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# Scranton/Lackawanna Continuum of Care Rating and Ranking Process

The Scranton/Lackawanna County Continuum of Care (CoC) used the following process for ranking new, renewal and reallocation projects for the FY2016 competition. From this process the CoC will develop a Priority Listing of all projects within the CoC based on the criteria established below. The final Priority Listing will be reflective of what actions are needed to end homelessness within our community.

## Eligibility for Funding

Projects that sought renewal for funding in 2016 (renewals) were required to submit APRs for their most recently completed grant year on August 22, 2016, along with a cover sheet (see Attachment A,) which stated the project component, number of proposed units and beds, total HUD grant amount and expiring grant number.

Projects that sought to receive reallocation or bonus funding in 2016 were required to submit a completed grant application in e-snaps and a Project Narrative in response to a Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the CoC and reviewed by the CoC board. Projects that the board recommended for inclusion in the CoC’s Priority Listing were required to meet all the criteria for new, reallocated and bonus projects as outlined in the NOFA.

To be eligible for placement on the Priority Listing, a project must submit all final documentation and application information to the Scranton/Lackawanna County CoC by August 15, 2016, meet the application deadlines established within the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), and meet all other eligibility criteria outlined in that NOFA and established by the CoC and its Governing Body. If a project is renewing an existing grant, the project must be in full compliance with all applicable laws and regulations established by the federal, state and local government.

## Renewal Scoring

The CoC established benchmarks included:

* Bed utilization rates on the January 2016 HIC
* Unit utilization on the last Wednesdays in January, April, July and October
* 85% of the participants in PH or SH will stay in the program or exit to PH destination
* 85% of adult participants will maintain or increase income
* 85% of Adult participants will be employed
* Projects will take people into their programs with HUD-defined barriers, with no income, and/or with a history of domestic violence

The CoC has adopted the Renewal Project Ranking Tool that scored renewal projects on a scale from 0 to 105 for PH and 0 to 99 for SH. This Ranking Tool utilized information gathered from each project’s most recent Annual Progress Report (APR) which was submitted to HUD, or, if the grant year was complete, but the APR not yet available at the time of ranking, the APR data from HMIS in addition to LOCCS financial information. The evaluation information included utilization rates, amount of funding returned to HUD, performance measures (discharging to or retaining permanent housing, maintaining or increasing income, and employment), serving people with high barriers and those coming from homeless locations, participation in CoC committee meetings and data quality. The scores from the Ranking Tool are used to rank Renewals.

A committee of 3 community stakeholders outside of the CoC Board convened to score all Renewals using the Renewal Project Ranking Tool. These stakeholders represented a local university, the Lackawanna County Dept. of Health and Human Services and the local United Way. They were trained on how to use the tool and given a week to score and return the score sheets to the Collaborative Applicant.

## Reallocation and Bonus Process Scoring

The CoC arrived at decisions regarding reallocation based on 1) data from the Point in Time and Housing Inventory counts and Coordinated Entry since its inception in HMIS February 2016 and 2) the priorities and perspectives of HUD and the CoC and 3) anticipation of the receipt of 2 newly awarded grants through last year’s competition.

The CoC placed an RFP for HUD Rapid ReHousing program for families in the local newspaper on 8/6/2016 with the deadline for submission indicated as 8/15/2016. Upon submission, two committees formed to review them. One was for reallocated projects and the other for the bonus project. Three evaluators, representing various stakeholders on the Board reviewed and scored the proposals for reallocated programs, based on criteria outlined in the evaluation tool which was given to each submitting provider. The committee convened on Tuesday, August 30th. Based on the scores, the projects were included in the CoC’s priority listing in the order recommended.

Six evaluators, representing various stakeholders on the Board reviewed and scored the proposals for the Bonus project on August 22nd. Based on the scores, one was recommended for inclusion in the CoC Priority listing for this year’s competition, and the other was declined. These two projects were notified via e-mail on August 25th of acceptance or rejection, with a hard copy of a letter mailed through the U.S.P.S. The rejected program was given the areas of weakness in their application.

