

ATTACHMENT 5. COC RATING & RANKING PROCEDURE, 1E-1

Table of Contents

1.	Project Selection & Ranking Procedure	2
	The CoC used a very detailed, objective, performance based approach to selecting both new and renewal projects. The scoring tools used an objective approach that considered contribution to overall system performance, project performance, and utilizing the housing first model.	
a.	Documentation of Objective Criteria, Renewals.....	8
	Performance Outcomes used to score applicants included overall contribution to system performance and grantee performance.	
i.	Documentation of Specific Method for Evaluating DV Projects	9
	Projects submitted by Victim Services Providers are allowed to explain variations in System Performance Measures due to the unique circumstances of the population they serve during the Rating & Ranking Interview. Information gathered during the interview process will be considered when scoring the Contribution to System Performance section.	
ii.	Documentation of Achieving Positive Housing Outcomes.....	10
	Scores were based on: 1) Exits to or retention in permanent housing; and 2) Exits to shelter, streets or unknown.	
b.	Documentation of Objective Criteria, New Projects.....	13
	Performance Outcomes used to score applicants included overall contribution to system, grantee performance, client accessibility, and project feasibility.	
i.	Documentation of Specific Method for Evaluating DV Projects	14
	Projects submitted by Victim Services Providers are allowed to explain variations in System Performance Measures due to the unique circumstances of the population they serve during the Rating & Ranking Interview. Information gathered during the interview process will be considered when scoring the Contribution to System Performance section.	
c.	Documentation of Objective Criteria, HMIS	16
	Performance Outcomes used to score applicants included overall contribution to system performance, grantee performance, CES support/participation, and data quality.	
d.	Documentation of Objective Criteria, SSO	21
	Performance Measures used to score applicants included applicant experience, project quality, client accessibility, and project feasibility.	



2018 HUD Continuum of Care (CoC) Program Project Selection and Ranking Process

I. Background

On June 20, 2018, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) released the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the 2018 Continuum of Care Program Competition. The NOFA is available by visiting the HUD Exchange website at <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/5719/fy-2018-coc-program-nofa/>. The Continuum of Care (CoC) Program (24 CFR part 578) is designed to promote a community-wide commitment to the goal of ending homelessness; to provide funding for efforts by nonprofit providers, states, and local governments to quickly rehouse homeless individuals, families, persons fleeing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and youth while minimizing the trauma and dislocation caused by homelessness; to promote access to and effective utilization of mainstream programs by homeless individuals and families; and to optimize self-sufficiency among those experiencing homelessness.

The Kings/Tulare Homeless Alliance (Alliance), which serves as the local CoC and Collaborative Applicant, is responsible for submitting the CoC Consolidated Application in e-snaps on behalf of the CoC. The CoC Consolidated Application is made up of the following three parts:

- FY 2018 CoC Application
- FY 2018 Project Applications
- FY 2018 CoC Priority Listing

In 2018, the estimated Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) for the Kings/Tulare CoC is \$2,257,440. The eligible application amounts are as follows:

Estimated Tier 1:	
94% of ARD	\$2,121,993
Estimated Tier 2:	
Remainder of ARD + Bonus Amount (Estimated Bonus Amount: \$135,446)	\$270,892
Estimated DV Bonus Amount:	
10% of Preliminary Pro Rata Need	\$204,944
Estimated CoC Planning Grant:	
3% of Final Pro Rata Need	\$67,723

The Alliance will submit a collaborative application to HUD for competition funds by September 18, 2018.

II. Project Ranking Policy

The Alliance will assign a unique rank to each project that it intends to submit to HUD for FY 2018 funding. Each project will be comprehensively reviewed, both new and renewal projects within the geographic area, using the scoring criteria and selection priorities below, to determine the extent to which each project is still necessary and contributes to improving system performance. Funds for projects that do not meet threshold or are determined to be underperforming, obsolete, or ineffective will be reallocated to new projects that meet a community priority and contribute to improving system performance.

The Alliance will use the below component prioritization after scoring all new and renewal projects within the CoC based on the Renewal Project, New Project, SSO Project and HMIS Scoring Criteria.

Within project component, rank will be made according to project score. Projects with equal scores and same project component type will be ranked according to cost efficiency. Projects that are deemed essential to the CoC but which would be at risk of loss of funding if placed in Tier 2, will be ranked at the bottom of Tier 1.

Projects will be ranked in the following order¹:

- HMIS
- SSO for Coordinated Entry
- Permanent Supportive Housing projects
- Rapid Re-housing projects
- All other projects

As HMIS and Coordinated Entry are HUD mandated requirements in order to receive Continuum of Care Program and Emergency Solutions Grant funding, they are strongly recommended as one of the top priorities in Tier 1 in order to secure funding for these authorized activities. HMIS and Coordinated Entry projects will be assessed for performance and spending in alignment with HUD requirements.

In accordance with HUD guidelines, the planning project will not be ranked.

