

## Objective of the Prioritization & Evaluation Subcommittee

The purpose of this committee is objectively rank Cabell-Huntington Wayne's renewal and new (bonus, reallocation, and consolidation) projects applications for the regular consolidated CoC NOFO application.

## NOFO Project Ranking Information

**Project Ranking.** HUD requires that Project applications submitted to the Continuum of Care (CoC) for inclusion on the FY 2022 CoC Priority Listing, as part of the CoC Consolidated Application, must be reviewed and either accepted and ranked, approved, or rejected by the CoC. All project applications approved by the CoC must be listed on the CoC Priority Listing in rank order, except project applications for YHDP renewal or replacement, CoC planning and UFA Costs projects which are not ranked. Higher ranked projects will be assigned to Tier 1 and lower ranked projects will be assigned to Tier 2. The purpose of this two-tiered approach is for CoCs to notify HUD which projects are prioritized for funding based on local needs and gaps.

The Prioritization and Evaluation (P&E) subcommittee ranks all projects (excluding YHDP renewal or replacement, CoC planning, and UFA Costs projects) applying for funding in the CoC Consolidated Application. This is an ordered ranking of all renewal and new projects the CoC is submitting in the application for funding. The project ranking *must* reflect HUD funding priorities, local need, and a data-driven process for evaluating individual project performance.

Prior to the ranking process, the CoC completes a full performance evaluation of all renewal projects and determines whether to include each individual project in the ranking. The Steering Consultant provides data and pertinent project information to the subcommittee. This information is used during the ranking process. Utilizing this data, the subcommittee meets to rank all new and renewal project applications in order of priority and to identify any project applications rejected by the CoC. For more information about the tiers or HUD's ranking process, see Section II.B.11.a of the 2022 CoC NOFO.

## FY2022 Available Funds

The following describes the funds available to CHWCoC through the 2022 CoC NOFO. Tier 1 is equal to 95 percent of the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand. **Tier 1 is \$2,851,477.** Tier 2 is the difference between Tier 1 and the maximum amount of renewal, reallocation, and CoC Bonus funds that a CoC can apply for (does not include YHDP renewal or YHDP replacement projects, CoC planning, and UFA Costs projects selected with DV Bonus funds). **Tier 2 is \$300,156** (5 percent of ARD + available CoC Bonus \$150,078). Also available in this NOFO are Planning funds (\$90,047) and the DV Bonus (\$154,626). The total available through the FY22 Consolidated application is \$3,396,306.

## HUD's Policy Priorities

CHWCoC utilizes HUD's policy priorities when creating rating and ranking tools to support the goal of ending homelessness. Below are HUD's Policy Priorities listed in Section II of the 2022 CoC NOFO.

1. Ending homelessness for all persons.
2. Use a Housing First approach.
3. Reducing Unsheltered Homelessness.
4. Improving System Performance
5. Partnering with Housing, Health, and Service Agencies.
6. Racial Equity
7. Improving Assistance to LGBTQ+ Individuals
8. Persons with Lived Experience
9. Increasing Affordable Housing Supply

## CHWCoC's Project Ranking Process

**Renewal Project Scoring.** Renewal projects approved by the P&E subcommittee for inclusion in the CoC project ranking will be scored according to an objective scoring tool based on their individual project performance, alignment with HUD and CoC policy priorities, and compliance. Performance and HMIS elements are heavily weighted measures in determining the overall CoC score for project applications. Data used in the project scoring tool comes from the most recently submitted Annual Performance Report (APR) for each project and System Performance reports for the project's last completed grant year. See attached sample scoring tools.

First-time renewals are projects that have not yet completed their first operating year, and thus, cannot be scored for their performance due to not having a completed Annual Performance Report (APR), will be evaluated utilizing the project's year-to-date data to ensure that each project is on track for implementation and anticipated outcomes.

**New or Bonus Project Selection.** New project applicants will be assessed on the following: project design, how the project addresses local priority needs, how the project aligns with the CoC's Strategic Plan and HUD's priority to end homelessness, budget appropriateness and accuracy, project match, leveraging, CoC participation, community collaboration, organizational capacity, and implementation timeline. The organization's use of the Housing First philosophy and its impact on systemwide performance measures will also be assessed. There may be new projects that fail to score well enough to be included in the NOFO submission, or there may not be enough new project funding to fund all requests.

**Domestic Violence Projects.** Domestic Violence (DV) projects are ranked along with other projects of the same project type but are scored utilizing a separate scoring tool, which places emphasis on safety planning. For further details, see Renewal Project Scoring and New or Bonus Project Selection (above). All outcome data is gleaned from APR data that is pulled from an HMIS comparable data base and recorded on a spreadsheet with no personally identifiable information.

