

## 2017 CoC Review, Score and Ranking Procedures

Date CoC Application Opened: July 14, 2017  
 CoC Application Due Date to HUD: September 28, 2017  
 Columbus/Franklin County Annual Renewal Demand (ARD): \$11,516,849 (\$10,977,268 with NCR Commons at 161 removal as a renewal)

### 2017 HUD Funding Available (may change based on HUD clarifications)

Tier 1	(94% of ARD)	\$10,825,838 (\$10,318,632)
Tier 2	(6% of ARD plus bonus funding)	\$1,382,022 (\$1,317,272)
Permanent Housing Bonus	(6% of ARD, included in Tier 2):	\$691,011 (\$658,636)
CoC Planning Funding	(not ranked)	\$345,505 (\$329,318)
UFA Funding	(not ranked)	\$230,337 (\$219,545)

The Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative awards the highest priority to PSH, RRH and TH programs serving youth. The following **Priority Guideline** will be used (both Tier 1 and 2):

1. Renewal PSH, RRH, and TH for youth
2. New PSH through reallocation or bonus for 100% CH
3. New RRH through reallocation
4. SSO for CPOA
5. Renewal HMIS
6. All other SSO or other project types

### Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative Scoring Process

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

Renewal projects	Points Available	Description
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Priority – New or reallocated projects renewing for the first time</b>		
Program Evaluation ranking		HUD emphasizes performance of funded programs. The latest program evaluation available (FY2017) ranks each project based on its performance for the period 7/1/2016 – 12/31/2016. Program Evaluation rankings are determined by measuring outputs and outcomes inclusive of Households Served, Successful Housing Outcomes, Housing Stability, Occupancy, Recidivism, Change in Income and annual Program Review and Certification to confirm compliance with HUD and local regulations. Participant Eligibility 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	9	
Medium	5	
Low/Not rated	1	

Usage of HUD grant funds		HUD emphasizes effective utilization of funds. Programs will be scored based on the total grant amount and the amount that was drawn down from HUD for the most recent closed grant cycle (6/30/2017).
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	

## Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative Ranking process

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

Below are listed the general raking 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 (unless HUD prioritization trumps this option).
- < The Priority Guideline, any HUD prioritization criteria and, all else equal, the funding impact on the entire continuum of care 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 continuum of care 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, continuum of care 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, continuum of care 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 FY17 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, continuum of care level funding amount (less funding is risked) will be moved last.

Option 4 (program priority based) – WILL NOT BE USED IN 2017

- < 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 two bullets.
- < Identify lower priority projects, based on any HUD guidance, and remove from Tier 1.
- < 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, continuum of care level funding amount (less funding is risked) will be moved to the first ranking(s) in Tier 2.
- < The identified Tier 2 projects, lower priority, will be moved in Tier 2
  - o Transitional housing projects, (non-youth serving) are listed in Tier 2 in order of scoring
  - o Other projects are listed in Tier 2 in the order of HUD's prioritization

Option 5 (spread the cuts across all programs) – WILL NOT BE USED IN 2017

- < 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 IN 2017

- < 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.

## Program Performance Measurement

Program performance outcome goals are compared with actual performance to determine consistency with CSB, RLFC 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](http://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 rating<sup>1</sup> 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 RLFC 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 RLFC Board decision is being appealed, to the RLFC before a final decision is made by the RLFC.

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

---

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

<sup>2</sup> 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.

## FY2018 Program Performance Standards<sup>3</sup> (in alpha order)

Based on CSB Governance Ends Policies, HUD standards, Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative - RLFC (CoC) local standards and best practices program performance.

Bolded measurements denote CSB Board established Ends Policies.

### Homelessness Prevention

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.
Access to resources and services to maintain and stabilize housing	Successful housing outcomes (%)	At least 90% will maintain or obtain housing.
	Successful housing outcomes (#)	Calculated based on the Successful housing outcomes % measurement.
	Housing Affordability at Exit (%) (Stable Families 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%.
	Financial Stability at Exit (Stable Families programs only)	At least 40% of households that exit the program achieve financial stability.
	If applicable, usage of CSB Direct Client Assistance (\$)	Average DCA will be consistent with program design.
	If applicable, usage of CSB Direct Client Assistance (%)	% of households that receive CSB DCA will be consistent with prior performance and/or program design.
Not enter the emergency shelter system	Recidivism (%)	≤5% of those who have successful housing outcomes will enter shelter within 365 days of program exit.
Efficient and effective use of a pool of community resources	Cost per household	Cost per household will be consistent with budget. Evaluated semi-annually and presented to the RLFC.
	Pass program certification	Provide access to and coordination with community resources and services to prevent homelessness.