III. Project Scoring Policy

A. Threshold Review

A preliminary, quantitative review of each application submitted will be completed by the Alliance. This review will:

- Confirm that application was submitted on time
- Confirm that all required attachments were submitted
- Confirm that the application meets HUD project quality threshold
- Confirm that the application meets certain local threshold requirements
- Confirm matching requirements are met

B. Contribution to System Performance

One of the most important factors in the local scoring process will be a review of a project's contribution to the improvement of overall system performance. Annual Performance Reports, HMIS data and other measurement tools will be reviewed carefully to ensure that all projects recommended for funding contribute to the improvement of system performance.

All complete, timely, and eligible applications will be scored by the Alliance Rating and Ranking Committee, using the scoring criteria located in the Appendix. Scores will determine each project's rank in the Alliance's application to HUD in accordance with Section II of this guidance. Scores may also be used to reject applications or to reduce budgets for low-scoring projects.

Applications received within 24 hours after the due date/time will receive a 5-point score reduction. Late submissions received between 24-48 hours after the due date/time will receive a 10-point score reduction. Late submissions received later than 48 hours after the due date/time will receive 0-points for the local competition. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure documents are delivered and received on time.

¹ Expansion grants will be ranked according to score and community priority, however they will not be placed higher than the qualifying renewal grant.

Total scores for each project are determined by adding up points in each section and then adding any bonus points, if applicable. All projects are judged together, both new and renewals. The scores from each Rating and Ranking committee member is computed and averaged for each project.

Once the committee completes the rating and ranking, the committee may consider the Alliance's priorities, whether the initial scoring is likely to result in any critical service gaps, whether grantees have a history of returning unspent funds to HUD and strategy related to Tier cut offs and HUD's selection process, and may make adjustments to budgets and produce the final ranking of projects to be included in the collaborative application. The recommendation of the Rating & Ranking Committee will go to the Alliance's Board of Directors and Membership for review and final approval.

Projects submitted to HUD in Tier 1 are expected to be funded, provided that the project meets HUD eligibility and threshold requirements. Tier 2 projects will be awarded funds by HUD based on a comparative score computed using the CoC's FY2018 application competitive score, the rank the Alliance gives to the project, and the project component.

Applicants will be notified in writing no later than September 3, 2018 of whether they will be included in the application to HUD and the amount to be allocated for each project. This information will also be posted on the Alliance website at www.kthomelessalliance.org no later than 5:00 pm on September 3, 2018.

IV. Using all Available Funds

If there are a lack of eligible project applications compared to the amount of funding available, additional project applications will be sought from the community. The Alliance will send out a public announcement of undersubscribed funds through its listserv, posting on the website, and sending out via social media portals.

The application deadline for these additional projects will be due as soon as possible upon notification to the public, but in no event later than the submission deadline to HUD.

V. Rating and Ranking Members

The Alliance recruits qualified, non-conflicted Rating & Ranking Committee members who are knowledgeable about homelessness and housing in the area and who are broadly representative of the relevant sectors, subpopulations, and geographic areas. The Rating & Ranking Committee will be composed of representatives from a cross-section of groups which might include: Faith-based and non-profit providers of homeless services and housing; housing developers; city representatives; Kings and Tulare County employees; mental health; substance abuse; veteran's services; and consumers.

Complete guidelines regarding the policies and selection process of Rating and Ranking Members can be found in the Alliance's Policy and Procedure Manual located on the Alliance's website at www.kthomelessalliance.org.

VI. Reallocation Policy

The Alliance may use the reallocation process to shift funds in whole or part from existing renewal projects to new project applications without decreasing the Alliance's annual renewal demand. HUD strongly encourages CoCs to take advantage of this option. The funds may be reallocated to develop new permanent supportive housing projects, new rapid re-housing projects, HMIS funds, or Support Services Only (SSO) for Coordinated Entry.

During comprehensive reviews of renewal projects, the Rating and Ranking Committee will use the Ranking Tool and

selection priorities to determine the extent to which each project is still necessary and addresses policy priorities (e.g. ending chronic homelessness, etc.). The Committee will reallocate funds to new projects whenever such reallocation(s) would reduce homelessness or address an underserved homeless population. In the event the Committee identifies a renewal project(s) whose funding should not be renewed (or funding should be decreased), the Committee will then determine whether any new proposed projects should be awarded and will proceed with reallocation.

VII. Appeals Process

If an applicant organization feels it has been unfairly eliminated from either the local or the federal competition, that a decision made by the Rating and Ranking Committee regarding the ranking, rejection, or funding of their project was prejudicial, unsubstantiated by project performance, or in violation of the 2018 Rating & Ranking Guidelines, the applying lead agency and sponsor if any may file an appeal according to the process outlined in the Alliance's Policy and Procedure Manual, which can be found on the Alliance's website at <https://www.kthomelessalliance.org/>.

Any agency desiring to appeal must contact the Alliance via email at msmith@kthomelessalliance.org by **September 7, 2018 at 5:00 pm** to state its intent to appeal. All appeals must be based on the information submitted by the application due date. No new or additional information will be considered. Omissions to the application cannot be appealed.

