**2018-2019 Board of Director Project Scoring Tool**

Each COC-funded project will be ranked using the Milwaukee CoC Project Scoring Tool. The scoring criteria is based on performance – as reported through an HMIS APR and timely completion of COC goals. The maximum possible number of points a project can earn is 100.

Attached to this scoring sheet is a report prepared by the Institute for Community Alliances, with explanation of data points used in 2018-2019 scoring.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CoC Agency Name:** | |
| **Project Type:** | **Project Name:** |
| **Grant Award Amount:** | **Total Points Awarded: *pts. / 100*** |

# Where do the points come from? Total Points|Points Awarded

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part 1** | Timely Submission: APR and Intent to Apply, PIT Count Participation, & Meeting Attendance | 0 pts. | *0 pts.* | COC Compliance | Penalty Only |
| **Part 2** | Unit Utilization | 17 pts. | *pts.* | From Housing Inventory Chart average utilization report | 17% of total |
| **Part 3** | HUD Performance Measures: Housing Stability, Increased Earned Income, and Increased Total Income | 45 pts. | *pts.* | From HMIS APR and HMIS Entry/Exit Report | 45% of total |
| **Part 4** | Risk Adjustment: High Risk Pool Score | 21 pts. | *pts.* | HMIS Generated Report (10/1/2015 – 9/30/2016) | 21% of total |
| **Part 5** | Reoccurrence | 5 pts. | *pts.* | HMIS Generated Report (10/1/2015 – 9/30/2016) | 5% of total |
| **Part 6** | Program Administration: Data Completeness, Effective Use of Federal Funds, LOCCS Draw, Housing First | 12 pts. | *pts.* | From HMIS APR and HMIS Entry/Exit Report  From report requested from HUD regarding quarterly drawdown and expenditures | 12% of total |

# Point Breakdown:

*\*\*Part 1: Timely Submission - No points awarded. Penalty Points assessed.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **0 points** | **-2 points** |
| **a)** HMIS APR submitted on time | On time | *pts.* |
| **b)** Turned in Project Application for review on time | On time | *pts.* |
| **c)** Participated in Point in Time Count event or Planning Meetings | Participated | *pts.* |
| **d)** Attended 80% or more CoC Full Body and Provider Advisory Committee Meetings from July 1st 2017 to June 30th, 2018 | Attended | *pts.* |

*\*\*Part 2: Unit Utilization (17 points possible)*

# Exceptions:

1. Agencies voluntarily reallocating project(s) shall be exempt from scoring in the category of “Unit Utilization.”
2. New and first year renewals shall be exempt from scoring in the category of “Unit Utilization.”

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **17 points** | **12 points** | **7 points** | **0 points** | **Points Awarded:** |
| Unit Utilization | 93-100% | 85-92% | 77-84% | 76% or less  76% or less |  |

*\*\*Part 3: HUD Performance Measures (45 points possible)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **15 points** | **10 points** | **5 points** | **0 points** | **Points Awarded:** |
| **a)** HUD Goal: Housing Stability (PSH, RRH, S+C) | 97% or higher | 93-96% | 80-92% | Under 80% |  |
| **b)** HUD Goal: Increased Earned Income (Stayers and Leavers) | 9% or higher | 4-8% | 1-3% | Under 1% |  |
| **c)** HUD Goal: Increased Total Income (Stayers and Leavers) | 50% or higher | 28-49% | 15-27% | Under 15% |  |

*\*\*Part 4: Risk Adjustment (21 points possible)*

Three risk factors were selected for the model based on scholarship, supported by Wisconsin outcomes, and sufficiently documented in HMIS (primarily through Annual Performance Reports [APRs]). These include:

* + Coming from the streets (or a place not meant for human habitation), or Safe Haven
  + No Income at program entry
  + Multiple (3 or more) Disabilities

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **7 points** | **5 points** | **3 points** | **0 points** | **Points Awarded:** |
| **a)** Coming from the streets (or a place not meant for human habitation, or Safe Haven | 30% or higher | 22-29% | 15-21% | Under 15% |  |
| **b)** No income at program entry | 30% or higher | 22-29% | 15-21% | Under 15% |  |
| **c)** Multiple (3 or more) disabilities | 30% or higher | 22-29% | 15-21% | Under 15% |  |

*\*\*Part 5: Reoccurrence (5 points possible)*

**Note:** Reoccurrence is calculated based on the number of people that exit a COC funded housing program and return to an Emergency Shelter that uses HMIS within one year. Reoccurrence calculation is based off of 555 report in HMIS. Projects with no exits will be awarded 2.5 points.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **5 points** | **3 points** | **2 points** | **0 points** | **Points Awarded:** |
| Reoccurrence Rate | 0 – 10% | 11-16% | 17-25% | 25% + |  |

*\*\*Part 6: Program Administration (12 points possible)*

# Exceptions:

1. Agencies voluntarily reallocating project(s) shall be exempt from scoring in the category of “Effective Use of Federal Funds”.
2. New and first year renewals shall be exempt from scoring in the category of “Effective Use of Federal Funds”.

If an agency cannot access LOCCS due to contractual issues with HUD, the agency is responsible to provide evidence of this situation to the Milwaukee Continuum of Care. If sufficient proof is provided, the agency will be exempt from the category of “Effective Use of Federal Funds”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **4 points** | **2 points** | **1 points** | **0 points** | **Points Awarded:** |
| **a)** Effective Use of Federal Funds | Spent 90-  100% of grant | Spent 80-  89% of grant | Spent 75-  79% | N/A |  |
| **b)** Data Completeness: Don’t Know, Missing, Refused | 0% - 1.0% | 1.1% - 2% | 2.1% - 3% | Greater than 3% |  |
| **d)** Housing First and Low Barrier | Yes | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |

# \*Overall Exceptions:

There are a few projects that have different maximum points possible, and therefore are exceptions to this general rule.

1. HMIS grant and IMPACT, Inc SSO grants will be placed at the bottom of the ranking of Tier 1 projects.
2. The following new projects awarded in 2017 will be placed in Tier 1. They are:

* Walker’s Point Youth and Family Services - RRH
* Milwaukee County Project Restore CH - PSH
* Milwaukee County Bonus Project -PSH
* Milwaukee County Housing First TBRA II – PSH (formerly SH)

# Tiebreaker:

Once the total number of points are calculated, the number of points earned will be divided by the total possible points for that project type. The resulting percentage will be placed in descending order, highest at top and lowest at bottom. If there is a tie between projects, a tiebreaker score will be used. The tiebreaker score will be based on cost effectiveness. The total HUD grant award amount will be divided by the number of successful outcomes (leaving to permanent housing).

*Example:* A program gets $100,000 grant. 25 households successfully went to permanent housing. The cost per successful outcome is: $4,000.

**Scoring criteria from HMIS reports (parts 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5, and 6b) are based on a linear range from the lowest scoring to highest scoring.**