

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--------|-------------|-----|--------|--------|-------------|-----------------------------------|---|--------|-------------|-----|----|--------|-------------|-----|----|-----------------------------------|---|
| TIME PERIOD FOR DATA REVIEW: APR - 01/01/17-12/31/17; CAN DATA – 01/01/2017-12/31/17; TIMELINESS – 12/07/17-02/28/18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. DATA QUALITY CRITERIA – 4 POINTS – DV PROJECTS NOT IN PARTICIPATING IN HMIS ARE EXCLUDED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 | PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION OVERALL SCORE: % of Error Rate for Personally Identifiable Information entered into CT HMIS | <5% | MAX POINTS = 1 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RRH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0.5</td> <td>3.5-5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.0</td> <td>0-3.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PSH/RRH/TH | 0.5 | 3.5-5% | 1.0 | 0-3.5% | Data Source: 2017 APR (CY17 Data) | APR Q6a. Data Quality: Personally Identifiable Information (PII) Overall Score - % of Error Rate | | | | | | | | | | |
| Points | PSH/RRH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.5 | 3.5-5% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.0 | 0-3.5% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2 | INCOME AND HOUSING DATA QUALITY: % of Error Rate for the following data points entered into CT HMIS: a. Destination b. Income and Sources at Entry c. Income and Sources at Annual Assessment d. Income and Sources at Exit | a. Destination – 0% b. Income and Sources at Entry - 0% c. Income and Sources at Annual Assessment – 0% d. Income and Sources at Exit - 0% | MAX POINTS = 2 a. DESTINATION: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RR H/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0.5</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> b. INCOME & SOURCES AT ENTRY: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RR H/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0.5</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> c. INCOME & SOURCES AT ANNUAL ASSESSMENT: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RR H/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0.5</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> d. INCOME & SOURCES AT EXIT: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RR H/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0.5</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PSH/RR H/TH | 0.5 | 0% | Points | PSH/RR H/TH | 0.5 | 0% | Points | PSH/RR H/TH | 0.5 | 0% | Points | PSH/RR H/TH | 0.5 | 0% | Data Source: 2017 APR (CY17 Data) | APR Q6c. Data Quality: Income and Housing Data Quality Destination - % of Error Rate Income and Sources at Entry - % of Error Rate Income and Sources at Annual Assessment - % of Error Rate Income and Sources at Exit - % of Error Rate |
| Points | PSH/RR H/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.5 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Points | PSH/RR H/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.5 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Points | PSH/RR H/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.5 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Points | PSH/RR H/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.5 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--------|----------------|--------|------|---------|----------------|-----|------|--|---|---|----------------|----|-----------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1.3 | TIMELINESS OF DATA ENTRY: a. % of project entry records entered into HMIS within specified benchmark b. % of project exit records entered into HMIS within specified benchmark | a. 100% OF PROJECT ENTRY RECORDS INPUT WITHIN: PH – 0-10 days TH – 0-6 days b. 100% OF PROJECT EXIT RECORDS INPUT WITHIN: PH – 0-10 days TH – 0-6 days | MAX POINTS = 1 a. PROJECT ENTRY RECORDS: <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RR H/TH</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0.5</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </table> b. PROJECT EXIT RECORDS: <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RR H/TH</th> </tr> <tr> <td>0.5</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PSH/RR H/TH | 0.5 | 100% | Points | PSH/RR H/TH | 0.5 | 100% | Data Source: HMIS Data Timeliness Report Time period examined: 12/07/17 – 2/28/18 | HMIS Data Timeliness Report to be run by CCEH. Appeals will used agency-run APR “Q6e. Data Quality: Timeliness” From “2017-18 Data Quality and Data Timeliness Memorandum of Agreement”: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Project type</th> <th>Data Benchmark</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TH</td> <td>2 Business Days</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PH (RRH, PSH)</td> <td>Must be entered w/in 5 business days</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Benchmarks in effect as of December 7, 2017 per MOU. | Project type | Data Benchmark | TH | 2 Business Days | PH (RRH, PSH) | Must be entered w/in 5 business days |
| Points | PSH/RR H/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.5 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Points | PSH/RR H/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.5 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project type | Data Benchmark | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TH | 2 Business Days | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PH (RRH, PSH) | Must be entered w/in 5 business days | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA – PSH: 32 POINTS; RRH/TH: 37 POINTS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | CAN REFERRALS W/HIGH NEED: % of CAN Referrals with VI-SPDAT score 10+ | PSH - 30% RRH/TH - 20% | MAX POINTS = 4 <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH</th> <th>RRH/TH</th> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>30%-49%</td> <td>20%-39%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>50%+</td> <td>40%+</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PSH | RRH/TH | 2 | 30%-49% | 20%-39% | 4 | 50%+ | 40%+ | Data Source: Fairfield County CAN records | CAN Staff to provide based upon CAN records. | | | | | |
| Points | PSH | RRH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 30%-49% | 20%-39% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 50%+ | 40%+ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2 | INCREASE EARNED INCOME: % of all adult participants who increased earned income from entry to exit/follow up (leavers and stayers) | PSH - 15% RRH/TH – 40% | MAX POINTS = 4 <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH</th> <th>RRH/TH</th> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>15%-25%</td> <td>40%-49%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>25%+</td> <td>50%+</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PSH | RRH/TH | 2 | 15%-25% | 40%-49% | 4 | 25%+ | 50%+ | Data Source: 2017 APR (CY17 Data) Excludes participants not yet required to have an annual assessment and where adults refused to provide information | APR Q 19a3: Cash Client Income Change – Income Source- by Entry and Latest Status/Exit; Q18 Client Cash Income Category - Earned/Other Income Category - by Entry and Annual Assessment/Exit Status <u>Numerator:</u> (Q19a3 Number of Adults w/Earned Income-Retained Income Category and Increased \$ at Annual (Stayers) or Exit (Leavers)) + (Q19a3 Number of Adults w/Earned Income-Did Not Have the Income Category at Entry and Gained the Income Category at Annual (Stayers) or Exit (Leavers)) <u>Denominator:</u> ((Q18 Adults at Annual (Stayers)-Total Adults + Q18 Adults at Exit (Leavers)-Total Adults)) – (Q18 Adults at Annual (Stayers)-Number of adult stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment) – (Q18 Adults at Annual (Stayers)-Client Doesn’t Know/Client Refused) – (Q18 Adults at Exit (Leavers)-Client Doesn’t Know/Client Refused) | | | | | |
| Points | PSH | RRH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 15%-25% | 40%-49% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 25%+ | 50%+ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|---------------------------|---|--------|-------------|--------|--------|-------------|-------------|---|------|--|---|---|
| 2.3 | INCREASE OTHER INCOME: % of all adult participants who increased other income from entry to exit/follow up (leavers and stayers) | PSH - 35% RRH/TH – 25% | <p>MAX POINTS = 4</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH</th> <th>RRH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>35%- 49%</td> <td>25%- 39%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>50%+</td> <td>40%+</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PSH | RRH/TH | 2 | 35%- 49% | 25%- 39% | 4 | 50%+ | 40%+ | <p>Data Source: 2017 APR (CY17 Data) Excludes participants not yet required to have an annual assessment and where adults refused to provide information</p> | <p>APR Q 19a3: Cash Client Income Change – Income Source- by Entry and Latest Status/Exit Q18 Client Cash Income Category - Earned/Other Income Category - by Entry and Annual Assessment/Exit Status</p> <p><u>Numerator:</u> (Q19a3 Number of Adults w/Other Income-Retained Income Category and Increased \$ at Annual (Stayers) or Exit (Leavers)) + (Q19a3 Number of Adults w/Other Income-Did Not Have the Income Category at Entry and Gained the Income Category at Annual (Stayers) or Exit (Leavers))</p> <p><u>Denominator:</u> ((Q18 Adults at Annual (Stayers)-Total Adults + Q18 Adults at Exit (Leavers)-Total Adults) – (Q18 Adults at Annual (Stayers)-Number of adult stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment) – (Q18 Adults at Annual (Stayers)-Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused) – (Q18 Adults at Exit (Leavers)-Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused))</p> |
| Points | PSH | RRH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 35%- 49% | 25%- 39% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 50%+ | 40%+ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.4 | PARTICIPANTS w/ANY INCOME: % of adult participants with 1+ source of income (leavers and stayers) | 70% | <p>MAX POINTS = 4</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RRH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>70-79%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>80-89%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>90%+</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PSH/RRH/TH | 1 | 70-79% | 2 | 80-89% | 4 | 90%+ | <p>Data Source: 2017 APR (CY17 Data) Excludes participants not yet required to have an annual assessment and where adults refused to provide information</p> | <p>APR Q18 Client Cash Income Category - Earned/Other Income Category - by Entry and Annual Assessment/Exit Status</p> <p><u>Numerator:</u> (Q18 Adults at Annual (Stayers)-1 or more source of income) + (Q18 Adults at Exit (Leavers)-1 or more source of income)</p> <p><u>Denominator:</u> ((Q18 Adults at Annual (Stayers)-Total Adults) + (Q18 Adults at Exit (Leavers)-Total Adults) – (Q18 Adults at Annual (Stayers)-Number of adult stayers not yet required to have annual assessment) – ((Q18 Adults at Annual (Stayers)-Adults with Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused Income Information) +)Q18 Adults at Exit (Leavers)-Adults with Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused Income Information))</p> | |
| Points | PSH/RRH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 70-79% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 80-89% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 90%+ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation | | | | | | |
|--------|---|--------------------|---|--------|-------------|---|---------|--|---|--|---|
| 2.5 | <p>PARTICIPANTS CONNECTED TO MAINSTREAM BENEFITS: Percentage of adult participants with 1+ source of Non-Cash benefits (SNAP, WIC, TANF, others, etc.)</p> | PSH/RRH/TH: 80% | <p>MAX POINTS = 4</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RRH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>80%-89%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>90%+</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PSH/RRH/TH | 2 | 80%-89% | 4 | 90%+ | Data Source: 2017 APR (CY17 Data) Excludes participants not yet required to have an annual assessment and where adults refused to provide information | <p>APR Q20b Number of Non-Cash Benefit Sources; APR Q18 Client Cash Income Category - Earned/Other Income Category - by Entry and Annual Assessment/Exit Status</p> <p><u>Numerator:</u> (Q20b Benefit at Latest Annual Assessment for Stayers-1 + Source(s)) + (Q20b Benefit at Exit for Leavers-1 + Source(s))</p> <p><u>Denominator:</u> ((Q20b Benefit at Latest Annual Assessment for Stayers-Total) + (Q20b Benefit at Exit for Leavers-Total)) – (Q18 Number of Stayers-Number of adult stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment) – (Q20b Benefit at Latest Annual Assessment for Stayers-Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused) – (Q20b Benefit at Exit for Leavers-Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused)</p> |
| Points | PSH/RRH/TH | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 80%-89% | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 90%+ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.6 | <p>PARTICIPANTS CONNECTED TO HEALTH INSURANCE: Percentage of all participants with 1+ source of health insurance</p> | PSH/RRH/TH: 90% | <p>MAX POINTS = 2</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RRH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>90%+</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PSH/RRH/TH | 2 | 90%+ | Data Source: 2017 APR (CY17 Data) Excludes participants not yet required to have an annual assessment and where adults refused to provide information | <p>APR Q21: Health Insurance; APR Q1 Report Validation Table</p> <p><u>Numerator:</u> (Q21 Latest Annual Assessment for Stayers-1 Source of Health Insurance) + (Q21 Latest Annual Assessment for Stayers-More than 1 Source of Health Insurance) + (Q21 Exit for Leavers-1 Source of Health Insurance) + (Q21 Exit for Leavers-More than 1 Source of Health Insurance)</p> <p><u>Denominator:</u> ((Q1 Number of Stayers) + (Q1 Number of Leavers)) – (Q21 Latest Annual Assessment for Stayers-Number of Stayers not yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment) – (Q21 Latest Annual Assessment for Stayers-Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused) – (Q21 Exit for Leavers-Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused)</p> | | |
| Points | PSH/RRH/TH | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 90%+ | | | | | | | | | | |