## Final Ranking

After the scoring of Renewals, Reallocations and New Projects using the scoring process outlined above, the CoC Board reviewed the ranking list in its entirety, assessing if the list reflected a strong continuum of services. In this review, consideration was given to the needs of subpopulations (e.g., veterans, individuals and families fleeing domestic violence, etc.), the type of housing services and the overall performance of projects. The Board decided to place all renewal projects first in Tier 1 in the order in which they were scored, with the rationale that they are all PH projects which serve the needs identified in our community with the exception of the one Safe Haven program (not a PH), which does have a high success rate and serve a population with a demonstrated need in our area. After renewal projects, reallocated projects were placed in the order which they were scored. The reallocated projects were devised to serve the community’s prioritized need of homeless families. Next, the Board prioritized a newly awarded, but not yet implemented project for survivors of domestic and sexual violence with the rationale that this project has a demonstrated need given PIT data and would be the only one serving that specific population which would be operated by the DV provider in our region, thus being able to provide the very specialized care and programming needed by that population and filling a gap in homeless services that exists at this time. This program was followed by the other newly awarded but not yet implemented project for Chronic Homeless individuals which will serve to reach functional zero given our current Chronic Homeless list, effectively ending Chronic Homelessness in our community. HMIS was placed next given that it does not house any people in our community, but it is a necessary tool used to capture information about our homeless population and services, and to report to the community and to HUD on program performance. Finally, the Bonus Project was placed at the bottom of the ranking list.

The Priority Listing will be ranked in accordance with the local community’s following **Policy Priorities**:

1. All Renewal PH and SH in order of scoring from the Renewal Project Rating Tool (Attachment B)
2. Reallocated PH Projects in order of ranking by the New Project Ranking Tool (Attachment D)
3. New PH Projects which have been awarded but not yet implemented in order of scoring by the New Project Ranking Tool (Attachment D)
4. The HMIS Project
5. The approved (via the New Project Ranking Tool) Bonus PH Project (Attachment E)

## Notice of Project Inclusion

A notice of Projects to be included in the Priority Listing for this year’s CoC NOFA was e-mailed to the full CoC membership on August 30th, 2016.

