**Metro Area Continuum of Care for the Homeless**

**Program Evaluation Process & Criteria**

**Overview**

Every CoC funded program is ranked and tiered annually per HUD guidance. The purpose is to ensure that HUD funded programs are providing the highest quality housing and services and that the programs are focused on achieving outcomes to end homelessness.

**Project Scoring**

Each CoC funded program seeking renewal funding in the FY2018 competition will be scored on their outcomes in addressing the HUD Performance Measures, adherence to HUD policy priorities, as well as their capacity to operate a CoC funded program.

**New Process for FY2018**

In order to improve accuracy, efficiency, and transparency, this year MACCH has instituted changes in the scorecard itself and in the process for completing the score card as follows:

* APR outcome data will be generated by HMIS and will cover a common year for all projects, October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017. This year is consistent with the HUD System Performance Measures against which the CoC as a whole is measured. Note: for DV programs, a performance reporting data form will be provided based on APR outcome metrics.
* Additional information needed to complete the scoring and ranking of projects will be collected in a Supplementary Data Form (SDF) to be completed by the renewal project grantee for each of their projects. This will include budget information and some of the information previously collected through the Site Review Scorecard.
* The FY2018 Project Renewal Scorecard for each project will be completed by MACCH or its consultant and provided to the grantees for review prior to ranking.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date of Review: |  |  |  |  |
| Project Name: |  | Type of Project:  | [ ]  PSH  [ ]  RRH [ ] TH  |
| Agency Name: |  |  DV Program?: | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  |
| Contact Person: |  |   |  |
| E-mail: |  |  |  |
| Phone: |  |  |  |

|  | **Criteria** | **Data Source/ Calculation** | **Max. Points** | **Scoring/Scaling** | **Reviewer Comments** | **Points** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **General Information Criteria** |
| **1** | **Project Type** | Supplementary Data FormQ1 | 3 | * 3 points: Renewal permanent housing (PSH and RRH)
* 0 points: Renewal TH projects
 |  |  |
| **Performance Outcome Criteria** |
| **2** | **Retention of Permanent Housing – PSH and RRH:** Percent of households that remained in permanent housing or exited to permanent housing | HMIS/ APR Q22a1 - Length of Participation (STAYERS),Q23a - Exit Destination – More than 90 DaysQ23b. Exit Destination – 90 Days or LessCalculation:(All Stayers (Q22a1 Total Stayers) + Leavers to PH (Q23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal))÷(Q5a1 Total Number of Persons - Q23a Total Deceased - Q23b Total Deceased) | 6 | * 6 points: 95-100%
* 4 points: 90-94%
* 2 points: 85-89%
* 0 points: <84%
 |  |  |
| **3** | **Returns to Homelessness:** Percentage of households who return to homelessness within 12 months of program exit | HMISBased on a household presenting at outreach, Emergency Shelter or Transitional Housing within 12 months of exit from the program. HMIS 703 ReportFor DV, based on data submitted to the Nebraska State DV Coalition. | 5 | * 5 points: 0-7% recidivism
* 2 points: 8-15% recidivism
* 0 points: ≥16% recidivism
 |  |  |
| **4** | **Increased Income:** **For RRH and PSH projects,** because of the **severity of needs** of participants projects, this measure includes both retained and increased.  | HMIS/ APR Q19a3 - Income Change by Income CategoryUsing Adults Any Income rowCalculation: (# Adults who Gained or Increased income from Entry to Follow-up/Exit+# Adults Retained Income Category and Same $ at Follow-up as at Entry)÷# Total Adults (including those with no income) | 5 | % stayers and leavers with retained or increased income* 5 points: ≥35%
* 3 points: 30-34%
* 2 points: 25-29%
* 0 point: <24%
 |  |  |
| **5** | **Unit Utilization Rate:** Average utilization rate of project  | HMIS/APRQ8b – Utilization Rates Calculation: Average of the 4 utilization benchmarks ÷ # of units reported in SDF | 5 | * 5 points: 95-100%
* 3 points: 90-94%
* 1 point: 85-89%

0 points: <85% |  |  |
| **6a** | **Cost Effectiveness – Cost per Unit/HH served:****For PSH,** cost per household served.**For RRH/TH,** cost per household served.  | GIWSupplementary Data FormHMIS/APR – Q8a Total number of households served at any time during the operating yearCalculation for PSH: Total Program Costs as reported by agency÷# of households served- 8aCalculation for RRH/TH:Total Program Costs as reported by agency÷APR Q8a Total # of Households | 1 | PSH-* 1 Point- <$15,000
* 0 Points- >$15,000