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|---------------------------------------|--|--------|-------------|----|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|------|---|---|------|--|--|
| 2.7 | <p>LENGTH OF STAY - RRH/TH ONLY: Length of stay for all participants is 12 months or less Note: Excludes DV projects and youth-serving projects</p> | <p>RRH: 95% TH: 85%</p> | <p>MAX POINTS = 5</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>RRH</th> <th>TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>95%-99%</td> <td>85%-89%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>100%</td> <td>90%+</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | RRH | TH | 3 | 95%-99% | 85%-89% | 5 | 100% | 90%+ | <p>Data Source: 2017 APR (CY17 Data) Excluded clients must be stated w/documentation provided in the 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form.</p> | <p>Excluded DV and youth participants must be stated as requested in the 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form with supporting documentation provided.</p> <p>APR Q22a1: Length of Participation – CoC Projects</p> <p><u>Numerator:</u> (Total- 30 days or less) + (Total-31 to 60 days) + (Total-61 to 90 days) + (Total-91 to 180 days) + (Total-181 to 365 days)</p> <p><u>Denominator:</u> (Total-Total)</p> | | | |
| Points | RRH | TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 95%-99% | 85%-89% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 100% | 90%+ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.8 | <p>EXIT TO PH DESTINATION: a. PSH: Percentage of all participants who remain in PSH or exited to permanent housing b. RRH/TH: Percentage of all participant leavers who exited to Permanent Housing</p> | <p>a. PSH: 95% b. RRH/TH: 90%</p> | <p>MAX POINTS = 6</p> <p>a. PSH:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>95%-99%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>b. RRH/TH</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>RRH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>90%-99%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PSH | 3 | 95%-99% | 6 | 100% | Points | RRH/TH | 3 | 90%-99% | 6 | 100% | <p>Data Source: 2017 APR (CY17 Data)</p> <p>Excludes “Deceased” and persons exiting to the following destinations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foster care home or group foster care home Hospital or other residential non-psychiatric medical facility Long-term care facility or nursing home | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PSH APR Q1 Report Validation Table; Q22a1: Length of Participation – CoC Projects; Q23a: Exit Destination – More Than 90 Days; Q23b: Exit Destination – 90 Days or Less <u>Numerator:</u> (Q22a1 Stayers-Total) + (Q23a-Total persons exiting to positive housing destinations) + (Q23b-Total persons exiting to positive housing destinations) <u>Denominator:</u> Q1 All Persons – (Q23a-Total persons whose destinations excluded them from the calculation) – (Q23b-Total persons whose destinations excluded them from the calculation) RRH/TH APR Q23a: Exit Destination – More Than 90 Days & Q23b: Exit Destination – 90 Days or Less <u>Numerator:</u> (Q23a-Total persons exiting to positive housing destinations) + (Q23b-Total persons exiting to positive housing destinations) <u>Denominator:</u> ((Q23a Total-Total) + (Q23b Total-Total)) – (Q23a-Total persons whose destinations excluded them from the calculation) – (Q23b-Total persons whose destinations excluded them from the calculation) |
| Points | PSH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 95%-99% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Points | RRH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 90%-99% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|---|--------|-------------|---|---------|---|------|--|---|
| 2.9 | HOUSING STABILITY: % returns to homelessness within 6 months of program exit Note: Excludes DV Projects | <5% | MAX POINTS = 4 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RRH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>>0%-5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PSH/RRH/TH | 2 | >0%-5% | 4 | 0% | Data Source: HMIS/SPM data Returns to ES, TH, SH | SPM 2ab Data File – Returns to Homelessness <u>Numerator:</u> # of Clients w/Returned on Begin Date within 6 months of Exited on End Date and returned to ES, TH or SH project (Returns 1/1/17-12/31/17) <u>Denominator:</u> # Clients who exited from program |
| Points | PSH/RRH/TH | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | >0%-5% | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. GRANT MANAGEMENT CRITERIA – 16 POINTS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 | UTILIZATION RATE: Occupancy rate | 95% | MAX POINTS = 5 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RRH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>95%-99%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PSH/RRH/TH | 3 | 95%-99% | 5 | 100% | Data Source: 2017 APR (CY17 Data) If projects with 6 units or less do not meet the benchmark, use a 3-year average. Information provided in the 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form will be considered in calculating utilization. | Information provided in the 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form will be considered in calculating utilization. APR Q8b Point-in-Time Count of Households on the Last Wednesday; 2017 Project App # Units <u>Numerator:</u> Average of Q8b Point-in-Time Count of Households Served on the Last Wednesday in Jan, April, July, October <u>Denominator:</u> # Units per 2017 Project Applications (and prior years where applicable) |
| Points | PSH/RRH/TH | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 95%-99% | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 | FUNDS RECAPTURED BY HUD: % of funds drawn down from prior year's HUD grant | 95% | MAX POINTS = 5 <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RRH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>95%-99%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PSH/RRH/TH | 3 | 95%-99% | 5 | 100% | Data Source: eLOCCS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructions In Project Renewal Summary Form Grantees can provide two full years and explanation of irregularities for consideration. | eLOCCS Summary page <u>Numerator:</u> eLOCCS Total Drawdowns <u>Denominator:</u> Total ARA amount on applicable GIW (2016 or 2017) |
| Points | PSH/RRH/TH | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 95%-99% | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 100% | | | | | | | | | | |

