

Clackamas County Continuum of Care

Project Ranking Criteria – 2016

Clackamas County Continuum of Care- FY2016 Ranking Process

During meetings, on April 12th and June 9th, 2016, the CoC Steering Committee (CoCSC) met to discuss the ranking and scoring criteria for the FY2016 CoC Application. A score card was created and sent to project staff to check over, fill in additional information, and send back completed. Data for these score cards uses the most **up-to-date past performance data** pulled from projects' most recently submitted APR or, for those projects who had an APR due but could not submit owing to Esnap's difficulties, from HMIS based on the most recent APR data that would have been submitted. The **score card** used, exemplifying **objective criteria used in review, ranking and selection** of projects is attached. The projects included in our FY2016 CoC Application were monitored, evaluated, reviewed, accepted, scored and ranked on August 11th, 2016 by the CoCSC. **Minutes of this and other CoCSC meetings are available to the public.**

Section 3 of the score card **considers the severity of needs experienced by program participants**. Bonus points were given to projects that serve participants with the most severe needs including Veterans and people who are Chronically Homeless.

There were a few projects that could not be evaluated or had outcomes that could not be compared with the other CoC projects. One project was not up and running by the time the score cards were made and two projects were new applications for the FY2016 process. Coordinated Housing Access and Homeless Management Information System could not be evaluated in a meaningful way to compare with the other projects because these projects don't remotely work in the same way as TH, RRH or PSH projects.

For those projects which could not be evaluated in the same way, the CoCSC discussed community priorities and made the following decisions:

1. Projects which are necessary for the success of the whole continuum need to be included in Tier 1, toward the bottom
2. Reallocated projects need to be included in Tier 1 to preserve the number of beds/units within the continuum
3. Projects newly funded in FY2015 should be placed as much as possible in Tier 1, and the rest at the top of Tier 2 because they are CoC priorities, but have not yet demonstrated success.
4. Bonus Projects were included at the bottom of Tier 2, as it will only be funded if all of our Tier 1 and Tier 2 programs are funded first.

Our CoC **monitors project performance** as part of the evaluation, review, scoring and ranking process. **Utilization rates, housing stability, destination upon program exit, increasing participant income, and connecting participants to benefits** are explicitly evaluated using the attached score card. **Participant eligibility and length of time homeless** were considered during this process to make sure we are serving the whole homeless community and to ensure that the CoC continues to move people out of homelessness and into permanent, stable housing as soon as possible.

Clackamas County Continuum of Care

Project Ranking Criteria – 2016

Project Name: _____

Date: _____

Assistance Type	Target Population	Number of Units (single site)/ Proposed Project Participation (scattered site)	Households Served	Amount of HUD CoC Contract/Award	Total Program Budget (including all cash funding sources)

Participant Demographics (pulled from APR):

Gender:	
Male	
Female	
Transgender	
Other	
Don't know/refused/missing	
Age:	
0-12	
13-17	
18-24	
25-61	
62+	
Don't/refused/missing	
Ethnicity:	
Hispanic/Latino	
Not Hispanic/Latino	
Don't know/Missing/Refused	

Race:	
White	
Black/African-American	
Asian	
American Indian/Alaska Native	
Native Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	
Multiple Races	
Don't know/refused/missing	
Domestic Violence Survivor:	
Yes	
No	
Don't know/refused/missing	

Clackamas County Continuum of Care

Project Ranking Criteria – 2016

1.	Project Narrative: Local Needs	Maximum points:9
-----------	---------------------------------------	------------------

1. *Please provide a brief narrative (no more than 1 page) describing how your program meets the four goals of the County’s Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness: preventing homelessness (or preventing returns to homelessness) (1 point), reducing the impacts of homelessness on children (1 point), contribute to a robust continuum of effective housing and services (1 point), and participating in strengthening the homeless services system (1 point). (1 point for quality of answers, 5 points total).*

