

Kanawha Valley Collective Continuum of Care  
Prioritization and Evaluation Subcommittee  
Ranking and Review Information 2021

***Objective of the Prioritization & Evaluation Subcommittee.***

The purpose of this committee is objectively rank all renewal and new (bonus, reallocation and consolidation) projects for the consolidated CoC applications.

***NOFO Project Ranking Information***

**Project Ranking.** Project applications submitted to the CoC for inclusion on the FY 2021 CoC Priority Listing as part of the CoC Consolidated Application must be reviewed and either accepted and ranked, approved, or rejected by the CoC. All project applications approved by the CoC must be listed on the CoC Priority Listing in rank order, except project applications for YHDP renewal or replacement, CoC planning and UFA Costs projects which are not ranked. Higher ranked projects will be assigned to Tier 1 and lower ranked projects will be assigned to Tier 2. The purpose of this two-tiered approach is for CoCs to notify HUD which projects are prioritized for funding based on local needs and gaps.

The P&E subcommittee will rank all projects (excluding YHDP renewal or replacement, CoC planning, and UFA Costs projects) applying for funding in the 2021 Consolidated Application. This is an ordered ranking of all renewal and new projects the CoC is submitting in the application for funding. The project ranking *must* reflect HUD funding priorities, local need, and a data-driven process for evaluating individual project performance.

Prior to the ranking process, the CoC completes a full performance evaluation of all renewal projects and determines whether to include each individual project in the ranking. The HMIS Administrator provides data and pertinent project information to the subcommittee. This information is used during the ranking process. Using this data, the subcommittee meets to rank all new and renewal project applications in order of priority and to identify any project applications rejected by the CoC.

**Projects Fully in Tier 1.** HUD will conditionally select new project applications created through reallocation or the CoC Bonus and renewal project applications, including renewals of previously funded DV Bonus projects, that are fully within Tier 1, that pass project eligibility, project quality, and if applicable, project renewal threshold review, based on CoC score, beginning with the highest scoring CoC to the lowest scoring CoC. As stated in Section II.B.11.a of the 2021 NOFO, if the available funding under this NOFO is reduced, a reduction will be made to all CoC's Tier 1 amount proportionately which would result in lower ranked Tier 1 project applications falling into Tier 2.

**Projects in Tier 2.** HUD will conditionally select new project applications created through reallocation and the CoC Bonus and renewal project applications, including renewals of previously funded DV Bonus projects that pass project eligibility, project quality, and if applicable, project renewal threshold review in Tier 2 using the criteria in Section II.B.11.b of the 2021 NOFO. HUD will select projects in order of point value until there are no more funds available. In the case of a tie, HUD will fund the projects in the order of CoC application score. In case there is still a tie, HUD will select the project from the CoC that has the highest score on the rating factors described in Section II.B.11.b of the 2021 NOFO.

**Projects Straddling Tiers.** If a project application straddles the Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding line, HUD will conditionally select the project application up to the amount of funding that falls

Kanawha Valley Collective Continuum of Care  
Prioritization and Evaluation Subcommittee  
Ranking and Review Information 2021

within Tier 1. Using the CoC score and other factors described in Section II.B.11 of this NOFO, HUD may then fund the Tier 2 portion of the project. If HUD does not fund the Tier 2 portion of the project, HUD may award the project at the reduced amount, provided the project is still feasible with the reduced funding (e.g., is able to continue serving homeless program participants effectively).

***KVCCoC's FY2021 Available Funds.***

**Tier 1:** 100% of the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) as described in Section III.B.2.a of this NOFO minus the Annual Renewal Amounts of YHDP replacement projects.

**Tier 1** = \$1,433,335

**Tier 2:** Tier 1 minus the maximum amount of renewal, reallocation, and CoC Bonus funds that a CoC can apply for (excludes YHDP renewal or YHDP replacement projects, CoC planning projects, and if applicable, UFA Costs projects, or projects selected with DV Bonus funds).