## Attachment A: Cover Sheet



## Attachment B: Renewal Project Rating Tool

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question #** | **Source** | **Clients Served** | **Totals** |  |  |
| 1 | APR Q7 | Total number of Adults Served |   |  |  |
| 1a | APR Q7 | Total number of Clients |   |  |  |
| 2 | APR Q9 | Total number of Households Served |   |  |  |
| 3 | HUD Submitted APR / LOCCS Screenshot | Households Proposed to Serve |   |  |  |
| 4 | APR Q7 | Total number of leavers |   |  |  |
| **Question #** | **Source** | **Utilization of Beds and Units** | **Households Served** | **Utilization Rate** |  |
| 5 | 2016 PIT / HIC | Bed Utilization on Point in Time / Housing Inventory Count for January 28 2016 |   | #DIV/0! |  |
| 6 | APR Q9 | Point-In-Time Count of Total Households Served on the Last Wednesday In January |   | #DIV/0! |  |
| 7 | APR Q10 | Point-In-Time Count of Total Households Served on the Last Wednesday In April |   | #DIV/0! |  |
| 8 | APR Q11 | Point-In-Time Count of Total Households Served on the Last Wednesday In July |   | #DIV/0! |  |
| 9 | APR Q12 | Point-In-Time Count of Total Households Served on the Last Wednesday In October |   | #DIV/0! |  |
| **Question #** | **Source** | **Housing Stability** | **Number of Exits** | **% of Clients** |  |
| 10 | APR Q36a | Clients who remained in program or exited the program to a HUD defined permanent destination |   | #DIV/0! |  |
| **Question #** | **Source** |   | **Total Households** | **% Entered from Homeless Situation** |  |
| 11 | APR Q20a1 | Residence Prior to Project Entry - Homeless Situations |   | #DIV/0! |  |
| **Question #** | **Source** | **Income and Employment** | **Number of Clients** | **% of Clients** |  |
| 12 | APR Q36 | Adults who maintained or increased earned income |   | #DIV/0! |  |
| 13 | APR Q36 | Adults who maintained or increased income |   | #DIV/0! |  |
| **Question #** | **Source** | **Data Quality** | **# of Persons DK/RF** | **# of Missing Data** | **% of Bad Data** |
| 14 | APR Q7b | SSN |   |   | #DIV/0! |
| 15 | APR Q7b | Race |   |   | #DIV/0! |
| 16 | APR Q7b | Veteran Status |   |   | #DIV/0! |
| 17 | APR Q7b | Residence Prior to Entry |   |   | #DIV/0! |
| 18 | APR Q7b | Zip of Last Permanent Address |   |   | #DIV/0! |
| 19 | APR Q7b | Income (at Entry) |   |   | #DIV/0! |
| 20 | APR Q7b | Income (at Exit) |   |   | #DIV/0! |
| 21 | APR Q7b | Substance Abuse (at Entry) |   |   | #DIV/0! |
| 22 | APR Q7b | Domestic Violence (at Entry) |   |   | #DIV/0! |
| 23 | APR Q7b | Destination |   |   | #DIV/0! |
| **Question #** | **Source** | **Housing First** | **Number of Barriers** | **% of Clients** |  |
| 24 | Q22a2 + Q22b2 | Number of Adults with Barriers |   | #DIV/0! |  |
| 25 | APR Q24a2 + Q25a2 | Adults with No Income at Entry |   | #DIV/0! |  |
| 26 | APR Q19 | Domestic Violence Survivor |   | #DIV/0! |  |
| **Question #** | **Source** | **Budget** | **Amount Returned** | **Total HUD Award** | **% of Amount Returned** |
| 27 | HUD Submitted APR / LOCCS Screenshot | Amount of funds the project returned at end of grant term |   |   | #DIV/0! |
| **Question #** | **Source** | **Cost Effectiveness** | **Total HUD Award Amount** | **HUD Cost per Household** | **Total Cost per Household** |
| 28 | HUD Submitted APR / LOCCS Screenshot | Expenditure per Household | $0 | #DIV/0! |   |
| **Question #** | **Source** | **CoC Participation** | **Total # of Meetings** | **Number of Meetings Attended** | **% Attendance** |
|   | Committee Chair compiled attendance signin sheets | CoC Meeting | 12 |   | 0% |
|   | Committee Chair compiled attendance signin sheets | HMIS Subcommittee | 8 |   | 0% |
|   | Committee Chair compiled attendance signin sheets | Discharge Planning Subcommittee | 3 |   | 0% |
|   | Committee Chair compiled attendance signin sheets | Education Subcommittee | 4 |   | 0% |
|   | Committee Chair compiled attendance signin sheets | Chronic Homeless Subcommittee | 12 |   | 0% |
|   | Committee Chair compiled attendance signin sheets | Coordinated Assessment Subcommittee | 8 |   | 0% |
| 29 | Committee Chair compiled attendance signin sheets | CoC Meeting & Subcommittee Attendance Total | 47 |   | 0% |
| **Question #** | **Source** | **Coordinated Entry** | **Total Agency Enrollments** | **# of Coordinated Entry Records Created by Agency** |  |
| 30 | Custom Query from HMIS | Coordinated entry records exceeds number of agency program enrollments |   |   |  |
| **Question #** | **Source** |   | **Referrals Received** | **Statuses Updated** |  |
| 31 | Custom Query from HMIS | Referral Statuses Updated |   |   |  |
| **Total Points:** |  |  |  |  |

## Attachment C: Renewal Project Scoring Rubric

### Clients Served

1 thru 4. The Clients Served section of the 2016 Ranking states the core numbers needed for calculating percentages elsewhere in the ranking. This section provides zero points.

### Utilization of Beds and Units

5. Utilization of beds on the night of January 27, 2016.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage | Points |
| 85% and above | 5 |
| 75% - 84% | 4 |
| 60% - 74% | 3 |
| 50% - 59% | 2 |
| 49% and below | 0 |

6 thru 9. Utilization rates of units on the last Wednesday in January, April, July and October (Each section can receive points – Max 5 points per quarter or 20 points overall)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage | Points |
| 85% and above | 5 |
| 75% - 84% | 4 |
| 60% - 74% | 3 |
| 50% - 59% | 2 |
| 49% and below | 0 |

### Housing Stability

10. Clients who remained in a program or exited the program to a HUD defined permanent destination

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage | Points |
| 85% and above |  15  |
| 75% - 84% | 13 |
| 65% - 74% | 10 |
| 60% - 64% | 5 |
| 50% - 59% | 3 |
| 49% and below | 0 |

11. Residence Prior to Project Entry - Homeless Situations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage | Points |
| 90% and above | 10 + 1 Bonus |
| 85% - 89% | 9 |
| 80% - 84% | 8 |
| 75% - 79% | 7 |
| 70% - 74% | 6 |
| 65% - 69% | 5 |
| 60% - 64 | 4 |
| 59% and below | 0 |

