

**Columbus and Franklin County Continuum of Care (OH-503)
2019 CoC Review, Score, and Ranking Procedures**

Date CoC Competition Opened:	7/3/19
Date e-snaps Opened:	7/9/19
Date CoC Application due to HUD:	9/30/19
Columbus/Franklin County Annual Renewal Demand (ARD):	\$13,179,482

I. 2019 HUD Funding Available

Tier 1	\$12,444,838
Tier 2 (including Bonus Funding)	\$1,393,619
Bonus Funding	\$658,974
DV Bonus Funding	\$659,772
CoC Planning Funding	\$395,384
UFA Funding	\$395,384

II. Priority Guideline

The following **Priority Guideline** will be used, while also applying the scoring process detailed below:

Tier 1:

1. New or reallocated projects renewing for the first time
2. Renewal PSH, RRH, and TH for youth
3. New PSH through reallocation or bonus for 100% CH
4. New RRH through reallocation or bonus
5. SSO for CPOA
6. Renewal HMIS

Tier 2:

1. Renewal PSH, RRH, and TH for youth
2. New PSH through reallocation or bonus for 100% CH
3. New RRH through reallocation or bonus
4. SSO for CPOA

III. Columbus and Franklin County CoC Scoring Process

Each of the projects renewing CoC funding will be awarded a score using the scoring process below:

Renewal projects	Points Available	Description
Program Evaluation ranking		HUD emphasizes performance of funded programs. The latest program evaluation available (FY2019) evaluates each project based on its performance for the period 7/1/2018 – 12/31/2018. Program Evaluation rankings are determined by measuring outputs and outcomes inclusive of Households Served, Successful Housing Outcomes based on destination at exit, Housing Stability, Occupancy, Recidivism, Change in Income and annual Program Review and Certification to confirm compliance with HUD and local regulations. Participant Eligibility for permanent supportive housing is ensured and enforced via the Unified Supportive Housing System and, therefore, is not incorporated into the Program Evaluation. The Program Performance Measurement and Program Performance Standards sections of this document detail the performance ranking.
High (meets 75% or more of measured outcomes and outputs)	9	
Medium (meets at least 50% but less than 75% of measured outcomes and outputs)	5	
Low/Not rated (meets less than 50% of measured outcomes and outputs)	1	
Usage of HUD grant funds		HUD emphasizes effective utilization of funds. Programs are scored based on the total grant amount and the amount that was drawn down from HUD for the most recent closed grant cycle (6/30/2019).
100% funds used	10	
80-99% funds used	8	
60-79% funds used	5	
40-59% funds used	2	
0-39% funds used	0	
Maximum possible points	19	
Minimum possible points	1	

IV. Columbus and Franklin County CoC Program Evaluation Elements

Each of the projects renewing their CoC funding will have their performance evaluated considering the metrics below, distinct based on the project type.

Supportive Housing

PSH – Permanent Supportive Housing; TH = Transitional Housing;

Ends	Measurement	Annual Metrics
Efficient number of households served	Households served (#)	Set based on prior year(s) attainment and program capacity.
Access to resources/services to move to and stabilize housing	Housing Stability	At least standard below or greater if prior year(s) achievement was greater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 12 months for PSH (goal to be set not to exceed 24 months,

Ends	Measurement	Annual Metrics
		actual attainment may be greater than goal) • Up to 4 months for TH
	Housing Affordability at Exit (%) (PSH only)	At least 50% of successful households have their housing affordability ratio, measured as cost of housing (rent and utilities) divided by the household's income at exit, lower than 50%. (Monitored only.)
Basic needs met in a non-congregate environment	Successful housing outcomes (%)	At least 90% successful housing outcomes for PSH and 77% successful housing outcomes for TH.
	Successful housing outcomes (#)	Calculated based on the Successful housing outcomes % measurement.
	Successful housing exits (%) (PSH only)	At least 50% of exits are successful housing outcomes.
Not re-enter the emergency shelter system	Exit to Homelessness (%)	<10% of those who obtain housing will return to homelessness within 180 days of exit.
Efficient and effective use of a pool of community resources	Cost per household	Cost per household will be consistent with budget. Evaluated annually and presented to the COC.
	Cost per unit	Cost per unit will be consistent with budget. Evaluated annually and presented to the COC.
	Program Occupancy Rate (%)	Full occupancy (>95%). For rental assistance units the occupancy goal is 100%.
	Turnover Rate (%) (PSH only)	Set based on prior year(s) attainment, an annual 20% turnover rate is desirable. (Monitored only.)
	Pass program certification	Provide access to resources and services to end homelessness.
CoC or HUD Standards	Negative Reason for leaving (%)	Less than 20% leave for non-compliance or disagreement with rules
	Increase in cash income, other than employment, from entry to exit or end of reporting period (%)	At least 30% of adults will increase income from other sources than employment from entry to exit or end of reporting period.
	Increase in income from employment, from entry to exit or end of reporting	At least 15% of adults will have increased employment income from

Ends	Measurement	Annual Metrics
	period (%)	entry to exit or end of reporting period.