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--------|-------------|---|-----|---|--|
| 3.3 | DRAWDOWN RATES: HUD Drawdown Quarterly | Each drawdown within 90 days - Yes/No | <p>MAX POINTS = 3</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Points</td> <td>PSH/RRH/TH</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PSH/RRH/TH | 3 | Yes | Data Source: eLOCCS Instructions in 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form | <p>eLOCCS Summary page</p> <p>Review dates of draws to confirm quarterly drawdown:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grantees can provide two full years and explanation of reasons for any irregularities for consideration in scoring. Will only consider quarters for which grant funds are available. No penalty will be assessed for projects where funds are fully drawn down prior to completion of all four quarters, as long as funds are drawn quarterly until completely drawn down |
| Points | PSH/RRH/TH | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| 3.4 | COMPLIANCE WITH HUD REQUIREMENTS: Environmental Review Documentation within 5 years | <=5 years - Yes/No | <p>MAX POINTS = 1</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Points</td> <td>PH/TH</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PH/TH | 1 | Yes | Data Source: Agency Instructions in 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form | Dates on Environmental Review Documentation within last 5 years |
| Points | PH/TH | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| 3.5 | TIMELY APR SUBMISSION: APR submitted within required time | Yes/No | <p>MAX POINTS = 2</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Points</td> <td>PH/TH</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PH/TH | 2 | Yes | Data Source: Sage Submissions Instructions in 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form | Review of documentation requested in 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form Agencies that are given an extension or exemption for their APR submission by HUD must provide documentation from HUD to that effect. |
| Points | PH/TH | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| 4. AGENCY COMPLIANCE AND PARTICIPATION– 12 POINTS | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 | DISCHARGE/APPEALS POLICY: Agency-level written discharge policy and appeals process | Policy & Appeals Process Provided - Yes/No | <p>MAX POINTS = 1</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Points</td> <td>PH/TH</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PH/TH | 1 | Yes | Data Source: Agency | Review documentation to ensure inclusion of discharge policies and appeals process |
| Points | PH/TH | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2 | CLIENT DATA CONFIDENTIALITY: Agency-level written procedures to ensure confidentiality of client data | Procedures Provided - Yes/No | <p>MAX POINTS = 1</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Points</td> <td>PH/TH</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PH/TH | 1 | Yes | Data Source: Agency | Review documentation to ensure inclusion of written procedures to ensure confidentiality of client data |
| Points | PH/TH | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3 | EQUAL ACCESS POLICY: Agency-level written policy to ensure compliance with HUD Equal Access Final Rule (Sept 2016) | Policy Provided – Yes/No | <p>MAX POINTS = 1</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Points</td> <td>PH/TH</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PH/TH | 1 | Yes | Data Source: Agency | Review documentation to ensure inclusion of policies in compliance with HUD Equal Access Final Rule (Sept 2016) |
| Points | PH/TH | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Yes | | | | | | | | |

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation |
|---|--|------------------------|--|--|--|
| 4.4 | COC COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION: Agency staff participate in at least one CoC Committee | Yes/No | MAX POINTS = 1 Points PH/TH 1 Yes | Source: ODFC records | Review of ODFC records indicates that agency participates in at least one CoC Committee |
| 4.5 | PIT PARTICIPATION: Agency/project participates in 2018 Point-in-Time Count and enters data collected in timely manner | Yes/No | MAX POINTS = 1 Points PH/TH 1 Yes | Source: ODFC records | Review of ODFC records indicates that agency/project participated in 2018 Point-In-Time Count and entered PIT data collected by the established deadline |
| 4.6 | CAN PARTICIPATION: Agency has submitted a signed Fairfield County Coordinated Access Network Memorandum of Understanding | Yes/No | MAX POINTS = 2 Points PH/TH 2 Yes | Source: CAN records | Review of CAN records indicates that the agency has submitted a Fairfield County CAN MOU. |
| 4.7 | QUARTERLY MONITORING PARTICIPATION: a. Agency/project participates in the HDC Quarterly Monitoring process b. Quarterly Monitoring report is submitted on time for the project | a. Yes/No b. Yes/No | MAX POINTS = 4 a. HDC Meeting Participation Points PH/TH 2 Yes b. Quarterly Monitoring Report Submitted Points PH/TH 2 Yes | Source: ODFC records | a. Review of ODFC records indicates that agency/project participated in the CoC's Quarterly Monitoring Process. Participation includes following activities specified in the 2017-18 Data Quality and Data Timeliness MOA. b. Review of ODFC records indicates that the agency submitted the project's Quarterly Monitoring report and APR on time for the April Quarterly Monitoring submission. |
| 4.8 | SOAR CERTIFICATION/ PARTICIPATION: Agency meets at least one of the following conditions: 1. Agency has a SOAR-certified staff member 2. Agency participated in 5/8/18 SOAR information session 3. Agency has a staff member registered to participate in the June 2018 training cohort 4. Agency has staff registered for online SOAR training | Yes/No | MAX POINTS = 1 Points PH/TH 1 Yes | Source: ODFC records | ODFC records indicate that the Agency has met at least one of the following conditions: 1. Agency has a SOAR-certified staff member 2. Agency participated in 5/8/18 SOAR information session 3. Agency has a staff member registered to participate in the June 2018 training cohort 4. Agency has staff registered for online SOAR training |
| 5. HUD PRIORITIES – PSH: 10 POINTS; RRH/TH: 5 POINTS | | | | | |
| 5.1 | HOUSING FIRST: The project follows a Housing First Model | Yes/No | MAX POINTS = 5 Points PSH/RRH/TH 5 Yes | Data Source: 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form | 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form: Agency's written commitment that the project will follow a Housing First approach where asked in the 2018 CoC project application. |