**Tier 2** = \$366,043 (**CoC Bonus**=\$91,511 and **DV Bonus**=\$274,532)

**Planning** = \$54,906

**TOTAL AVAILABLE: \$1,854,284**

***KVC& HUD Policy Priorities***

This section provides additional context regarding the selection criteria of this NOFO and is included here to help the CoC better understand how the selection criteria support the goal of ending homelessness:

*1. Ending homelessness for all persons.* To end homelessness, CoCs should identify, engage, and effectively serve all persons experiencing homelessness. CoCs should measure their performance based on local data that consider the challenges faced by all subpopulations experiencing homelessness in the geographic area (e.g., veterans, youth, families, or those experiencing chronic homelessness). CoCs should partner with housing, health care, and supportive services providers to expand housing options, such as permanent supportive housing, housing subsidies, and rapid rehousing. Additionally, CoCs should use local data to determine the characteristics of individuals and families with the highest needs and longest experiences of homelessness to develop housing and supportive services tailored to their needs.

*2. Use a Housing First approach.* Housing First prioritizes rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing and does not have service participation requirements or preconditions. CoC Program funded projects should help individuals and families move quickly into permanent housing, and the CoC should measure and help projects reduce the length of time people experience homelessness. Additionally, CoCs should engage landlords and property owners to identify an inventory of housing available for rapid rehousing and permanent supportive housing participants, remove barriers to entry, and adopt client-centered service methods. HUD encourages CoCs to assess how well Housing First approaches are being implemented in their communities.

*3. Reducing Unsheltered Homelessness.* In recent years, the number of people experiencing unsheltered homelessness has risen significantly, including a rising number of encampments in many communities across the country. People living unsheltered have extremely high rates of physical and mental illness and substance use disorders. CoCs should identify permanent housing options for people who are unsheltered.

*4. Improving System Performance.* CoCs should be using system performance measures

Kanawha Valley Collective Continuum of Care  
Prioritization and Evaluation Subcommittee  
Ranking and Review Information 2021

(e.g., average length of homeless episodes, rates of return to homelessness, rates of exit to permanent housing destinations) to determine how effectively they are serving people experiencing homelessness. Additionally, CoCs should use their Coordinated Entry process to promote participant choice, coordinate homeless assistance and mainstream housing, and services to ensure people experiencing homelessness receive assistance quickly, and make homelessness assistance open, inclusive, and transparent. CoCs should review all projects eligible for renewal in FY 2021 to determine their effectiveness in serving people experiencing homelessness, including cost-effectiveness. CoCs should also look for opportunities to implement continuous quality improvement and other process improvement strategies. HUD recognizes the effects of COVID-19 on CoC performance and data quality and, compared to previous CoC NOFOs, reduces the points available for rating factors related to system performance.

*5. Partnering with Housing, Health, and Service Agencies.* Using cost performance and outcome data, CoCs should improve how all available resources are utilized to end homelessness. This is especially important as the CARES Act and American Rescue Plan have provided significant new resources to help end homelessness. HUD encourages CoCs to maximize the use of mainstream and other community-based resources when serving persons experiencing homelessness and should:

- a) work closely with public and private healthcare organizations and assist program participants to obtain medical insurance to address healthcare needs;
- b) partner closely with PHAs and state and local housing organizations to utilize coordinated entry, develop housing units, and provide housing subsidies to people experiencing homelessness. These partnerships can also help CoC Program participants exit permanent supportive housing through Housing Choice Vouchers and other available housing options. CoCs and PHAs should especially work together to implement targeted programs such as Emergency Housing Vouchers, HUD-VASH, Mainstream Vouchers, Family Unification Program Vouchers, and other housing voucher programs targeted to people experiencing homelessness. CoCs should coordinate with their state and local housing agencies on the utilization of new HOME program resources provided through the Homelessness Assistance and Supportive Services Program that was created through the American Rescue Plan;
- c) partner with local workforce development centers to improve employment opportunities; and
- d) work with tribal organizations to ensure that tribal members can access CoC-funded assistance when a CoC's geographic area borders a tribal area.

