**FY 2021 CoC Program Competition Board of Directors Project Scoring Tool**

Each COC-funded renewal project will be scored and ranked using the Milwaukee CoC Project Scoring Tool. The scoring criteria is based on performance – as reported through HMIS reports that affect the CoC’s annual system performance measures, information available in SAGE, information available in LOCCS, CoC participation, Housing First fidelity, service quality, information provided in the Intent to Apply, and timely completion of COC goals. New projects, first year renewals, and renewals applying for the first time in the CoC's competitive project scoring process are exempt from this evaluation tool. Mercy Housing Saint Catherine’s is exempt from using this tool due to the 2021 transfer of their CoC grant. The maximum possible number of points a project can earn is 88.

|  |
| --- |
| **CoC Agency Name:**  |
| **Project Type:**  | **Project Name:**  |
| **Grant Award Amount:**  | **Total Points Awarded: *pts. / 88 pts.*** |

#

#

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scoring Criteria | Total Points Available | Total Points Awarded | Where  |  |
| **Part 1** | Timely Submission: APR, Intent to Apply; PIT Count Participation, Meeting Attendance | 0 pts. |  *pts.* | COC Compliance | Penalty Only |
| **Part 2** | Unit Utilization  | 15 pts. |  *pts.* | From Housing Inventory Chart Average Utilization Report Submitted in annual CoC APR Report | 15% of total |
| **Part 3** | HUD Performance Measures: * Housing Stability (15 points)
* Increased Earned Income (5 points)
* Increased Total Income (5 points)
* Reoccurrence (5 points)
 | 30 pts. |  *pts.* | From HMIS Reports including APR, 0555, 0706, 0703 | 30% of total |
|  **Part 4** | Housing First* 3 points for submitting Pathways self-assessment by deadline with at least 3 staff
* 3 points for submitting Housing First policy by deadline, including requested content, and involving CoC project staff in creating the policy
 |  6 pts. |  *pts.* | Housing First self-assessment, Policy submission | 6% of total |
| **Part 5** | Risk Adjustment:-Coming from the Streets/Place Not Meant for Human Habitation, No Income, Disabling Conditions (HMIS)-Vulnerability Factors of Population to Be Served (Intent to Apply) |  14 pts. |  *pts.* | -HMIS-Generated Report (10/1/19 – 9/30/20) (12 pts.)-Intent to Apply Form Selection of Vulnerability Factors (2 pts.) | 14% of total |
| **Part 6** | Program Administration: Data Quality, Effective Use of Federal Funds, LOCCS Quarterly Draws |  23 pts. |  *pts.* | From ICA Monitoring Report, LOCCS Report Regarding Quarterly Drawdown and Expenditures | 23% of total |

# Point Breakdown:

*\*\*Part 1: CoC Compliance – No points awarded. Penalty Points assessed.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **0 points** | **Penalty points** |
| **a)** 2 most recent HMIS APRs submitted in SAGE on time, no later than 90 days after most recent operating year end date | On time |  *-2 pts. for each late submission* |
| **c)** Turned in Project Application (Intent to Apply) for review on time | On time |  *-5 pts.* |
| **d)** Participated in January 2020 and 2021 Point in Time Count events | Participated |  *-2 pts.* |
| **e)** Attended 80% or more CoC Provider Advisory Committee Meetings from January 1st 2020 – June 30th, 2021 | Attended |  *-2 pts.* |

*\*\*Part 2: Unit Utilization (15 total points possible)*

# Due to the noncompetitive nature of the previous FY 2020 CoC Program Competition and in the interest of flexible evaluations while the COVID-19 pandemic continues to affect the CoC, several CoC renewal projects have 2 complete operating years that have not been evaluated for unit utilization or spending of available CoC funding in priority ranking of Milwaukee CoC projects.

# Projects will be scored on the best outcome of the 2 most recently completed grant years in unit utilization and spending as recorded in the eLOCCS system.