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---|------|---|---|
| 5.2 | PSH DEDICATED FOR CHRONIC: PSH Only: PSH Bed Inventory is dedicated to fill all beds with chronically homeless | PSH: 100% CH Beds Dedicated | MAX POINTS = 5 <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Points</td> <td>PSH</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PSH | 5 | 100% | Data Source: 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form | 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form: Agency's written commitment to dedicate all beds for chronic in 2018 CoC project application. |
| Points | PSH | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 100% | | | | | | | | |
| 6. FAIRFIELD COUNTY COORDINATED ACCESS NETWORK (CAN) PARTICIPATION CRITERIA – 18 POINTS ONLY PROJECTS THAT ARE DETERMINED TO BE 100% CAN COMPLIANT ARE ELIGIBLE FOR POINTS IN THIS CATEGORY | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.1 | <p>THIS IS A THRESHOLD REQUIREMENT – ONLY PROJECTS FOUND TO HAVE REPORTED AND FILLED ALL VACANCIES THROUGH THE CAN WILL BE ELIGIBLE FOR POINTS IN SECTION 6 - FAIRFIELD COUNTY COORDINATED ACCESS NETWORK (CAN) PARTICIPATION CRITERIA</p> <p>VACANCIES REPORTED: 100% project vacancies are reported to and filled through the Fairfield County CAN</p> <p><i>Note: Projects serving HIV/AIDS participants, DV projects, and TH projects may be exempt based upon review by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee.</i></p> | Yes/No | NO POINTS THRESHOLD REQUIREMENT | Data Source: Fairfield County Coordinated Access Network (CAN) Data and HMIS records | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-reference HMIS data on program entries to vacancies reported to FCCAN • HPM Facilitators will also be consulted to review data | | | | |
| 6.2 | <p>PARTICIPANT ELIGIBILITY: Project fills vacancies through the FCCAN Housing Placement process, ensuring at least 1 Adult Participant per HH w/previous residence that indicates qualified literal homelessness¹</p> <p><i>Note: Projects serving HIV/AIDS participants, DV projects, and TH projects may be exempt based upon review by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee.</i></p> | 100% of Households | MAX POINTS = 5 <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Points</td> <td>PSH/RRH/TH</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PSH/RRH/TH | 5 | 100% | Data Source: Fairfield County Coordinated Access Network (CAN) Data and HMIS | <p>FCCAN and HMIS data on project entries from 1-1-2017 to 12-31-2017 will be cross-referenced with CAN data on client eligibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participant eligibility for projects with funding requirements to serve subpopulations will be reviewed and considered in scoring. |
| Points | PSH/RRH/TH | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 100% | | | | | | | | |

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|--|--|--------|-------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| 6.3 | <p>LENGTH OF TIME FROM CAN REFERRAL TO AGENCY RESPONSE: Agencies responds to CAN referrals in timely manner</p> <p>Note: Projects serving HIV/AIDS participants, DV projects, and TH projects may be exempt based upon review by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee.</p> | <p>Measures business days between date of FCCAN referral and agency response.</p> <p>Project average number of days will be assessed in quintiles. Projects with the lowest average are in the top quintile. Projects with highest average are in the lowest quintile.</p> | <p>MAX POINTS = 5</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="890 435 1245 764"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>Average # of Days- top fifth of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Average # of Days is in 21-40% of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Average # of Days is in 41-60% of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Average # of Days is in 61-80% of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>Average # of Days is in lowest fifth of projects</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PH/TH | 5 | Average # of Days- top fifth of projects | 3 | Average # of Days is in 21-40% of projects | 2 | Average # of Days is in 41-60% of projects | 1 | Average # of Days is in 61-80% of projects | 0 | Average # of Days is in lowest fifth of projects | <p>Data Source: Fairfield County Coordinated Access Network (CAN) Data</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects will not be scored unless fully compliant with CAN policies and procedures and housing placement process. • Measured by time between Referral Date and Agency Response Date • All referrals scored, even those which are not accepted. |
| Points | PH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Average # of Days- top fifth of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Average # of Days is in 21-40% of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Average # of Days is in 41-60% of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Average # of Days is in 61-80% of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Average # of Days is in lowest fifth of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|--------|-------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| 6.4 | <p>LENGTH OF TIME FROM AGENCY REFERRAL ACCEPTANCE TO HOUSING PLACEMENT: Referral accepted by agency must be housed in a timely manner</p> <p><i>Note: Projects serving HIV/AIDS participants, DV projects, and TH projects may be exempt based upon review by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee..</i></p> | <p>Measures business days between date of agency referral acceptance and date when participant is housed.</p> <p>Project average number of days will be assessed in quintiles. Projects with the lowest average are in the top quintile. Projects with highest average are in the lowest quintile.</p> | <p>MAX POINTS = 5</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="890 451 1245 781"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>Average # of Days- top fifth of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Average # of Days is in 21-40% of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Average # of Days is in 41-60% of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Average # of Days is in 61-80% of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>Average # of Days is in lowest fifth of projects</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PH/TH | 5 | Average # of Days- top fifth of projects | 3 | Average # of Days is in 21-40% of projects | 2 | Average # of Days is in 41-60% of projects | 1 | Average # of Days is in 61-80% of projects | 0 | Average # of Days is in lowest fifth of projects | <p>Data Source: Fairfield County Coordinated Access Network (CAN) Data and HMIS 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects will not be scored unless fully compliant with CAN policies and procedures and housing placement process. • Use FC CAN data on accepted referrals • Measured by time between Referral Acceptance Date and Date Housed |
| Points | PH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Average # of Days- top fifth of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Average # of Days is in 21-40% of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Average # of Days is in 41-60% of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Average # of Days is in 61-80% of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Average # of Days is in lowest fifth of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--------|-------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| 6.5 | <p>CAN REFERRAL DENIAL RATE: % of CAN referrals denied by agency for reasons that are not on list of acceptable denials</p> <p><i>Note: Projects serving HIV/AIDS participants, DV projects, and TH projects may be exempt based upon review by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee.</i></p> | 0% of referrals denied | <p>MAX POINTS = 3</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PH/TH | 3 | 0% | Data Source: Fairfield County Coordinated Access Network (CAN) Data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects will not be scored unless fully compliant with CAN policies and procedures and housing placement process. Use FC CAN data on accepted and denied referrals The following reasons will be considered acceptable reasons for a denied referral: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criminal background that precludes placement in the specific housing location offered by project (ex: participant is on the sex offender registry and project is within proximity of school/park/etc., NOT simply the presence of a criminal background) Handicap accessibility (match was made without knowledge that client needed accessible unit or that the unit was not handicap accessible) Error was made by HPM (client didn't meet funder-required eligibility criteria, missing diagnosis, etc.) | | | | | | | | |
| Points | PH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. COST EFFECTIVENESS CRITERIA – 8 POINTS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.1 | <p>COST EFFECTIVENESS – COST PER UNIT/HOUSEHOLD SERVED: PSH - Average cost unit/household served RRH/TH - Average cost per household served</p> | <p>Project Average Household Cost to CoC Project Maximum Average Cost Ratio will be assessed in quintiles. Projects with the lowest cost ratios are in the top quintile. Projects with highest cost ratios are in the lowest quintile.</p> | <p>MAX POINTS = 4 Quintiles for scattered-site projects and site-based projects will be assessed separately.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Project Cost Ratio in top fifth of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Project Cost Ratio in 21-40% of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Project Cost Ratio in 41-60% of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Project Cost Ratio in 61-80% of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>Project Cost Ratio in lowest fifth of projects</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PH/TH | 4 | Project Cost Ratio in top fifth of projects | 3 | Project Cost Ratio in 21-40% of projects | 2 | Project Cost Ratio in 41-60% of projects | 1 | Project Cost Ratio in 61-80% of projects | 0 | Project Cost Ratio in lowest fifth of projects | Data Source: 2018 GIW, 2017 Project Application budget/award, Renewal Project Summary Form, APR, Project Unit Count Form | <p>Calculation for Project Average per Household Cost: <u>Numerator</u>: GIW Total ARA Amount <u>Denominator</u>: # of units or households served (Project renewal Summary Form/Project Units Count Form)</p> <p>CoC Project Maximum Average Per Household Cost Allowed: <u>Numerator</u>: (# of households served x CoC services cost standard) + (# of housing units x FMR) <u>Denominator</u>: # of households served</p> <p>Project Average Household Cost to CoC Project Maximum Average Cost Ratio: <u>Numerator</u>: Project Average per Household Cost <u>Denominator</u>: Project Average Maximum Per Household Cost Allowed</p> |
| Points | PH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Project Cost Ratio in top fifth of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Project Cost Ratio in 21-40% of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Project Cost Ratio in 41-60% of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Project Cost Ratio in 61-80% of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Project Cost Ratio in lowest fifth of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| 7.2 | COST EFFECTIVENESS – COST PER POSITIVE EXIT: PSH - Average cost per household that remains or exits to Permanent Housing destination. RRH/TH - Average cost per exit to Permanent Housing destination. | Project Average Household Cost will be assessed in quintiles. Projects with the lowest average costs will be in the top quintile. Projects with highest average costs will be in the lowest quintile. | <p>MAX POINTS = 4</p> <p>Quintiles for scattered-site projects and site-based projects will be assessed separately.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PH/TH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Project Average Cost in top fifth of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Project Average Cost in 21-40% of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Project Average Cost in 41-60% of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Project Average Cost in 61-80% of projects</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>Project Average Cost in lowest fifth of projects</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Points | PH/TH | 4 | Project Average Cost in top fifth of projects | 3 | Project Average Cost in 21-40% of projects | 2 | Project Average Cost in 41-60% of projects | 1 | Project Average Cost in 61-80% of projects | 0 | Project Average Cost in lowest fifth of projects | Data Source: 2018 GIW, 2017 Project Application budget/award, Renewal Project Summary Form, APR, Project Unit Count Form | <p>Calculation for PSH: <u>Numerator:</u> GIW Total ARA Amount <u>Denominator:</u> (APR Q1 Number Adult Stayers + Q23 Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q24 Permanent Destinations Subtotal)</p> <p>Calculation for RRH/TH: <u>Numerator:</u> GIW Total ARA Amount <u>Denominator:</u> (APR Q23 Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q24 Permanent Destinations Subtotal)</p> |
| Points | PH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Project Average Cost in top fifth of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Project Average Cost in 21-40% of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Project Average Cost in 41-60% of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Project Average Cost in 61-80% of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | Project Average Cost in lowest fifth of projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. PENALTIES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8.1 | HUD MONITORING: Disposition of HUD Monitoring and Findings | No monitoring, no findings if monitored, or monitoring findings have been resolved within last 2 years. | <p>0 points: Within last 2 years, no monitoring, no findings if monitored, or monitoring findings have been resolved</p> <p>-5 points: Monitored within last 2 years and findings unresolved</p> | Source: Instructions in 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form. Provision of HUD Monitoring Report and Response to Findings over the past 2 years | Review of information provided in 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form regarding monitoring, along with any supplemental monitoring documents provided. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8.2 | LATE SUBMISSION OF REQUIRED DOCUMENTS: Late submission of documents for 2018 renewal project scoring process | Late submission to result in penalty | -2 points for each document up to a maximum of -10 points | Source: ODFC records on submission of 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form and required documents to CoC, | Funding Oversight Subcommittee to review list of projects that have submitted 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form and required documents late. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. BONUS POINTS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

