

# HUD CONTINUUM OF CARE (CoC) 2014 RENEWAL APPLICATIONS

## Guidance Document #2: Renewal Project Rating and Ranking Guidance

### October 1, 2014

*This document focuses on our rating and ranking process for renewal project applications for the 2014 CoC competition and specifies very tight turnaround for required information from you.*

**Who do we contact with questions?** For policy or application questions, you can contact Ryan Deibert at 503-823-2368 or [ryan.deibert@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:ryan.deibert@portlandoregon.gov). If you have specific questions about the ServicePoint reports that PHB has generated for your projects, please contact Hunter Belgard ([hunter.belgard@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:hunter.belgard@portlandoregon.gov) or 503-823-2381) or Wendy Smith ([wendy.smith@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:wendy.smith@portlandoregon.gov) or 503-823-2386).

**Note that you are required to complete Attachment 2 for each of your renewal projects and return it via email to Shannon Singleton at [shannon.singleton@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:shannon.singleton@portlandoregon.gov) no later than 5:00 PM on Friday, October 3, 2014.**

**How will our CoC rate and rank renewal projects this year?** As in prior years, HUD requires that our local CoC rate and rank each renewal project application as part of submitting the applications to HUD. In Guidance Document #1, we described the NOFA process, including HUD's requirements regarding Tier 1 / Tier 2 categories. As in prior years, our local renewal project rating and ranking *does not* affect whether your project is eligible to apply for funds, nor does it affect the total funding amount for which you may apply.

Regardless, we do want the annual rating and ranking process to be meaningful both at a project- and a system-level as we review project performance and opportunities for greater effectiveness in delivering HUD-funded services. To that end, CoC staff and a designated task force of non-conflicted Home for Everyone (HFE) Coordinating Board members who will review information that CoC staff will collect for each project to objectively score each on an 80-point scale. Scoring criteria are described in Attachment 1 of this document. Projects will be ranked in the final CoC application based on their respective scores. Again, our local renewal project ranking *does not* affect whether your project is eligible to apply for funds, nor does it affect the total funding amount for which you may apply.

The HFE Coordinating Board CoC task force will complete rating and ranking of all renewal projects on Monday, October 6, 2014. The task force will separately recommend to the HFE Coordinating Board which project should be placed in Tier 1 and Tier 2 of the CoC application to HUD. The HFE Coordinating Board will approve final rating and ranking and tier placement of all projects at its October 8, 2014, meeting.

We also acknowledge that this year's ranking methodology – like all ranking methods – is imperfect. Because this year's rating and ranking will not affect renewal project eligibility or budgets, we are hoping to again use this year's process as a learning year to test out potential rating and ranking methods for future years. We welcome your feedback and plan to reach out to providers, through the HFE Coordinating Board, in the coming months to discuss how we might improve rating and ranking in future years, especially for those items listed as "unable to score in 2014."

**What additional information does our project need to submit to complete rating and ranking?** This year, we have attempted to simplify the rating and ranking process for renewal projects by pulling most of the data for rating and ranking directly from HMIS, rather than by having projects separately submit the data separately. All of the information by which your project will be scored comes from the following items:

- Your project's most recent APR\*. You do not need to submit this to PHB. PHB will pull this report from HMIS, based on your most recent completed grant year. For projects serving victims of domestic violence, PHB will pull data from HMIS and from the comparable database. If you believe that data PHB will pull from HMIS may differ significantly from that which you submitted to HUD, contact Shannon Singleton ([shannon.singleton@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:shannon.singleton@portlandoregon.gov)) immediately to discuss further.
- **By no later than 5PM on Friday, October 3, 2014, submit via email to [shannon.singleton@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:shannon.singleton@portlandoregon.gov):**
  - Complete Attachment 2\*\*: Evidence Based and Promising Practices List for CoC Rating and Ranking 2014
  - **If your project does not fall under the referenced practices**, submit the evidence base for your program practice.