2. *Please provide a brief narrative (no more than 1 page) describing how your program addresses equity. The CoC draft definition of equity is: **an on-going process of learning to acknowledge our biases, being flexible, and adapting services and policies to eliminate discrimination and disparities in the delivery of human services. The goal of equity is to provide opportunity and outcomes free from biases and favoritism for all program participants and staff.** Specifically: What are you doing to ensure equity, dignity and respect for all program participants? (1 point) What is your organization doing to increase its cultural competency (please consider the full range of characteristics that contribute to a person’s culture)? (1 point) (1 point for quality of answers, 3 points total)*

3. *Please provide a brief narrative (no more than 1 page) answering the following question: What innovative strategies are you using to meet the unique needs of homeless households in Clackamas County?(1 point)*

The following criteria are based on HUD Performance Measurements and local need. Data sources are APRs for each project’s most recent program year, Project Applications, Coordinated Housing Access, and Point-in-Time data.

2.	Project Performance Criteria	Maximum points:32
-----------	-------------------------------------	-------------------

The first section is based on HUD’s Performance Criteria, as articulated in the competition NOFA.

Criteria	Possible Points	Points Awarded
Compliance: Project <u>does not</u> currently have unresolved HUD audit findings or is in process of resolving.	1	

Clackamas County Continuum of Care

Project Ranking Criteria – 2016

<p>Drawdowns: Project spent all CoC funds in contract year. (from HUD) Less than 90%=0 points, 90-94%=1, 95-100%=2 If project is still in the initial contract period – 2 points</p>	2	
<p>Leverage: Committed to provide leverage of at least 150% of project CoC funds in 2015 renewal. Less than 100%=0 points, 100-150%=2, 150%+=4</p>	4	
<p>HMIS Data Quality: Had 0% null/missing on all HMIS data elements on APR Q7 question. More than 8%=0, 6-8%=1, 4-6%= 2, 2-4%= 3, more than 0-2%=4 , 0%=5 All individuals elements listed must be less than 5% null.</p>	5	
<p>Bed Utilization: Average Bed utilization was at least 95% (APR Q10). Less than 80%= 0, 80-85%=1, 86-90%=2, 90-94%=3, 95-99%=4, more than 99%=5 For RRH programs: Proposed project participation vs Households Served</p>	5	
<p>Mainstream Benefits: All programs: 85% or more program participants exiting with non-cash benefits (APR Q26A.2). Less than 55%=0, 56-65%=1, 66-75%=2, 76-84%=3, 85-95%=4, more than 95%=5</p>	5	
<p>Ending Homelessness: The PSH program met the local goal of at least 95% of clients remaining in permanent housing placement or exited to permanent housing. (APR Q36) Less than 80%=0, 80-84%=1, 85-89%=2, 90-94%=3, 95-99%=4, more than 99%=5 OR The TH program met the local goal of at least 95% of clients exiting to permanent housing (APR Q36). Less than 80%=0, 80-84%=1, 85-89%=2, 90-94%=3, 95-99%=4, more than 99%=5 OR The RRH program met the local goal of at least 80% of clients who exited the program to permanent housing, maintain permanent housing 6 months after program exit. Less than 58%=0, 58-64%=1, 65-71%=2, 72-79%=3, 80-86%=4, more than 86%=5</p>	5	
<p>Increased or Maintained Income: All homeless programs met the local goal of at least 75% of adult clients having increased <u>total income</u> at end of operating year or at exit (APR Q36). Less than 60%=0, 60-64%=1, 65-69%=2, 70-74%=3, 75-80%=4, more than 80%=5</p>	5	

Clackamas County Continuum of Care

Project Ranking Criteria – 2016

3. HUD Criteria Bonus Points	Maximum points: 5
-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The second section contains criteria based on needs identified in the County’s biennial Point-in-Time Count and the Coordinated Housing Access process.

- Project has dedicated Veteran Households beds (1 point) _____
- Project prioritizes Chronically Homeless people (1 point) _____
- Serving in expanded capacity as CHA door (1 point) _____
- Project has committed to using a Housing First model (1 point) _____
- Project reallocated funds during the last CoC Application (1 point) _____

Total Score (46 Max): _____