*6. Racial Equity.* In nearly every community, Black, Indigenous, and other people of color are substantially overrepresented in the homeless population. HUD is emphasizing system and program changes to address racial equity within CoCs. CoCs should review local policies, procedures, and processes to determine where and how to address racial disparities affecting individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

*7. Persons with Lived Experience.* HUD is encouraging CoCs to include in the local planning process people who are currently experiencing or have formerly experienced homelessness to address homelessness. People with lived experience should determine how local policies may need to be revised and updated, participate in CoC meetings and committees as stakeholders, provide input on decisions, and provide input related to the local competition process (e.g., how

Kanawha Valley Collective Continuum of Care  
Prioritization and Evaluation Subcommittee  
Ranking and Review Information 2021

rating factors are determined). CoCs should seek opportunities to hire people with lived experience.

***KVCCoC's Project Ranking Process.***

**Renewal Project Scoring.** Renewal projects approved by the Prioritization and Evaluation subcommittee (P&E) for inclusion in the CoC project ranking will be scored according to an objective scoring tool based on their individual project performance, alignment with HUD and CoC policy priorities, and compliance. Performance and HMIS elements are heavily weighted measures used by HUD in determining the overall CoC score for the NOFO. Data used in the project scoring tool comes largely from the most recently submitted Annual Performance Report (APR) for each project. See attached sample scoring tools.

First-time renewals are projects that have not yet completed their first operating year, and thus, cannot be scored for their performance due to not having a completed Annual Performance Report (APR). P&E will evaluate each first-time renewal project's year-to-date data to ensure that each project is on track for implementation and anticipated outcomes.

**New or Bonus Project Selection.** New project applicants will be assessed on the following: project design, how the project addresses local priority needs, how the project aligns with local strategies and HUD's priority to end homelessness, budget appropriateness and accuracy, project match, leveraging, CoC participation, community collaboration, organizational capacity, and implementation timeline. The organization's use of the Housing First philosophy and its impact on systemwide performance measures will also be assessed. There may be new projects that fail to score well enough to be included in the NOFO submission, or there may not be enough new project funding to fund all requests.

**Domestic Violence Projects.** Domestic Violence (DV) projects are ranked along with other projects of the same project type but are scored utilizing a separate scoring tool, which places emphasis on safety planning. For further details, see Renewal Project Scoring and New or Bonus Project Selection (above). All outcome data is gleaned from APR data that is pulled from an HMIS comparable data base and recorded on a spreadsheet with no personally identifiable information.

**Ranking Order.** New and renewal projects approved for inclusion in the CoC's project ranking will be ranked in the following order:

1. CoC infrastructure projects:
  - a. HMIS Renewal Projects
  - b. Coordinated Entry Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects
2. Renewal Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) and Rapid Rehousing (RRH) projects, ranked in order of highest to lowest percentage score
3. New projects approved for inclusion in ranking

**Tie Breakers.** Ties within the same project type will be broken in the following order:

Kanawha Valley Collective Continuum of Care  
Prioritization and Evaluation Subcommittee  
Ranking and Review Information 2021

1. Highest % of clients exiting to or retaining permanent housing.
2. Highest utilization rate
3. Largest grant amount

The P&E Committee may adjust individual projects up or down in the ranking or reallocate funds to other projects to fulfill HUD priorities, prevent potential loss of funding, local priorities, and maximize the overall CoC application score.

# Permanent Supportive Housing

## Ranking & Scoring Tool

Project Name \_\_\_\_\_

Grant ID \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Points Awarded</b>	
<b>Bonus Points</b>	+
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	

