

## **Allegheny County Continuum of Care (PA-600) 2018 Rate, Rank, Review, and Selection Criteria Process**

This document describes the 2018 Rate, Rank, Review, and Selection Criteria Process utilized by the [Allegheny County Continuum of Care \(CoC\), PA-600](#), for the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 Continuum of Care Program Competition (2018 NOFA). An overview of the development of these processes, along with a timeline, is provided following the description of the processes and criteria.

*The [Homeless Advisory Board \(HAB\)](#) is the working board that acts on the behalf of the CoC to ensure the fulfillment of the responsibilities of the CoC, and is the body responsible for finalizing the process decisions described in this document. Allegheny County Department of Human Services (DHS) has been designated as the Infrastructure Organization by the HAB. Within this designation, DHS has been delegated the day-to-day and operational responsibilities that fulfill the core duties of the CoC, including serving as the Collaborative Applicant and supporting the administrative duties required to complete the annual NOFA application.*

---

### **2018 CoC Review and Ranking**

---

#### ***Eligibility for Ranking***

Projects that sought renewal for funding in 2018 were required to submit their Performance Outcome Tool Justifications to DHS by May 15, 2018. Beyond submitting required materials by the deadlines outlined by DHS and in the NOFA, renewal projects were required to have an executed Grant Agreement from HUD and be in full compliance with all applicable local, state and federal laws and regulations.

Projects that sought to receive reallocation funding in 2018 were required to submit a complete proposal in response to a Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by DHS and reviewed by a diverse, cross-functional evaluation committee, including members of the HAB, by the date outlined in the RFP (June 14, 2018). Further, projects that the RFP evaluation committee recommended for inclusion in the NOFA were required to meet all the criteria for renewals, as outlined above.

#### ***Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tool***

The 2018 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tool was developed to evaluate performance and to rank HUD CoC renewal projects for the 2018 NOFA.

The tool is organized around eleven performance areas: (a) unit utilization; (b) housing performance (e.g., exists to permanent housing); (c) income, employment, health insurance and non-cash benefits; (d) length of time in program; (e) recidivism; (f) data quality; (g) data quality timeliness; (h) file completeness; (j) fiscal; (k) cost effectiveness; and (l) housing first compliance. Data for each measure is scored on a scale and weighted to balance the ranking tool results around a consistent 100-point scale. Data to populate the tool for each project was extracted from HMIS, except for sections (h), (j), (k) and (l). Fiscal data maintained through DHS was used to complete sections (j) and (k), and a Monitoring Scorecard and Housing First Monitoring Checklist were used to complete sections (h) and (l).

Once the tool was populated with data it was shared with the corresponding project. Project leads reviewed the completed tool, provided justification for requests to adjust any scores, and described plans to address any low performance measures.

### ***Reallocation Strategy***

A full description of the CoC's reallocation strategy can be found in the 2018 Reallocation Process document. Funds for reallocation were identified through an adjustment process for lower scoring projects (scores based on the 2018 Renewal project Performance Outcome Tool). One project was selected through an open and competitive RFP process to apply for the reallocated funds in the 2018 NOFA.

### ***Ranking Strategy***

The 2018 ranking strategy continued the data-driven, performance-based and needs-oriented processes implemented in 2017. The 2018 strategy included:

- Renewal projects that were operational for all of calendar year 2017 were ranked in order of score using the 2018 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tool. Projects that became operational in 2017, and thus did not have a full year of data, were also scored using the 2018 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tool but were grouped after the projects that were operational for all 2017<sup>1</sup>. A data dictionary was included as a part of the overall distribution of the tool.
  - The 2018 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tool was completed for each project using data pulled from HMIS or a comparable data system.
  - Each project reviewed the scores on the tool and provided a justification for any score that should be adjusted.
  - The Evaluation Committee assessed proposed score changes and adjusted scores per their review. The Evaluation Committee also attributed additional points to projects serving particularly vulnerable clients. Based on entry assessment data in HMIS, one additional point was added to projects for each of the below outlined vulnerable population thresholds:
    - 50% or more of households served were chronically homeless at entry
    - 60% or more of households served had person(s) with 2 or more disabilities at entry
    - 50% or more of households served had adults with zero income at entry
    - 40% or more of households served came from places not meant for human habitation at entry
  - Final scores were used to rank projects in order of score, and final review and approval is conducted by the Homeless Advisory Board (HAB).
- One renewal project was not operational in 2017 and was ranked at the bottom of Tier 1.
- HMIS and Allegheny Link projects are considered critical to the overall operations of the CoC, and therefore were placed in the middle of Tier 1.
- Expansion project using the reallocated funds was ranked at the bottom of Tier 1.
- Bonus projects were ranked at the bottom of Tier 2, with the domestic violence bonus project ranked first, followed by five regular bonus projects selected.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Per the 2018 Priority Ranking List, projects ranked 41-57 represent the projects that were not operational for all CY2017; these projects are ranked in order of score but fall below the projects that were operational for all CY2017.

