

**NYC Coalition on the Continuum of Care
2016
Evaluation Process**



Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	2
II.	Highlights for 2016 Evaluation Process	2
III.	Evaluation Review Process	2
IV.	2016 NYC CCoC Evaluation Process Timeline	4
V.	Project Evaluation Methodology	4
VI.	Specific Instruction and Data Source	5
VII.	Scoring Summary Tables	7
VIII.	Technical Assistance Contact Information	8
IX.	Appeals Form	9
X.	Question 10 – Consumer Participation Form	10

2016 Evaluation Process

I. Introduction

Each year, HUD releases a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) which details the requirements for applying for Continuum of Care (CoC) program funding. One requirement of the NOFA is that each application is reviewed and ranked in order of local priority by a group of community stakeholders. In New York, the group of stakeholders is the NYC Coalition on the Continuum of Care (NYC CCoC) Steering Committee. The Evaluation Committee, formed by the Steering Committee, is in charge of reviewing the Continuum of Care's evaluation process which partially determines the ranking. The NYC Department of Homeless Services (DHS) serves as the coordinator of this evaluation process.

In anticipation of the FY2016 NOFA, the NYC CCoC is issuing the evaluation criteria to be used as part of the 2016 NOFA ranking process. This document outlines the requirements related to the evaluation process. To ensure that our application is competitive and fully funded, NYC CCoC reserves the right to amend these requirements and/ or issue additional requirements as needed and in response to criteria issued in the FY2016 HUD NOFA.

II. Highlights for the 2016 Evaluation Process

The 2016 NYC CoC annual evaluation data collection process has been impacted by poor data quality in the HMIS data warehouse. This has limited DHS's ability to populate the evaluation tool directly from the HMIS data warehouse as was done in 2015. In addition esnaps, HUD's official system for submitting annual performance reports (APR) has been down since late November 2015. These two factors have resulted in changes in the data source for the 2016 evaluation process.

The 2016 evaluation instrument will be completed by providers through an online survey. The data source will consist of projects most recent APR submitted in esnaps prior to March 31, 2016. For projects that have been unable to submit in esnaps due to technical issues with the system, an APR generated from the project's internal database, reflecting the most recently completed contract period can be used. Projects will be responsible for submitting accurate information into the online survey and providing back up documentation. Documentation can include their official APR when available or a summary report from their agency database. If you are unable to retrieve your official APR from esnaps, please submit a copy from your internal database. Projects will be responsible for complete the online survey and submitting back up to validate their online survey submission.

For the 2016 evaluation, items that measure the percentage of chronic homelessness and homeless persons served will be unscored. This change was made after poor data quality was identified in the HMIS data warehouse. To improve data quality for the upcoming NOFA competition, projects will be required to submit back up documentation from their HMIS (or compatible data system) verifying client eligibility. Our goal is to improve data quality so that these questions can be scored and taken from HMIS next year.

Compliance with Housing First which was part of the 2015 evaluation has been removed since it was required through the 2015 NOFA application.

The goal of the evaluation is to demonstrate the effectiveness of the CoC programming and help identify potential areas of improvement. Results from the evaluation will contribute to the CoC competitive application and identify lower performing program that could benefit from Performance & Quality Improvement (PQI) technical assistance.

III. Evaluation Review Process

All projects that have been operating for at least one year and have completed an APR will be included in the evaluation process. Projects that were not renewed in the 2015 NOFA do not have to complete the evaluation process. Any project which feels that they should be exempt from the evaluation process should contact their DHS representative by March 30 to establish eligibility. All projects that have been operating for at least one year will be considered eligible for the evaluation.