VIII. Assurances

Project applicants will be required to sign an agreement to the following:

- Applicant will complete the Project Application with the same information as contained in this application unless there were adjustments made during the rating/ranking process. Those adjustments will be included in your project ranking letter and supersede the original application submitted.
- Applicant agrees to participate fully in KTHMIS, the local Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)
- Applicant agrees to fully participate in the Coordinated Entry System for Kings/Tulare Counties.
- Applicant understands that HUD funded homeless assistance projects are monitored by the Alliance and may include an annual site monitoring visit, as well as the submission of the program's most recent Annual Performance Report sent to HUD and their most recent audited financial statement and any management letters if applicable when submitting their application.
- Applicant understands that if funding is awarded they are responsible to inform the Alliance when:
 - Changes to an existing project or change in sub-population served that is significantly different than what the funds were originally approved for, including any budget amendments submitted to HUD
 - Increase/decrease of other funding to the project that could affect projected numbers of participants served, program staffing, performance, etc.
 - Delays in the start-up of a new project
 - Program is having difficulty in meeting projected numbers served or performance outcomes.
- Applicant agrees to execute the following documents and submit as a part of their application to the Rating & Ranking Committee:
 - Kings/Tulare Homeless Alliance Applicant "Hold Harmless" Agreement; and
 - Memorandum of Understanding for HUD Funded Programs.

IX. Timeline

This list highlights the steps your agency will take to participate in the local NOFA competition. Please take special note of these dates.

<p>June 20, 2018</p>	<p>HUD NOFA RELEASED</p>
<p>July 6, 2018</p>	<p>PROVISIONAL RATING & RANKING TOOL RELEASED The provisional tool will be released for public comment. Both local and HUD priorities will be incorporated into the tool. The tool will be released sent out via the Alliance Listserv, posted on the website, and via social media portals.</p>
<p>July 26, 2018 5:00 pm</p>	<p>COC PROGRAM NOTIFICATION TO RENEW All agencies that wish to renew an existing project must confirm via email their intent to renew. Emails must be sent to Machael Smith at msmith@kthomelessalliance.org.</p>
<p>August 3, 2018 11:00 am – 12:00 pm Webinar</p>	<p>COC APPLICANT WORKSHOP This workshop provides an overview of the CoC application process, grant funds available, requirements, and key strategies for a successful application in the Rating & Ranking and to HUD.</p> <p>To join the webinar, visit https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/155395173 from your computer, tablet or smartphone. Meeting materials and recording will be available after the webinar for those unable to attend at the scheduled date and time. This is a mandatory workshop for all HUD applicants.</p>
<p>August 9, 2018</p>	<p>RATING & RANKING TOOL APPROVED The Alliance Board will review and approve the 2018 Rating and Ranking tool. Public comments will be reviewed and incorporated into the tool, as appropriate.</p>
<p>August 14-18, 2018 Alliance Office 1900 N. Dinuba Blvd #G Visalia, CA</p>	<p>APPLICANT PRE-SUBMITTAL MEETINGS (OPTIONAL) Applicants have the opportunity to attend a 1:1 meeting with the Alliance for an application review prior to submitting for rating & ranking. This intent of this process is to alleviate common application mistakes, answer questions and provide technical assistance.</p>
<p>August 19, 2018 11:59 pm VIA Email</p>	<p>APPLICATION SUBMITTAL DEADLINE FOR RATING & RANKING Applications will be due to the Alliance, along with required attachments as outlined in the Applicant Selection & Ranking Process materials. Send via email to msmith@kthomelessalliance.org by the submittal deadline.</p> <p>Complete applications include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> PDF of the application submitted through e-snaps. <input type="checkbox"/> PDF file containing the following items, each separated by a title page: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Most recent APR <input type="checkbox"/> LOCCS report showing draws for most recent operating year – or – operating year to date if program is in its first year. <input type="checkbox"/> Match letters, or letter indicating when you expect to receive match documentation <p>Submit one PDF set of the following items per agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> PDF of the completed Applicant Profile as submitted through e-snaps <input type="checkbox"/> Separate PDF copies of the following items, each separated by a title page: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Most recent Audit, if applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect Cost Rate Agreement, if applicable

- 501c3, if not on file with the Alliance
- Project related MOUs, if not on file with the Alliance:
 - Kings/Tulare Homeless Alliance Hold Harmless Agreement
 - Memorandum of Understanding for HUD Funded Programs
- HUD Monitoring Letter and all correspondence with HUD, if applicable

Please submit the name and phone number for the contact person for Rating & Ranking questions. This person should be knowledgeable about your agency and project application(s).

August 28, 2018	<p>RATING & RANKING Applicants must be available via telephone to respond to questions that may arise during the review process. Please provide contact information for the Rating & Ranking Committee.</p>
September 3, 2018	<p>NOTIFICATION OF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS POSTED ON WEBSITE AND SENT TO APPLICANTS IN WRITING</p>
September 7, 2018 5:00 pm	<p>DEADLINE FOR APPEALS</p>
September 10, 2018 5:00 pm	<p>DEADLINE FOR FINAL PROJECT APPLICATION Project applications must be uploaded to esnaps and a PDF of the application must be e-mailed to msmith@kthomelessalliance.org with confirmation that the application has been submitted in e-snaps.</p>
September 16, 2018	<p>PUBLIC POSTING OF APPLICATION The CoC will post all parts of the CoC Consolidated Application – including the CoC Application attachments, the completed Priority Listing, and the Project Applications. A notification of the posting will be sent out via the Alliance Listserv, posted on the website, and via social media portals.</p>
September 18, 2018 5:00 pm PDT	<p>ENTIRE CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION SUBMITTED TO HUD (BY ALLIANCE)</p>

Appendix A: 2018 RENEWAL PROJECT Scoring Criteria



2018 CoC RENEWAL HOUSING PROJECT Scoring Criteria

Total Maximum Score = 200 points

Use of Objective Criteria: Included categories such as Contribution of System Performance, Financials, Severity of Needs and Fair Housing. The scoring tool outlined the evaluation criteria, source of criteria, calculation and point structure.

