

Tri-County Continuum of Care for Hunterdon, Sussex, & Warren Counties

Review and Ranking Process 2020

Board Committee:

Chair: Meagan O'Reilly
Joan Bruseo
Lauren Burd
Shawn Buskirk
Nick Kapetanakis
Tina Magarino
Dianna Morrison
Susan Nekola
Carol Novrit
Laura Richter
Roni Todd-Marino

The Tri County Continuum of Care has established a transparent framework for the decision-making process guiding the annual CoC application for HUD funding for homelessness assistance projects. Performance measures and scoring criteria are adjusted annually to maintain alignment with HUD priorities and local objectives.

The Selection Committee consists of non-biased persons; i.e. members of the CoC who do not represent or have any formal association with an agency submitting an application to the CoC. The Selection Committee will receive copies of all project proposals prior to meeting and be prepared to:

- Conduct a review of each application
- Evaluate each application against defined criteria
- Rank each proposal in order
- Provide recommendations to the CoC Executive Committee regarding whether a proposal should be submitted for funding and how it should be ranked against other proposals.

Veterans Committee:

Chair: Jenn Stivers

Each individual who participates in the review process agrees to hold all information related to the proposals in confidence before, during and after the review proceedings. Rankings and scores will be shared with applicants prior to presentation to the CoC. Findings of the committee will be presented to the Executive Committee of the Tri-County CoC for final approval.

New Projects

- Applicant is a 50l(c)(3) not for profit or a local unit of government.
- Projects must meet all HUD eligibility criteria.
- Applicant must have the organizational capacity to implement a project in alignment with all HUD standards and cannot have a history of findings or unresolved issues with HUD or the State of NJ or counties of Warren, Sussex or Hunterdon.

Renewal Projects

Projects will be evaluated on a 105-point basis. The Selection Committee members are asked to assign a score based on information in the application, performance review, and local and HUD priorities. All projects are scored together and then ranked from highest to lowest score. A minimum score of 60 is required to be included in the FY 2020 application.

A new or renewal project application must meet the priority threshold, or it will be automatically rejected by the Selection Committee. Applications also must use a housing first approach, agree to participate in the Coordinated Entry System, commit to a policy of non-discrimination, and comply with all other provisions of the Policies & Procedures of the Coordinated Entry System.

Upon a project application submission, the Selection Committee will first closely review the information in order to ensure that:

- All proposed program participants will be eligible for the program component type selected;
- The organization is eligible to submit a project application;
- The proposed activities are eligible under the 24 CFR part 578;
- Each project narrative is fully responsive to the question being asked and that it meets all
 criteria for that question as required by the NOFA's detailed instructions provided in esnaps;
- The data provided in various parts of the project application are consistent; and
- All required attachments, such as letters of commitment correspond to the attachments list in e-snaps and the attachments contain accurate and complete information.

Applications submitted may be returned for suggested modifications or amendments. Those project applications that are accepted for submission may be invited to present their project to the Selection Committee. The dates, times and location will be emailed to the organization. Interviews are meant to clarify the applications only and are not meant to be used to provide new information that could affect scoring.

Shortly after the presentations, the projects within each priority will then be scored by the Selection Committee according to the criteria set by the CoC Executive Committee.

Scoring Criteria and Application Scorecard-Renewal Projects

Desk Monitoring Scoring Criteria:

- 1. Client Review
- 2. HMIS Compliance
- 3. Client Feedback/Staff Training
- 4. Financial Review
- 5. Project Administration
- 6. Coordination & Housing First
- 7. CoC Participation

Scoring Criteria	Points
Client Review	9
HMIS Compliance	8
Client Feedback/Staff Training	5
Financial Review	12
Project Administration	8
Coordination & Housing First	18
CoC Participation	5
Total Points Possible	65

The scoring tool for Program Performance is included below:

Program Performance						
Goals	Required Performance Standards		%	Points Awarded		
Project maintains an appropriate utilization rate for the year	At least an 85% utilization average for the year	≥85%=5				
		70%-84%= 3				
		50%-69%= 1				
Households receive some form of 54% o earned or unearned income	54% of households have some	≥54%= 5				
	form of income	40%-53%= 3				
earned or direarned income		25%-39%= 1				
Adults that are not enrolled in	20% of adults not enrolled will have earned income	≥20%= 5				
SSDI/SSI process will have some level		15%-19%= 3				
of earned income	nave earned income	10%-14%= 1				
Households have increased their level	54% of households have increased	≥54%= 3				
of income from project entry to exit	their income	40%-53%= 2				
(or update)	their income	25%-39%= 1				
Households are connected to	56% of households are connected	≥56%= 5				
Households are connected to mainstream non-cash benefits	to noncash benefits	45%-55%= 3				
		35%-44%= 1				
Households obtained mainstream	56% of households obtained	≥56%= 3				
non-cash benefits from project entry	noncash benefits	45%-55%= 2				
to exit (or update)	Horicasti belletits	35%-44%= 1				
Households remain in or are being	80% of households remain/discharged to permanent	≥80%= 5				
discharged to a permanent		75%-79%= 3				
destination	housing	70%-74%= 1				
Households being discharged from		<10%= 4				
projects due to noncompliance or a disagreement with the project rules or persons	Less than 10% of households are discharged due to negative causes	10%-15%= 2				
Households being discharged are not	Less than 10% of households are discharged to identified locations	<10%= 5				
discharged to another transitional		10%-15%= 3				
housing project, emergency shelter or place not meant for habitation		15%-20%= 1				
		•	Total Score			
			Total Possible	40		

Scoring Criteria and Application Scorecard- New Projects

New Project Scoring Criteria:

- 1. Submission
- 2. HMIS Compliance/Data Quality
- 3. Housing First
- 4. Match & Leverage
- 5. CoC Participation
- 6. Bonus Points

Category	Explanation	Max. Points (50)
Submission	Project is submitted on time and is aligned with HUD/CoC priorities	10
HMIS Compliance/Data Quality	Serves Eligible clients (5 pts)	5
Housing First Orientation in Admission and Termination Criteria	RLI & supportive documentation demonstrate housing first philosophy	10
Match & Leverage	25% match 150% leverage	5
CoC Participation	Project participates in Exec. Committee, sub-committee, and/or Coordinated Assessment	10
Bonus Points	Dedicated/Prioritized for the Chronically Homeless	10

Appeals Process

If an applicant organization feels it was denied the right to reasonably participate in the local application process or has been unfairly eliminated from either the local or the federal competition, that a decision made by the CoC Selection Committee regarding the ranking, rejection, or funding of their project was prejudicial, unsubstantiated by project performance, or in violation of the 2020 Continuum of Care Guidelines, the applying agency and sponsor, if any, may file an appeal to be reconsidered for inclusion in either the local competition or federal competition.

A written appeal request must be submitted to the CoC within one week of the notice of the decision by email to Chair, Meagan O'Reilly (moreilly@co.hunterdon.nj.us). The Tri-County Selection Committee will hear all appeals. It is the responsibility of the Applicant to address each area(s) identified as a factor(s) of the funding decision in a manner that could result in a more favorable decision.

Decisions of the Selection Committee will be presented to the Tri County CoC for public comment.