence project applications will be scored and ranked consistent with project applications of other types (i.e., new, expansion, or renewal projects).
 - b. Domestic Violence projects, similar to other difficult to serve populations and populations with severe needs and disabilities, will be scored and ranked with consideration to the specific severity of needs and vulnerabilities the project population serves. Specifically, the Scoring and Ranking Team may evaluate whether project outcomes for projects serving these populations have been impacted by the severity of needs.
5. Tie Breaking: If a situation arises where two projects earn the same score, the following criteria will apply:
- a. First Tie-Breaker: The project with the highest monitoring score. The mode of monitoring must be the same, as described in the section of this document on monitoring.
 - b. Second Tie-Breaker: The project with the highest local application score (from the score card).
 - c. Third Tie-Breaker: The project with the highest score on the SNH CoC's performance monitoring tool.

Reallocation Process

HUD expects CoCs to seek continual improvement in quality of projects and the overall performance of the CoC in terms of improving community outcomes and reducing homelessness. HUD mandates that CoCs use cost, performance and outcome data to improve how resources are used to end homelessness, and HUD prioritizes funding for CoCs that have demonstrated the ability to reallocate resources to higher performing projects. Through the reallocation process, HUD allows the CoC to shift funds to better address local needs and priorities and improve overall performance without decreasing the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand.

The Scoring and Ranking Team will use objective, performance-based criteria that are approved as part of the regular scoring process to determine the extent to which projects address HUD and local priorities. During the ranking process, the EWG Scoring and Ranking Team may reallocate funds from existing renewal projects to new projects if reallocating resources will better help end homelessness in SNH CoC's

geographical area.

As accounted for in the local score card, reallocation may happen for several reasons:

1. Low-performing projects (as determined by the application and monitoring scores) may be defunded and these funds reallocated to new projects.
2. Significant history of under-spending of CoC funds by a provider may result in having funds reduced or completely reallocated to new projects. This is to ensure that the community is maximizing the use of existing funds. The CoC will notify applicants at risk of under-spending in advance of reallocation of funds.
3. Providers may choose not to apply for renewal funding, and these funds will be voluntarily reallocated to new projects.
 - a. Applicants may self-identify programs that could be strengthened by modifying their project. This is considered a Voluntary Reallocation. While these projects are considered new project applications, consideration may be given during the scoring and ranking process to applicants who have redesigned projects to better meet the needs of the community.
 - b. As with any new project, applicants understand that new projects through voluntary reallocation have the same likelihood of being funded as all other projects. While bonus points may be assigned as defined in the score card, voluntary reallocation does improve the chance of a project being funded.

Funds from renewal projects that are not funded in whole or in part will be reallocated to new project(s), provided that the new project(s) meets eligibility and quality thresholds established by HUD in the current NOFA. Any renewal projects that are partially or fully defunded may participate in the local appeals process as outlined in the appeals section of this document.

Notification of Funding Recommendations

The Collaborative Applicant will notify local applicants of funding recommendations in writing within two business days of the closing of the scoring and ranking process. The overall ranking results will be posted on <http://helphopehome.org/funding-opportunities/>.

Written feedback regarding the project application is available to all applicants by emailing a request for feedback to HelpHopeHome@ClarkCountyNV.gov. Debriefing sessions will be held with an applicant agency at their request, which must be submitted in writing to HelpHopeHome@ClarkCountyNV.gov. The debriefing shall be held within two weeks after the conclusion of the competition period and will be done by members of the Scoring and Ranking Team, Collaborative Applicant or third-party facilitator.

Appeals to Ranking Decisions

All eligible applicants have the opportunity to appeal both their score and their preliminary ranking prior to the SNH CoC Board's final approval of the priority funding list. A project applicant may appeal a decision if the application:

- Is rejected from inclusion as part of the CoC Consolidated application submission, or
- Received less funding than applied for.

To appeal the applicant must demonstrate that:

- Their score is not reflective of the application information provided, or
- There was bias or unfairness in the process that warrants the appeal.

All notices of appeal must be based on the information submitted by the application due date as part of the full Project Application. Omissions to the application cannot be appealed. The notice of appeal must include a written statement specifying the grounds asserted for the appeal and must be submitted by an individual authorized to represent the agency, such as the Executive Director.

Both new and renewal projects may participate in the appeals process. Project applicants that did not meet the threshold requirements outlined in the section of this document titled as such are not eligible to appeal.

Applicants must notify the CoC of their intent to appeal in writing by sending an email to HelpHopeHome@ClarkCountyNV.gov. All appeals must be received within three (3) business days of the notification of project rankings. Every effort will be made for the appeal to be heard in a timely manner, and if needed, a special meeting will be scheduled.