<sup>2</sup> All bonus projects were selected using an open and competitive RFP process.

### **Review and Ranking Process**

Utilizing the Performance Outcome Tool and reallocation and ranking strategies described above, the following process was implemented to rank projects for the 2018 NOFA:

- Performance Outcome Tool
  - HAB approved the 2018 Performance Outcome Tool on March 27, 2018<sup>3</sup>
  - DHS generated the Performance Outcome Tool for each project and distributed them to service providers along with instructions for the pre-application process and a Data Dictionary on April 24, 2018
  - Service providers returned reviewed Performance Outcome Tools, including any score adjustment requests and justification, to DHS for Evaluation Committee review by May 15, 2018
- Reallocation and Bonus Projects
  - Funding to be reallocated determined by reviewing lower scoring projects and adjusting underspent amounts (i.e., one project was selected to not seek renewal, and two projects were reduced); decisions to reallocate funds were made in collaboration with the impacted projects, and final notifications were made by May 15, 2018
  - RFP for reallocated and regular bonus funds was issued on May 24, 2018, and an RFP for domestic violence bonus funds was issued on July 5, 2018
  - Proposals were reviewed by Review Committees using criteria outlined in the RFPs and projects selected; projects selected for reallocated and regular bonus funds were notified on July 9, 2018, and the project selected for domestic violence bonus funds was notified on August 7, 2018.
- Review and Ranking Evaluation Committee
  - Each Evaluation Committee member<sup>4</sup> received one third of the 2018 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tools to review.
  - During review, if an evaluator felt a score should be changed, the evaluator indicated the section and question, the amount to increase or decrease the score, and a justification of why it should be changed on the official evaluator's score sheet.
  - Evaluator's score sheets were returned to DHS; projects were ranked by score with notation of any proposals for score changes from evaluators.
  - Evaluation Committee convened to review, discuss and confirm recommended ranking list; this discussion included attributing additional points to projects serving particularly vulnerable clients (see Ranking Strategy section, above, for details)
- Posting and Appeal
  - The recommended ranking list was posted on the CoC webpage and projects were notified of their ranking and the appeal process on August 15, 2018
  - Any appeals received will be reviewed by the Appeal Review Team and recommended response to the appeals will be put forward to the HAB
- Final Ranking List
  - The HAB will review recommended ranking list and any recommended adjustments, including results of appeal process
  - HAB's final ranking list will be publicly posted on the CoC webpage

---

<sup>3</sup> The 2018 Performance Outcome Tool was developed through the HAB's CoC Analysis and Planning Committee, which reviewed the 2017 tool and processes and made adjustments based on CoC needs and priorities, and input from Committee members, whom represent the a range of CoC stakeholders.

<sup>4</sup> As an update to the 2017 process, representatives from CoC funded programs did not serve on the Evaluation Committee in 2018.

### ***Ranking Appeal Process***

All projects were notified of their ranking on August 15, 2018. A project may appeal their ranking by submitting a complete appeal form (Appendix B) by email to Hilary Scherer ([hilary.scherer@allegHENYcounty.us](mailto:hilary.scherer@allegHENYcounty.us)) no later than 12:00pm on August 23, 2018. Appeals submitted on time and in full will be reviewed by the Appeal Review Team. The Appeal Review Team consists members of the CoC Evaluation Committee.

If the Appeal Review Team determines that an appeal should result in an adjustment to the ranking, all Projects whose ranking is affected will be notified. The HAB will make the ultimate determination of ranking, confirming the final list for submission.