RRH-* 1 Point- <$7,500
* 0 Points- >$7,500
 |  |  |
| **6b** | **Cost Effectiveness – Cost per Exit to Permanent Housing:****For PSH,** cost per household that remains or exits to Permanent Housing destination.**For RRH/TH,** cost per exit to Permanent Housing destination. | GIW Supplementary Data FormHMIS/APR – Q22a1. Length of participation - CoC Projects, Q23a. Exit Destination – More than 90 Days, Q23b. Exit Destination – 90 Days or LessCalculation for PSH:Total Project Cost ÷(APR Q22a1 Total Stayers + Q23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal)Calculation for RRH/TH:Total Project Cost ÷(APR Q23a Permanent Destinations Subtotal + Q23b Permanent Destinations Subtotal)  | 3 | PSH-* 3 Points- <$3,000
* 2 Points- $3,001-6000
* 1 Point- $6,001-9000
* 0 Points- >$9,000

RRH-* 3 Points- <$2,500
* 2 Points- $2,251-4,500
* 1 Point- $4,501-6,750
* 0 Points- >$6,750
 |  |  |
| **6c** | Percentage of Grant Award for Housing | [Housing Dollars divided by Annual Renewal Amount] x100 Source: GIW | 0 | * NOT SCORED IN 2018
 |  |  |
| **7** | **eLOCCS Drawdowns:** Drawdown of funds by grantee conducted at least quarterly. | Supplementary Data FormAs instructed in the SDF, grantee is to attach summary page from eLOCCS showing dates and amounts of drawdowns for the last full grant year. An explanation of irregularities preventing drawdowns at least quarterly should be provided in SDF for review. Grantees with irregularities are asked to provide prior year’s information as supplement. | 1 | * 1 point: Yes
* 0 points: No
 |  |  |
| **8** | **Utilization of Grant Funds:** Percentage of funds drawn down in last complete contract year. | Supplementary Data FormAs instructed in the SDF, grantee to provide summary page from eLOCCS showing dates and amounts of drawdowns for the last full grant year. An explanation of irregularities preventing drawdowns at least quarterly should be provided in SDF for review. Grantees with irregularities are asked to provide prior year’s information as supplement. | 3 | * 3 points: 0-1% of funds not drawn down
* 1 point: 2-5% funds not drawn down
* 0 points: 5-10% of funds not drawn down

Deduct 1 point: For every 10% of funds recaptured |  |  |
| **9** | **HMIS Data Quality:** Project reports high-quality data to HMIS | HMIS Data Quality ReportOctober 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017DV projects to submit Data Quality Report from their comparable database for same date range. APR 6a-d. | 5 | Percentage of unduplicated client records with null or missing values for the Universal Data Elements:* 3 points: 0-3%
* 1 point: 4-10%
* 0 points: ≥10%

Percentage of unduplicated client records with refused or unknown values for the Universal Data Elements:* 2 points: 0-5%
* 1 point: 5-10%
* 0 points: ≥10%
 |  |  |
| **10** | **HUD Monitoring:** Disposition of HUD Monitoring and Findings | If the project was monitored in the program year (Oct 1, 2016-September 30, 2017) the project must submit the letter from the field office noting closure of findings and concerns. | 1 | Agency provided HUD field office letter documenting closure of monitoring:* 1 point: Yes
* 0 points: No
 |  |  |
| **11** | **Client data confidentiality policies and procedures:**Agency has documentation of client data confidentiality policies and procedures | Provision of agency’s client data confidentiality policies and procedures covering this project | 1 | Agency provided client data confidentiality policies and procedures:* 1 point: Yes
* 0 points: No
 |  |  |
| **12** | **Discharge policies/appeals process:** Agency has documentation of client discharge policies and appeals process | Provision of agency’s client discharge policies and appeals process covering this project. | 1 | Agency has a client discharge and appeals policy and procedure* 1 point: Yes
* 0 points: No
 |  |  |
| **13** | **Housing First:** Project has adopted low barriers to entry and no requirements for service participation per the MACCH Housing First Policy | Supplementary Data Form | 5 | Project follows MACCH Housing First Policy:* 5 points: Yes
* 0 points: No
 |  |  |
| **14** | **Coordinated Entry** | Agencies participation in MACCH CES process- MACCH will certify agencies participation for 2018 NOFA | 1 | Agency participated in MACCH CES* 1 point- Yes
* 0 points- NO
 |  |  |