Rapid Re-housing Program

Ends	Measurement	Annual Metrics
Efficient number of households served	Households served (#)	Set based on program capacity, prior year(s) attainment and funds available.
	New households served (#)	Set based on program capacity, prior year(s) attainment and funds available.
	Average length of participation	Not to exceed standard below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100 days for all family programs except J2H • 90 days for the single adult RRH program • 180 days for J2H
Access to resources/services to move to and stabilize housing	Usage of CSB Direct Client assistance (\$)	Average DCA amount will be consistent with prior performance and/or program design.
	Usage of CSB Direct Client Assistance (%)	% of households that receive CSB DCA will be consistent with prior performance and/or program design.
	Average length of shelter stay	Average stay in Emergency Shelter not to exceed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 days for families • 23 days for single adults (calculated from the date of program entry to shelter exit).
	Housing Affordability at Exit (%) (Family programs only)	At least 50% of successful households have their housing affordability ratio, measured as cost of housing (rent and utilities) divided by the household's income at exit, lower than 50%.
	Increase in cash income, other than employment, from entry to exit or end of reporting period (%) (J2H only)	At least 30% of adults will increase income from other sources than employment from entry to exit or end of reporting period.
	Increase in income from employment, from entry to exit or end of reporting period (%) (J2H only)	At least 15% of adults will have increased employment income from entry to exit or end of reporting period.
Basic needs met in a non-congregate environment	Successful housing outcome (%)	At least 90% successful housing outcomes for families and 70% for single adults exiting the RRH Program.

Ends	Measurement	Annual Metrics
		At least 33% successful housing outcomes for single adults exiting Tier 2 emergency shelters (RRH single adult program only).
	Successful housing outcome (#)	Calculated based on the Successful housing outcomes % measurement.
Not re-enter the emergency shelter system	Recidivism (%)	<10% of those who obtain housing will return to homelessness within 180 days of program exit.
	Movement (%) (RRH single adult program only)	<15% of clients served who exit the emergency shelter will immediately re-enter another shelter. (Monitored only)
	Average Number of Service Instances (RRH single adult program only)	Average number of shelter stays per distinct clients served within 12 months. Not to exceed 2.3.
Efficient and effective use of a pool of community resources	Cost per household	Cost per household will be consistent with budget. Evaluated annually and presented to the CoC.
	Pass program certification	Provide resources and services to end homelessness.

V. Columbus and Franklin County CoC Ranking process

The CoC Board and CoC will review a number of ranking options each year, detailed below. The CoC will analyze each option and discuss which option fits better for the CoC with each CoC application cycle. The CoC will review the option proposed by the CoC Board and will give final approval.

Below are listed the general ranking guidelines.

- < Under Tier 1 ranking, first time renewal projects (new or reallocated) will be ranked first.
- < Projects will be ranked in descending order, based on the accumulated total points and ranking options.
- < If two or more projects receive the same number of points, the ranking will be randomized by project.
- < Under Tier 1 ranking, the HMIS project will be ranked last.
- < The Priority Guideline, any HUD prioritization criteria and, all else equal, the funding impact on the entire CoC will govern the ranking positions in any options considered.

Special Projects

- < Projects serving families and youth

Option 1 (descending score based, renewals prioritized)

- < List all renewal projects (including first time renewals and HMIS project as detailed above) in the order of their scoring for Tier 1, up to Tier 1 amount or closest amount.

- < If there is a tie for the last ranked, renewal, non-special project in Tier 1, the tiebreaker is the amount of the grant. The program that has a grant amount that will have the least impact on the overall CoC level funding amount (less funding is risked) will be moved to the first ranking(s) in Tier 2.
- < All other projects are listed in Tier 2, in the order of the Priority Guidelines and their score.
- < List reallocation projects in Tier 2 (unless gap permits Tier 1).

Option 2 (descending score based, reallocation in Tier 1)

- < List all renewal projects (including first time renewals and HMIS project as detailed above) in the order of their scoring for Tier 1, up to Tier 1 amount or closest amount less the amount allocated for the next bullet.
- < Capture any reallocation project(s) in Tier 1, after the renewal projects.
- < If there is a tie for the last ranked, renewal, non-special project in Tier 1, the tiebreaker is the amount of the grant. The program that has a grant amount that will have the least impact on the overall, CoC level funding amount (less funding is risked) will be moved to the first ranking(s) in Tier 2.
- < All other projects are listed in Tier II, in the order of the Priority Guidelines and their score.