Name of Program: _____

Name of Agency: _____

Interviewer: _____

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria	Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points	Actual Points
40%	Contribution to System Performance ^{1,2}	1. Occupancy/Average Daily Unit Utilization ³	APR, Q9	(Average number of households served at all four PIT dates)/ (number of units in project)	>=80%	79% – 70%	<70%	5	
		2. Project serves eligible households only.	APR, Q20a1, Q20a2, Q20a3 ⁴	N/A	100%	N/A	<100%	5	
		3. Percentage of participants who gained or increased earned income from entry to exit	APR, Q24b2 1 st Row	%	>=24%	23% – 18%	<18%	10	
		4. Percentage of participants who gained or increased other (non-employment) income from entry to exit	APR, Q24b2 3 rd Row	%	>=56%	55% – 42%	<42%	10	
		5. Percentage of all participants with earned income	APR, Q24b3 1 st Row	%	>=24%	23% – 18%	<18%	10	
		6. Percentage of all participants with cash income other than employment	APR, Q24b3 3 rd Row	%	>=56%	55% – 42%	<42%	10	
		7. PSH/RRH Programs: Connecting clients to	APR, Q7, Q26a2 & Q26b2	Total number of adults with at least one non-cash benefit for stayers	>=56%	55% – 42%	<42%	5	

Specific Method of Evaluating Victim Services Providers: Providers were allowed to explain variations in performance due unique circumstances of the DV population during the Rating & Ranking interview. This information gathered during the interview is derived from the DV Comparable Database and is considered when scoring the Contribution to System Performance section.

¹ Renewal projects that are not yet under contract or haven't completed a full year of operations will be scored in this section by using an average of all like-kind renewal projects. DV projects shall submit report data from a comparable database, as required by HUD.

² DV projects that have unique circumstances regarding performance measures due to the nature of the DV population shall have an opportunity to provide additional information during the rating & ranking interview process. This information will be incorporated into the scoring for the System Performance section.

³ Consideration will be made for projects with low bed utilization due to delays from Coordinated Entry referrals of clients that are document ready.

⁴ Applicant must provide a narrative to explain how program eligibility is determined. Discuss where people came from and any data that might be confusing to the Rating and Ranking Committee.

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria	Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points	Actual Points
40% (con't)	Contribution to System Performance (con't)	8a.	PSH Programs: Percentage of participants who remain in PSH or exited to permanent housing	APR, Q29a1	(Subtotal of Permanent Destinations)/ (Total Number of Leavers – Deceased)	>=80%	79% – 70%	<70%	10
		8b.	RRH Programs: Exit to permanent housing	APR, Q29a2	(Subtotal of Permanent Destinations)/ (Total Number of Leavers – Deceased)	>=80%	79% – 70%	<70%	
		9.	Leavers who exit to shelter, streets or unknown	APR, Q29	(Subtotal of Temporary Destinations)/ (Total Number of Leavers – Deceased)	<10%	11-15%	>15%	10
		10.	Timely submission of APR to HUD	APR	N/A	APR submitted on time to HUD	-	APR submitted late	5
		Subtotal							
20%	Financials	11.	Audit Review	Audit Submitted by Agency	N/A	Audit shows agency as a low risk auditee AND no audit findings	Audit shows agency as a low risk auditee OR agency has no audit findings	Audit shows agency as a high risk auditee AND audit findings	20
		12.	LOCCS	APR, Q31a4	Q31a4 Expended Subtotal / Q31a4 Applicable Total Expenses plus Admin	Less than 10% or \$10,000 (whichever is less)	Less than 15% or \$15,000 (whichever is less)	Greater than 15% or \$15,000	10
		13.	LOCCS	LOCCS Report/ Print Out	Regular and timely draws from LOCCS	Draws on a monthly or bi-monthly basis	Draws on a quarterly basis	Draws less than quarterly	10
Subtotal								40	

Achieving Positive Housing Outcomes: Scores were based on: 1) Exits to or retention in permanent housing; and 2) Exits to shelter, streets or unknown.