### Income and Employment

12. Adults who maintained or increased earned income

HUD has granted Safe Haven projects exempt from this metric on the Annual Performance Report and will therefore not have it included in the final calculated percentage of possible available points.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage | Points |
| 85% and above | 5+1 Bonus |
| 70% - 84% | 4 |
| 55% - 69% | 3 |
| 40% - 54% | 2 |
| 25% - 39% |  1  |
| 24% and below | 0 |

13. Adults who maintained or increased income

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage | Points |
| 85% and above | 10 + 1 Bonus |
| 80% - 84% |  9  |
| 70% - 79% | 8 |
| 60% - 69% | 7 |
| 50% - 59% | 6 |
| 40% - 49% | 5 |
| 30% - 39% | 4 |
| 20% - 29% | 3 |
| 10% - 19% | 2 |
| 1% – 9% | 1 |
| Below 1% | 0 |

### Data Quality

14 thru 23. This set of questions are Universal Data Elements or Program Specific Data Elements which are required across all pertinent programs in the Scranton / Lackawanna County Continuum of Care. All questions in this section are worth one point except for question 17, “Residence Prior to Entry” and question 23 “Destination” which are worth 2 points each.

14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage | Points |
| 0 – 5% flawed data | 1 |
| 6% and more flawed data | 0 |

17, 23.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage | Points |
|  0- 5% flawed data | 2 |
| 6% and more flawed data | 0 |

### Housing First

24. Number of Adults with Barriers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage | Points |
| 90% or above | 5 |
| 76% – 89% | 4 |
|  61% – 75%  | 3 |
| 46% - 60%  | 2 |
| 30% - 45% | 1 |
| 29% or below | 0 |

25. Adults with No Income at Entry

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage | Points |
| 90% or above | 5 |
| 76% – 89% | 4 |
| 61% – 75% | 3 |
| 46% - 60%  | 2 |
| 30% - 45% | 1 |
| 29% or below | 0 |

26. Domestic Violence Survivor

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage | Points |
| 90% or above | 5 |
| 76% – 89% | 4 |
| 61% – 75% | 3 |
| 46% - 60%  | 2 |
| 30% - 45% | 1 |
| 29% or below | 0 |

### Budget

27. Amount of funds the project returned at end of grant term

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage | Points |
| 0 – 2.5% return of funds | 5 |
| 2.6 – 5% return of funds  | 4 |
| 6 – 7.5% return of funds | 3 |
| 7.6 – 10 return of funds | 2 |
| 11% and above | 0 |

### Cost Effectiveness

28. Expenditure per Household

This is a proposed metric for ranking next year. The SLCoC is gathering this information purely to gather information to inform whether or not the metric should be included for 2017. This measure provides zero points.

### CoC Participation

29. CoC Meeting & Subcommittee Attendance Total

This metric measures engagement between grant recipient organizations with the Scranton / Lackawanna County Continuum of Care.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage | Points |
| Participate 91% - 100% | 5 |
| Participate 75% - 90% | 2 |
| Participate 50% - 74% | 1 |
| Participate 0 – 49% | 0 |

### Coordinated Entry

30 thru 31. The Coordinated Entry questions are included on the ranking in order to prepare Scranton / Lackawanna County Continuum of Care members for the inclusion of these metrics moving past the 2016 ranking. These two questions are not scored.

