MA-516 Massachusetts Balance of State
NOFA 2019 - Ranking and Review Process

The Balance of State Ranking process requires three separate sets of people to work in tandem. Small ranking groups use objective measures to establish a score for every project being ranked. The Project Evaluation Committee uses these scores and prepares recommendations to the Advisory board, who makes a final decision on ranking.

The ranking process and the tool used to establish the scores for ranking were carefully vetted with the provider community via the large planning group meetings on 11/7/18, 1/2/19, and 7/9/19. A sample version of the tool can be found at the end of this document.

Project Applications were due to DHCD no later than 5:00 pm on August 16, 2019. Project ranking relied entirely on Project Applications, APR data extracted directly from the SAGE system, and monitoring reports from DHCD. Those reports were packaged with the ranking tool and distributed to the small ranking groups on August 19, 2019.

The small ranking groups, using the tool with objective measures outlined below, worked independently to score the projects assigned to them. The small groups submitted final scores to the chair of the Project Evaluation Committee by August 27, 2019.

Once to Project Evaluation Committee receives the scores from the small scoring groups, they are responsible for developing no more than three recommended strategies for a final ranking to the advisory board. At least one strategy MUST be in the order of the scores, with the highest scoring project at the top and the lowest scoring project at the bottom. Projects receiving the same score will be ordered as outlined in the "Breaking Ties" section below.

- The Project Evaluation Committee MAY recommend a different strategy to the advisory board for final ranking in certain specific examples. They may recommend:
- Moving new project proposals lower in the ranking to preserve well-functioning renewal projects.
- Moving project expansion proposals next to, but lower in the ranking than the project they are expanding.
- Move individual projects in the ranking to adjust for exceptional circumstances that are outside the project's or the project's subrecipient's or sponsor's ability to address. Examples of this may include natural disaster or other unexpected / unpreventable loss of a large percentage of the project's units.

On August 27, 2019, the Project Evaluation Committee met to review the projects as a whole and to assign ranking. All projects submitting applications in E-SNAPS were included in the ranking and will be attached to the CoC's NOFA response.

After careful consideration, the Project Evaluation Committee prepared a recommendation to the Advisory Board to alter the ranking of the projects. They offered three specific recommendations, one of which was, "Move new projects (excepting the Coordinated Entry, and the TSS TH/RRH Expansion to the bottom of Tier two in the order of scoring, and in doing so, preserve already existing housing and services resources."

On September 4, 2019, the Advisory Board met and adopted the Ranking and Review Committee's recommendation as written above. The final ranking can be found below.

Objective Measures in the tool

There are four threshold criteria for the ranking process. Failure to meet these threshold criteria results in the project not being ranked by the small groups and reallocated. Those criteria are:

- Compliance with Coordinated Entry
- Documenting the minimum match
- Being an active member of the CoC (for renewal projects only)
- The application being complete and understandable.

All project proposals met the minimum threshold criteria this year and so were subsequently scored and ranked.

The objective measures from the tool and the points assigned them are outlined in the table below

Performance Measures (max 40)

MA-516 Massachusetts Balance of State
NOFA 2019 - Ranking and Review Process

% of participants successful in obtaining or retaining permanent housing (max 20)	
>90%	20 points
85%-90%	10 points
<85%	0 points
% of households served in comparison to those promised (max 10)	
>90%	10 points
85%-90%	5 points
<85%	0 points
% of persons served in comparison to those promised (max 10)	
>90%	10 points
85%-90%	5 points
<85%	0 points
Serving Vulnerable Persons (max 20)	
Chronic Homelessness – project designation (max 10)	
Dedicated	10 points
Dedicated Plus	10 points
Nor Dedicated	0 points
Does the project serve exclusively youth or those fleeing domestic violence (max 5)	
Yes	5 points
No	0 points
Is the Project "Housing First"? (max 5)	
Yes	5 points
No	0 points
Fiscal (max 15)	
Project billing submitted on time? (max 5)	
Consistently on time	5 points
Late one or two times	3 points
Late more than two times	0 points
Rental Assistance Project? (max 5)	
Yes	5 points
No	0 points
% of funds awarded that were reverted (max 5)	
Less than 5%	5 points
5% to 10%	3 points
10% to 15%	2 points
More than 15%	0 points
Compliance (max 30)	
Data Quality (max 10)	
1 point for each of select data elements with less than 10% null	Up to 10 points
APR submission (max 10)	
Submitted to DHCD on time	5 points
Submitted to DHCD late	0 points
Submitted to HUD on time	5 points
Submitted to HUD late	0 points
APR accepted by HUD	0 points
APR rejected by HUD	- 5 points
Monitoring (max 10)	
No findings, no concerns	10 points
No findings, some concerns, all resolved	8 points
1 or more findings, all resolved	5 points
Unresolved concerns	3 points
Unresolved findings	0 points