Scoring Element	Max Points	Scoring Threshold	Awarded Points
<b>1. Permanent Housing Placements</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Reports The percentage of persons who remained in or exited to permanent housing destinations.	20	20 Points: 98-100% 15 Points: 96-97% 10 Points: 94-95% 0 Points: 93% or less	
<b>2 Discharges to Temporary Destinations</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of project participants who exited to the places listed as temporary destinations on the APR	15	15 Points: 0% 10 Points: 1-2% 5 Points: 3-4% 0 Points: 5% or higher	
<b>3. Utilization Rate</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report Average bed utilization on all PIT dates.	10	10 Points: 91% or more 5 Points: 80-90% 0 Points: 79% or less	
<b>4. Total Income</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Report The percentage of adults that maintained or increased total income (earned income or other income) by program exit.	10	10 Points: 75% or more 5 Points: 65-74% 3 Points: 55-64% 0 Points: 54% or less	
<b>5. Timely Submission of Annual Performance Report</b> Objective Source: SAGE Annual Performance Report submitted in SAGE on time. If the submission was rejected by HUD, report must be amended and resubmitted within 30 days.	10	10 Points: Yes 0 Points: No	
<b>6. Serving Vulnerable Populations</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of clients served who are experiencing two or more of the following: unsheltered homelessness, substance use disorder, severe mental illness, currently fleeing domestic violence, or are chronically homeless.	10	10 Points: 90% or more 5 Points: 89 - 50% 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>7. Housing First Approach</b> Objective Source: Program Policies & Servicepoint review The extent to which the project follows a housing first approach: 1. Individuals are placed and stabilized in permanent housing without preconditions, and 2. Individuals never face requirements to participate in services as a condition to retain their housing. 3. Individuals do not face a "three strikes" eviction policy	10	10 Points: 3 factors met 5 Points: 2 factor met 0 Points: 0 - 1 factors met	
<b>8. Grant Spending</b> Objective Source: eLOCCS The percentage of project funds spent during the last operating year.	10	10 Points: spent 100% 5 Points: spent 98-99% 3 Points: spent 96-97% 0 Points: spent 95% or less	
<b>9. Mainstream Benefits (Non-Cash)</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of households that maintained or increased non-cash benefits at program exit.	5	5 Points: 70% or more 3 Points: 60-69% 0 Points: 59% or less	
<b>Total Possible Points</b>	<b>100</b>		

**Application Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Bonus Points Available

Scoring Element	Max Bonus	Scoring Threshold	Bonus Points
<b>1. Racial Equity</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project participants mirror the CoC's homeless population demographics.	5	5 Points: an equal or higher percentage of clients of color served 0 Points: a lower percentage of clients of color served	
<b>2. HMIS</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project: 1. Has satisfactory data quality, and 2. Has satisfactory data timeliness	10	10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>Total Possible Bonus</b>	<b>15</b>		

<b>Total Bonus Points:</b>
----------------------------

# Rapid Rehousing Housing

## Ranking & Scoring Tool

Project Name \_\_\_\_\_

Grant ID \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Points Awarded</b>	
<b>Bonus Points</b>	+
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	

Scoring Element	Max Points	Scoring Threshold	Awarded Points
<b>1. Permanent Housing Placements</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Reports The percentage of persons served who moved into positive housing.	20	20 Points: 75% or higher 15 Points: 70-74% 10 Points: 65-69% 0 Points: 64% or less	
<b>2. Length of Time to Move-In</b> Objective Source: APR Report The average length of time for persons to move into housing.	15	15 Points: 30 days or less 10 Points: 31-40 days 5 Points: 41-50 days 0 Points: 51+ days	
<b>3. Discharge to Temporary Destinations</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of project participants who exited to places listed as temporary destinations on the APR	10	10 Points: 0% 5 Points: 1-4% 0 Points: 5% or higher	
<b>4. Total Income</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Report The percentage of adults that maintained or increased total income (earned income or other income) by program exit.	10	10 Points: 75% or more 5 Points: 65-74% 3 Points: 55-64% 0 Points: 54% or less	
<b>5. Timely Submission of Annual Performance Report</b> Objective Source: SAGE Annual Performance Report submitted in SAGE on time. If the submission was rejected by HUD, report must be amended and resubmitted within 30 days.	10	10 Points: Yes 0 Points: No	
<b>6. Serving Vulnerable Populations</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of clients served who are experiencing or more of the following: unsheltered homelessness, substance use disorder, severe mental illness, currently fleeing domestic violence, or are chronically homeless.	10	10 Points: 90% or more 5 Points: 89-50% 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>7. Housing First Approach</b> Objective Source: Program Policies and Servicepoint Review The extent to which the project follows a housing first approach: 1. Individuals are placed and stabilized in permanent housing without preconditions, and 2. Individuals never face requirements to participate in services as a condition to retain their housing. @	10	10 Points: factors met 5 Points: factors met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>8. Grant Spending</b> Objective Source: eLOCCS The percentage of project funds spent during the last operating year.	10	10 Points: spent 100% 5 Points: spent 98-99% 3 Points: spent 96-97% 0 Points: spent 95% or less	
<b>9. Mainstream Benefits (Non-Cash)</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of households that maintained or increased non-cash benefits by program exit.	5	5 Points: 70% or more 3 Points: 60 – 69% 0 Points: 59% or less	
<b>Total Possible Points</b>	<b>100</b>		