---

### **Process Development Overview**

The CoC Analysis and Planning Committee is one of four standing committees of the HAB. In addition to regularly reviewing CoC data, policies and strategies, the CoC Analysis and Planning Committee has been charged with developing recommendations for evaluating programs and funding. As such, each year the Committee integrates local data analyses, the CoC's priorities and goals, local lessons learned, national best practices, and programmatic regulations/requirements to develop recommendations on the specific process for reviewing and ranking new/renewal/expansion projects for the HUD CoC Program Application.

The CoC Analysis and Planning Committee meets monthly and has open membership (monthly meeting schedule posted publicly on website and CoC members are reminded of Committee dates and invited to participate at least annually). The Committee held discussions particular to reviewing, ranking, and reallocating projects for the 2018 Continuum of Care Program Competition beginning in September 2017 and continuing monthly thereafter.

The following timeline provides a summary of key dates for developing the process and criteria:

- September 13, 2017—CoC Analysis and Planning Committee begins targeted conversations around the review, ranking, and reallocation process for 2017.
- March 19, 2018—CoC Analysis and Planning Committee's recommendation for the 2018 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tool was shared with the CoC for public comment. Comments were collected through March 23, 2018 and shared with the HAB.
- March 27, 2018—HAB approved 2018 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tool.

**Appendix A**  
**2018 Performance Outcome Tool**

**Allegheny County Continuum of Care Evaluation  
2018 Renewal Application Project  
Performance Outcomes**

Agency: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Evaluation Data Review Period: **1/1/2017** to **12/31/2017**  
 Total HUD 2016 Grant Award: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_  
 Type of Program: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Housing Programs: No. of Units \_\_\_\_\_ No. of Beds \_\_\_\_\_  
 Subpopulation Target A Served: \_\_\_\_\_ Subpopulation Target B Served: \_\_\_\_\_

**Summary of Persons Served during Evaluation Period:**

	Households without Children		Households with Children	
Total Households Served :	Number of Households without Children		Number of Households with Children	
Total Persons Served:	Adults		Children	
	Leavers		Stayers	
Total Persons:	Leavers		Stayers	
Households:	Exiting Households		Households Staying	
Total Adults:	Exiting		Staying	

All Performance Measures are generated from HMIS for the purpose of reviewing and ranking 2018 renewal projects. The tool was developed by the Continuum of Care Analysis and Planning Committee and approved by the Homeless Advisory Board to be utilized for the HUD CoC.

**a. Unit Utilization**

	Specific Households in Units - Last Wednesday of given Month	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points
January Utilization of Units		#DIV/0!		0.75	0.00	#DIV/0!
April Utilization of Units		#DIV/0!		0.75		
July Utilization of Units		#DIV/0!		0.75		
October Utilization of Units		#DIV/0!		0.75		

**b. Housing Performance**

	Specific Measure by Program Type	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points
RRH: Consumers exiting to any HUD-defined PH option		#DIV/0!		3	0	
PSH: Consumers remaining in PSH or exiting to any HUD-defined PH option		#DIV/0!		4	0	

**c. RRH Income,  
Employment, Health  
Insurance & Non Cash  
Benefits (Leavers)**

	Specific Outcome Measure	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points
1. <u>ADULT</u> consumers who maintain or increase income from all sources (excludes zero income)		#DIV/0!		0.75	0	#DIV/0!
2. <u>ADULT</u> consumers become or remain employed during program		#DIV/0!		0.75		
3. <u>ADULT &amp; CHILD</u> consumers who have health insurance		#DIV/0!		0.75		
4. <u>ADULT</u> consumers who maintain or increase non-cash benefits		#DIV/0!		0.75		

**c. PSH Income,  
Employment, Health  
Insurance & Non Cash  
Benefits (Leavers and  
Stayers)**

	Specific Outcome Measure	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points
1. <u>ADULT</u> consumers who maintain or increase income from all sources		#DIV/0!		0.75	0	#DIV/0!
2. <u>ADULT</u> consumers become or remain employed during program		#DIV/0!		0.75		
3. <u>ADULT &amp; CHILD</u> consumers who have health insurance		#DIV/0!		0.75		
4. <u>ADULT</u> consumers who maintain or increase non-cash benefits		#DIV/0!		0.75		

**d.RRH Length of Time**

Average Length of time from program enrollment to move in date (30 days)

Rapid Rehousing: Consumers staying or exiting program in 9 months or less

Specific Measure by Program Type	% of Total Served	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points
	N/A		1	0	
	#DIV/0!		2	0	

**e. Recidivism**

Consumers exiting from a program to PH destination but return to homeless system (street outreach or ES or TH) in 6 months

Specific Outcome by Program	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points
0	#DIV/0!		1	0	#DIV/0!