| # | Renewal Evaluation Criteria | 2018 Benchmarks | Points | Notes | Calculation | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--------|-------------|---|-----|--------|-------|---|--|--|--|
| 9.1 | HUD HOUSING FIRST ASSESSMENT TOOL: a. Agency completes HUD Housing First Assessment Tool for project b. Agency completes the HF Assessment Tool Follow Up Form | a. Completed HF Assessment Submitted – Yes/No b. HF Improvement Plan Submitted – Yes/No | MAX POINTS = 4 a. HF Assessment Submitted <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PH/TH</th> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> b. HF Improvement Plan Submitted <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PH/TH</th> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PH/TH | 2 | Yes | Points | PH/TH | 2 | Yes | Source: 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form; Housing First Assessment Tool; Housing First Assessment Tool Follow Up Form | Review of: 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form; Housing First Assessment Tool; Housing First Assessment Tool Follow Up Form HUD Housing First Assessment Tool can be found here: https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/5294/housing-first-assessment-tool/ |
| Points | PH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Points | PH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. PROJECTS DEDICATED TO SERVING VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10.1 | POLICIES/PROTOCOLS/PROCEDURES IN PLACE TO IMPROVE CLIENT SAFETY: Projects serving survivors of domestic violence have policies, protocols and/or procedures in place at the project-level that are designed to improve the safety of their clients. | Yes/No | MAX POINTS = 4 <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RRH/TH</th> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PSH/RRH/TH | 4 | Yes | 0 | No | Data Source: Description provided in 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form; Documentation of policies, protocols or procedures. | Description of policies, protocols and/or procedures and documentation provided will be reviewed to determine whether the agency has established policies, protocols and/or procedures at the project level that improve client safety. | | |
| Points | PSH/RRH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | No | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10.2 | SAFETY PLANNING: Project staff works with individual clients (and their households) to develop a safety plan that is designed to improve and maintain the safety of the clients. | Yes/No | MAX POINTS = 4 <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>PSH/RRH/TH</th> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table> | Points | PSH/RRH/TH | 4 | Yes | 0 | No | Data Source: Description provided in 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form; Documentation of policies, protocol or procedures. | Description of activities and documentation provided will be reviewed to determine whether there is an established project-level process to work with clients to develop a safety plan tailored to their circumstances and needs and that is designed to improve and maintain client safety. | | |
| Points | PSH/RRH/TH | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | No | | | | | | | | | | | | |

¹ Homeless person includes those who were homeless prior to entering the institutional setting and stayed in the institution for less than 90 days and those who entered the program when the older HUD homeless regulations applied.

2018 ODFC / CT – 503 CoC Renewal Project Scoring Standards

FINAL: APPROVED 2018.06.25; REVISIONS 2018.07.03

The following policies apply to projects dedicated to serving those fleeing from Domestic Violence:

- For DV projects, an APR data report will need to be run by the agency from their HMIS-equivalent data management system and submitted with the 2018 Renewal Project Summary Form. For DV programs unable to generate an APR through a database, a manually completed version of the APR tables used for scoring must be submitted.
- DV projects will be exempted from the following criteria:
 - All Data Quality criteria due to use of HMIS-equivalent data management system
 - Performance Outcomes criteria:
 - #3.6 Length of Stay – DV RRH/TH projects are exempted in order to serve participants longer, if necessary
 - #3.9 Returns to Homelessness – DV projects are exempted due to data restrictions put into place in order to maintain client confidentiality and safety.
 - Fairfield County CAN Compliance – may be exempted from all criteria for the CY17 time period upon review by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee.
- Only DV projects will be scored on Section 10 criteria, related to client safety and safety planning.

Tiebreakers:

In the event that a tie occurs in the ranking score, the following CoC priority policies will be considered as tiebreaking criteria:

1. Total Data Quality score + Total Performance score + Total HUD Priorities score
2. Total Agency Compliance and Participation score + Total FCCAN Participation score
3. Total Grant Management score + Total Cost Effectiveness score

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

Policy Approval & Adoption

This policy document was recommended to the Non-Conflicted Members of the ODFC Coordinating Council for approval and adoption by the ODFC Funding Oversight Subcommittee on 06/15/18.

This policy document was approved and adopted by the Non-Conflicted Members of the ODFC Coordinating Council on 06/20/18.

Review & Input Process

In preparation for the 2018 HUD CoC NOFA, initial feedback on the scoring standards for renewal projects and project ranking was solicited from the ODFC CT-503 CoC-funded grantees, ODFC Standards and Evaluations Committee, the ODFC Data Quality Subcommittee and the ODFC Executive Committee through various meetings and email distributions/solicitations:

- A review of the 2017 scoring and ranking of projects was held on 11/13/17 with the ODFC CT-503 CoC-funded grantees and included opportunity for grantees to provide feedback on the 2017 scoring criteria and process.
- Existing and proposed new scoring criteria for project renewal evaluations, the data sources used to assess those criteria and the calculations to be used to evaluate performance of the criteria were provided to the Standards and Evaluations Committee for review and input at Committee meetings on 2/1/18 and 2/15/18.
- The Standards & Evaluations Data Quality Subcommittee provided input during a 3/9/18 meeting on the following: existing and proposed new scoring criteria for project renewal evaluations; the tools used to gather data; and the scoring process.
- Input on the CoC funding priorities and ranking for the 2018 NOFA was solicited during meetings of the Executive Committee on 2/26/18 and 4/5/18. This included a survey on CoC priorities in key areas: target populations, housing needs, service needs, system infrastructure needs and CoC priorities.

