

City of Oklahoma City Continuum of Care (CoC) 2015 CoC Rating and Review Procedure

Background

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) released the Continuum of Care (CoC) FY2015 CoC Program Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) on September 18, 2015. The City of Oklahoma City Planning Department on behalf of the Oklahoma City CoC will submit a collaborative application to HUD for competition funds on or before November 20, 2015. One of the primary responsibilities of the CoC is to develop a new, renewal and reallocation process for selection and ranking criteria of projects for CoC Program funding.

Rating and Review Procedure for New and Renewal Project Applications

When considering new and renewal projects for award, City of Oklahoma City Planning Department staff will conduct a preliminary review of all applications to determine if the project meets the eligibility and threshold requirements as established by HUD. Planning Department staff will review project applications, documentation of 501(c)(3) status, program policies, Annual Performance Reports (APRs); monitoring reports, and A-133 audit reports as applicable.

All projects that meet eligibility and threshold requirements will be presented to members of the CoC Governing Board. In accordance with HUD regulations, no member may participate in or influence discussions or resulting decisions concerning the award of a grant or other financial benefit to the organizations that the member represents. The CoC Board members are knowledgeable about homelessness and housing in the area and are broadly representative of the relevant sectors and subpopulations.

The CoC will establish a time frame that allows for review and discussion about the applications, questions and clarification about applications with applicant agencies, scoring of the applications, and presenting project scoring and ranking recommendations. The CoC Board determines the rank and funding levels of all projects considering all of the information provided to them on the application, APRs, monitoring reports and through the applicant presentations. City of Oklahoma City Planning Department staff will provide technical assistance by responding to questions of the CoC Board and correcting technical inaccuracies if they arise in conversation. Each CoC Board member is responsible for calculating scores for each new and renewal project. The average score for the project is then used to determine the ranking. The CoC uses a two tiered ranking system. Tier 1 funding is equal to 85% of the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand and Tier 2 is for the remaining amount plus any funds available for bonus projects. All new projects will be scored in Tier 2. A project may straddle the Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding line. The CoC Board considers adjustments for CoC and HUD priorities. Scoring results are delivered to applicants electronically with a reminder about the appeal process if a project application is rejected. Applicants not selected by the CoC to be included in the CoC submission to HUD may appeal by submitting their e-snaps Solo Application directly to HUD no later than November 20, 2015, at 7:59:59pm. Once the scoring is finalized funding recommendations are made the Social Services Committee of the City Council for their approval. Once approved by the Social Services Committee funding recommendations are presented to the entire City Council for their approval.

Reallocation Process

Reallocation is the process by which a CoC shifts funds in whole or in part from existing CoC funded projects that are eligible for renewal to create one or more new projects. A reallocated project must be a new project that serves new participants and has either a rapid re-housing or permanent supportive housing program design. The CoC Board will use reallocation to make strategic improvement to the homelessness system by eliminating projects that are underperforming or are more appropriately funded from other sources. Reallocation decisions are based on a thorough analysis of the needs and gaps in housing and services in the community.

CoC Evaluation and Rating Tool

Agency: _____

Program: _____

Rating Factor	Maximum Points	Score	Percent
1. HEARTH and Opening Doors Objectives. The project articulates how it will advance the goals set forth in HEARTH and Opening Doors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce new entries into homelessness (5 Points) • Reduce length of time people are homeless (5 Points) • Reduce returns to homelessness (5 Points) • Increase participant income (5 Points) • Increase access to mainstream resources (5 Points) 	25		
2. Serves/will serve at least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chronically Homeless or Veterans (10 points) • Persons with disabilities (mental illness, substance abuse, HIV/AIDS, etc.) (5 points) • Families with children (5 points) • Transition Age Youth 18-24 (5 points) 	10		
3. The project provides or will provide critical services (housing, health, transportation)	10		
4. Project has a clear plan how it will ensure that all persons served meet HUD's definition of homelessness or at risk of homelessness.	5		
5. Project is able to articulate a clear unmet need in the community that this project will fill.	5		
6. Application clearly explains the agency's current and future contributions to Journey Home OKC.	10		
7. Current or formerly homeless person(s) are involved in the program design and on the Board of Directors	5		
8. The application clearly articulates how the agency collaborates with community partners.	10		
9. Proposed goals are measurable and meet HUD's national objectives.	10		
10. The budget shows that the agency is aware of and prepared to meet the HUD required match.	5		
11. The cost per client is reasonable based on the proposed services provided by the project.	5		
SUBTOTAL	100		
RENEWAL HOUSING PROJECTS ONLY			
12. HMIS omission rate less than 5% for the last 12 months.	15		
13. No findings from most recent monitoring visit.	15		
14. Results from pre-scored APR reporting	70		
TOTAL	200		

Pre-Scored APR Reporting Tool

Agency: _____

Program: _____

Rating Factor	Maximum Points	Score
PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING PROJECTS ONLY		
1. The % of persons who remained in the permanent housing program as reported on previous APRs submitted in esnaps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90-100% = 40 points • 80-89.9% = 34 points • 75-79.9% = 28 points • 70-74.9% = 12 points • < 69.9% = 0 points 	40	
2. The % of persons age 18 or older who maintained or increased their total income (from all sources) as reported on previous APRs submitted in esnaps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50-100% = 20 points • 20-49.9% = 16 points • 15-19.9% = 8 points • < 14.9% = 0 points 	20	
3. The % of persons age 18 through 61 who maintained or increased their earned income as reported on previous APRs submitted in esnaps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30-100% = 10 points • 9-19.9% = 6 points • 3-8.9% = 3 points • < 2.9% = 0 points 	10	
TRANSITIONAL HOUSING PROJECTS ONLY		
1. The % of persons who exited to permanent housing as reported on previous APRs submitted in esnaps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80-100% = 30 points • 70-79.9% = 24 points • 65-69.9% = 18 points • 52-64.9% = 12 points • < 51.9% = 0 points 	30	
2. The % of persons age 18 or older who maintained or increased their total income (from all sources) as reported on previous APRs submitted in esnaps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 56-100% = 20 points • 42-55.9% = 16 points • 30-41.9% = 12 points • 19-29.9% = 8 points • < 18.9% = 0 points 	20	
3. The % of persons age 18 through 61 who maintained or increased their earned income as reported on previous APRs submitted in esnaps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30-100% = 20 points • 20-29.9% = 16 points • 9-19.9% = 12 points • 3-8.9% = 3 points • < 2.9% = 0 points 	20	
TOTAL	70	

Note: When possible 3-year averages will be used for scoring. When not possible, a 2- year average will be used; if the project has only one year of data one year of data will be used.