## NYC CCOC 2018 OBJECTIVE RANKING & SELECTION PROCESS
### September 2018

**Threshold Review**

All applications for new and renewal projects are reviewed for threshold to ensure compliance with the HEARTH Act, the CoC Program Interim Rule, the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), CoC written standards, and the local CoC Request for Proposals (RFP). Any new or renewal project that does not meet the threshold requirements are not considered for funding.

**Renewal Project Performance Scoring & Selection**

The NYC CCOC Steering Committee (CoC Board) determines the evaluation scoring standards for renewal projects annually using the following process: 1) Draft standards are proposed by the Evaluation Committee. 2) Proposed standards are shared with the Steering Committee at a regularly scheduled meeting and distributed by email. 3) At a subsequent Steering Committee meeting, stakeholder input is discussed 4) The Steering Committee makes adjustments to the standards and adopts the final standards.

Scoring standards adopted are the objective criteria used by the CoC to review, rate, rank, and select renewal projects for inclusion in or exclusion from the CoC Priority Listing. These objective criteria use APR and HMIS data to evaluate cost effectiveness (e.g. unit utilization and spending of funds), performance (e.g. length of stay, income increases, accessing non-cash benefits & health insurance, & exits to/maintenance of PH), type of population served (e.g. chronically & literally homeless), consumer participation, and compliance with administrative requirements. Objective criteria include factors related to achieving positive housing outcomes (e.g., exiting to or maintaining permanent housing, increasing income, and accessing non-cash benefits). The NYC Department of Social Services (DSS) analyzes evaluation data and prepares scoring reports, which are distributed to all project applicants and posted publicly on the CoC website.

Renewal projects demonstrating a history of poor performance over multiple years are not selected for funding. In addition, projects with a history of under spending may have their grants reduced. Funds previously used to support these projects are reallocated to create new PSH, RRH, and Joint TH/RRH projects.

Applicants have the opportunity to submit appeals related to renewal evaluation scores and/or reallocation decisions to an ad hoc Appeals Committee, which is appointed by the Steering Committee and reviews and approves or denies all requests. Applicants are notified in writing of decisions by the Appeals Committee. Parties with conflicts of interest are disallowed from participation on the Appeals Committee.

**New Project Application Scoring & Selection**

Annually, the CoC analyzes the most critical gaps in the housing inventory, determines the type of new project applications that will be sought, and posts to its website and widely distributes via email an RFP for new projects funded through both bonus and reallocation. The CoC welcomes and solicits new project applications from organizations that currently receive or have received CoC Program funds and from organizations that have never received CoC Program funds.

The Steering Committee appoints a review committee of subject matter experts to review, rate, rank & competitively select new project applications for inclusion in the CoC Priority Listing. Parties with conflicts of interest are disallowed from participation on the review committee. The Committee uses objective criteria to score applications. The committee may give the CoC consultants/DSS direction to work with applicants to make adjustments to strengthen applications and ensure the applications included in the final submission to HUD meet the most critical gaps identified by the CoC. The CoC provides technical assistance to all applicants to ensure that the process is accessible to any applicant, including those that have not previously received funding.

**Ranking**

In the annual CoC competition, HUD requires communities to rank projects for funding in two tiers. CoCs must rank all new and renewal projects, except CoC Planning. Projects in Tier 1 are generally ensured funding, as long as the project application meets minimum HUD requirements, and the CoC meets the basic requirements of the annual CoC competition. The amount that CoCs must rank in Tier 1 and Tier 2 is established each year by HUD in the CoC Program Competition NOFA. Tier 2 projects have to compete nationally for funding.

Each year the NYCCCoC Independent Review Team (IRT) reviews new & renewal project scoring results along with gaps in the housing inventory and critical CoC infrastructure needs as identified through data and CoC leadership & membership feedback. The IRT discusses ranking strategies and adopts the final ranking strategy. Parties with conflicts of interest are disallowed from participation.

Projects included in the 2018 NYC CoC Priority Listing were ranked in the following order:

1. Projects operating long enough to be evaluated through the annual renewal evaluation process were ranked at the top of Tier 1 in order based on score with consolidated projects ranked at the spot assigned to their highest ranked component project;
2. Followed, in Tier 1; by renewal projects that were not scored;
3. Followed in Tier 2 by remaining evaluated renewal projects in order based on score;
4. Followed by new projects in a manner that prioritizes projects with higher RFP application scores and maximizes resources available to end homelessness.

**Consideration of Severity of Participant Needs and Vulnerabilities**
The CoC's ranking & selection process prioritizes funding for projects serving vulnerable participants, including: youth under age 25, people experiencing chronic homelessness, people with zero income, criminal history, active substance use, and those reluctant to engage in services.  For example, the CoC took these actions to ensure consideration of these vulnerabilities:

- renewal projects with 100% of entrants being people experiencing chronic homelessness received up to 5 points & were ranked higher;
- new projects dedicating units for unaccompanied and parenting youth under age 25 received bonus points & were ranked higher
- CoC ranked and selected new projects based on:
  1. applicant experience & capacity to serve vulnerable people (e.g., chronically homeless, active substance users, people reluctant to engage, people with criminal history, zero income &/or disabilities, unsheltered)
  2. a clear outreach & supportive services plan to engage & serve the most vulnerable people using a Housing First approach.

Projects not targeting vulnerable populations were not funded.  Only PSH projects dedicating 100% of beds for chronic homelessness & PSH, RRH projects, and Joint TH/RRH using a low barrier Housing First approach were selected for funding.