

# MA Balance of State CoC Rating and Review Procedures

## FFY 2018

Formerly, the Ranking and review committee was 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. This resulted in the committee being very large and unable to act nimbly at the time of ranking, resulting in being unable to reduce the number of recommendations to the advisory board to a manageable number.

At the direction of the Advisory board, and through amendment of the governance charter on September 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017, the Ranking and Review Committee was broken into two smaller, task oriented subsets. The first, larger subset are ranking groups, whose role is to use the objective criteria based project evaluation scoring tool and identify scores for each proposed project. The second subset, known as the Project Evaluation Committee, uses the scores presented by the ranking groups to order the projects into rankings. This includes a series of objective measures to break ties for projects receiving the same scores as well as to consider any outliers that should be considered. The Project Evaluation Committee makes recommendations for the final ranking to the Advisory Board, who has final authority.

Separately, but also at the direction of the Advisory Board, the Admin committee worked with the newly formed Project Evaluation Committee to substantially revise the ranking tool to one based entirely in objective, measurable criteria, and that provided advantages in ranking for projects that served more vulnerable people, consistently maintained regulatory compliance, and had positive housing outcomes for their participants. The tool was carefully vetted with the provider community via the large planning group meetings on 11/1/17, 12/6/17, and 1/3/18. Incorporating the feedback from those sessions, the final version of the tool was rolled out to the entire provider community in the planning group meeting on 2/7/18. A sample version of the form can be found at the end of this document.

Project Applications and most recent APRs were due to DHCD no later than 3:00 pm on August 10, 2018. 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 ranking 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 24, 2018.

On August 27, 2018, the Project Evaluation 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. They offered two specific recommendations, one of which was, "Move new projects (excepting the HMIS expansion project) to the bottom of Tier two in the order RFR scoring, and in doing so, preserve already existing housing and services resources."

On August 29, 2018, the Advisory Board met and adopted the Ranking and Review Committee's recommendation as written above.

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

Rank	Project Name	Component
1	1043-45 Beacon Street Project	PSH
2	Julie House	PSH
3	Watertown Supported Housing	PSH
4	Metrowest SH	PSH
5	Waltham Supported Housing	PSH
6	Journey to Success	PSH
7	JRI Supported Housing - Hope for Families Program	PSH
8	Supportive Occupant Services	PSH
9	YWCA Fina House Project	PSH
10	Disabled Family Leasing	PSH
11	Watertown Waltham Rental Assistance for the Chronically Homeless	PSH
12	Vietnam Veterans Workshop S+C	PSH
13	Newton I SH	PSH
14	Tri-City Stepping Stones	PSH
15	NEW BEGINNINGS	PSH
16	Corley's	PSH
17	Community Housing S+C	PSH
18	Greater Boston Tenant Based S+C	PSH
19	Chelsea-Revere Homeless to Housing	PSH
20	Brookside Terrace S+C	PSH
21	Community Housing Initiative	PSH
22	North East Scattered Site Tenancy (NESST)	PSH
23	LINCOLN ST	PSH
24	Proyecto Opciones	PSH
25	Home Rise (1st year)	PH (RRH)
26	TSS TH-RRH (DV) (Component Conversion)	Joint TH/RRH
27	North Star Housing (Not yet started)	PSH
28	SMOC Metrowest Permanent Supported Housing (1st year)	PSH
29	Housing Pronto (Not yet started)	PSH
30	HMIS Continuous Quality Improvement	HMIS
49	HMIS Continuous Quality Improvement Expansion (New Administrative)	HMIS
31	Greater Boston Mobile Stabilization Team	SSO
32	BHA Brookline Rental Assistance for the Chronically Homeless	PSH
33	Newton II SH	PSH
34	Tri-City Homeless to Housing	PSH
35	Scattered Site Transitional Apartment Project	TH
36	METROWEST LEASED HOUSING	PSH
37	Bedford Veterans Quarters	PSH
38	Tri-City Rental Assistance	PSH
39	Aggressive Treatment and Relapse Prevention Program (ATARP)	PSH
40	HOAP S+C	PSH
41	Post-Acute Treatment Services / Pre-Recovery Services (PDPR)	PSH
42	Home Again / Fresh Start	PSH
43	Oxford House	PSH
44	Greater Boston Sponsor Based S+C	PSH
45	Project Home S+C	PSH
46	Brookline SHP Leasing	PSH
47	Tri-City Housing Now Expansion	PSH
48	Youth Tranisition to Independent Living Program	TH
50	Second Step - TSS TH-RRH Expansion - TBRA (New - DV)	Joint TH/RRH
51	Young Parent PSH (New)	PSH
52	SMOC - SMOC VAV RRH - TBRA (New - DV)	RRH
53	Mystic Valley RRH - TBRA (New)	RRH

# Sample Tool

Project name:					
Grant Number:					
Project Type	PH		74		
Last Year's Grant \$	\$748,744				
Total Units	55				
Threshold Criteria					
A. Does the Project Participate in Coordinated Entry?	Yes				
B. Has the project documented minimum match?	Yes				
C. Is the Applicant an Active CoC member?	N/A				
D. Is the Application Complete with consistent data?	Yes				
Performance Measures					
1. Permanent Housing Outcomes					
1a. Total # of Stayers in the last reporting period				44	
1b. Total Persons Exiting				9	
1c. Total Persons exiting to Positive Outcomes				5	
1d. Total Persons excluded from outcome				0	
1e. % of participants successful in this measure	92%			20	
2. Total Households Served					
2a. Number of Households Served				49	
2b. Number the project is supposed to have				55	
2c. % of households served to those proposed	89%			5	
3. Persons Served over time					
3a Enter number of Beds Proposed				55	
3a. Enter number of participants served on the last day in January				40	
3b. Enter number of participants served on the last day in April				40	
3c. Enter number of participants served on the last day in July				45	
3d. Enter number of participants served on the last day in October				46	
3e. Average % of participants served over time	78%			0	
Serving Vulnerable Persons					
4. Prioritizing Chronic Homelessness: The project is designated in the application as:					
	Dedicated Plus				10
5. Coordinated Assessment Scores					
5a. Average Coordinated Entry System Score				23	
5b. Project Average Coordinated Entry Score				34	
5c. % of project average vs system average	148%			10	
6. Does the project exclusively serve unaccompanied youth or those fleeing Domestic violence?					
			No		0
7. Does the Project meet the threshold for "Housing First"?					
			No		0
Fiscal					
8. Project's billing was submitted on time?		Consistently on Time			5
9. Reversions					
9a. Is this a rental assistance project (AKA as Shelter Plus care?)		No			0
9b. Are we measuring for the first complete grant year?					
The last two digits of the grant number:		10			FALSE
9c. Amout of Grant Funds Spent		\$534,743 Reverted: \$214,001			40%
9d. % of funds reverted		More than 15%			0
Compliance					
10. Data Quality: 1 point for each universal data element with <10% null. Elements include last name, social security number, date of birth, race, ethnicity, gender, veteran status, disabling condition, project entry date, and client location					
		9			9
11. APR submitted to DHCD on time - 30 days after the close of the grant?				No	0
12. APR submitted to HUD on time - 90 days after the close of the grant?				Yes	5
12a. Was the most recent APR reviewed buy HUD rejected by them?				No	0
13. Monitoring Score?		No findings and no concerns			10
Total					
					74