

MA-516 Massachusetts Balance of State Continuum of Care NOFO 2021 - 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.

The Project Evaluation Committee met on September 21, 2021 to review the tool and discuss the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on CoC projects. Through this process, the Committee determined to give all applicants equal points in the Performance Measures for this year only and retained the remainder of the scoring criteria in the tool.

Project Applications were due to DHCD no later than 5:00 pm on October 07, 2021. Project ranking relied entirely on Project Applications, APR data extracted directly from the SAGE system, and fiscal data from DHCD. That information was packaged with the ranking tool and distributed to the small ranking groups on October 18, 2021 after members attended a Ranking Training webinar.

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 October 22, 2021.

Once the 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 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 October 26, 2021, 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 NOFO response.

After careful consideration, the Project Evaluation Committee prepared three options for the Advisory Board to consider. These recommendations took into consideration existing projects that are operating well and requesting expansion, as well as the value per household of new projects, specifically acknowledging projects that proposed a large number of units at a low per-household cost. The Advisory Board met on October 27, 2021 to consider the options, and after thoughtful review and discussion, it voted to accept one of the alternative options presented by the Project Evaluation Committee.

It was discovered later that day that the demarcation line between Tier 1 and Tier 2 had been placed in the wrong position on the form being used. While this did not affect ranking position, it did affect whether a project fell into Tier 1 or Tier 2. CoC staff immediately corrected the form and contacted Advisory Board members via a group email and telephone calls to take a second vote to accept or reject the revised Tier positioning. The Project Evaluation Committee was notified of this at the same time to ensure complete transparency. The subsequent Advisory Board vote on October 29, 2021 unanimously accepted the ranking in the corrected ranking form. [The final ranking](#) can be found below.

MA-516 Massachusetts Balance of State Continuum of Care NOFO 2021 - Ranking and Review Process

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) ALL PROJECT RECEIVED FULL POINTS ON THIS CRITERIA	
% 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

MA-516 Massachusetts Balance of State Continuum of Care NOFO 2021 - Ranking and Review Process

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 Continuum of Care
NOFO 2021 - Ranking and Review Process

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			
<u>1. Permanent Housing Outcomes</u>			
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
<u>2. Total Households Served</u>			
2a. Number of Households Served			49
2b. Number the project is supposed to have			55
2c. % of households served to those proposed	89%		5
<u>3. Persons Served over time</u>			
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			
<u>4. Prioritizing Chronic Homelessness: The project is designated in the application as:</u>			
	Dedicated Plus		10
<u>5. Coordinated Assessment Scores</u>			
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. Amount 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 Continuum of Care
NOFO 2021 - Ranking and Review Process
Final Ranking

Project	Final Ranking Score	Tier
Turn the Key	1	Tier 1
Greater Boston Tenant Based S+C	2	Tier 1
Aggressive Treatment and Relapse Prevention Program (ATARP)	3	Tier 1
Mystic Valley Homeless to Housing w/Consolidation (surviving grant)	4	Tier 1
Post-Acute Treatment Services / Pre-Recovery Services (PDPR)	5	Tier 1
Greater Boston Rental Assistance for the Chronically Homeless (GBREACH)	6	Tier 1
North Star Housing	7	Tier 1
Metrowest Leased Housing Consolidation	8	Tier 1
Advocates Supported Housing Consolidation	9	Tier 1
Alternative House	10	Tier 1
Journey to Success	11	Tier 1
Somerville Stepping Stones w/consolidation (Individual)	12	Tier 1
Disabled Family Leasing	13	Tier 1
Proyecto Opciones	14	Tier 1
Pathfinder PH Program	15	Tier 1
NEW BEGINNINGS	16	Tier 1
North East Scattered Site Tenancy S+C	17	Tier 1
Tri-City Rental Assistance Project	18	Tier 1
Housing Pronto	19	Tier 1
Shelter Plus Care	20	Tier 1
Julie House	21	Tier 1
JRI Supportive Housing-Hope for Families Program	22	Tier 1
YWCA Fina House Project	23	Tier 1
TSS TH-RRH Combined	24	Tier 1
Brookside Terrace S+C	25	Tier 1
Scattered Site Transitional Apartment Project	26	Tier 1
Home Again/Fresh Start	27	Tier 1
HMIS Dedicated	28	Tier 1
HMIS Continuous Quality	29	Tier 1
North Shore CoC CE	30	Tier 1
Coordinated Entry	31	Tier 1
MA-516 Coordinated Entry	32	Tier 1
Community Housing Initiative	33	Tier 1
Respond PH-RRH DV Bonus	34	Tier 1
Brookline Rental Assistance for the Chronically Homeless (BREACH)	35	Tier 1
Wayside ShortStop Transitional Housing Program	36	Tier 1
Greater Boston Sponsor Based S+C	37	Tier 1
HOAP S+C	38	Tier 1
Maya's House	39	Tier 1

**MA-516 Massachusetts Balance of State Continuum of Care
NOFO 2021 - Ranking and Review Process**

LTLC PSH Program	40	Tier 1
LINCOLN ST	41	Tier 1
CTI PH-PSH for People Experiencing Chronic Homelessness	42	Tier 1
CTI Youth TH-RRH	43	Tier 1
Greater Boston Mobile Stabilization Team	44	Tier 1
Community Housing S+C	45	Tier 1
Welcome Home 1 Expansion	46	Tier 1
Campus Apartments Consolidation	47	Tier 1
Emerson St S+C	48	Tier 1
Campus TH-RRH	49	Tier 1
Emmaus RRH	50	Tier 1
Emmaus RRH Expansion (Reallocation and Bonus)	51	Tier 1
Disabled Family Leasing Expansion (Reallocation)	52	Tier 1
Tier 2		
Disabled Family Leasing Expansion (Reallocation)	52	Tier 2
Welcome Home 1 Expansion 2.0 (Bonus)	53	Tier 2
Respond PH-RRH Expansion (DV Bonus)	54	Tier 2
Alternative House Expansion (DV Bonus)	55	Tier 2
Permanent Housing Supports – New Bonus	56	Tier 2
New Dawn – New DV Bonus	57	Tier 2
Intensive Outreach and RRH – New Bonus	58	Tier 2
Project Included, but unranked per NOFO		
MA-516 Planning		

Projects highlighted in **yellow** are expansions and those highlighted in **green** are new projects. The **orange** project straddles tiers 1 and 2.