<sup>3</sup> Additional system performance measures will be calculated based on HUD guidance.

	Average length of participation	Based on program design, an average of 180 days for Stable Families Gladden program program and 365 days for Stable Families LSS program.
--	---------------------------------	---

### Emergency Shelter – Coordinated Point of Access

Ends	Measurement	Annual Metrics
Efficient number of households served	<b>Households served (#)</b>	Set based on system demand.
Access to resources to address immediate housing need	<b>Successful diversion outcome (%)</b>	At least 25% of single adults and 40% of families contacting the central point of access will be diverted to other community resources.
	Pass program certification	Provide access to and coordination with community resources and services to prevent homelessness.
	Shelter Linkage (%)	At least 95% of those referred for intake into an emergency shelter will enter shelter.
Not re-enter the emergency shelter system	Diversion Recidivism (%)	<10% of those diverted will enter shelter within 30 days of diversion.
Efficient and effective use of a pool of community resources	Pass program certification	Provide access to resources and services to end homelessness.
	Cost per household	Cost per household will be consistent with budget. Evaluated semi-annually and presented to the RLFC.

### Emergency Shelter

Ends	Measurement	Annual Metrics
Efficient number of households served	<b>Households served (#)</b>	Set based on prior year(s) attainment, fair share of system demand, facility capacity, and funds available to program.
	<b>Occupancy rate (%)</b>	Set at 100% to ensure efficient use of available capacity. Measured for adult Tier 2 <sup>4</sup> shelters only.

<sup>4</sup> Tier 2 shelters include LSS Faith Mission shelters, Southeast Friends of the Homeless and VOAGO Men's shelters, YMCA Women's shelter and Maryhaven Shelter2Housing shelter. Overflow and triage homeless shelters are not included.

Access to resources to address immediate housing need	Successful housing outcomes (%)	Obtain housing at standard below or greater if prior year(s) achievement was greater: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 33% for adult Tier 2 shelters</li> <li>• At least 70% for family shelters.</li> </ul>
	Successful housing outcomes (#)	Calculated based on the Successful housing outcomes % measurement.
	Successful outcomes (%) (Triage and Safety shelters only)	The percent of distinct clients who exit from the Triage shelter to Tier 2 shelters or other successful destinations, at least 60%. (Monitored only.)  The percent of distinct clients who exit from the Maryhaven Safety shelter to adult Tier 2 shelters or other successful destinations, at least 30%.
	Successful outcomes (#) (Safety shelter only)	Calculated based on the Successful outcomes % measurement.
	Usage of CSB Direct Client Assistance (%) (family shelters only)	% of households that receive CSB DCA will be consistent with prior performance and/or program design.
	Usage of CSB Direct Client Assistance (#) (family shelters only)	# of households that receive CSB DCA will be consistent with prior performance and/or program design.
Basic needs met in secure, decent environment	Pass program certification	Provide secure, decent shelter.
Temporary, short-term stay	Average length of stay	Not to exceed standard below or average for prior year(s) if less than standard below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 days for adult Triage shelters</li> <li>• 30 days for adult Tier 2 shelters</li> <li>• 20 days for family shelters</li> <li>• 12 days for Safety shelter.</li> </ul>
	Average Engagement Time (family shelters and adult Tier 2 shelters)	Not to exceed standard based on the policies and procedures (less or equal to 7 days)
Not re-enter the emergency shelter system	Recidivism	<u>&lt;10%</u> of those who obtain housing will return to homelessness within 180 days of exit. Not applicable to Overflow shelters.
	Movement (%) (Adult Tier 2 shelters only)	<15% of those who exit the Tier 2 emergency shelter will immediately re-enter another Tier 2 shelter. (Monitored only.)
	Detox exits (Safety shelter only)	At least 10% of Safety shelter exits will enter a detoxification program.

Efficient and effective use of a pool of community resources	Cost per household	Cost per household will be consistent with budget. Evaluated semi-annually and presented to the RLFC.
	Pass program certification	Provide access to resources and services to end homelessness.

