

Operating Procedures
Project Evaluation and Selection Committee
Of the LA-503 CoC Governing Council
Updated 9/7/2016

The purpose of the Project Evaluation and Selection Committee is to review and select project sponsors for CoC funding, evaluate project performance for the CoC application, decide scoring and prioritization criteria for the CoC application and other funding.

I. Issuance of RFPs

The committee decides RFPs to issue for the CoC application after a review of the NOFA and a consideration of the needs of the CoC to meet the goals to end chronic, family and youth homelessness as well as maintain functional zero for veteran homelessness.

All RFPs shall specify that eligible applicants include agencies that are not currently members of the CoC (Service Providers and Professionals Association). Some RFPs may indicate a preference for new providers as a way to expand CoC capacity.

The CoC also issues RFPs to select replacement project sponsors for existing projects. In this way, new project sponsors may be selected to improve project performance outside of the HUD's formal reallocation process.

In the event that a replacement project sponsor is needed immediately for an existing project, UNITY may issue an RFP without a meeting of the CoC Governing Council.

II. Reallocation Policy

The Project Evaluation and Selection Committee will consider partial or full reallocation of projects on an annual basis, usually as part of the CoC application process. Decisions regarding partial or full reallocation will be made based on:

- Project performance
- Historical spending and balances in the past two program years
- Review of current performance
- Compliance issues (CoC and HUD)
 - Includes operating as housing first, low-barrier, and using coordinated entry
- Priorities of the CoC including the need to serve specific populations (ie. veterans, chronic, families, youth) and the program type.

III. Selection of New Project Sponsors (including replacement project sponsors)

UNITY conducts a threshold review of proposals that are received and reports to the committee if any proposals fail the threshold review. UNITY will contact respondents prior to the committee meeting to obtain any missing attachments.

The committee shall review the proposals submitted to UNITY and score proposals using a rubric that includes performance, housing first, compliance, financial capacity, and cultural competency. Additional areas of review are determined on a case by case basis.

The committee shall meet to discuss proposals and finalize scores. Committee members may attend in person, via conference call, or by submitting scoring sheets prior to the meeting. Committee members are encouraged to provide comments that can be shared with respondents during debriefings.

If one agency has the highest score for multiple RFPs, the committee will discuss the agency's capacity to start multiple projects. If the committee decides no respondents have the capacity to conduct the project, the RFP may be re-issued.

IV. Rating and Review Procedures - Project Evaluation

A. Threshold Review for Inclusion in the CoC Application

Renewal projects were determined to be eligible for inclusion in the CoC application based on threshold criteria:

- Completed and returned the "Request for Funding"
- Timely APR Reporting
- Compliance

B. Project Performance Scores are calculated for renewal projects with over one year of performance to measure. UNITY distributed the proposed scoring key is distributed to the CoC membership for comment before the scoring criteria is decided by the Project Evaluation and Selection Committee. The scoring key includes the measurement, data source, weight, and scale for each measure being scored.

Project performance scores for renewal projects included an *evaluation of how the project improves CoC System Performance* with the greatest emphasis on permanent housing outcomes:

- Permanent housing outcomes
- Employment and income growth
- Returns to homelessness
- Length of time homeless

Other criteria include:

- Mainstream resources
- Program utilization rates
- Participation in CoC (SPPA) meetings
- HMIS Data Quality and Compliance
- Serving Literally Homeless clients
- Cost effectiveness
- Balance in most recent project year
- Fiscal compliance

Draft scores are emailed to each agency which are encouraged to review the scores and contact UNITY within 7 days regarding any errors. All projects with a low score are

offered a meeting with UNITY staff to ensure no errors were made in the calculation of scores. The notice includes instructions for appeal to the CoC Governing Council.

New Coordinated Entry projects were considered based on the application which described their ability to reach chronically homeless, service resistant, or special populations including youth, LGBTQ, and victims of human trafficking. Goals were established related to *contribution to improving CoC System performance* regarding:

- a. Length of time homeless
- b. Reducing the number of first time homeless

C. Project Rankings and Prioritization

The project rankings use objective measurements to measure project contribution to the performance of the CoC system. Prioritization and tiering of projects will take into consideration the needs of the CoC system and differences in service needs for subpopulations like the chronically homeless, youth, families with children, and victims of domestic violence.

1) Threshold for Tier 1

Tier 1 projects are generally ranked in order of score with the following additional provisos:

- A) All Tier 1 projects must meet conditions for Housing First, Low Barrier and Participation in coordinated entry system. Any project not meeting these criteria will be placed in Tier 2 regardless of score.
- B) Projects will be placed in Tier 1 regardless of score if they are deemed **Critically Important Projects**. A Critically Important Project must meet all three of the following conditions:
 - 1) This project could not continue without its CoC funding **AND**
 - 2) There are no other projects in the community of the same project type that could effectively absorb the clients served by this project **AND**
 - 3a) This project is essential to preventing people from having to live on the streets or live in life-threatening situations **OR**
 - 3b) This project is essential to reaching the goal of ending chronic homelessness, youth homelessness or family homelessness or of maintaining functional zero in veteran homelessness

2) Ranking of Projects not subject to scoring:

Projects with less than one year of performance or those with a new project sponsor (with less than one year of performance) will not be scored as long as they have met other threshold criteria for funding. The following ranking method will be used:

- New Coordinated Entry Projects – Top of Tier One
- New project sponsors for existing renewals or new projects with less than one year of performance– PSH Top of Tier 1, RRH Tier 2
- HMIS projects – Top of Tier 1

Bonus Projects – Top of Tier 2
New Reallocation Projects – Top of Tier 2

3) Renewal Project Ranking

All other projects will be ranked according to their performance scores regardless of component type.

- 4) The CoC Governing Council will make the final decisions on project rankings taking into account the *differences in service needs for subpopulations like the chronically homeless, youth, families with children, and victims of domestic violence.*

V. Public Notification

All decisions of the Project Evaluation and Selection Committee shall be posted on the UNITY website, sent via email to the CoC, and presented at CoC meetings.

All materials will be made available in alternative formats, including translations for those with limited English proficiency.