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria		Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points	Actual Points
10%	Coordinated Entry System	14.	Referrals are kept up to date in HMIS	HMIS Referral Report ⁵	Accuracy of referral data in HMIS as reported in Monthly Referral Report	>=90%	89% - 75%	<75%	10	
		15.	Participation in monthly Case Management Roundtable Meetings	Roundtable Sign-in Sheets	Number of times agency representative attended/ total number of meetings	>=90%	89% - 75%	<75%	10	
		Subtotal								20
5%	HMIS & Data Quality	16.	HMIS Data Quality Standards	HMIS Data Quality Report AHAR 11	Number of missing, don't know, & refused responses/ total number of applicable records	<5% missing, don't know, or refused	6%-10% missing, don't know, or refused	>10% missing, don't know, or refused	5	
		17.	HMIS Compliance	Annual Site Visit Compliance Checklist	Number of Acceptable ("A") ratings/ total number of rated items	>=90%	90% - 80%	<80%	5	
		Subtotal								10
5%	Alliance Participation	18.	Participation in monthly Membership Meetings	Meeting sign-in sheets	Number of times agency representative attended/ total number of meetings	>=90%	89% - 75%	<75%	5	
		19.	Representative serves on an Alliance Committee	Meeting sign-in sheets	N/A	Serves on two or more committees	Serves on one committee	Does not serve on an Alliance committee	5	
		Subtotal								10
5%	Local Funding Priority	20.	Project is in alignment with local FY2018-2019 funding priorities	Alliance HUD CoC Program Funding Priorities	N/A	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	10	
		Subtotal								10

⁵ Report period of 1/1/17 – 12/31/17

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria	Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points	Actual Points
10%	Severity of Needs	21. Project allows entry to program participants with: low or no income, current or past substance use, history of domestic violence, and criminal records – with the exceptions of restrictions imposed by federal, state or local law or ordinance	Alliance HUD CoC Program Funding Priorities	N/A	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	20	
		Subtotal							20
5%	Fair Housing	22. Adheres to Fair Housing regulations and for having in place or agreeing to implement specific outreach to identify and engage homeless individuals and families, including meaningful outreach to persons with disabilities and limited English proficiency, and measures to market to those least likely to access services	Rating & Ranking Interview	N/A	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	10	
		Subtotal							10
Total								200	

Bonus Points	Length of time from referral to enrollment	HMIS	Date of enrollment – Date of referral	<=90 days	91 – 120 days	>120 days	10	
---------------------	--	------	---------------------------------------	-----------	---------------	-----------	-----------	--

Total Score: _____ / 200

Comments: _____

Name of Rating & Ranking Committee Member: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix B: 2018 NEW PROJECT Scoring Criteria



2018 CoC NEW HOUSING PROJECT¹ Scoring Criteria
Total Maximum Score = 200 points

Use of Objective Criteria: Included categories such as Contribution of System Performance, Financials, Feasibility and Fair Housing. The scoring tool outlined the evaluation criteria, source of criteria, calculation and point structure.

Name of Program: _____

R&R
Interviewer
Name: _____

Name of Agency: _____

Weight	Scoring Factor	Scoring Criteria	Max	Actual
15%	Applicant Experience	1. Applicant and subrecipient's prior experience in serving homeless people and in providing housing similar to that proposed in the application.	15	
		2. Satisfactory experience with prior HUD grants and other public contracts, including satisfactory drawdowns and performance for existing grants as evidenced by timely reimbursement of subrecipients (if applicable), regular drawdowns, timely resolution of monitoring findings, and timely submission of APRs on existing grants.	15	
		Subtotal	30	
30%	Contribution to System Performance ²	3. Extent to which the applicant: a. Demonstrates an understanding of the needs of the people to be served b. Proposes an appropriate mix of people to be served through the program c. Shows a clear relationship between the type of housing provided and needs of the population to be served d. Shows a clear relationship between the type of supportive services provided and the needs of the population to be served e. Supports Housing First where the client is housed regardless of their involvement in services they do not believe will help them achieve their stated goals f. Gains access to mainstream (non-CoC) resources g. Establishes performance measures for housing and income that are measurable, objective and meet or exceed HUD and CoC benchmarks h. Commitment to quickly place households in permanent housing	25	
		4. Extent to which the applicant provides a sound plan to ensure that homeless people will be assisted to both OBTAIN and REMAIN in permanent housing and only terminate clients based on lease violations	15	
		5. Extent to which there is a sound plan to ensure that participants will be assisted to both increase their INCOMES and to maximize their ability to LIVE INDEPENDENTLY	15	
		6. Project is in alignment with local FY2018-2019 funding priorities	5	
		Subtotal	60	

Specific Method of Evaluating Victim Services Providers: Providers were allowed to explain variations in performance due unique circumstances of the DV population during the Rating & Ranking interview. This information gathered during the interview is derived from the DV Comparable Database and is considered when scoring the Contribution to System Performance section.

¹ Expansion grants are new funding requests to expand an existing project. Therefore, the applicant should have historical performance data from the current project that the Rating & Ranking Committee can use as a proxy to rate the grant application.

² DV projects that have unique circumstances regarding performance measures due to the nature of the DV population shall have an opportunity to provide additional information during the rating & ranking interview process. This information will be incorporated into the scoring for the System Performance section.

