

Frederick County Coalition for the Homeless

Grant Review & Quality Assurance Committee Review Criteria for Continuum of Care Applications and Priority Ranking Status

In July 2004, the Committee established the following Goal, Objective Measurements and Process to rank the applications submitted for funding under the HUD Continuum of Care Grant Application. The criteria were updated in 2008 to better evaluate permanent supportive housing projects.

Goal: To prioritize projects through a fair and rational process using objective criteria driven by the Housing Gaps Analysis, Continuum of Care strategies, and other local goals and planning initiatives.

Objective Measurements Established:

1. Percentage of Other Funding leveraged for the project (cash match/total expenditures – APR question 19).
2. Percentage of dollars expended for supportive services - transitional housing only (supportive services expenditures/total expenditures – APR question 19).
3. Percentage of dollars expended for permanent housing - permanent housing only (leasing, acquisition, rehabilitation, and utilities expenditures/total expenditures – APR question 19).
4. Percentage of clients graduating or exiting into permanent housing (number of persons moving into permanent housing/total number of persons that left during the grant year – APR question 14).
5. Percentage of actual person served as compared to the projected number to be served during the grant year – APR question 2a + 2b divided by APR question 1).
6. Percentage of beds the project provides in relation to the total number of beds funded by all proposed projects.
7. Renewal project that meets an on-going need.
8. New project that meets a need for permanent housing.

Process: The following documents will be reviewed for each applicant - Project Application (CoC exhibit 2 including project budget); most recent Annual Progress Report (APR); and other information as requested from the applicant organizations. Site visits and interviews may be conducted as needed. Based upon the information provided, the project is rated against the measurements established; the process results in an objective priority ranking for all projects.

Update: In 2013, this process was supplemented by the adding the attached criteria, which includes HUD's Homeless Policy Priorities and the Scoring Criteria Summary for the Continuum of Care Grant. Future efforts will focus on a more detailed analysis of recipient performance as well as an evaluation of consistency with HUD's Homeless Policy Priorities.

HUD's Homeless Policy Priorities

For details about HUD's policy priorities, please review the NOFA.

1. Strategic Resource Allocation.

- Comprehensive review of all projects
- Underperforming, obsolete, or ineffective should be reallocated

2. Ending chronic homelessness.

- Increasing Beds
- Targeting
- Housing First

3. Ending family homelessness.

- Rapid Re-Housing

4. Removing Barriers to CoC Resources.

- Centralized or Coordinated Assessment System
- Transitional Housing
- Prioritizing Households Most in Need

5. Maximizing the use of mainstream resources, including preparing for implementation of the Affordable Care Act

6. Building partnerships.

- Public Housing Agencies (PHA)
- Philanthropy

7. Other Priority Populations:

- Veterans
- Homeless Youth

Scoring Criteria Summary

| Scoring Factor Sections | Points |
|---|-----------|
| <p>CoC Strategic Planning and Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ending Chronic Homelessness (including increase beds dedicated to Chronically Homeless) (16 points) ○ Housing Stability (Transitional Housing to Permanent Housing <u>AND</u> Permanent Housing retention: 80%) (10 points) ○ Jobs and Income Growth (20% of participants have employment income, 54% of participants have income from other sources) (8 points) ○ Mainstream Benefits (56% of participants) (7 points) ○ Increase Use of Rapid Rehousing (10 points) ○ Opening Doors implementation (3 points) ○ Ending Family Homelessness (4 points) ○ Addressing the Needs of Victims of Domestic Violence (2 points) ○ Ending Youth Homelessness (2 points) ○ Reaching Unsheltered Homeless (3 points) ○ Ending Veteran Homelessness (4 points) | 69 |
| <p>CoC Coordination of Housing and Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Preventing Homelessness (2 points) ○ Discharge Planning (4 points, one for each system of care). ○ Consolidated Plan Coordination (2 points) | 28 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Emergency Solutions Grants Consultation (3 points) ○ Coordination with Other Funding Sources (1 point) ○ Public Housing Agencies Engagement (2 points) ○ Use of Housing First Approach (3 points) ○ Has Centralized or Coordinated Assessment System (2 points) ○ Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (2 points) ○ Educational Assurances (2 points) ○ Preventing Involuntary Family Separation (2 points) ○ Preparing for Implementation of Affordable Care Act (1 point) ○ Identify Resources for Services (2 points). | |
| Recipient Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CoC Engages in Performance Monitoring (3 points) ○ CoC Assist in Increasing Performance (3 points) ○ CoC Assist in Increasing Capacity (3 points) ○ Reducing Homeless Episodes (3 points) ○ Outreach (1 point) ○ Tracking and Reducing Returns to Homelessness (2 points) | 15 |
| CoC Housing, Services, and Structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regular, Open CoC Meetings (2 points) ○ No Written Complaints (2 points) ○ Inclusive Structure (2 points) ○ Use of Project Application Performance Metrics (2 points) ○ Accuracy of Grant Inventory Worksheet (1 point) ○ Ranking and Selection Process (3 points) ○ Housing Inventory Count Submission (1 point) | 13 |
| Leveraging 100% participation in 150% leveraging | 5 |
| Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ HMIS Governance Charter (2 points) ○ HMIS Plans in Place (1 points) ○ Diverse HMIS Funding (2 points) ○ Bed Coverage (86% participation) (2 points) ○ Data Quality (less than 10% missing/null and refused/unknown)(2 points) ○ Procedures for Entry and Exit Dates (1 point) ○ Ability to Generate Required Reports (1 point) | 11 |
| Point-in-Time Count <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Point-in-Time Count and Data Submission (3 points) ○ Reduction in Point-in-Time Count Since 2012 (2 points) ○ Collect and Report Subpopulation Data (2 points) ○ Methodology for Unsheltered Count (2 points) | 9 |
| Subtotal | 150 |
| Bonus points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Administration amount 7% (2 points) ○ No Supportive Service Only Projects in Tier 1 (2 points) ○ Accuracy of Submission of HUD-2991 (2 points) | 6 |
| Total | 156 |