\*If your project's initial start date was after to July 1, 2013, the project is new enough that it would not have been required to submit an APR during the period described above. If that's the case, PHB may be unable to pull a complete APR for your project, and the project will be automatically ranked at the median score. Please still complete an Attachment 2 for each project.

\*\*If your agency has multiple renewal projects, you must separately submit response to Attachment 2 for each project.

**How can I appeal the CoC's rating and ranking decisions if I believe that they are incorrect?** The HFE Coordinating Board will review and approve final rating and ranking of renewal project applications at its October 8, 2014, meeting. If you believe that the factual basis upon which the HFE Coordinating Board's 2014 CoC Task Force made its rating and ranking decision is incorrect, you must contact Shannon Singleton by email ([shannon.singleton@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:shannon.singleton@portlandoregon.gov)) no later than 5:00 PM on Friday, October 10, 2014, to file an appeal. The appeal must state which specific factors related to the rating and ranking of your project were factually incorrect (e.g. incorrect APR data were pulled from HMIS), provide comparable alternate information that you believe to be factually correct, and provide documentation supporting the appeal. The HFE Coordinating Board's 2014 CoC Task Force will review any such appeals and will solely determine whether the appeals have merit. If the Task Force finds that any appeal has merit, it will adjust final rankings accordingly. The CoC Task Force will notify all renewal project applicants of final rating and rankings no later than October 20, 2014.

**Attachment 1**

**OR-501 Continuum of Care 2014 Rating/Ranking Criteria for Renewals**

Score Total = 80	Category	Field	Assessment	Data Source	Scoring Narrative
30	AHFE Priorities	Population served	vets, adults with disabilities, families with children, women, or female survivors of domestic violence	PDR	18 points for 100% priority populations. Deduct 3 points for every 10% non-disabled males served (e.g. 20% non-disabled males = -6 points (total 12 points)).
		Equity	Equitable access assessment: Does project serve populations of color equal to or greater than their respective percentage of people experiencing homelessness in Multnomah County? (Comparison source: 2013 PIT Count)	PDR	3 points for each of the following populations: African American, Latino, Native American, Asian & Pacific Islander; 12 points to culturally specific providers
		Vulnerability	UNABLE TO ASSESS FOR 2014 RATING/RANKING	UNABLE TO ASSESS FOR 2014 RATING/RANKING	UNABLE TO ASSESS FOR 2014 RATING/RANKING
20	Outcomes	Housing Placement / Retention	PH: % households retaining permanent housing placement at end of operating year or exiting to other permanent destination	APR (Q29, Q27)	5 points for achieved HUD objective (80%) Up to 5 points based on quintile ranking
			TH: % households exiting to permanent destination	APR (Q29)	5 points for achieved HUD objective (80%) Up to 5 points based on quintile ranking
		Income / Benefits	% of adult participants who increased income from employment between program entry and exit	APR (Q23-24)	2 pts. for achieved HUD goal (20%) Up to 2 points based on quintile ranking
			% of adult participants who increased income from sources other than employment between program entry and exit	APR (Q23-24)	2 pts. for achieved HUD goal ( <del>54%</del> 20%) Up to 2 points based on quintile ranking
			% of adult participants who obtained non-cash mainstream benefits from entry date to program exit	APR (Q25-26)	Up to 2 points based on quintile ranking
		20	Service Delivery Model	Evidence Based Practice	Does the program model fit with the current evidence base for the population served?
Locally Successful Model	UNABLE TO ASSESS FOR 2014 RATING/RANKING			UNABLE TO ASSESS FOR 2014 RATING/RANKING	UNABLE TO ASSESS FOR 2014 RATING/RANKING
5	HMIS	Data Completeness		APR (Q7)	Up to 5 points for < 5% Missing Data decrease with each 5% missing data
5	Financial	Unspent Funds	Percentage of HUD funds spent	HUD expenditure reports	100% = X pts.; 90-99% = X pts.; <90% = 0 pts.