The EWG will appoint an Appeals Committee of four members. Three of these individuals will have been designated as Appeals Committee members as part of the recruitment process for the Scoring and Ranking Team. The fourth member will be a Scoring and Ranking Team member who scored and ranked applications during the current application cycle. The three members who were designated as the Appeals Committee initially (and who did not participate in the scoring and ranking process) will be voting members of the Appeals Committee. The individual who participated in the scoring and ranking process will serve on the Appeals Committee in a non-voting capacity. No member of the Appeals Committee may have a conflict of interest with any of the agencies applying for the current round of funding. All members of the Appeals Committee must sign a Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Agreement.

The role of the Appeals Committee is to read and review only those areas of the application that are being appealed and to hold an appeal hearing. Each appeal hearing will include a set amount of time (no more than one hour) for the organization representative(s) to present a case and participate in a discussion with the Appeals Committee. The applicant is required to attend the appeal hearing in order for the appeal to be considered. Failure to appear for the hearing will result in loss of the opportunity to present their case.

After the hearing, the Appeals Committee will render a decision within two (2) business days and notify the applicant in writing if they uphold or overturn the recommendations of the Scoring and Ranking Team. If the applicant does not agree with the appeal decision, the agency may request to have an appeal heard by the full SNH CoC Board. This request must be submitted in writing to HelpHopeHome@ClarkCountyNV.gov. The board will hear the appeal and return a decision to the applicant at the meeting during which the EWG Scoring and Ranking Team makes funding recommendations. The decision of the SNH CoC Board is final on all appeals.

Recommendations for Approval by the SNH CoC Board

Following the scoring and ranking process, the EWG Scoring and Ranking Team members present their funding recommendations to the full SNH CoC Board for final decisions. At this meeting, the SNH CoC board will also hear any appeals that have been elevated from applicants and return their decision during the meeting.

The SNH CoC Board members then vote to approve or decline the recommendations. Any SNH CoC board member whose agency is also an applicant for the current round of funding must recuse himself or herself from discussion and voting so as not to pose a conflict of interest. Upon final voting on the recommendations, the nonconflicted SNH CoC board members will approve the Collaborative Applicant to move forward with submitting the Consolidated Application to HUD.

Appendix A: Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Form



Southern Nevada Homelessness Continuum of Care Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Agreement Scoring and Ranking Team

Per the Southern Nevada Homelessness Continuum of Care (SNHCoC) Scoring and Ranking Procedures,

1. All members of the Scoring and Ranking Team members must sign a Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Agreement.
2. No member shall vote upon or participate in the discussion of any matter, which shall have direct financial bearing on the organizations the member represents. Conflict of interest and even the appearance of a conflict of interest must be avoided. Members shall report a conflict of interest and recuse themselves from voting on issues where a conflict of interest is apparent or identified.
3. As it relates to business and action items, any SNHCoC Board member has an actual or perceived conflict of interest when the member's actions result, or appear to result, in personal, organizational, or professional gain. An actual or perceived conflict of interest occurs when:
 - a. The member is a salaried employee of any organization that receives, or is eligible to receive, Continuum of Care funds;
 - b. The member serves on the Board of Directors or as a Trustee of any organization that receives, or is eligible to receive, Continuum of Care funds; and/or
 - c. The member has a relative or close personal relationship with a person who is employed, or serves on the Board at any organization that receives, or is eligible to receive, Continuum of Care funds.
4. SNHCoC Board members who receive goods and services as a client of an organization that receives, or is eligible to receive, Continuum of Care funds is not deemed to have a direct conflict of interest unless the member may receive differential treatment as a result of their position on the SNHCoC Board.
5. For the purpose of confidentiality, members should not disclose the content or performance of applications with applicants or other parties outside of the scoring and ranking deliberation process. The process includes meetings of the Scoring and Ranking Team, the appeals process, and provision of recommendations to the SNHCoC.

In signing this document, I certify that I do not have a conflict of interests as listed above that may influence my participation or decision-making process. I also certify that I will keep confidential the content and performance of providers outside of the scoring and ranking deliberation process.

Printed Name

Signature

Representing Organization

Date

Appendix B: FY 2019 Notice of Funding Announcement Ranking Information

This section will be updated upon the release of FY 2019 HUD CoC Notice of Funding Announcement.

Appendix C: Tier 2 Calculations

This section will be updated upon the release of FY 2019 HUD CoC Notice of Funding Announcement.