# Exceptions:

Agencies voluntarily reallocating project(s) shall be exempt from scoring in the category of “Unit Utilization.”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **15 points possible**  | **Points Awarded:** |
| Unit Utilization | 93-100% |  |

*\*\*Part 3: HUD Performance Measures (30 total points possible)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **25 points possible** | **Points Awarded:** |
| **a)** HUD Goal: Housing Stability – Exits to Permanent Housing (PSH, RRH, S+C)  | 97% or higher (15 points possible) |  |
| **b)** HUD Goal: Increased Earned Income (Stayers and Leavers) | 10% or higher (5 points possible) |  |
| **c)** HUD Goal: Increased Total Income (Stayers and Leavers) | 55% or higher(5 points possible) |  |

*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 possible** | **Points Awarded:** |
| Reoccurrence Rate  | 0 – 5% |  |

*\*\*Part 5: Risk Adjustment (14 total points possible)*

Projects indicating they will address 5+ vulnerability factors in their proposed projects in Intent to Apply forms will receive 2 points. **Points awarded: 2 points**

Vulnerability of population served by the renewal projects will also be assessed through HMIS reports by subpopulation:

For programs serving a majority of households without children:

* + 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** | **4 points** | **Points Awarded:** |
| **a)** Coming from the streets, place not meant for human habitation, or Safe Haven  | 30% or higher |  |
| **b)** No income at program entry | 30% or higher |  |
| **c)** Multiple (3 or more) disabilities | 30% or higher |  |

**OR**

For programs serving a majority of households with children:

* No income at program entry
* Disabling condition

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **6 points** | **Points Awarded:** |
| **a)** No income at program entry | 30% or higher |  |
| **b)** Disabling condition | 40% or higher |  |

**OR**

For programs dedicated to serving youth and households with children that have a youth head of household:

* Coming from the streets, place not meant for human habitation, or Safe Haven
* No income at program entry
* Disabling condition

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **4 points** | **Points Awarded:** |
| **a)** Coming from the streets, place not meant for human habitation, or Safe Haven | 30% or higher |  |
| **b)** No income at program entry | 30% or higher |  |
| **c)** Disabling condition | 40% or higher |  |

*\*\*Part 6: Program Administration (23 total points possible)*

# Due to the noncompetitive nature of the previous FY 2020 CoC Program Competition and in the interest of flexible evaluations while the COVID-19 pandemic continues to affect the CoC, most CoC renewal projects have 2 complete operating years that have not been evaluated for unit utilization or spending of available CoC funding in priority ranking of Milwaukee CoC projects.

# Projects will be scored on the best outcome of the 2 most recently completed grant years in unit utilization and spending as recorded in the eLOCCS system (6a).

# Exceptions:

Agencies voluntarily reallocating project(s) 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 for providing evidence of this situation to the Milwaukee Continuum of Care Lead Agency by a deadline established by the Lead Agency on a case-by-case basis. If sufficient proof is provided by this deadline, the agency will be exempt from scoring in 6a and 6b and receive full points for 6a and 6b.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **14 points** |  |  | **Points Awarded:** |
| **a)** Effective Use of Federal Funds | * Spent 97-100% of grant (projects without rent assistance budget line item)
* Spent 90-100% of grant (projects with rent assistance budget line item)
 |  |  |  |
|  | **5 points** | **2.5 points** | **0 points** |  |
| **b)** Completed Quarterly Draws  | Agency Completed at Minimum Quarterly Draws for 2 Most Recently Completed Operating Years | Agency Completed Quarterly Draws for 1 out of 2 Most Recently Completed Operating Years | Agency Did Not Complete at Minimum Quarterly Draws for 2 Most Recently Completed Operating Years |  |
|  | **4 points** |  |  |  |
| **c)**  Data Quality: Total Data Quality Error Percentage (from ICA Monitoring Report) | 0% - 1.0% |  |  |  |

**Ranking of Scored Renewal Projects and Tiebreaker Scoring:**

Once the total number of points is calculated based on linear range, 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 renewal projects, a tiebreaker score will be used. The tiebreaker score will be based on cost effectiveness. Cost effectiveness will be measured by the total HUD grant award amount being 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 for parts 2, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a, 4b, 5c, 6a, 6c are scored on a linear range calculation from the lowest scoring to highest scoring.**