**Ranking Order.** New and renewal projects approved for inclusion in the CoC's project ranking will be ranked in the following order:

1. CoC infrastructure projects:
  - a. HMIS Renewal Projects
  - b. Coordinated Entry Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects
  - c. All other SSO projects
2. Safe Haven (SH) projects, ranked in order of highest to lowest percentage score
3. Renewal Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) and Rapid Rehousing (RRH) projects, ranked in order of highest to lowest percentage score
4. New projects approved for inclusion in ranking

**Tie Breakers.** Ties within the same project type will be broken in the following order:

1. Highest % of clients exiting to or retaining permanent housing.
2. Highest utilization rate
3. Largest grant amount

The P&E Committee may adjust individual project applications up or down in the ranking or reallocate funds to other projects to fulfill HUD priorities, prevent potential loss of funding, and maximize the overall CoC application score.

# Permanent Supportive Housing

## Ranking & Scoring Tool

Project Name \_\_\_\_\_

Grant ID \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Total Points Available: 115</b>	
<b>Points Awarded</b>	
<b>Bonus Points</b>	+
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	

Scoring Element	Max Points	Scoring Threshold	Awarded Points
<b>1. Permanent Housing Placements</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Reports The percentage of persons who remained in or exited to permanent housing destinations.	20	20 Points: 98-100% 15 Points: 96-97% 10 Points: 94-95% 0 Points: 93% or less	
<b>2. Unsheltered Homelessness</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of project participants who exited to the places not meant for human habitation.	15	15 Points: 0% 10 Points: 1-2% 5 Points: 3-4% 0 Points: 5% or higher	
<b>3. Utilization Rate</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report Average bed utilization on all PIT dates.	10	10 Points: 91% or more 5 Points: 80-90% 0 Points: 79% or less	
<b>4. Total Income</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Report The percentage of adults that maintained or increased total income (earned income or other income) by program exit.	10	10 Points: 75% or more 5 Points: 65-74% 3 Points: 55-64% 0 Points: 54% or less	
<b>5. Timely Submission of Annual Performance Report</b> Objective Source: SAGE Annual Performance Report submitted in SAGE on time. If the submission was rejected by HUD, report must be amended and resubmitted within 30 days.	10	10 Points: Yes 0 Points: No	
<b>6. Serving Those with Severe Service Barriers</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of clients served who are: experiencing unsheltered homelessness, living with substance use disorder or severe mental illness, are currently fleeing domestic violence, or are chronically homeless.	10	10 Points: 90% or more 5 Points: 89 - 50% 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>7. Housing First Approach</b> Objective Source: Housing First Subcommittee The extent to which the project follows a housing first approach: 1. Individuals are placed and stabilized in permanent housing without preconditions, and 2. Individuals never face requirements to participate in services as a condition to retain their housing.	10	10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>8. Grant Spending</b> Objective Source: eLOCCS The percentage of project funds spent during the last operating year.	10	10 Points: spent 100% 5 Points: spent 98-99% 3 Points: spent 96-97% 0 Points: spent 95% or less	
<b>9. Mainstream Benefits (Non-Cash)</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Report The percentage of households that maintained or increased non-cash benefits at program exit.	5	5 Points: 70% or more 3 Points: 60-69% 0 Points: 59% or less	
<b>Total Possible Points</b>		<b>100</b>	

<b>Application Score:</b>	
---------------------------	--

## Bonus Points Available

Scoring Element	Max Bonus	Scoring Threshold	Bonus Points
<b>1. Racial Equity</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project participants mirror the CoC's homeless population demographics.	5	5 Points: an equal or higher percentage of clients of color served 0 Points: a lower percentage of clients of color served	
<b>2. HMIS</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project: 1. Has satisfactory data quality, and 2. Has satisfactory data timeliness	10	10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>Total Possible Bonus</b>	<b>15</b>		

<b>Total Bonus Points:</b>	
----------------------------	--

## PSH Ranking Tool Information

	Points	Percentage of Total Available
<b>Maximum Points Available</b>	115	
<b>Objective Criteria:</b>		
<b>Max Points Available</b>	115	100%
<b>System Performance:</b>		
<b>Max Points Available</b>	35	30%
<b>Severe Service Barriers:</b>		
<b>Max Points Available</b>	10	

# Rapid Rehousing Housing

## Ranking & Scoring Tool

Project Name \_\_\_\_\_

Grant ID \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Total Points Available: 115</b>	
<b>Points Awarded</b>	
<b>+ Bonus Points</b>	
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	