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

Committees: Roles and Responsibilities

As detailed below, various ODFC committees are charged with the following responsibilities related to the scoring and ranking of renewal project applications.

ODFC Standards and Evaluation Committee

The ODFC Standards and Evaluation Committee is comprised of approximately 10 members, including 2 non-biased, non-conflicted individuals. As most members of the Standards and Evaluation Committee are CT-503 CoC grantees, the Committee will function only in an advisory role in the development of 2018 Renewal Project Scoring Standards and Appeals Process. Feedback from the Standards and Evaluation Committee will be solicited given their technical expertise, but the Standards and Evaluation Committee will have no decision-making authority regarding the scoring criteria to be adopted or the thresholds and point system related to those criteria.

Responsibilities of the Standards and Evaluation Committee include:

- Review and provide feedback regarding proposed new and existing scoring criteria.
Note: this Committee will not review criteria benchmarks or point allocations.

ODFC Data Quality Subcommittee (Subcommittee of Standards and Evaluation Committee)

The ODFC Data Quality Subcommittee is a subcommittee of the Standards and Evaluation Committee. The Data Quality subcommittee is comprised of representatives with expertise on data quality. Members of this subcommittee are also members of the CT HMIS Steering Committee and serve as HMIS Data Coordinators for their respective organizations. As many of the members of the Data Quality Subcommittee are conflicted due to their status as CT-503 grantees, they hold no decision-making authority. However, members of this subcommittee offer experience working on data issues within their agencies and on behalf of the CoC, as well as on prior CoC applications. As such, they are able to provide input and feedback regarding the scoring process, appropriate expectations on data collection and management and tools used to collect data and information for scoring.

Responsibilities of the Data Quality Subcommittee include:

- Review and provide feedback regarding proposed scoring criteria, scoring tools and scoring process.
Note: this Committee will not review criteria benchmarks or point allocations.

ODFC Funding Oversight Subcommittee

ODFC's Funding Oversight Subcommittee is a subcommittee of the Funders Collaborative and is comprised of individuals associated with organizations that do not receive Continuum of Care program

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development within the CT-503 jurisdiction. These individuals are considered non-conflicted in determining future funding considerations for the CT-503 CoC.

In order to guarantee an unbiased process that is based on established CoC priorities in determining funding allocations, the Funding Oversight Subcommittee will undertake the following activities:

- Review and recommend to the Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council the adoption of the following:
 - 2018 Renewal Project Scoring Standards
 - 2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process
 - 2018 New Project Solicitation(s)
 - Selection of new CoC-funded projects
 - 2018 Renewal Projects scoring, including review of appeals
 - Projects to be fully or partially reallocated, reallocation amounts and reallocation appeals
 - Ranking and tiering of all CoC-funded projects for 2018 CoC NOFA competition

Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council

The Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council are comprised of individuals associated with organizations that do not receive Continuum of Care program funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development within the CT-503 jurisdiction. These individuals are considered non-conflicted in determining future funding considerations for the CT-503 CoC.

This group will undertake the following activities:

- Approve and adopt the following CoC policies/documents:
 - 2018 Renewal Project Scoring Standards
 - 2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process
 - 2018 New Project Solicitation(s)
- Approve and adopt the selection of new project applications.
- Approve and adopt the final scoring of renewal project applications.
- Approve and adopt the final ranking and tiering of all CoC-funded project applications.
- Approve and adopt list of projects to be fully or partially reallocated, reallocation amounts and reallocation appeals

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

Guiding Principles for 2018 Project Evaluation, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking

The CoC seeks to conduct a fair, unbiased process in which projects are ranked according to project performance, CoC priorities and local need, and federal priorities.

Guiding Principles for 2018 Project Evaluation, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking

The ODFC/CT-503 CoC seeks to achieve the following goals as part of the evaluation and ranking of CoC-funded renewal projects:

- Maximize funding available to end homelessness throughout the CoC;
- Prioritize available funding for projects that are most successful in ending homelessness;
- Create new resources in order to respond to the increased needs identified in many communities within the CoC;
- Build upon the CoC's existing infrastructure by increasing capacity for quickly identifying individuals experiencing homelessness, prioritizing assistance towards those with the greatest needs, and rapidly connecting households to permanent housing;
- Incentivize all CoC-funded providers to continuously monitor and improve their project performance, implement HUD policy priorities, and participate in the CoC meetings, committees and other initiatives.

In focusing on these goals, the CoC's project evaluation and ranking process will include an allocation strategy that determines whether projects should be reallocated either partially or in full due to the following:

- Poor performance
- Lack of need within the CoC for the project
- Lack of compliance with HUD and/or CoC priorities
- Project is determined to not be cost effective
- Project funds are likely to be recaptured
- Monitoring indicates serious problems with the project

Upon the availability of new or reallocated funds, the CoC will conduct a fair, open and transparent process regarding the selection of new projects. Priorities for new projects will be established by the CoC and will reflect CoC needs and HUD priorities. Project selection will be based on criteria outlined by the CoC through a new project solicitation process.

The CoC will also conduct a fair and transparent process regarding the ranking and tiering of projects to be included on the 2018 Priority List. Ranking and tiering decisions will be informed by CoC and HUD priorities, as well as local needs and project performance.

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

2018 Renewal Project Evaluation and Scoring Policy

On an annual basis, the CT-503 CoC establishes scoring standards to evaluate and score HUD CoC-funded renewal projects in preparation for the ranking of projects for the NOFA. In order to determine whether renewal projects are performing well or underperforming, the ODFC/CT-503 CoC project-level evaluation of each project's performance will encompass the following areas:

- Data quality
- Project performance
- Grant management
- Agency compliance and participation
- Compliance with HUD and CoC policy priorities
- Participation in the Fairfield County Coordinated Access Network (which includes the assignment of resources based upon severity of needs)
- Cost effectiveness
- Resolution of any HUD monitoring findings

Process for Renewal Project Evaluation and Scoring

The following process was used to develop the 2018 renewal project evaluation policies and scoring standards:

- Input on renewal project scoring standards and related documents is solicited from the following:
 - ODFC CT-503 CoC-funded grantees
 - ODFC Standards and Evaluations Committee
 - ODFC Data Quality Subcommittee
 - ODFC Executive Committee
- Input is used to inform the drafting of policies, scoring standards and related documents. Drafting of documents and policies is conducted by CoC staff and CoC NOFA consultants, Diana T. Myers and Associates.
- Draft policies are presented to the Funding Oversight Subcommittee for full review and discussion. Direction from the Funding Oversight Subcommittee is used to create updated versions of the scoring standards, policies and related documents.
- The Funding Oversight Subcommittee recommends updated versions of the scoring standards, policies and related documents for approval and adoption by the Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council.
- The Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council conducts a review of the scoring standards, policies and related documents. Once any issues raised by the NCMCC are addressed in a satisfactory manner, a vote to approve and adopt final scoring standards, policies and related documents will take place.

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

- Upon approval and adoption, final scoring standards, policies and related documents will be publicly posted to the ODFC website and distributed to the members of the Executive Committee and CoC-funded agencies via email.
- Scoring of renewal projects commences following the adoption of final scoring standards, policies and related documents. Instructions for submitting the required information for renewal project scoring will be provided to CoC-funded renewal project grantees with a strict timeline for their response.