2016 Evaluation Process

The following outlines key steps and aspects of the 2016 project evaluation process:

1. Evaluation Process Information Sessions

- **Session 1: Tuesday, March 29, 9:30-10:30, DHS Room 1303**
- **Session 2: Tuesday, March 29, 2:00-3:00, DHS Room 1602**
- **Session 3: Thursday, March 31, 9:30-10:30 Room 1770**
- **Session 4: Thursday, March 31, 3:30-4:30 Room 1770**

Details for the information sessions will be emailed to the CoC distribution list and the NOFA contacts, and will be posted on www.nychomeless.com. **These sessions are not mandatory.**

2. Back up documentation

- Back up documentation is due on April 8, 2016. The data source will consist of a project's most recent APR submitted in esnaps prior to March 31, 2016. For projects that have been unable to submit due to technical issues with esnaps, an APR generated from the project's internal database reflecting the most recently completed contract period can be used. If you are unable to retrieve your official APR from esnaps, please submit a copy from your internal database. Note: The same APR cannot be used for more than one year's evaluation. Failure to submit the APR with the online survey by the deadline will result in deduction and or disqualification from the evaluation process.

3. Tool Completion

- Projects will complete the online survey tool using their most recently completed APR or APR generated from the project's internal database reflecting the most recent contract period. Calculations that result in decimal points .5 and over will be rounded up to the next whole number. Calculations that result in decimal points less than .5 will be rounded down to the previous whole number.
- DHS will communicate the preliminary evaluation results April 25, 2016. Final results will be posted on the NYC CCoC website and individual project results will be sent via email. A general notification will go out via the NYC CCoC distribution list.

4. Appeals process:

- Projects wishing to appeal must submit the appeal form on page 8 of this document to DHS by May 2, 2016
- An Ad Hoc appeal committee will convened to review the appeals and communicate their final decisions by May 16, 2016
- Applicants disputing appeals decisions may appeal to the CCoC Steering Committee. Steering Committee decisions are final.

5. Results:

- **Results of the evaluation will released May 20, 2016**
- Projects rated as "low" performer or that do not achieve the applicable housing outcome goal or any other specific performance minimums established by the Steering Committee will be subject to the PQI process, possible submission of a PQI plan, and ongoing review/monitoring.
- These scores, in conjunction with other CCoC priorities, will be used to determine the final project ranking and tier assignment, as applicable, for the HUD collaborative application.

2016 Evaluation Process

IV. 2016 NYC CCoC Evaluation Process Timeline

Activity	Deadline
Discuss Recommended Changes to 2016 Evaluation Process	January – March 2016
Approve 2016 Evaluation Tool at Steering Committee Meeting	March 18, 2016
Evaluation Online Survey Opens for Data Collection	March 28, 2016
Deadline to Notify DHS for Exempt Status	March 30, 2016
Evaluation Information Sessions	March 29 & March 31
Online Evaluation Survey Due with verification materials (back-up documentation to survey and consumer participation materials)	April 8, 2016
Preliminary Results	April 25, 2016
Appeals of Evaluation Results Due	May 2, 2016
Program Notified on Status of Appeals	May 16, 2016
Final Evaluation Results	May 20, 2016

V. Project Evaluation Methodology

Performance Goal Achievement

Performance data included in evaluation tools will be compared to benchmarks and rated as either “achieved” or “not achieved”. Unless otherwise indicated in the evaluation tool, a goal is “achieved” when the benchmark is met. Performance which exceeds benchmark as defined by the tool will be considered for additional points. Please refer to accompanied final evaluation tool.

Project Performance Results

Performance data for each project will be reviewed and result in a project performance rating of “high,” “medium,” or “low.” Performance scores and ratings will be based on achievement of performance goals specific to each program type, as described below.

Results will be based on the overall score as a percentage of the total possible points for each project (which varies by project type and specific exemptions detailed the Scoring Summary Tables). The thresholds for inclusion in each category will be determined based on the final distribution of scores. Projects with scores resulting at the bottom 10% of all projects will be considered low performers. Projects results in the top 10% will be considered high performers. The remaining project will be considered medium performers.