Scoring Element	Max Points	Scoring Threshold	Awarded Points
<b>1. Permanent Housing Placements</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Reports The percentage of persons served who moved into positive housing.	20	20 Points: 75% or higher 15 Points: 70-74% 10 Points: 65-69% 0 Points: 64% or less	
<b>2. Length of Time to Move-In</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The average length of time for persons to move into housing.	15	15 Points: 30 days or less 10 Points: 31-40 days 5 Points: 41-50 days 0 Points: 51+ days	
<b>3. Unsheltered Homelessness</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of project participants who exited to places not meant for human habitation.	10	10 Points: 0% 5 Points: 1-4% 0 Points: 5% or higher	
<b>4. Total Income</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Report The percentage of adults that maintained or increased total income (earned income or other income) by program exit.	10	10 Points: 75% or more 5 Points: 65-74% 3 Points: 55-64% 0 Points: 54% or less	
<b>5. Timely Submission of Annual Performance Report</b> Objective Source: SAGE Annual Performance Report submitted in SAGE on time. If the submission was rejected by HUD, report must be amended and resubmitted within 30 days.	10	10 Points: Yes 0 Points: No	
<b>6. Serving Those with Severe Service Barriers</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of clients served who are: experiencing unsheltered homelessness, living with substance use disorder or severe mental illness, are currently fleeing domestic violence, or are chronically homeless.	10	10 Points: 90% or more 5 Points: 89-50% 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>7. Housing First Approach</b> Objective Source: Housing First Subcommittee The extent to which the project follows a housing first approach: 1. Individuals are placed and stabilized in permanent housing without preconditions, and 2. Individuals never face requirements to participate in services as a condition to retain their housing.	10	Does the project operate using the Housing First Approach? 10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>8. Grant Spending</b> Objective Source: eLOCCS The percentage of project funds spent during the last operating year.	10	10 Points: spent 100% 5 Points: spent 98-99% 3 Points: spent 96-97% 0 Points: spent 95% or less	
<b>9. Mainstream Benefits (Non-Cash)</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Report The percentage of households that maintained or increased non-cash benefits by program exit.	5	5 Points: 70% or more 3 Points: 60 – 69% 0 Points: 59% or less	
<b>Total Possible Points</b>		<b>100</b>	

<b>Application Score:</b>	
---------------------------	--

## Bonus Points Available

Scoring Element	Max Bonus	Scoring Threshold	Bonus Points
<b>1. Racial Equity</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project participants mirror the CoC's homeless population demographics.	5	5 Points: an equal or higher percentage of clients of color served 0 Points: a lower percentage of clients of color served	
<b>2. HMIS</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project: 1. Has satisfactory data quality, and 2. Has satisfactory data timeliness	10	10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>Total Possible Bonus</b>	<b>15</b>		

<b>Total Bonus Points:</b>	
----------------------------	--

## RRH Ranking Tool Information

	Points	Percentage of Total Available
<b>Maximum Points Available</b>	115	
<b>Objective Criteria:</b>		
<b>Max Points Available</b>	115	100%
<b>System Performance:</b>		
<b>Max Points Available</b>	35	30%
<b>Severe Service Barriers:</b>		
<b>Max Points Available</b>	10	

# Safe Haven

## Ranking & Scoring Tool

Project Name \_\_\_\_\_

Grant ID \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Total Points Available: 115</b>	
<b>Points Awarded</b>	
<b>+ Bonus Points</b>	
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	

Scoring Element	Max Points	Scoring Threshold	Awarded Points
<b>1. Permanent Housing Placements</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Reports The percentage of persons who exited to positive housing destinations.	20	20 Points: 75% or higher 15 Points: 70-74% 10 Points: 65-69% 0 Points: 64% or less	
<b>2. Unsheltered Homelessness</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of project participants who exited to places not meant for human habitation.	10	10 Points: 0% 5 Points: 1-2% 3 Points: 3-4% 0 Points: 5% or higher	
<b>3. Utilization Rate</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report Average bed utilization on all PIT dates.	10	10 Points: 91% or more 5 Points: 80-90% 0 Points: 79% or less	
<b>4. Total Income</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Report The percentage of adults that maintained or increased total income (earned income or other income) by program exit.	10	10 Points: 75% or more 5 Points: 65-74% 3 Points: 55-64% 0 Points: 54% or less	
<b>5. Timely Submission of Annual Performance Report</b> Objective Source: SAGE Annual Performance Report submitted in SAGE on time. If the submission was rejected by HUD, report must be amended and resubmitted within 30 days.	10	10 Points: Yes 0 Points: No	
<b>6. Serving Those with Severe Service Barriers</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of clients served who are: experiencing unsheltered homelessness, living with substance use disorder or severe mental illness, are currently fleeing domestic violence, or are chronically homeless.	10	10 Points: 90% or more 5 Points: 89-50% 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>7. Length of Stay</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The average length of stay in the program.	10	10 Points – 180 days or less 0 Points – 181+ days	
<b>8. Housing First Approach</b> Objective Source: Housing First Subcommittee The extent to which the project follows a housing first approach: 1. Individuals are placed and stabilized in permanent housing without preconditions, and 2. Individuals never face requirements to participate in services as a condition to retain their housing.	10	10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>9. Grant Spending</b> Objective Source: eLOCCS The percentage of project funds spent during the last operating year.	10	10 Points: spent 100% 5 Points: spent 98-99% 3 Points: spent 96-97% 0 Points: spent 95% or less	
<b>Total Possible Points</b>		<b>100</b>	