2018 Renewal Project Evaluation and Scoring Policy

Evaluation and scoring of CoC-funded renewal projects will inform project ranking and tiering for the FY18 CoC NOFA competition. ODFC/CT-503 has adopted the following policies for the evaluation and scoring of projects for the FY18 HUD CoC application:

1. Housing First is a policy of the CT 503/ODFC CoC. The CoC will make efforts to reallocate non-compliant projects to providers that ensure a Housing First model will be implemented with the newly funded, reallocated project.
2. Renewal projects will be scored in accordance with the 2018 Renewal Project Scoring Standards. Note: Projects that submitted a request for consolidation prior to the 2017 CoC NOFA Competition may be allowed to be scored as a single project upon indication from the HUD Hartford Field Office that the consolidation request will move forward. If a process for consolidation of grants is included in the 2018 CoC NOFA, projects requesting consolidation through that process may be allowed to be scored as a single project.
3. Preliminary scores will be reviewed by the ODFC Funding Oversight Subcommittee and approved by the Non-Conflicted Members of the ODFC Coordinating Council.
4. Grantees will be given an opportunity to appeal preliminary scores. See the “2018 Renewal Project Scoring Appeals Process” stated further on in this document for details.
5. The final scoring will be presented to the Funding Oversight Subcommittee for review and recommendation to the Non-Conflicted Members of the ODFC Coordinating Council.
6. The Non-Conflicted Members of the ODFC Coordinating Council will review the recommendations of the ODFC Funding Oversight Subcommittee regarding appeals, scoring and ranking of renewal projects, resolve any remaining issues, and vote on their approval and adoption.
7. The final scoring of renewal projects will be reported to the ODFC Executive Committee, distributed to CoC-funded grantees and posted on the ODFC website.
8. The CoC has adopted a Quarterly Monitoring process to assist projects in identifying performance issues and improving performance on an ongoing basis. Low performing projects are expected to fully participate in this process and work to improve performance, seeking TA from the CoC where needed.

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

2018 Renewal Project Scoring Appeals Process

As part of the scoring of the ODFC/CT-503 Continuum of Care renewal projects, the CoC will utilize the following procedure to provide grantees with a process to have errors corrected and to provide additional information for issues that the grantee believes may be worth special consideration.

The renewal project scoring appeals process for data corrections and appeals is as follows:

- A preliminary scoring document will be distributed to each grantee for review that will include data on each project's performance on each scoring criteria and the related score.
- All grantees will have five (5) days to submit questions and appeals regarding performance data and/or scoring.
 - Written appeals should be submitted to through the openingdoorsoffairfieldcounty@gmail.com email address, with the Subject line "Appeal of 2018 Scoring - [Project Grant #] – [Agency Name]"
 - Grantees should use the form provided by the CoC to submit an appeal.
- Performance data and related scoring adjustments that need to be made based upon data or calculation errors will be corrected by ODFC staff or their consultants (DMA), with the grantee notified about any correction(s) made as quickly as possible.
- If the grantee raises an issue that must be addressed through an exception to the scoring policies as described in the 2018 Renewal Project Scoring Standards, the grantee's written appeal will be reviewed by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee.
- The Funding Oversight Subcommittee will evaluate all written appeals submitted and make a recommendation to the Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council regarding whether each appeal is granted or denied.
- The Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council will review Funding Oversight Subcommittee recommendations and, upon resolution of any remaining issues, vote to approve and adopt decisions.
- DMA/ODFC staff will adjust performance data and scores based on the disposition of each appeal.
- Grantees will be informed by email communication about the disposition of their written appeal by DMA/ODFC staff.
- Final scoring that incorporates appeal decisions will be determined and released per the "2018 Renewal Project Evaluation and Scoring Policy" stated earlier in this document.

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

2018 Renewal Project Reallocation

As stated earlier in this document, ODFC/CT-503 CoC will use project evaluation and scoring to determine which projects should be allocated funds under the FY18 CoC NOFA Competition. ODFC/CT-503 will employ a reallocation policy aimed at the following:

- Determining which projects should continue to receive funding based upon performance, meeting CoC needs and furthering HUD priorities.
- Determining which projects are underperforming and whether funds allocated to underperforming projects may better utilized if reallocated to another project.
- Determining whether projects are cost effective and, if not, should a project or a portion of a project be reallocated.
- Identifying whether funds are fully utilized by each project. If there is a risk that HUD might recapture funds, the CoC will seek to determine whether a reallocation plan should be implemented to ensure no loss of CoC funding.

The ODFC/CT-503 CoC's Reallocation policy will be adopted as follows:

- The Funding Oversight Subcommittee will review and recommend the general reallocation strategy to the Non-Conflicted Members of the ODFC Coordinating Council.
- The Non-Conflicted Members of the ODFC Coordinating Council will review and approve the adoption of the final reallocation strategy.

Reallocation of Underperforming Projects

Using the 2018 Renewal Project Scoring Standards tool, projects will be scored across a variety of criteria covering a number of areas: data quality; project performance; agency performance/compliance; compliance with grant requirements; compliance with HUD priorities; compliance with Fairfield County Coordinated Access Network (CAN) policies; cost effectiveness; ODFC/CoC participation; and resolution of HUD monitoring findings.

Scores will be given for each criterion, with all scores summed for a total score for each project. High scores reflect strong performance and low scores reflect weak performance. Low performing projects will be considered for reallocation and projects scoring the least number of points for two consecutive years (2017 and 2018) will be prioritized for reallocation. A project is considered to be low performing when the project's score places the project in the bottom 25% of the projects scored in that year; for 2017, projects that were not funded will not be included in the 25%.

Projects subject to reallocation based on poor performance will be provided with an opportunity to submit an appeal. The Reallocation Appeals Policy and Process described further on in this section provides more detail.

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

Reallocation of Projects Based on Cost Effectiveness

As part of the FY17 CoC NOFA Competition, the ODFC/CT-503 CoC reallocated funds from projects based on a cost effectiveness strategy. The cost effectiveness strategy included the adoption of the following as cost standards:

- Services:
 - Family household: \$5,500
 - Single adult household: \$4,000
- Housing: amount spent per household should not exceed the FMR payment for the size of unit needed in the geographic area in which the unit is located

Unit information, household type and location of units was provided by grantees. Using the information provided by grantees, a total project maximum amount was calculated and projects which exceeded the maximum were subject to partial reallocation of the amount over the maximum.

In 2018, projects will again be reviewed for cost effectiveness using the standards adopted in 2018. Projects that exceed the maximum amount for services and/or housing will be considered for partial reallocation by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee. The Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council will review any recommended cost effectiveness reallocations recommended by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee and make the final determination regarding such reallocations.

Projects subject to cost effectiveness reallocation will be provided with an opportunity to submit an appeal. The Reallocation Appeals Policy and Process described further on in this section provides more detail.

Reallocation for Other Reasons

The CT-503 CoC will also consider reallocation of projects for other reasons, including:

- Lack of need within the CoC for the project
- Project funds are likely to be recaptured
- Monitoring indicates serious problems with the project

Projects subject to reallocation for any of these reasons will be provided with an opportunity to submit an appeal. The Reallocation Appeals Policy and Process described further on in this section provides more detail.

2018 Reallocation Process

Any project reallocations based upon increasing the project's cost effectiveness will occur as follows:

- The Funding Oversight Subcommittee will review and recommend a list of projects to be reallocated and a reallocation amount based upon the adopted cost effectiveness housing and services standards.

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

- The Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council will review the list of projects and amount to be reallocated to improve cost effectiveness and approve the adoption of that list as they deem appropriate.
- Grantees with projects subject to reallocation will be notified by phone of the reallocation decision by a representative from ODFC. Grantees will also be notified of the reallocation decision in writing via email. Grantees will be advised that CoC-funded projects that intend to continue to operate must do so at or below the ODFC/CT-503 CoC's cost standard. A form will be provided offering a list of options for moving forward, including:
 - The project will submit a renewal project application based on the reduced budget. This budget must meet the CoC's cost standards for services and housing.
 - The project cannot operate at full capacity without the funds dedicated for reallocation; thereby the project will reallocate project funds in addition to the Reallocation Amount determined by ODFC.
 - The project wishes to appeal the reallocation decision.
- The list of projects subject to reallocation to improve cost effectiveness will be posted on the ODFC website and distributed to CoC grantees.
- Grantees subject to reallocation will have five (5) days to submit an appeal. The Reallocation Appeals Policy and Process described further on in this section provides more detail.