**Application Score:** \_\_\_\_\_



## Bonus Points Available

Scoring Element	Max Bonus	Scoring Threshold	Bonus Points
<b>1. Racial Equity</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project participants mirror the CoC's homeless population demographics.	5	5 Points: an equal or higher percentage of clients of color served 0 Points: a lower percentage of clients of color served	
<b>2. HMIS</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project: 1. Has satisfactory data quality, and 2. Has satisfactory data timeliness	10	10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>Total Possible Bonus</b>	<b>15</b>		

<b>Total Bonus Points:</b>
----------------------------

# DV-Rapid Rehousing Housing

## Ranking & Scoring Tool

Project Name \_\_\_\_\_

Grant ID \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Points Awarded</b>	
<b>Bonus Points</b>	+
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	

Scoring Element	Max Points	Scoring Threshold	Awarded Points
<b>1. Permanent Housing Placements</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Reports The percentage of persons served who moved into positive housing.	20	20 Points: 75% or higher 15 Points: 70-74% 10 Points: 65-69% 0 Points: 64% or less	
<b>2. Length of Time to Move-In</b> Objective Source: APR Report The average length of time for persons to move into housing.	10	10 Points: 30 days or less 5 Points: 31-40 days 3 Points: 41-50 days 0 Points: 51+ days	
<b>3. Unsheltered Homelessness</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of project participants who exited to places not meant for human habitation.	10	10 Points: 0% 5 Points: 1-4% 0 Points: 5% or higher	
<b>4. Total Income</b> Objective Source: System Performance & Annual Performance Report The percentage of adults that maintained or increased total income (earned income or other income) by program exit.	10	10 Points: 75% or more 5 Points: 65-74% 3 Points: 55-64% 0 Points: 54% or less	
<b>5. Timely Submission of Annual Performance Report</b> Objective Source: SAGE Annual Performance Report submitted in SAGE on time. If the submission was rejected by HUD, report must be amended and resubmitted within 30 days.	10	10 Points: Yes 0 Points: No	
<b>6. Serving Vulnerable Populations</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The percentage of clients served who are experiencing two or more of the following: unsheltered homelessness, substance use disorder, severe mental illness, currently fleeing domestic violence, or are chronically homeless.	10	10 Points: 90% or more 5 Points: 89-50% 0 Points: 49% of less	
<b>7. Housing First Approach</b> Objective Source: Housing First Subcommittee The extent to which the project follows a housing first approach: 1. Individuals are placed and stabilized in permanent housing without preconditions, and 2. Individuals never face requirements to participate in services as a condition to retain their housing.	10	10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>8. Grant Spending</b> Objective Source: eLOCCS The percentage of project funds spent during the last operating year.	10	10 Points: spent 100% 5 Points: spent 98-99% 3 Points: spent 96-97% 0 Points: spent 95% or less	
<b>9. Safety Planning</b> Source: Osniium Data The percentage of clients that entered the project during the operating year who participated in safety planning.	10	10 Points: 99-100% 5 Points: 95-98% 0 Points: 94 or less	
<b>Total Possible Points</b>	<b>100</b>		

**Application Score:**

## Bonus Points Available

Scoring Element	Max Bonus	Scoring Threshold	Bonus Points
<b>1. Racial Equity</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project participants mirror the CoC's homeless population demographics.	5	5 Points: an equal or higher percentage of clients of color served 0 Points: a lower percentage of clients of color served	
<b>2. HMIS</b> Objective Source: Annual Performance Report The extent to which the project: 1. Has satisfactory data quality, and 2. Has satisfactory data timeliness	10	10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>Total Possible Bonus</b>	<b>15</b>		

<b>Total Bonus Points:</b>
----------------------------