<b>Application Score:</b>	
---------------------------	--

## Bonus Points Available

Scoring Element	Max Bonus	Scoring Threshold	Bonus Points
<b>1. Racial Equity</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project participants mirror the CoC's homeless population demographics.	5	5 Points: an equal or higher percentage of clients of color served 0 Points: a lower percentage of clients of color served	
<b>2. HMIS</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project: 1. Has satisfactory data quality, and 2. Has satisfactory data timeliness	10	10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>Total Possible Bonus</b>	<b>15</b>		

<b>Total Bonus Points:</b>	
----------------------------	--

## SH Ranking Tool Information

	Points	Percentage of Total Available
<b>Maximum Points Available</b>	115	
<b>Objective Criteria:</b>		
<b>Max Points Available</b>	115	100%
<b>System Performance:</b>		
<b>Max Points Available</b>	30	26%
<b>Severe Service Barriers:</b>		
<b>Max Points Available</b>	10	



# DV-Rapid Rehousing Housing

## Ranking & Scoring Tool

Project Name \_\_\_\_\_

Grant ID \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Total Points Available: 115</b>	
<b>Points Awarded</b>	
<b>+ Bonus Points</b>	
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	

Scoring Element	Max Points	Scoring Threshold	Awarded Points
<b>1. Permanent Housing Placements</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Reports The percentage of persons served who moved into positive housing.	20	20 Points: 75% or higher 15 Points: 70-74% 10 Points: 65-69% 0 Points: 64% or less	
<b>2. Length of Time to Move-In</b> Objective Source: APR Report The average length of time for persons to move into housing.	10	10 Points: 30 days or less 5 Points: 31-40 days 3 Points: 41-50 days 0 Points: 51+ days	
<b>3. Unsheltered Homelessness</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of project participants who exited to places not meant for human habitation.	10	10 Points: 0% 5 Points: 1-4% 0 Points: 5% or higher	
<b>4. Total Income</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Report The percentage of adults that maintained or increased total income (earned income or other income) by program exit.	10	10 Points: 75% or more 5 Points: 65-74% 3 Points: 55-64% 0 Points: 54% or less	
<b>5. Timely Submission of Annual Performance Report</b> Objective Source: SAGE Annual Performance Report submitted in SAGE on time. If the submission was rejected by HUD, report must be amended and resubmitted within 30 days.	10	10 Points: Yes 0 Points: No	
<b>6. Serving Those with Severe Service Barriers</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of clients served who are: experiencing unsheltered homelessness, living with substance use disorder or severe mental illness, are currently fleeing domestic violence, or are chronically homeless.	10	10 Points: 90% or more 5 Points: 89-50% 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>7. Housing First Approach</b> Objective Source: Housing First Subcommittee The extent to which the project follows a housing first approach: 1. Individuals are placed and stabilized in permanent housing without preconditions, and 2. Individuals never face requirements to participate in services as a condition to retain their housing.	10	10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>8. Grant Spending</b> Objective Source: eLOCCS The percentage of project funds spent during the last operating year.	10	10 Points: spent 100% 5 Points: spent 98-99% 3 Points: spent 96-97% 0 Points: spent 95% or less	
<b>9. Safety Planning</b> Objective Source: Osnum Data The percentage of clients that entered the project during the operating year who participated in safety planning.	10	10 Points: 99-100% 5 Points: 95-98% 0 Points: 94 or less	
<b>Total Possible Points</b>	<b>100</b>		

<b>Application Score:</b>	
---------------------------	--

## Bonus Points Available

Scoring Element	Max Bonus	Scoring Threshold	Bonus Points
<b>1. Racial Equity</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project participants mirror the CoC's homeless population demographics.	5	5 Points: an equal or higher percentage of clients of color served 0 Points: a lower percentage of clients of color served	
<b>2. HMIS</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project: 1. Has satisfactory data quality, and 2. Has satisfactory data timeliness	10	10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>Total Possible Bonus</b>	<b>15</b>		

<b>Total Bonus Points:</b>	
----------------------------	--

## DV-RRH Ranking Tool Information

	Points	Percentage of Total Available
<b>Maximum Points Available</b>	115	
<b>Objective Criteria:</b>		
<b>Max Points Available</b>	115	100%
<b>System Performance:</b>		
<b>Max Points Available</b>	30	26%
<b>Severe Service Barriers:</b>		
<b>Max Points Available</b>	10	