Each performance measure is weighted differently based on the relative importance of the measure to the overall performance and quality of CCoC housing and services. An “exceeded” rating doubles the “achieved” score, unless otherwise indicated below. The base point value is indicated alongside each measure in the Evaluation Tool. Project scores are then calculated as a percentage of the total possible points for the project type. Projects performing below performance standards established by the Steering Committee will be referred to the PQI process, as described in the PQI protocols.

Identical overall scores will be decided through a review of the value achieved starting with the following indicators: spend down of HUD funds, followed by utilization, then housing stabilization and then earned income indicators. Programs with the same overall score will be weighed against each other on individual measures listed above followed by the remaining indicators on the evaluation tool. In the unlikely event that there is still a tie, the Evaluation Committee along with the Chairs will decide on a tie breaking measure base CoC priorities.

2016 Evaluation Process

VI. Specific Instructions and Data Source

Where the source is listed as APR, the data source will consist of projects most recent APR submitted in esnaps prior to March 31, 2016. For project that have been unable to submit in esnaps due to technical issues with the system, an APR generated from the project's internal database reflecting the most recent contract period can be used. If you are unable to retrieve your official APR from esnaps, please submit a copy from your internal database.

Question 1: APR question 10 for programs serving individuals and Q11 for programs serving families (will average the PIT utilization rates.)

Question 2: Projects will look in HMIS to determine how many new entrants came into the Permanent Housing program after the specified dates. Projects will provide DHS with verification of chronic status entered into the HMIS or compatible data base system. Acceptable forms of documentation include a print out of aggregate level results for project eligibility. Project eligibility will not be score during this evaluation cycle.

* McKinney-Vento Act Definition of Chronically Homeless

Chronically homeless. (1) An individual who: Is homeless and lives in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter; and Has been homeless and living or residing in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter continuously for at least one year or on at least four separate occasions in the last 3 years; and Can be diagnosed with one or more of the following conditions: substance use disorder, serious mental illness, developmental disability (as defined in section 102 of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15002)), post-traumatic stress disorder, cognitive impairments resulting from brain injury, or chronic physical illness or disability;

(2) An individual who has been residing in an institutional care facility, including a jail, substance abuse or mental health treatment facility, hospital, or other similar facility, for fewer than 90 days and met all of the criteria in paragraph (1) of this definition, before entering that facility;

OR

(3) A family with an adult head of household (or if there is no adult in the family, a minor head of household) who meets all of the criteria in paragraph (1) of this definition, including a family whose composition has fluctuated while the head of household has been homeless.

<https://www.onecpd.info/resources/documents/CoCProgramInterimRule.pdf>

Question 3: Projects will calculate this from HMIS using the Admission Date to determine if participants fall in the timeframe. Program will use 'Residence Prior to Program Entry' and 'Length of Stay at Previous Place' (if they came from an institutional setting). Projects will provide DHS with verification of project eligibility entered into the HMIS or compatible data base system. Acceptable forms of documentation include a print out of aggregate level results for project eligibility. Project eligibility will not be score during this evaluation cycle.

Question 4: Project will calculate this from HMIS. Project will use the Admission Date, Discharge Date or Last Day of Fiscal Year to calculate an average length of stay.

Questions 5-8: The data for these questions will come from the APR.

Question 9: This information will be gathered from program contract APR. Newly funded programs that recently reallocated funds have will not be scored on the spend-down of HUD funding question. The scores for these projects will be adjusted to account for this exemption by taking the number of points received as a percent of total points available under the other categories.

2016 Evaluation Process

$$\left[\frac{Q30 \text{ or } Q31: \text{Total SHP fundsexpended}}{Q3: \text{Amount of Contract or Award}} \right]$$

Note: many projects do not enter any data for APR Q3 (grant amount). If this is not complete, the score will be zero.

Question 10: Complete the form on page 9 and email to DHS (nyccoc@dhs.nyc.gov) by April 8, 2016 along with a copy of the minutes from a consumer/tenant meeting. Note, agency personnel should answer the questions about having a survey and grievance policy, not a consumer.

