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# 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’s Southern Tier, representing Broome, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware, Otsego, & Tioga Counties, the group of stakeholders is CoC NY-511’s (NY-511) NOFA Committee. A Rating and Ranking Panel, appointed by NOFA Committee members, is tasked specifically with the CoC’s evaluation process which partially determines each project’s ranking. CARES of NY, Inc. serves as the facilitator of the Rating and Ranking Panel’s evaluation process on behalf of the collaborative applicant.

In anticipation of the FY20 CoC Program Competition NOFA, NY-511 is issuing the following evaluation criteria to be used as part of the *Renewal Project Application* and *New Project Application* ranking process. To ensure that the CoC’s application is competitive and fully funded, NY-511 reserves the right to amend these requirements and/or issue additional requirements as needed and in response to criteria issued in the FY20 CoC Program Competition NOFA.

# Highlights for the FY20 Evaluation Process

The 2020 Rank and Review Application process will occur in three (3) phases, with the intent to allow agencies adequate time to complete the full Rank and Review Application.

* **Phase 1** focuses on project and system outcomes, using the most recent APR and HMIS System Performance data to “rate” projects. Completed applications (including required attachments) for each CoC project must be submitted to CARES by the stated deadline to be considered complete; CARES will send all applications to the Review Team.*.* The data source will consist of projects’ most recent Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted in Sage prior to March 31, 2020 and provided by the HMIS Systems Administrator.
* **Phase 2** includes narratives allowing agencies to explain unique circumstances which may affect project performance. Part 2 of the Application must be submitted to CARES of NY, Inc. by the stated deadline to be considered complete; CARES will send all applications to the Rating and Ranking Panel. After submission, each agency/project is assigned an interview time with the Rating and Ranking Panel.
* **Phase 3** of the Rank & Review Process includes project interviews with the Review Team. After release of the NOFA, the NOFA Committee will draft questions based on specific criteria included in the NOFA to be asked during project interviews. Projects will receive these questions prior to the interview.

The FY20 *Renewal Project* evaluation process will commence with the distribution of an RFP Application as well as the Part 1 of the Rank and Review tool, 2020 Evaluation Instructions, and NY-511’s Written Standards on a date TBD. CARES will host a training on data pulled for the Part 1 tool. After one week, CARES will send the final Part 1 tool and attachments to funded agencies for their completion. The Review and Ranking Panel will score Part 1 and CARES will provide a debriefing for each funded agency, if requested. The Part 2 (narrative) tool will be approved by the NOFA committee and sent out for completion. Finally, Part 3 (interview) will take place.

The data source will consist of projects’ most recent Annual Performance Report (APR), submitted in Sage prior to March 31, 2020 and provided by the HMIS Systems Administrator. FY19 Project Applications will be reviewed by Rating and Ranking Panel members for FY20 Renewal Projects not being ranked to allow for discussion regarding programmatic inquires or projected changes.

The FY20 *New Project* evaluation process will commence with the distribution of an RFP Application as well as 2020 Evaluation Instructions and NY-511’s Written Standards at a date TBD. The project ranking process will be completed by Rating and Ranking Panel members’ review of RFP responses and project performance data.

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

# Evaluation Review Process

All projects that have been operating for at least two years and have completed two full APRs will be considered eligible for the *Renewal Project* evaluation process. Projects that were not renewed in the FY19 NOFA do not have to complete the evaluation process. Any project that believes they should be exempt from the evaluation process should contact CARES at a date TBD to establish eligibility.

Only projects recommended or approved for *Reallocation* will be considered eligible to submit a

*New Reallocated Project* application. The following outlines key steps and aspects of the FY20 *Renewal Project* and *New Project* evaluation processes:

# RFP Applications and Back-up Documentation Submission

* RFP Applications and Back-up documentation for Renewal Projects being ranked are due by a date TBD. The Back-up Documentation data source will consist of a project’s most recent APR, submitted in Sage prior to March 31, 2020 and provided by the HMIS Systems Administrator. RFP Applications shall be completed using data reflective of the data source. Note: The same APR cannot be used for more than one year. Note: CoC & HMIS Monitoring reports will also be submitted for review as part of the Rating & Ranking Process.
* RFP Applications and Back-up documentation for New Projects (*Reallocated and Bonus)* being ranked are due by a date TBD. The Back-up Documentation data source will be a copy of the agency’s most recent audit and should be attached to the *New Project RFP* response.
* RFP Applications and Back-up documentation for New Projects (*DV Bonus)* are due in e-snaps by a date TBD.

# RFP Evaluations by Rating and Ranking Panel Members

# Rating and Ranking panel members are considered by the NOFA Committee and invited by CARES to participate. After panel members agree to participate, one to two days are scheduled to conduct project interviews and for scoring to take place. Interviews will be scheduled for a date after the NOFA is released to allow for any HUD-specific criteria to be incorporated into the interview process. Panel members are provided a copy of each project’s full application for review and score forms to complete. After conducting interviews with each agency, the Rating and Ranking panel discusses and finalizes scores for each project application. In the event project applications initially receive the same score, it is the responsibility of the Rating and Ranking panel to break the tie.