Any reallocations determined due to poor project performance/compliance will occur as follows:

- The list of reallocations to occur based upon project performance/compliance will be determined through the renewal project scoring process.
- The Funding Oversight Subcommittee will review renewal projects with the lowest scores and recommend projects for reallocation to the Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council.
- The Non-Conflicted Members of the ODFC Coordinating Council will review and approve/adopt the projects to be reallocated through project performance and compliance as they deem appropriate.
- Upon approval and adoption of the list of projects subject to reallocation due to poor project performance/compliance, the affected grantees will be notified by phone of the reallocation decision by a representative of ODFC. Grantees will also be notified of the reallocation decision in writing via email.
- Grantees subject to reallocation will have five (5) days to submit an appeal. The Reallocation Appeals Policy and Process described further on in this section provides more detail.
- A final list of all project reallocations to take place through the FY 2017 CoC NOFA will be posted on the ODFC website and distributed to all CoC grantees.

Any reallocations determined due to other reasons, such as lack of need within the CoC, recapture of funds or serious concerns identified through monitoring, will occur as follows:

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

- Upon determination by ODFC staff that a project may need to be reallocated due to an issue such as lack of need within the CoC, recapture of funds or serious concerns identified through monitoring, documentation will be collected for presentation to the relevant committees.
- The Funding Oversight Subcommittee will review documentation and make a recommendation to the Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council regarding reallocation of projects where this is deemed to be the appropriate response.
- The Non-Conflicted Members of the ODFC Coordinating Council will review and approve/adopt the projects to be reallocated where they deem the documentation to support this action.
- Upon approval and adoption of the list of projects subject to reallocation, the affected grantees will be notified by phone of the reallocation decision by a representative of ODFC. Grantees will also be notified of the reallocation decision in writing via email.
- Grantees subject to reallocation will have five (5) days to submit an appeal. The Reallocation Appeals Policy and Process described further on in this section provides more detail.
- A final list of all project reallocations to take place through the FY 2017 CoC NOFA will be posted on the ODFC website and distributed to all CoC grantees.

2018 Reallocation Appeals Policy and Process

Grantees subject to reallocation for poor performance or cost effectiveness will have five (5) days from the date of notification of the reallocation to submit an appeal.

Written appeals should be submitted through the openingdoorsoffairfieldcounty@gmail.com email address, with the email subject line "Appeal of 2018 Reallocation-[Grant #]-[Agency Name]". Grantees wishing to submit an appeal for a project subject to reallocation must indicate their intent to appeal on the form that is provided by the CoC. The grantee is responsible for providing the information requested for the appeal.

The Funding Oversight Subcommittee will evaluate all written appeals submitted for review and decide whether each appeal is granted or denied.

The Non-Conflicted Members of the ODFC Coordinating Council will review and approve/adopt the appeal decisions made by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee.

Grantees will be informed by email communication about the disposition of their written appeal.

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

New Project Selection

As part of the annual CoC NOFA Competition, the ODFC/CT-503 CoC may identify funds available for new projects. The CoC is committed to ensuring an open and transparent process for the selection of new projects. As such, where funding availability permits, the CoC will issue a new project solicitation for new projects to be distributed widely to interested parties.

New Project Priorities

In order to determine priorities for new projects, CoC staff and the CoC's consultant (DMA) developed a survey to assess needs and funding priorities which was distributed to the members of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee met on 2/26/18 and 4/5/18 to review the survey results and additional data and to discuss CoC funding options. The Executive Committee came to consensus around the following general recommendations:

- Approximately 70% of funding available for new projects should be directed toward Rapid Re-housing projects, with target populations of families with children and youth.
- Approximately 30% of funding available for new projects should be directed toward Permanent Supportive Housing projects, with an emphasis on funding for services. While chronic would be the first priority for this housing, other populations could be considered based upon need and following the CoC's adopted prioritization policies.

The Executive Committee noted that funding priorities can be revisited as needed, particularly upon the availability of additional information regarding funding levels.

Drafting of New Project Solicitations

In order to ensure a fair and transparent process regarding the selection of new projects, the CoC will draft and issue a new project solicitation for each project type identified by the CoC as a funding priority. The process for drafting and release of new project solicitations is as follows:

- CoC staff and the CoC's consultant will draft the new project solicitation.
- The new project solicitations for each project type will be reviewed by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee. Upon satisfaction with the content and quality of the solicitations, the Funding Oversight Subcommittee will recommend them to the Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council for release.
- The Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council will review all new project solicitations. Upon satisfaction with the content and quality of the solicitations, the Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council will vote to approve the solicitations for release by the CoC.

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

Distribution of New Project Solicitations

Once new project solicitations are approved by the Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council, the CoC will release them to the public. The CoC will work to identify multiple outlets for distribution of the solicitations, including through the CoC's website and email distribution list, as well as those of related and partner organizations through the region and the state.

Review of New Project Pre-Applications

New project solicitations will request that those interested in applying submit a pre-application for CoC review. The information to be included in the pre-application will be detailed in the new project solicitation.

All pre-applications submitted by the deadline stated in the new project solicitation will be reviewed by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee. The Funding Oversight Subcommittee can request additional information from the applicants where clarification would be helpful in the decision-making process. For each pre-application submitted, the Funding Oversight Subcommittee will make a recommendation as to whether or not it should receive funding through the FY18 CoC NOFA Competition.

All recommendations made by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee will be sent to the Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council for review. Following this review, the Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council will vote on which pre-applications will be asked to submit a full application for a new project as part of the ODFC/CT-503 CoC's FY18 CoC Priority List.

All agencies submitting pre-applications will be notified in writing via email regarding the decision of the CoC. In addition, the CoC will publicly post a list of new project pre-applications selected for inclusion on the CT-503 CoC FY18 Priority List as well as those not selected.

Upon selection, new project applicants must submit a new project application through the HUD e-snaps system in a timely manner and within the deadline established by the CoC.

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

Ranking of Projects for the Priority List

Project Ranking

The CoC expects that the 2018 CoC Competition NOFA will require the CoC to rank projects included on the 2018 Priority List. As part of this process, the CoC anticipates that projects will be sorted into Tier 1 and Tier 2. In past CoC Competitions, projects placed into Tier 2 have been scored by HUD in order to determine if they will receive funding.

Project ranking and placement of each project into Tier 1 or Tier 2 will be determined by several factors:

- For renewal projects, a significant portion of the project's rank will be based upon the project's performance, as determined through the Renewal Project Scoring process.
- Discussion will be held regarding strategies for the ranking of renewal projects without a full year of operations.
- For all projects, CoC policies related to the placement of specific project types (i.e., HMIS, Planning, Supportive Services Only for coordinated entry/access, Permanent Supportive Housing, Rapid Re-Housing, Transitional Housing, New and Bonus projects), will be determined by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee and the Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council, with consideration of input provided by the Executive Committee.
- The Funding Oversight Subcommittee and Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council will review various ranking/tiering scenarios in order to determine the most competitive scoring options for projects placed into Tier 2.
- Additional factors, including CoC and HUD priorities, may be considered by the Funding Oversight Subcommittee and Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council in determining project ranking.

The process for determining project ranking and tiering will include the following:

- Once all project applications have been selected for inclusion on the 2018 Priority List or rejected (including selection of projects for reallocation and new project selections), final project ranking and tiering decisions will be made.
- The Funding Oversight Subcommittee will review various project ranking and tiering scenarios and recommend a preferred project ranking and tiering scenario to the Non-Conflicted Members of the Coordinating Council for approval and adoption.
- The Non-Conflicted Members of the ODFC Coordinating Council will review the project ranking/tiering recommendation(s) of the Funding Oversight Subcommittee and approve/adopt a scenario.
- Upon adoption of final project ranking and tiering for the 2018 Priority List, the CoC will publicly post the information and provide notification to grantees/applicants.

Opening Doors of Fairfield County/CT-503 CoC FY2018 Project Scoring, Reallocation, Selection and Ranking Process

Applicant Notification & Public Posting

All applicants will be notified of the results of the ranking process according to the deadline established in the 2018 CoC Competition NOFA. Applicants will be notified regarding the project's rank order on the 2018 Priority List, project placement into Tier 1 or Tier 2, or the rejection of their project for inclusion on the Priority List. The CoC will provide notification in writing via email. The CoC will also publicly post information on ranking and tiering of projects and the list of projects accepted or rejected for inclusion on the 2018 Priority List on the CoC's website.