

# MA Balance of State CoC Rating and Review Procedures

## FFY 2016

The Ranking Committee is composed of staff from the MA Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) who is the Collaborative Applicant, provider staff from across the CoCs geographic area, CoC project provider staff from outside the geographic area, a representative of one of the CoC's housing authorities and a representative from a private property developer.

At the request of the advisory board, the Admin Committee spent time looking at the ranking tool used in the 2015 NOFA process and revising it to incorporate factors to be considered in the ranking. Those factors include the vulnerability of the project's clients, whether the project participates in Coordinated Entry, and whether the project utilizes funds effectively and bills regularly.

The Admin Committee presented the changes to the Planning Group (the entire CoC) on June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016. Feedback was offered by the planning group and incorporated by the Admin Committee.

The changes were presented to the Ranking Committee on June 29<sup>th</sup> via webinar during which a few additional alterations, primarily of a formatting nature were suggested. At the same meeting, the committee was broken into small groups that would work together to review assigned project applications. Care was taken to assure no project application was assigned where a member of the small group may have a conflict of interest.

The Admin Committee altered the tool formatting according to the wishes of the Ranking Committee.

On July 6<sup>th</sup> the Planning Group once again met and reviewed the tool and the manner in which it weighted the different factors being reviewed. No substantive feedback was offered, but again, a few formatting suggestions were made and a number of typos noticed. The Admin Committee made these slight fixes.

On July 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016, the Advisory Board met again and approved the tool for use for the ranking of projects for the FFY'16 NOFA process. The final version of the form can be found on the last page of this document

Project Applications were due to DHCD no later than 5:00 pm on August 12<sup>th</sup>. All applications were submitted on time. In addition, HUD was unable to receive APRs from grantees so each subrecipient was asked to submit a new APR with the date parameters of 7/1/15 to 6/30/16 for each project at the same time. These were also all received by the deadline.

Project ranking relied entirely on Project Applications, APRs and monitoring reports from DHCD. Those reports were packaged with the ranking tool and distributed to the small groups who worked independently to score the projects assigned to them. The small groups submitted final scores to the DHCD Federal Grants Manager by August 22<sup>nd</sup>.

On August 22<sup>nd</sup>, the Ranking Committee met again to review the projects as a whole and to assign ranking. Rankings were initially assigned by raw score. In the event of a tie, permanent housing projects were ranked above transitional housing projects which were ranked above supportive services only projects. In the cases where ties within project type existed, renewals were ranked above new projects. In the cases where ties existed within renewal projects of the same project type, projects were ranked in descending order from that serving the greatest number of persons to that serving the least number of persons.

After careful consideration, the group prepared a recommendation to the Advisory Board to alter the ranking of the projects. The specific recommendation was, "Move new projects (HomeRISE RRH, SMOC Metrowest Permanent Supported Housing and MA-516 Coordinated Entry) to the bottom of Tier two in in descending order of persons proposed to be served, and in doing so, preserve already existing housing and services resources."

On August 23<sup>rd</sup>, the Advisory Board met and adopted the Ranking and Review Committee's recommendation.

The final ranking of the projects looks like this, with Tier two projects highlighted in orange and the project that straddles both tiers highlighted in yellow. New proposals have ranking and components highlighted in blue.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Component</b>
1	Corley's Project	PSH
2	Home Again / Fresh Start	PSH
3	Community Housing S+C	PSH
4	Brookside Terrace S+C	PSH
5	Tri-City Rental Assistance	PSH
6	North East Scattered Site Tenancy S+C	PSH
7	NEW BEGINNINGS	PSH
8	Community Housing Initiative	PSH
9	LINCOLN ST	PSH
10	Julie House	PSH
11	YWCA Fina House Project	PSH
12	JRI Supported Housing - Hope for Families Program	PSH
13	Washington Street Residence	PSH
14	Oxford House	PSH
15	Metrowest SH	PSH
16	Journey to Success	PSH
17	Tri-City Homeless to Housing	PSH
18	Post-Acute Treatment Services / Pre-Recovery Services (PDPR)	PSH
19	Tri-City Stepping Stones	PSH
20	METROWEST LEASED HOUSING	PSH
21	Kaszanek House PSH - component change	PSH
22	Mobile Homeless Outreach Team - FY 2014	Outreach
23	HMIS Continuous Quality Improvement	HMIS
24	MA - 513 CoC HMIS Project	HMIS
25	Greater Boston Tenant Based S+C	PSH
26	Aggressive Treatment and Relapse Prevention Program (ATARP)	PSH
27	Disabled Family Leasing	PSH
28	HOAP S+C	PSH
29	Vietnam Veterans Workshop S+C	PSH
30	Bedford Veterans Quarters	PSH
31	The Devens Project	PSH
32	Tri-City Housing Now Expansion	PSH
33	Greater Boston Sponsor Based S+C	PSH
34	Scattered Site Transitional Apartment Project	Transitional
35	Essex North A SHP Leasing	PSH
36	Greater Boston Mobile Stabilization Team	SSO
37	Chelsea-Revere Homeless to Housing	PSH
38	Supportive Occupant Services	PSH
39	Project Home S+C	PSH
40	Proyecto Opciones	PSH
41	HomeRISE RRH - New Project	PSH (RRH)
42	Metrowest Permanent Supported Housing - New Project	PSH
43	MA-516 Coordinated Entry - new project - reallocation	PSH