**f. Data Quality**

Program had no data quality missing values

**Data Quality: Errors**

Name  
 Social Security Number  
 Date of Birth  
 Race  
 Ethnicity  
 Gender  
 Veteran Status (at entry) ADULT  
 Relationship to Head of Household  
 Client Location  
 Disabling Condition  
 Destination at Exit  
 Income and Sources at Entry  
 Income and Sources at Annual  
 Income and Sources at Exits  
 Chronic Homelessness (missing)

Number of HMIS Records with Errors as Defined by HUD	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points
	#DIV/0!		1	0	#DIV/0!
	#DIV/0!				

**g. Data Quality: Timeliness**

Data Quality:RRH Entry  
 Data Quality:RRH Exit  
 Data Quality: PSH Exits  
 Data Quality: PSH Annual

PSH/RRH Number of Records 3 days or less for Exits PSH=Annals 60 day window	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points
	#DIV/0!		0.5	0	#DIV/0!
	#DIV/0!		0.5	0	#DIV/0!
	#DIV/0!		1	0	#DIV/0!
	#DIV/0!		1	0	#DIV/0!

**h. Monitoring- File  
Completeness :Both RRH &  
PSH**

	Score From Monitoring Tool	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points
File Completeness (2017 records)		0%		1	0	

**i. Monitoring: PSH Only**

	Score From Monitoring Tool	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points
PSH Project serving Adults with disabling condition		#DIV/0!		1	0	

**j. Fiscal**

Grant expended all funding  
(Amount Returned in last HUD  
grant)  
Billing reports are submitted timely  
during 2017

	Amount / Number	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points
\$ -	#DIV/0!			1	0	#DIV/0!
0	0%			1		

**k. Cost Effectiveness of  
Program**

Cost per successful exit for RRH  
Cost per successful exit and stayers  
for PSH

	Amount	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points
#DIV/0!			1	0	
#DIV/0!			1	0	

**l. Housing First Monitoring  
Compliance with Housing First  
Principles**

	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points
0		1	0.0	

**TOTALS**

	Total Points for All Categories	Percentage of Total Points
<b>Total Score (RRH programs)</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Total Score (PSH programs)</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0%</b>

## Project Response to Performance Outcomes on Ranking Tool

Name of Person Reviewing Outcomes:

Date of Review:

**Did the program receive maximum or near maximum points in all the Performance Measures?**

Yes

No

**The project may comment on their performance below by category. Be brief and concise.**

1. Comments on Performance

Performance	Explanation/Comments
a. Unit Utilization	
b. Housing Performance	
c1. Income	
c2. Employment	
c3. Health Insurance	
c4. Non-Cash Benefits	
d.RRH Length of Time	
e. Recidivism	
f. Data Quality: Elements	
g. Data Quality Timeliness	
h. Monitoring Files-Completeness Both RRH & PSH	
i. Monitoring-PSH ONLY Serving appropriate clients	
j. Fiscal	
k. Cost Effectiveness	
l. Housing First	

2. Further information about this program that may assist the evaluator to understand the challenges or the high performance of your program.

**Allegheny County CoC HUD Monitoring Scorecard**

Provider: 0  
 Program Name: 0 Project Type: 0  
 Number of files Reviewed: 4 Date:

Category of Review	Files Passing Review	Percentage	Score	Rubric for scoring:
<b>Completed Intake: Program Agreement signed and dated by client</b>		0%		100% = 1 point 75% to 99 % = .75 50% to 74 % = .5 25% to 49% = .25 0 to 24% = 0%
<b>Goal/Service Plan:</b> Within first 30 days, reviewed at least quarterly		0%		100% = 1 point 75% to 99 % = .75 50% to 74 % = .5 25% to 49% = .25 0 to 24% = 0%
<b>Homeless Verification:</b> Third party or self-certification		0%		100% = 1 point 75% to 99 % = .75 50% to 74 % = .5 25% to 49% = .25 0 to 24% = 0%
<b>Consistent Case Notes:</b> Contact on at least a monthly basis		0%		100% = 1 point 75% to 99 % = .75 50% to 74 % = .5 25% to 49% = .25 0 to 24% = 0%
<b>Habitability Standards:</b> Deficiencies addressed in corrective action plan and plan submitted within 30 days		0%		100% = 1 point 75% to 99 % = .75 50% to 74 % = .5 25% to 49% = .25 0 to 24% = 0%
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>0</b>	

**Comments**

<b>Completed Intake: Program Agreement signed and dated by client</b>	
<b>Goal/Service Plan:</b> Within first 30 days, reviewed at least quarterly	
<b>Homeless Verification:</b> Third party or self-certification	
<b>Consistent Case Notes:</b> Contact on at least a monthly basis	
<b>Habitability Standards:</b> Deficiencies addressed in corrective action plan and plan submitted within 30 days	



Allegheny County HUD PSH Fiscal

Agency 0  
Project 0

	Contract Executed Amount	Amount Received from January - December 2017	Units	Contracted Cost/Unit	Beds	Contracted Cost per Bed	PSH = Adult Stayers plus successful outcomes	Actual ExpendituresCost/Successful Outcome
PSH			0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!

Amount of Funds Returned under HUD 2016

Timeliness of Billing

Yes NO

January		
February		
March		
April		
May		
June		
July		
August		
September		
October		
November		
December		
Total	0	0

## Allegheny County Housing First Checklist

**Agency Name:** 0

**Project Name:** 0

Purpose: The Housing First Checklist was adopted from the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (September 2016) and has been modified in format to establish Housing Monitor: The reviewer will place a 1 in either the yes or no core element box. To score projects: the yes column will be added together to total the number of core Program/Project: The agency will receive a copy of the checklist after the completion of the review. The agency will be given 2 weeks to respond to the the review. The

Yes	No	Weighted Score	Core Elements of Housing First at Program/ Project Level	Monitor Notes/ Comments
			<b>Does the project ensure that participants are not screened out based on the following items:</b>	
		0	<b>1. Having too little or no income</b>	
		0	<b>2. Active or history of substance use, or treatment compliance</b>	
		0	<b>3. Having a criminal record with exceptions for state mandated restrictions</b>	
		0	<b>4. History of domestic violence (eg. Lack of protective/restraining order, period of separation from abuser or law enforcement involvement.</b>	
		0	<b>Does the project ensure that participants are not terminated from the program for the following reasons:</b>	
		0	<b>5. Failure to participate in voluntary supportive services. Failure to complete, participate, or make progress in service plan.</b>	
		0	<b>6. Loss of income or failure to increase income.</b>	
		0	<b>7. Being a victim of domestic violence.</b>	
		0	<b>8. Substance use in and of itself, without other lease violations.</b>	
		0	<b>9. Program had less than 5% of household exits in the past 12 months due to involuntary termination.</b>	
0			<b>Total of yes and no answers</b>	

Form Completed by:

Completion Date:

<b>Program Comments/Action Plan:</b>
--------------------------------------

Signature of Program Director or Executive Director

Date

**Appendix B**  
**2018 Ranking Appeal Form**

**Allegheny County Continuum of Care (PA-600)  
2018 NOFA Continuum of Care Program Competition  
Ranking Appeal Form**

**Instructions**

*Complete contact information and provide a one (1) page maximum summary that clearly articulates the ranking issue being appealed and provides justification for the requested change. Projects should review the Allegheny County Continuum of Care 2018 Rate, Rank, Review, and Selection Criteria Process document before submitting an appeal to ensure that the justification provided is not duplicative of review and ranking processes that have already been completed, such as the service providers review of completed Performance Outcome Tools for their projects.*

**Submit this completed form by 12:00pm on Thursday, August 23, 2018 and return to Hilary Scherer at [hilary.scherer@alleghenycounty.us](mailto:hilary.scherer@alleghenycounty.us)**

**Contact Information**

**Agency Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Email:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Phone:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Appeal and Justification (one page)**