Option 3 (descending performance based, prioritize any reallocations)

- < List all renewal projects in the order of their performance (HIGH, MEDIUM, LOW) and Priority Guidelines, (including first time renewals and HMIS project as detailed above) in Tier 1, up to Tier 1 amount or closest amount less the amount allocated for the next bullet.
- < Capture the reallocation project(s) in Tier 1, after the renewal projects.
- < If there is a tie for the last ranked, renewal, non-special project in Tier 1, the tiebreaker is the amount of the grant. The program that has a grant amount that will have the least impact on the overall, CoC level funding amount (less funding is risked) will be moved to the first ranking(s) in Tier 2.
- < Projects rated as "LOW" performers based on the FY2019 Program Evaluation are listed in Tier 2 in the order of Priority Guidelines (renewal).
- < If the amount is not sufficient to meet the minimum amount of Tier 2 amount needed for Tier 2 ranking, renewal projects rated as "MEDIUM" will be listed in descending order of their score. If there is a tie for the last ranked, the tiebreaker is the amount of the grant. The program that has a grant amount that will have the least impact on the overall, CoC level funding amount (less funding is risked) will be moved last.

Option 4 (descending score based, new project in Tier 1)

- < List all renewal projects (including first time renewals and HMIS project as detailed above) in the order of their scoring for Tier 1, up to Tier 1 amount or closest amount less the amount allocated for the next bullet.
- < Capture one new project in Tier 1, after the renewal projects.
- < If there is a tie for the last ranked, renewal, non-special project in Tier 1, the tiebreaker is the amount of the grant. The program that has a grant amount that will have the least impact on the overall, CoC level funding amount (less funding is risked) will be moved to the first ranking(s) in Tier 2.
- < All other projects are listed in Tier II, in the order of the Priority Guidelines and their score.

Option 5 (spread the cuts across all programs) – WILL NOT BE USED FOR 2019

- < List all renewal projects (include first time renewals and HMIS project as detailed above) in the order of their scoring.
- < List reallocation project(s) in Tier 1, after all renewal projects.

- < Apply the HUD published funding decrease (amount at risk in Tier 2) to all renewal and reallocation projects, by decreasing funding across the board, by a calculated percentage.

Option 6 (spread the cuts across all programs that scored low) – WILL NOT BE USED FOR 2019

- < List all renewal projects (include first time renewals and HMIS project as detailed above) in the order of their scoring for Tier 1, up to Tier 1 amount or closest amount.
- < List reallocation project(s) in Tier 1, after all renewal projects.
- < Apply the HUD published funding decrease (amount at risk in Tier 2) to all renewal projects that scored below a certain level (10 points), by decreasing funding across these projects, by a calculated percentage.

VI. Program Performance Measurement

Program performance outcome goals are compared with actual performance to determine consistency with CSB, CoC, or HUD standards. For outcome definitions and methodologies, please see the Appendix of the Annual Program Evaluation or the Program Methodology document posted on www.csb.org.

Each performance goal is assessed as achieved (Yes), not achieved (No), or not applicable (N/A). *Achieved Goal* is defined as 90% or better of a numerical goal or within 5 percentage points of a percentage goal, except where a lesser or greater value than this variance also indicates an achieved goal (e.g. Average Length of Stay goal was met if actual achievement is 105% or less of goal). HUD performance goals do not allow for this variance, they are fixed goals. *Not Applicable* is assigned when a performance goal was not assigned; the reason for this is explained in the footnote for the respective program.

Each program is assigned a performance rating¹ of High, Medium, or Low as determined by overall program achievement of performance outcomes for the evaluation period. Ratings are based on the following:

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Achievement of Program Outcome Measure 2</i>
<i>High</i>	<i>achieve at least 75% of the measured outcomes and at least one of the successful housing outcomes (either number or percentage outcome)</i>
<i>Medium</i>	<i>achieve at least 50% but less than 75% of the measured outcomes</i>
<i>Low</i>	<i>achieve less than 50% of the measured outcomes</i>

Programs rated as “Low” or experiencing long-standing and/or serious program issues and/or systemic agency concerns will be handled by CSB through a Quality Improvement Intervention (QII) process. This process is based on quarterly one-on-one dialogues between CSB and the provider agency and considers agency plans and progress on addressing program issues. If the agency and/or CSB find that the QII process is not working, either may refer the concerns/issues to the CoC Board for handling (if the program is solely funded by HUD and not CSB). The provider will be given an opportunity to present its case, if the CoC Board decision is being appealed, to the CoC before a final decision is made by the CoC.

¹ In some instances, the program was too new to evaluate; therefore, a performance rating was not assigned.

² If serious and persistent program non-performance issues existed prior to evaluation, then the program was assigned a lower rating than what its program achievement of performance outcomes would otherwise warrant.

For interim (quarterly) reports, programs which meet less than one-half of measured outcome goals will be considered a “program of concern”.