### Outreach Programs

Ends	Measurement	Annual Metrics
Efficient number of households served	Households served (#)	Set based on prior year(s) attainment and funds available.
	New households served (#)	Set based on prior year attainment and funds available.
Access to resources to address immediate housing need	Usage of CSB Direct Client Assistance (%)	At least 25% will receive CSB DCA.
Basic human needs met in secure, decent environment	Successful outcomes (%)	At least 75% successful housing/shelter outcomes.
	Successful outcomes (#)	Calculated based on the Successful outcomes % measurement.
	Successful housing outcomes (%)	At least 55% of successful outcomes obtain housing.
	Successful housing outcomes (#)	Calculated based on the Successful housing outcomes % measurement.
	Exited Households to PSH (#)	Set based on anticipated vacancies and prior year(s) attainment.
Do not re-enter the emergency shelter system	Recidivism (%)	<u>≤10%</u> of those who obtain housing will return to homelessness within 180 days.
Efficient and effective use of a pool of community resources	Cost per household	Cost per household will be consistent with budget. Evaluated semi-annually and presented to the RLFC.
	Pass program certification	Provide access to resources and services to address immediate housing or shelter needs.



## 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"> <li>At least 12 months for PSH (goal to be set not to exceed 24 months, actual attainment may be greater than goal)</li> <li>Up to 4 months for TH</li> </ul>
	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 (%)	<u>&lt;10%</u> 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 semi-annually and presented to the RLFC.
	Cost per unit	Cost per unit will be consistent with budget. Evaluated semi-annually and presented to the RLFC.
	Program Occupancy Rate (%)	Full occupancy (>95%). For rental assistance units the occupancy goal is 100%.
	<b>Turnover Rate (%)</b> (PSH only)	Set based on prior year(s) attainment, an annual 20% turnover rate is desirable. (Monitored only.)
	<b>Pass program certification</b>	Provide access to resources and

Ends	Measurement	Annual Metrics
		services to end homelessness.
RLFC or HUD Standards	<b>Negative Reason for leaving (%)</b>	Less than 20% leave for non-compliance or disagreement with rules
	<b>Increase in cash income, other than employment, from entry to exit or end of reporting period (%)</b>	At least 30% of adults will increase income from other sources than employment from entry to exit or end of reporting period.
	<b>Increase in income from employment, from entry to exit or end of reporting period (%)</b>	At least 15% of adults will have increased employment income from entry to exit or end of reporting period.

### Direct Housing/Rapid Re-housing/Navigator 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"> <li>• 100 days for all family programs except J2H</li> <li>• 90 days for the navigator program</li> <li>• 180 days for J2H</li> </ul>
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 Engagement Time (Navigator Program only)	Average stay in emergency shelter not to exceed 7 days from the date of shelter entry to Navigator engagement.
	Average length of shelter stay	Average stay at Emergency Shelter not to exceed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 days for families</li> <li>• 23 days for single adults</li> </ul> (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

Ends	Measurement	Annual Metrics
		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 50% for single adults exiting the Navigator Program.  At least 33% successful housing outcomes for single adults exiting Tier 2 emergency shelter (Navigator 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 (%) (Navigator Program only)	<15% of clients served who exit the emergency shelter will immediately re-enter another shelter. (Monitored only)
	Average Number of Service Instances (Navigator 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 semi-annually and presented to the RLFC.
	<b>Pass program certification</b>	Provide resources and services to end homelessness.

## Transition Program Direct Client Assistance

Ends	Measurement	Annual Metrics
Efficient number of households served	Households served (#)	Set based on prior year(s) attainment and funds available to program.
Access to resources/services to move to and stabilize housing	Usage of CSB Direct Client Assistance (%)	At least 95% will receive financial assistance
	Usage of CSB Direct Client assistance (\$)	Average DCA amount will be consistent with prior performance, funds available and /or program design.
Basic needs met in a non-congregate environment	Successful housing outcomes (%)	At least 98% successful housing outcomes.
	Successful housing outcomes (#)	Calculated based on the Successful housing outcomes % measurement.
Not re-enter the emergency shelter system	Recidivism (%)	<u>≤10%</u> 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 semi-annually and presented to the RLFC.
	<b>Pass program certification</b>	Provide access to resources and services to end homelessness.

As directed by the RLFC, this document was created by CSB, the CoC Lead.

Last reviewed and approved by the continuum of care on 11/08/16.