## Attachment D: New / Reallocated Project Ranking Tool

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Selection/Criteria** | **Score** | **Strengths/Weaknesses** |
| **Organizational Experience (15 Pts)** | (1-5) |   |
| The organization demonstrates past success in working with & providing housing & support services to homeless individuals or families. (2B) |   |   |
| The organization demonstrates strong experience in meeting HUD’s performance goals for RRH clients. If the organization hasn’t previously operated an RRH Program, they demonstrate strong experience in meeting similar goals set forth by their organization. (2B) |   |   |
| The organization demonstrates strong experience in effectively utilizing federal funds to provide housing and support services as well as leveraging state, local or private sector funds. (sect. 2B) |   |   |
| Subtotal Organizational Experience | 0 |   |
| **Target Population (5 pts)** | **(1-5)** |   |
| The organization proposes to serve families experiencing homelessness and clearly defines any specific sub-populations they intend to serve. The number of beds proposed is appropriate to serve the target population. (3B, 4B, 5A, 5B) |   |   |
| **Approach (10 pts)** | **(1-5)** |   |
| The organization presents a strong plan for recruiting, retaining and professionally developing quality staff who are experienced in working with the target population. (Narrative) |   |   |
| The organization presents a strong strategy for coordinating with outside partners to ensure that the RRH program is successful (4A + Narrative) |   |   |
| Subtotal Approach | 0 |   |
| **Housing Services (15 pts)** | **(1-5)** |   |
| The organization presents a strong plan for assisting individuals in obtaining and maintaining housing with thoughtful consideration of how to address needs and barriers. (4A, 2) |   |   |
| The organization presents a strong plan for identifying appropriate scattered site units – units that are suitable for habitation by RRH clients, have reasonable rents and are located within the county. (4A + narrative) |   |   |
| The organization presents a strong plan for recruiting and working with landlords and other homeless service providers. (4A + narrative) |   |   |
| Subtotal Housing Services | 0 |   |
| **Support Services (15 pts)** | **(1-5)** |   |
| The organization presents a strong plan for who will provide the supportive services listed in Section 4A of the application (proposer, partner agency or non-partner agency), how frequently they will access them and how (onsite, program van, etc.) they will be accessed. |   |   |
| The supportive services that are included in the proposal are appropriate for the needs of the target population. (4A) |   |   |
| Subtotal Support Services | 0 |   |
| **Referrals and Outreach (5 pts)** |   |   |
| The organization presents a strong plan for managing referrals through Coordinated Entry, and has a contingency plan if the RRH Program experiences difficulty meeting the requirements to serve exclusively homeless individuals. (Narrative) |   |   |
| **Performance Outcomes (10 pts)** | (1-5) |   |
| The organization presents a strong plan for tracking and achieving the HUD performance standards for maintaining or exiting to permanent housing, maintaining or increasing family income, and maintaining or gaining at least one non-cash benefit (e.g. food stamps) during the year. (6A + narrative) |   |   |
| The organization thoughtfully describes other outcomes it plans to achieve through the program and presents a strong plan for tracking and achieving those outcomes. (6B) |   |   |
| *Subtotal Performance Outcomes* | 0 |   |
| **HMIS (5 pts)** | (1-5) |   |
| The organization is experienced in inputting data into HMIS or an equivalent database and demonstrates a strong plan for inputting quality data in a timely way. (Narrative) |   |   |
| **Compliance with Applicable Laws and Regulations (5 pts)** | (1-5) |   |
| The organization has attached updated HUD form 2880, Disclosure, and form 50070, Drug-free workplace to their e-snaps applicant profile (included with application) |   |   |
| **Budget and Budget Narrative (10 pts)**  | (1-5) |   |
| The organization proposes a detailed budget and budget narrative that justifies cost. The cost per unit is of good value to the CoC.(7A – 7J) |   |   |
| The organization provides a clear description of Match amount by Type (in-kind or cash), Source (gov’t or private), Contributor and Purpose. (7I + attachments) |   |   |
| Subtotal Budget and Budget Narrative: | 0 |   |
| **Collaboration (10 pts)** | (1-5) |   |
| Housing First/Low Barrier (5 pts) (3B) |   |   |
| **Coordinated Entry (5 pts)** | (1-5) |   |
| The organization presents a strong plan for incorporating the CoC’s Coordinated Entry process into their project. (3B Q3 + Narrative)  |   |   |
| **Total (115 pts)** |   | 0 |

## Attachment E: New / Reallocated Project Narrative

1. Describe the organization’s plan for recruiting, retaining and professionally developing quality staff who are experienced in working with the proposed population.
2. Describe your organization’s strategy to work with outside organizations in service coordination efforts, including those organizations indicated in section 4A of the project application.
3. Describe your organization’s plan for identifying appropriate scattered site units that are suitable for habitation by RRH clients, have reasonable rents and are located within the county.
4. Describe your organization’s plan for recruiting and working with landlords and other homeless service providers.
5. Please add any additional detains on supportive service coordination and how services will be accessed (program vehicle, public transportation, etc.)
6. Describe the organization’s plan to obtain appropriate referrals for the proposed program, including the incorporation of the Coordinated Entry process. Please include a contingency plan if the program has difficulty obtaining referrals exclusively for homeless families.
7. Describe the organization’s plan for tracking and achieving the HUD performance standards for maintaining or exiting to permanent housing, maintaining or increasing family income, and maintaining or gaining at least one non-cash benefit (e.g. food stamps) during the year.
8. Please describe your organization’s experience in inputting data into HMIS or an equivalent database including the input of all relevant measures on a timely basis.
9. Describe the organization’s plan for incorporating the CoC’s Coordinated Entry process into the proposed project.

Please attach updated copies of HUD forms 2880 and 50070.