

Renewal Project Ranking Criteria • 2015 NOFA

Note: New projects for PSH, RRH or Coordinated Intake will be scored based on separate criteria to be distributed by 10-5-2015.

Renewal projects will be ranked according to three criteria: 1) the degree to which the project contributes to CoC systems outcomes; 2) project performance as compared to all other funded projects; and 3) commitment to priority populations.

A total of 100 points is available: Up to 60 points for contributing to systems outcomes; up to 36 points for outperforming other CoC projects; and up to 4 points for targeting and/or serving priority populations.

In addition, up to 12 bonus points are available. Bonus points will be awarded based on brief narrative responses to 3 questions designed to provide a window into project operations and outcomes. Completion of the bonus questions is optional.

1. Systems Measures

Projects will receive up to 10 points for their contribution toward each of the CoC Systems Measures: Utilization, cost-effectiveness, successful housing outcomes, improved employment outcomes, increased income, and access to mainstream benefits.

Points: **10 points** if the project exceeds the CoC Performance Goal by 10% or more
5 points if the project meets the CoC Performance Goal
0 points if the project does not meet the CoC Performance Goal and falls below it by 10% or more

2. Project Performance Measures

Projects will gain or lose up to 6 points for the degree to which they fall above or below the "average" CoC outcome for each systems measure.

Points: **1 - 6 points** for the degree to which the project exceeds the average project outcome
(-1) to (-6) points for the degree to which the project falls below the average project outcome

3. Process Measures

Projects will receive up to 1 point for each of the priority populations they target and/or served, for a maximum of 4 points.

Points: **.5 points** for each priority population that the project is dedicated to: veterans; chronically homeless; youth; families with children
.5 points for each priority population that the project served during the fiscal year, regardless of target population

CoC Performance Measure Thresholds

Effectiveness	<p>1. Housing Stability</p> <p>At least 89% of CoC program participants exit to a PH destination or maintain their current PSH tenancy during the reporting year. [HUD threshold: 80%]</p>
	<p>2. Job and Income Growth</p> <p>a. 32% or more of CoC project participants are employed at exit. [HUD threshold: 20%]</p> <p>b. 65% or more of CoC project participants have income from sources other than employment. [HUD threshold: 54%]</p>
	<p>3. Mainstream Benefits</p> <p>At least 95% of CoC project participants have at least 1 source of mainstream benefits. [HUD threshold: 56%]</p>
Efficiency	<p>4. Utilization</p> <p>a. PSH project must have an average occupancy rate of at least 90% over the course of the reporting year.</p> <p>b. TH project must have an average occupancy rate of at least 80% over the course of the reporting year.</p>
	<p>5. Cost per Successful Housing Outcome</p> <p>a. PSH projects must spend less than 60% of CoC PSH project funds on producing a positive outcome, where a positive outcome is achieved when project participants maintain their housing or exit to another PH destination.</p> <p>b. TH projects must spend less than 75% of CoC TH project funds on producing a positive outcome, where a positive outcome is achieved when project participants exit to PH.</p>

Example: System Measures

Points awarded for meeting CoC performance goals related to project efficiency and effectiveness, since meeting these goals contributes directly to the CoCs capacity to reduce and end homelessness.

Points: Up to 60 points available	10 Points: Exceeded CoC System Performance Goal by 10% or more
	5 Points: Met CoC System Performance Goal
	0 Points: Did Not Meet CoC System Performance Goal

October 1 to September 30		Efficiency		Effectiveness			
Program Type	Program	Average Utilization	Cost per (+) Outcome	% Successful Outcome	% Employed	% w. Nonempl. Income	% w. Noncash Benefits
PSH	Performance Goal	90%	\$7K	89%	32%	65%	95%
PSH	Project 1	100% = 10 pts	\$5K = 10 pts	100% = 10 pts	28% = 5 pts	100% = 10 pts	90% = 5 pts
PSH	Project 4	80%=0 pts	\$13K = 0 pts	85% = 5 pts	14% = 0 pts	90% = 10 pts	35% = 0 pts
PSH	Project 5	95%=5 pts	\$6.5K = 5 pts	68% = 0 pts	55% = 10 pts	60% = 5 pts	100% = 5 pts

Example: Project Performance

Points awarded for producing project outcomes that are better than 50% of CoC projects; points detracted for producing outcomes that are worse than 50% of CoC projects. Projects are compared to other projects of their type (PSH or TH).

