Columbia Greene Housing Coalition:

Rank and Review Process

In the Columbia Greene Housing Coalition (CGHC), the Ranking and Monitoring Committee is charged with overseeing the Rank and Review process. As described in the CGHC bylaws, the Ranking and Monitoring Committee is responsible for reviewing and rank scoring CoC funding applications, and monitoring successful HUD funded CoC Projects through performance evaluations”. The Continuum of follows a collaborative process for the development of funding applications, including funding priorities and the number and type of applications. Each year the Rank and Review Application is established by the committee which is then reviewed and approved by full Membership.

Review and Approval of the Rank & Review Application

The Rank and Review process begins once the Collaborative Applicant submits the Grant Inventory Worksheet. Once submitted, the Ranking and Monitoring Committee meets to discuss the previous year’s Rank & Review application, process, and feedback from reviewers and projects. The committee considers information gained on behalf of the CoC over the past year and makes revisions to the application. The committee presents the revised draft of the application to the CGHC Board. Any additional changes to the application or review team suggested by the Board may be made by the committee. Once the Ranking and Monitoring Committee has updated the Board, the application is presented to full Membership for the comment period. Any comments received from Membership are then considered by the committee for final decisions regarding further revisions. The Rank & Review Application is then finalized and shared with Membership for projects to complete.

Project Participation

Each renewal project completes a Rank & Review Application for the renewal project. The most recent APR submitted to HUD by the project is used to complete the Rank & Review application. Each application must be completed (including all required attachments) and submitted on time in order to be considered complete and passed to the review team. At the time of submission, each project/agency is assigned an interview time with the review team. It is expected that each project will meet with the review team.

Reviewers

Members of the review team are individuals from the community who are knowledgeable about the CoC and its providers. Reviewers are non-funded and objective individuals. The Ranking and Monitoring Committee schedules a day for Rank & Review project interviews and scoring to take place. Each reviewer is provided a copy of project applications and score forms. Once the review team convenes and conducts interviews with each project, the review team scores each application. These scores result in the ranking. The review team provides any final comments to be shared with projects or Membership.

Project Ranking

The project ranking is first shared with the Ranking and Monitoring Committee. The committee reviews the process and all scoring in order to adopt the ranking. Projects projected to fall into Tier 2 are contacted and notified of their ranking and offered the opportunity to go over the project’s scores. Afterwards, the ranking is shared with Membership. At that time, each project receives a copy of their individual scores and is given the opportunity to meet with the Collaborative Applicant to debrief.

*Appeal Process*

If during this debriefing, a mathematical error is found by the project, the error can be corrected, and notice of the correction will be provided to the NOFA Committee and the Board. Formal appeals can only be submitted by a project after a debriefing has been completed. An appeal may not be submitted if the basis of the appeal is one of the following: the applicant did not answer all the questions on the application, the applicant did not submit the application with all required attachments, or the applicant did not submit by the required deadline. The appeals process applies only to project ranking. There is no appeal for project tiering.

Project Tiering

When the NOFA is released, the priorities and tiering outlined in the application are strategically applied by the CoC to the project ranking. Reallocation, new projects, and other CoC priorities are considered through CoC discussions. The tiering is presented by the Ranking and Monitoring Committee to the Board who approves it to go to Membership for a vote. Membership votes on the tiering and approves the Project Listing and the CoC Application.

*Bonus Projects*

Each year, there may be bonus funds available. The CoC is permitted to apply for one (1) bonus project, which will compete nationally against other bonus projects on a HUD scoring system set forth in the NOFA. HUD will notify the CoC’s what the bonus funds may be used for. The bonus project will complement and fill an unmet need. The application for a bonus project is a separate RFP. The reviewers will score and rank the bonus projects; however, there are no interviews for bonus projects. After the bonus projects are ranked, ranking is sent to membership. Bonus projects will be chosen with the goal of applying for all available funds.

*Reallocation*

In addition to the scoring criteria, all projects must meet a minimum threshold, which includes: participation in Coordinated Entry, participation in Point in Time, and participation within HMIS. Additionally, if a project consistently demonstrates unsatisfactory project performance outcomes and fails to make significant changes to improve its performance, that project may be recommended for reallocation. A threshold review will take place after the Rank and Review process to ensure the threshold requirement has been met by each project. If the threshold has not been met, the Rank and Review team can recommend to the CoC Board possible reallocation or substantial amendments to the contract. CoC funded agencies may voluntarily choose to reallocate CoC funds. These will be reviewed by the Rank and Review team as well. Those agencies who choose to voluntarily reallocate will receive priority in the reallocation ranking process.

Attachment B: FY2015 Rank and Review Application

The CGHC emphasizes the importance and impact of using the Rank & Review Application as the primary basis for determining the Project Listing submitted as part of the CoC Consolidated Application. The Rank and Review Application is thoughtfully revised each year to include both HUD and CoC standards, incorporating both national and local priorities, balancing objective performance measures with subjective narrative description of project operations.