**Balance of State Project Rating Form**

Project :

Date

Evaluator:

	YES / NO	Points Awarded
200		
<b>Part A: Housing Emphasis (Maximum Points – 25)</b>		
1. Project Component		FALSE
2. Program agrees to offer chronic homelessness priority for future openings through attrition		0
3. Program Participates fully in Coordinated Entry		
<i>Total for Housing Emphasis</i>	25	#VALUE!
<b>Part B: Vulnerable or Difficult to Serve Populations (Maximum Points – 70)</b>		
Select "Yes" for any subpopulation the project is designed to serve		
1. Veterans		
2. Domestic Violence Victims		
3. Unaccompanied Minors		
4. Families with Children		
5. Those with chronic mental health issues		
6. Those with substance abuse issues		
7. Unsheltered		
<i>Total Points for Population Vulnerability</i>	70	0
<b>Part C: HMIS Data Quality &amp; APR (Maximum Points – 20)</b>		
1. APR Data Quality based on most recent APR:		
1 point for each universal data element <10% missing. Data elements include Name, Social Security Number, Date of Birth, Race, Ethnicity. Gender. Veteran Status. Disabling Condition, Residence Prior to Program Entry, Destination		0
2. APR Submitted to DHCD on time		
Yes 10 points		
<i>Total Points for HMIS Data Quality and APR</i>	20	0
<b>Part D. Project Outcomes (Maximum Points – 45)</b>		
1. % persons who remained in the project or exited for permanent housing:		
90% or more = 20 points, 80%-89% = 15 points, 73%-77% = 10 points		FALSE
2a. #s Served: Enter # of Persons served		
2b. Enter # proposed in Application		#DIV/0!
<b>Choose either 3a or 3b as indicated in the project application. Street outreach projects proceed to question 4.</b>		
3a. % of adults that maintain or increase their total income from all sources:		
79% or more = 15 points, 65-78% = 10 points, 55% - 64% = 5 points		FALSE
3b. % of persons aged 18 - 61 who maintained or increased their earned income		
20% or more = 15 points, 11%-19% = 10 points		FALSE
<b>Only Street Outreach Projects should complete Question 4 below</b>		
4. Service linkages: Identify the actual # of persons served by the program as applicable to each measure, and the number of persons who accomplished the measure	# of persons Applicable	# of persons Accomplished
4a Service linkage measure - Physical Disability		
4b Service linkage measure - Developmental Disability		
4c Service linkage measure - Chronic Health Condition		
4d Service linkage measure - HIV / AIDS		
4e Service linkage measure - Mental Health Condition		
4f Service linkage measure - Substance Abuse		
Percent of persons with needs linked with services	#DIV/0!	
Choose the appropriate percentage bracket		FALSE
<i>Total Points for Project Outcomes</i>	45	#DIV/0!
<b>Part E. Compliance (Maximum Points – 35)</b>		
1. Did the project have any findings during the most recent project monitoring? If the project has not been monitored, enter "No."		
2. If there were findings, did the project complete its corrective action plan bringing it into compliance? If there were no findings, leave blank.		
3. Utilization rates: Enter number of participants proposed to be served in the application		
3a Enter number of participants served on the last day in January		0
3b Enter number of participants served on the last day in April		
3c Enter number of participants served on the last day in July		
3d Enter number of participants served on the last day in October		
	#DIV/0!	
<i>If utilization rate is low, be sure to check the narratives to see if there are extenuating circumstances. If there are, make a note in the comments section</i>		
3e Choose the response that reflects the % expressed in the cell above		FALSE
4. Project's billing was submitted on time		FALSE
5. Amount of Grant Funds from last completed fiscal year		
		FALSE
	#DIV/0!	0
		FALSE
<i>Total Points for Compliance</i>	30	0
<b>Part F. Leverage (150% = Maximum Points – 10)</b>		
Enter amount of funds applied for		Points Awarded
Enter total amount of leverage		
<i>Total Points for Leverage</i>	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Projects scoring 0 in Criteria B, C1, 2. or D, must submit a performance improvement plan by <b>February 1, 2013</b> to the CoC and must submit quarterly APRs to the CoC. If performance still below required funds to be reallocated before next NOFA.		
Sel. Comm Comments:		
<b>FINAL SCORE</b>		<b>#DIV/0!</b>