Points: Up to 36 points available	Above average: 1 - 6 points based on distance from CoC median (6 programs will be above the median, 6 will be below)
	Below average: -1 to -6 points based on distance from CoC median

Oct 1, 2014 - Sept 30, 2015		Efficiency		Effectiveness			
Program Type	Program	Average Utilization	Cost per (+) Outcome	% Successful Outcome	% Employed	% Nonempl. Income	% Noncash Benefits
PSH	Project average	90%	\$7K	70%	25%	90%	85%
PSH	Project 1	100% = 6 pts	\$5K = 3 pts	100% = 6 pts	Etc.	Etc.	Etc.
PSH	Project 2	93% = 1 pt	\$11K = -4 pts	86% = 4 pts			
PSH	Project 3	83% = -3 pts	1.8K = 6 pts	71% = 1 pt			

Example: Process Measure Points

Points awarded for the project's commitment to processes that target HUD priority populations - veterans, chronic homeless persons, unaccompanied youth and young adults, and families with children - as measured by 1) dedication of the service model to a particular priority population; and 2) actual services provided to persons in priority populations, based on the number of persons served from each priority population during the reporting year.

Points: Up to 4 points available

.5 points: Service Model is dedicated to the Priority Population

.5 points: Project served the Priority Population during the reporting year (even if model is not dedicated to the priority population)

0 points: Service model does not target the Priority Population *and* no persons from the Priority Population were served during the reporting year

Program Type	Program	Veterans	Chronic Homeless Persons	Youth & Young Adults	Families with Children	Total for Program Model
<i>Service Model*</i>						
PSH	Project 1	0	0	0	0.5	0.5
PSH	Project 2	0.5	0.5	0	0	1
TH	Project 3	0	0	0	0.5	0.5

* The project's service model is dedicated to one or more priority populations, e.g. Youth/Young Adults; or Chronically Homeless Veterans

Program Type	Program	Veterans	Chronic Homeless Persons	Youth & Young Adults	Families with Children	Total for Priority Persons Served	Total for Priority Populations
<i>Program Services**</i>							
PSH	Project 1	0	0.5	1	0.5	1.5	2
PSH	Project 2	0.5	0.5	0	0	1	2
TH	Project 3	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	1

** The project served persons from the priority population during the reporting year (based on HMIS data)

Example: Overall Project Ranking

A project ranking score is derived by tallying all awarded points, for a maximum score of 100 points plus up to 12 bonus points.

Points: Up to 100 points available plus up to 10 bonus points

0 to 60 points: Contributed to CoC Performance

(-36) to (+36) points: Exceeded of Fell Below Average CoC Project Performance

0 to 4 points: Targeted CoC Priority Populations

Top tier

Middle tier

Bottom tier

Program Type	Program	System Contribution Score	Project Outcomes Score	Priority Population Score	Total Ranking Score	Bonus Points	2015 Ranking Points
PSH	Project 1	55	13	2	70	0	70
TH	Project 2	30	18	2	50	5	55
PSH	Project 6	60	30	3	93	5	98
PSH	Project 8	10	24	0	34	10	44

Bonus points will be awarded based on narrative responses to the 3 questions below. Up to 12 points are available.

1. If your project's effectiveness fell below the CoC threshold on any system performance measure (successful outcome to housing, improved employment outcome, increased income, or access to mainstream benefits): Explain the circumstances or barriers faced by your project participants that interfered with optimal project outcomes. Specifically, describe the severity of needs and vulnerabilities experienced by participants, which may include low or no income, current or past substance abuse, or criminal records. Please provide anecdotal or empirical evidence to illustrate your point(s). **Points: 1 point will be awarded for each outcome that is addressed.**
2. Describe how your project implemented project eligibility and prioritization requirements such as requirements related to chronic homeless or disability status, and/or high service needs. **Points: 4 points will be awarded for a response that describes the process.**
3. Describe how CoC funds impact the lives of your project participants. Please provide an example of a project participant who was assisted by your project. **Points: 4 points will be awarded for a response that describes impact.**