2016 Evaluation Process

VII. Score Table Summary

	PH	Some PH S+C	TH	SSO	SH	RRH
Unit Utilization	6	6	6	0	6	0
Chronically Homeless	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Eligibility	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average Length of Stay	3	3	3	0	0	3
Gained or Increased other Income	4	4	4	4	4	4
Gained or Increased Employment Income	4	4	4	4	4	4
Non-Case Benefits	4	4	4	4	4	4
Housing Stabilization	8	8	8	8	8	8
Spend Down	3	0	3	3	3	3
Consumer Participation	4	4	4	4	4	4
Total Maximum Points	36	33	36	27	33	30
Possible Deduction items						
Supplemental Documentation*	-10	-10	-10	-10	-10	-10
HMIS Uploads	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5
HMIS Participation Agreement	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5

*DEDUCTIONS WILL BE TAKEN IF ANY SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS NOT SUBMITTED ON TIME - April 8, 2016 (including the most recent APR and Q10 documents).

2016 NYC CCoC Evaluation Process

VIII. Technical Assistance and Contact Information

For additional questions related to the 2016 NYC CCoC evaluation process, deadlines, and applications, please contact:

Contact Name	Phone Number	Email	Portfolio Coverage
Aleida Valentin	212-232-0529	avalenti@dhs.nyc.gov	Agencies L-Z
Merih Anil	212-232-0830	manil@dhs.nyc.gov	Agencies A-K

For all questions related to **Shelter Plus Care** projects, applicants should contact their government agency sponsor.

Sponsor Government Agency	Contact Name	Phone Number	Email
NYC Department of Housing and Preservation Development	Dave Rouge	(212) 863-6469	dr9@hpd.nyc.gov
NYS Office of Mental Health	Ann Marie LaVallo	518-474-5191	AnneMarie.Lavallo@omh.ny.gov
NYS Office of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Services	Sheila Singleton	646-728-4636	Sheila.Singleton@oasas.ny.gov

If you have specific questions regarding HUD project guidelines, you may contact the local HUD field office representatives listed below. Please do not contact the HUD office regarding our local application deadlines or process as Continuum staff is available to answer those questions.

IX. 2016 NYC CCoC Evaluation Process: Appeals Form

This form must be completed and sent to DHS (nyccoc@dhs.nyc.gov) by noon (12pm) on 5/2/16

How to Appeal: If you appeal your score, please write a few short sentences describing what you are appealing and attach evidence demonstrating why you think that the appeal should be granted. For example, if your appeal involves information from your data system (such as AWARDS), please submit a copy of the page from your data system.

Name of Agency: _____

Program Name: _____

Program Address: _____

Part I

Section and Question (Measurement and Source/Score) being appealed and why.

Section: _____ Question: _____

Explanation:

Section and Question (Measurement and Source/Score) being appealed and why.

Section: _____ Question: _____

Explanation:

Section and Question (Measurement and Source/Score) being appealed and why.

Section: _____ Question: _____

Explanation:

Part II

Executive Director /Other Executive Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

2016 NYC CCoC Evaluation Process

Attachments:

X. Question 10 – Consumer Participation

This form must be completed and sent to DHS (nycccoc@dhs.nyc.gov) by noon (12pm) on April 8, 2016

Name of Agency: _____

Program Name: _____

- 1) Does the program have a client/tenant grievance policy? yes no
- 2) Does the program survey consumers/residents and/or complete documented interviews with current consumers at least annually to obtain feedback on program service quality, the service/housing environment, and opportunities for improvement? yes no
- 3) A copy of the minutes from the most recent consumer/tenant meeting attached. yes no
- 4) I certify that the above information accurately represents program's consumer involvement practices.

Consumer Participant Signature

- 5) I certify that the above information accurately represents program's consumer involvement practices.

Program Officer Signature