Breaking Ties

Projects will sometimes receive the same score. In those cases ties will be broken in the following way to determine which project is placed higher than the other in the ranking.

- Where the projects receiving the same score are different project types, projects will be prioritized in the following order:
  - HMIS
  - Coordinated Entry
  - Permanent Supported Housing
  - Permanent Housing / Rapid Rehousing
  - Joint Transitional Housing / Rapid Rehousing
  - Transitional Housing
  - Supportive Services Only
- Where projects receive the same score, and are of the same project type, renewal projects shall be prioritized over new projects
- Where projects receive the same score, and are of the same project type, and are both either renewal or new, the project that will serve the most people shall be prioritized.
- Where projects receive the same score, and are of the same project type, and are both either renewal or new, and will serve the same number of people, the project utilizing the least funds, as a measure of cost per household, shall be prioritized.

MA-516 Massachusetts Balance of State
NOFA 2019 - Ranking and Review Process

Sample Tool

Project name:			
Grant Number:			
Project Type	PH		
Last Year's Grant $	$748,744	**74**	
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**

MA-516 Massachusetts Balance of State
NOFA 2019 - Ranking and Review Process
Final Ranking

Rank	Project Name
1	Disabled Family Leasing
2	Advocates Supported Housing
3	Julie House
4	Metrowest SH
5	Greater Boston Rental Assistance for the Chronically Homeless
6	Journey to Success
7	LINCOLN ST
8	Home Again/Fresh Start
9	METROWEST LEASED HOUSING
10	Chelsea-Revere Homeless to Housing
11	NEW BEGINNINGS
12	Proyecto Opciones
13	Mystic Valley Homeless to Housing
14	Tri-City Rental Assistance Project
15	Greater Boston Tenant Based S+C
16	North East Scattered Site Tenancy S+C
17	Greater Boston Mobile Stabilization Team
18	HMIS Continuous Quality Improvement
20	MA-516 Coordinated Entry Grant **New**
21	North Star Housing (**First Year Incomplete**)
22	SMOC Metrowest Permanent Supportive Housing Program
23	Housing Pronto (**First Year Incomplete**)
24	Scattered Site Transitional Apartment Project
25	Community Housing Initiative
26	Brookline Rental Assistance for the Chronically Homeless
27	JRI Supportive Housing-Hope for Families Program
28	YWCA Fina House Project
29	Community Housing S+C
30	Post-Acute Treatment Services / Pre-Recovery Services (PDPR)
31	Aggressive Treatment and Relapse Prevention Program (ATARP)
32	Brookside Terrace S+C
33	TSS TH-RRH
34	TSS TH-RRH Expansion **New**
35	Greater Boston Sponsor Based S+C
36	HOAP S+C
37	Bedford Veterans Quarters
38	HomeRISE
39	MA-516 South and West PSH **New**
40	Metro-Boston East PSH **New**
41	Metro-Boston West PSH **New**
42	Upper Merrimack Valley PSH **New**
43	MA-516 DV RRH **New**
	Projects Not Requiring Ranking
	Advocates Supported Housing **Consolidation**
	Mystic Valley Homeless to Housing **Consolidation**
	MA-516 Planning Grant
	TSS TH-RRH **Combined**

Projects not highlighted are in Tier 1. Projects highlighted in blue are in Tier 2. The Projects highlighted in gold is partially in Tier 2