Weight	Scoring Factor	Scoring Criteria	Max	Actual
20%	Project & Client Accessibility	7. Extent to which the applicant conducts outreach in all areas of the community such as emergency shelters, places not meant for human habitation, etc. to locate potentially eligible homeless people	15	
		8. Adheres to Fair Housing regulations and for having in place or agreeing to implement specific outreach to identify and engage homeless individuals and families, including meaningful outreach to persons with disabilities and limited English proficiency, and measures to market to those least likely to access services	10	
		9. Project does not present barriers to entry (e.g. sobriety, income, criminal background, number of children, LGBTQ status, etc.)	15	
		Subtotal	40	
25%	Project Feasibility	10. Applicant clearly describes a viable plan for rapid implementation of the program, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing the first program participant within 6 months of the award. For full points, project must have: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Solid plan for site control through existing relationships. b. Description of the steps it will take to complete the C1.9a (technical submission) in an expedited manner. 	30	
		11. Project is cost-effective and is similar in cost to like-kind projects.	10	
		12. Match is appropriate for project type and supports eligible activities.	10	
		Subtotal	50	
10%	Alliance Participation	13. Participation in monthly membership meetings 15 points: >=90% attendance 7 points: 89% – 75% attendance 0 points : < 75% attendance	10	
		14. Representative serves on an Alliance Committee 15 points: Serves on two or more committees 7 points: Serves on one committee 0 points: Does not serve on a committee	10	
		Subtotal	20	
		Total	200	

Comments: _____

Name of Rating & Ranking Committee Member: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix C: 2018 HMIS PROJECT Scoring Criteria



2018 CoC HMIS PROJECT¹ Scoring Criteria
Total Maximum Score = 200 points

Use of Objective Criteria: Included categories such as Contribution of System Performance, Financials, Data Quality & Capacity . The scoring tool outlined the evaluation criteria, source of criteria, calculation and point structure.

Name of Program: _____

Name of Agency: _____

Interviewer: _____

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria	Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points	Actual Score
40%	Contribution to System Performance	1.	Bed Coverage: Emergency Shelters	APR, H10a	Average % of all bed types (without children, with children, and with only children)	>=86%	85% - 75%	<75%	15
		2.	Bed Coverage: Transitional Housing	APR, H10b	Average % of all bed types (without children, with children, and with only children)	>=86%	85% - 75%	<75%	15
		3.	Bed Coverage: Rapid Re-housing	APR, H10c	Average % of all bed types (without children, with children, and with only children)	>=86%	85% - 75%	<75%	15
		4.	Bed Coverage: Permanent Supportive Housing	APR, H10d	Average % of all bed types (without children, with children, and with only children)	>=86%	85% - 75%	<75%	15
		10.	Timely submission of APR to HUD	APR	N/A	APR submitted on time to HUD	-	APR submitted late	20
Subtotal								80	

¹ Expansion grants are new funding requests to expand an existing project. Therefore, the applicant should have historical performance data from the current project that the Rating & Ranking Committee can use as a proxy to rate the grant application.

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria		Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points	Actual Score
20%	Financials	11.	Audit Review	Audit Submitted by Agency	N/A	Audit shows agency as a low risk auditee AND no audit findings	Audit shows agency as a low risk auditee OR agency has no audit findings	Audit shows agency as a high risk auditee AND audit findings	20	
		12.	LOCCS	APR, H12 & H13	H13 Total Expenditures / H12 CoC Program Grant	Less than 10% or \$10,000 (whichever is less)	Less than 15% or \$15,000 (whichever is less)	Greater than 15% or \$15,000	10	
		13.	LOCCS	LOCCS Report/ Print Out	Regular and timely draws from LOCCS	Draws on a monthly or bi-monthly basis	Draws on a quarterly basis	Draws less than quarterly	10	
		Subtotal								40
15%	Coordinated Entry System	14.	Participation in monthly Case Management Roundtable Meetings	Roundtable Sign-in Sheets	Number of times agency representative attended/ total number of meetings	>=90%	89% - 75%	<75%	30	
		Subtotal								30
10%	HMIS & Data Quality	15.	HMIS Data Quality, Residential Projects	APR, 11a	Average of missing, don't know, refused values	<5% missing, don't know, or refused	6%-10% missing, don't know, or refused	>10% missing, don't know, or refused	10	
		16.	HMIS Data Quality, Street Outreach/SSO Projects	APR, 11b	Average of missing, don't know, refused values	<5% missing, don't know, refused	6%-10% missing, don't know, refused	>10% missing, don't know, or refused	10	
		Subtotal								20

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria		Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points	Actual Score
10%	Alliance Participation	17.	Participation in monthly Membership Meetings	Meeting sign-in sheets	Number of times agency representative attended/ total number of meetings	>=90%	89% - 75%	<75%	10	
		18.	Representative serves on an Alliance Committee	Meeting sign-in sheets	N/A	Serves on two or more committees	Serves on one committee	Does not serve on an Alliance committee	10	
		Subtotal								20
5%	Local Funding Priority	19.	Project is in alignment with local FY2018-2019 funding priorities	Alliance HUD CoC Program Funding Priorities	N/A	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	10	
		Subtotal								10
Total									200	

Comments: _____

Name of Rating & Ranking Committee Member: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria		Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points	Actual Score
10%	Alliance Participation	18.	Participation in monthly Membership Meetings	Meeting sign-in sheets	Number of times agency representative attended/ total number of meetings	>=90%	89% - 75%	<75%	10	
		19.	Representative serves on an Alliance Committee	Meeting sign-in sheets	N/A	Serves on two or more committees	Serves on one committee	Does not serve on an Alliance committee	10	
		Subtotal								20
5%	Local Funding Priority	20.	Project is in alignment with local FY2018-2019 funding priorities	Alliance HUD CoC Program Funding Priorities	N/A	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	10	
		Subtotal								10
Total									200	

Comments: _____

Name of Rating & Ranking Committee Member: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix D: 2018 SSO PROJECT Scoring Criteria



2018 CoC COORDINATED ENTRY (SSO) PROJECT¹ Scoring Criteria

Total Maximum Score = 200 points

Use of Objective Criteria: Included categories such as Project Quality, Client Accessibility, Feasibility and Agency Capacity. The scoring tool outlined the evaluation criteria, source of criteria, calculation and point structure.

Name of Program: _____

Name of Agency: _____

R&R
Interviewer
Name: _____

Weight	Scoring Factor	Scoring Criteria	Max	Actual
15%	Applicant Experience	1. Applicant and subrecipient’s prior experience in serving homeless people and in providing services similar to that proposed in the application.	15	
		2. Satisfactory experience with prior HUD grants and other public contracts, including satisfactory drawdowns and performance for existing grants as evidenced by timely reimbursement of subrecipients (if applicable), regular drawdowns, timely resolution of monitoring findings, and timely submission of APRs on existing grants.	15	
		Subtotal	30	
50%	Project Quality & Client Accessibility	3. Extent to which the applicant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Demonstrates an understanding of the needs of the people to be served b. Proposes an appropriate mix of people to be served through the program c. Shows a clear relationship between the type of supportive services provided and the needs of the population to be served d. Ensures that project participants are directed to appropriate housing and services that fit their needs e. Establishes performance measures that are measurable, objective and meet or exceed HUD and CoC benchmarks f. Commitment to quickly place households in permanent housing 	30	
		4. Extent to which the applicant conducts outreach in all areas of the community such as emergency shelters, places not meant for human habitation, etc. to locate potentially eligible homeless people	20	
		5. Whether there is a strategy for advertising the project that is designed specifically to reach homeless with the highest barriers within Kings and Tulare Counties.	20	
		6. Project does not present barriers to entry (e.g. sobriety, income, criminal background, number of children, LGBTQ status, etc.)	15	
		7. Adheres to Fair Housing regulations and for having in place or agreeing to implement specific outreach to identify and engage homeless individuals and families, including meaningful outreach to persons with disabilities and limited English proficiency, and measures to market to those least likely to access services	10	
		8. Project is in alignment with local FY2018-2019 funding priorities	5	
		Subtotal	100	

¹ Expansion grants are new funding requests to expand an existing project. Therefore, the applicant should have historical performance data from the current project that the Rating & Ranking Committee can use as a proxy to rate the grant application.

Weight	Scoring Factor	Scoring Criteria	Max	Actual
20%	Project Feasibility	9. For NEW CES: Applicant clearly describes a viable plan for rapid implementation of the program, documenting how the project will begin services within 6 months of the award. For full points, project must have: a. Solid plan for site control through existing relationships. b. Description of the steps it will take to complete the C1.9a (technical submission) in an expedited manner. For RENEWAL CES: Extent to which Applicant has rapidly implemented award and commenced services.	25	
		10. Project is cost-effective and is similar in cost to like-kind projects.	10	
		11. Match is appropriate for project type and supports eligible activities.	5	
		Subtotal	40	
15%	Alliance Participation	12. Participation in monthly membership meetings 15 points: >=90% attendance 7 points: 89% – 75% attendance 0 points : < 75% attendance	15	
		13. Representative serves on an Alliance Committee 15 points: Serves on two or more committees 7 points: Serves on one committee 0 points: Does not serve on a committee	15	
		Subtotal	30	
		Total	200	

Comments: _____

Name of Rating & Ranking Committee Member: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix E: Alliance HUD Program Competition Funding Priorities



**Kings and Tulare Counties
Continuum of Care (HUD) Program Competition
FUNDING PRIORITIES
FY2018-2019**

The Kings/Tulare Homeless Alliance has established the following local housing priorities¹ for the FY2018 HUD Continuum of Care Program Competition². In addition to meeting one of the identified housing priorities in the table below, all projects³ seeking funding must:

- 1) Maximize the use of mainstream benefits, including:
 - a. Coordinate with existing mainstream resources to enroll participants in eligible programs and connect them to community based services; and
 - b. Actively enroll participants in healthcare and/or assist participants in understanding and accessing expanded services available through the Affordable Care Act changes; and
 - c. Secure funding for services through mainstream resource programs and other partnerships.

- 2) Work to remove barriers to local resources by:
 - a. Prioritizing those most in need of services through the use of the VI-SPDAT and Housing Priority List;
 - b. Actively participating in Every Door Open, the Kings/Tulare coordinated entry & assessment process; and
 - c. Work to reduce the number of people exiting for unknown or negative reasons.

Priority	Focus Area
High	PSH projects for 100% chronically homeless households utilizing the Housing First model, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Projects adding new Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) beds dedicated to chronically homeless; b) Projects targeting existing PSH beds for chronically homeless; and c) Projects dedicating 100% of existing PSH beds to the chronically homeless at bed turnover.
High	Existing RRH projects. New Joint TH and PH-RRH projects.
Medium	New projects that are Dedicated PLUS. All other projects.

¹ HMIS, Coordinated Entry, and CoC Planning Grants are not subject to Prioritization, as they are required elements of a CoC.

² In addition to meeting a local housing priority, all projects will go through the Alliance’s Rating & Ranking process.

³ HMIS and CoC Planning grants excluded.

Appendix F: Alliance Standard Performance Measures

Goal	Purpose	Systems	Program Outcome Targets	Outcomes Calculation
Housing Stability	Indicates program/system level success in ending homelessness as measured by those who retain permanent housing or attain other permanent housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanent Supportive Housing 	87% of persons will remain in the permanent housing program as of the end of the operating year or exit to permanent housing (subsidized or unsubsidized).	The number of Stayers in the program PLUS the number of Leavers who exited to a permanent housing destination ÷ by the total number of Stayers and Leavers.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transitional Housing Rapid Re-Housing 	65% of persons will exit to permanent housing (subsidized or unsubsidized) during the operating year.	Permanent housing placement is calculated by determining the number of Leavers who exited to a permanent housing destination ÷ the total # of Leavers.
Increased Income	Indicates that program is assisting households to obtain sufficient income to attain housing. A higher rate is considered positive.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanent Supportive Housing 	56% of persons age 18 and older will maintain or increase their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the operating year or program exit.	The # of adults whose amount of cash income from any source remained the same or increased based on the persons income at intake and then at exit, or if they remained housed, at their most recent assessment ÷ by the total # of adult Leavers PLUS adult Stayers.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapid Re-housing Transitional Housing 	56% of persons age 18 and older will increase their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the operating year or program exit.	The # of adults whose amount of cash income from any source increased based on the persons income at intake and then at exit, or if they remained housed, at their most recent assessment ÷ by the total # of adult Leavers PLUS adult Stayers.

Goal	Purpose	Systems	Program Outcome Targets	Outcomes Calculation
Earned Income	Indicates that program is assisting households to stabilize housing by becoming employed or maintaining employment. A higher rate is considered positive.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanent Supportive Housing 	24% of persons age 18 through 61 will maintain or increase their earned income as of the end of the operating year or at program exit.	The number of persons (ages 18-61) whose amount of earned income remained the same or increased based on the persons earned income at intake and then at exit, or if they remained housed, at their most recent assessment ÷ by the total # of Leavers PLUS Stayers (ages 18-61).
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapid Re-housing Transitional Housing 	24% of persons age 18 through 61 will increase their earned income as of the end of the operating year or at program exit.	The number of persons (ages 18-61) whose amount of earned income increased based on the persons earned income at intake and then at exit, or if they remained housed, at their most recent assessment ÷ by the total # of Leavers PLUS Stayers (ages 18-61).
Bed Utilization	Indicates efficient use of community resources. High occupancy rate indicates system efficiency at turning over units and providing programs that are well-designed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emergency Shelter Transitional Housing Rapid Re-Housing/ Permanent Supportive Housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60% min. bed utilization for ES 80% min. bed utilization for TH 80% min. bed utilization for RRH 95% min. bed utilization for PSH 	Total number of bed nights ÷ total number of nights in the month.
Average Length of Stay	A reasonably short length of stay indicates efficiency related to turnover of beds which is essential to meet system demand for emergency shelter.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emergency Shelter 	Currently tracked but not monitored.	Exit Date (or report end date) - Entry Date ÷ number of clients served during the report period.

Goal	Purpose	Systems	Program Outcome Targets	Outcomes Calculation
Average Length of Participation	Indicates that system is assisting households to achieve independence without long-term reliance on the system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rapid Re-Housing ▪ Homeless Prevention 	Currently tracked but not monitored.	Exit Date (or report end date) - Entry Date ÷ number of clients served during the report period.
Households Served	Indicates volume of households served by the system and provides a better understanding of household size as it relates to unit occupancy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emergency Shelter ▪ Transitional Housing ▪ Permanent Supportive Housing 	Currently tracked but not monitored.	The number of households served by the program (or system) during the report period.
Newly Homeless	Indicates the volume of newly homeless persons served by emergency shelters.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emergency Shelter 	Currently tracked but not monitored.	The number of newly homeless ¹ clients ÷ total number of clients served during the report period.
Recidivism	Indicates system's success in ending homelessness as measured by number of households who attain housing and do not return or enter shelter subsequent to successful housing outcome.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emergency Shelter ▪ Transitional Housing ▪ Rapid Re-Housing ▪ Homeless Prevention 	Currently tracked but not monitored.	The total number of recidivist clients ² ÷ the total number of clients served during the report period.

¹ Newly Homeless is defined as the number of persons that entered the emergency shelter during the report period that have not been served by other programs in the HMIS as of 7/01/2013.

² A recidivist client is defined as one that exits a system with a successful outcome (specific to that system) and re-enters the system within one year after exit from the system.