Final results will be posted to the CARES website. CARES will facilitate the Rating and Ranking Panel’s review of New Project applications and back-up documentation utilizing the 2020 Project Rating and Ranking Tool. Eligible applicants submitting New Project applications to serve survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that meet the definition of homeless in paragraph 4 of 24 CFR 578.3 will be invited to attend the Rating and Ranking Panel’s review in person in order to respond to inquiries from Panel members pursuant to their proposals and to address aspects of Housing First. confidentiality, HMIS/CES participation, performance measures that may differ from CoC benchmarks, etc. Final results will be posted to the CARES website.4

All agencies receive their project scores and are offered the opportunity to debrief with CARES. Debriefing allows agencies the opportunity to request clarification regarding how/why Application question/s received certain scores. Debriefings are required if agencies are considering an appeal. Agencies may choose to appeal project score/s within the allotted time frame (see the **Appeals Process** outlined below). After all debriefings with CARES are completed and appeals considered by the Rating and Ranking Panel, the project ranking is presented to the Board for approval.

1. **Appeals Process**
* **Who May Appeal?**An agency may appeal a decision concerning a Renewal or New/Bonus project application submitted by that agency.
* **What May Be Appealed?**
The appeals process applies to project scoring and ranking ***only***. *There is no appeal for project tiering.* An appeal may ***not*** be based on the following:
	+ Failure to answer any question/s on the application
	+ Failure to submit required attachments to the application
	+ Failure to submit the application by the required deadline
* **Any mathematical errors found by an applicant will be corrected by CARES.**
* **Timing of an Appeal**

Formal appeals may be submitted by a project within **three (3) business days** of debriefing. Appeals must be submitted in writing to CARES (ncassaro@caresny.org), who will then forward to the impartial committee determined by the Governance Committee. The written appeal must consist of a brief statement no longer than one page, and can be in the form of a letter, memo or email.

* **Appeals Decisions**

Appeals will be considered by an impartial committee determined by the Governance Committee. The impartial committee will communicate its final decision by DATE TBD. Appeals are decided by majority vote of the impartial committee, and once decided, are final and may not be overturned by the NOFA Committee, Board or Membership.

# Results

* Final *Renewal Project* evaluation results will be released by Date TBD; Final *New Project* evaluation results will be released by Date TBD (*New Projects*).
* Renewal Projects demonstrating low performance or that do not achieve the applicable housing outcome goal or other specific performance minimums established by the NOFA Committee/Rating and Ranking Panel will be subject to at least the PQI process, including possible submission of a PQI plan and ongoing review/monitoring and at most consideration for Reallocation per NY-511’s NOFA Reallocation Process.
* Evaluation results, in conjunction with the policy priorities and eligible components identified by HUD upon the issuance of the FY20 CoC Program Competition NOFA, will be used to determine the final project ranking and tier assignment, as applicable, for the FY20 CoC Program Competition CoC Priority Listing.

# 2018 NY-511 CoC Evaluation Process Timeline – Subject to Change Based on Release of the NOFA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Activity | Deadline |
| Discuss Recommended Changes to 2020Evaluation Process | July 2020 |
| Approve 2020 Project Rating and Ranking Tool Part 1 – NOFA Cmte | April 2020 |
| Distribute 2020 Part 1 Ranking Tool and Attachments for Renewal Projects | TBD |
| NOFA Committee Approves Part II tool | July 2020 |
| Deadline to Notify CARES for Exempt Status Request | TBD |
| Scoring and Debriefing of Part I with funded agencies | TBD |
| Rating and Ranking Panel Review Part I | TBD |
| Submit RFP Applications and Back-up documentation | TBD |
| Rating and Ranking Panel Review Part 2 | TBD |
| Communication of Preliminary Results/Reallocation Discussion – NOFA Cmte | TBD |
| Appeals of Evaluation Results Due | TBD |
| CoC informed regarding NOFA Committee/Panel Recommendations | TBD |
| Distribute 2020 CoC Competition Materials for New Project Applications | TBD |
| Submit New Project (Reallocation & Bonus) RFP Applications to CoC Coordinator | TBD |
| Submit New Project (DV Bonus) Applications in e-snaps | TBD |
| Deadline to submit all Project Applications in e-snaps | TBD |
| Rating and Ranking Panel Review (New Projects) | TBD |
| Communication of Preliminary Rating and Ranking Results Discussion | TBD |
| Appeals of Evaluation Results Due | TBD |
| Final reviews & Project Ranking | TBD |

1. **Project Evaluation Methodology**

**Achievement**

Performance data indicated in NY-511’s Project Rating and Ranking Tool will be compared to achievement benchmarks and given a corresponding score. Unless otherwise indicated in the evaluation tool, a goal is “achieved” when the benchmark is met.

# Project Performance Results

Results will be based on the overall score as a percentage of the total possible points for each project (which varies by project type). 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 with results in the top 10% will be considered “high” performers. The remaining projects 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 CoC housing and support services. The maximum point value is indicated alongside each measure in the Project Rating and Ranking 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 NOFA will be referred to the PQI process, as described in the PQI protocols.

Identical overall *Renewal Project* scores will be decided through a review of the value achieved starting with the following indicators: Exits to Permanent Housing, Returns to Homelessness, Serving High Need Populations, and Income Factors. Programs with the same overall score will be weighed against each other on the individual measures listed above followed by the remaining Rating Factors on the evaluation tool. In the unlikely event that there is still a tie, the Rating and Ranking Panel will decide on a tie-breaking measure based on attendance at NOFA committee meetings.

1. **Specific Instructions and Data Source – *Renewal Projects***

**Where the source is listed as APR,** the data source will consist of each project’s most recent APR submitted in Sage prior to March 31, 2020 and provided by the HMIS Systems Administrator.

# Rating and Ranking Panel members will review the following APR Questions for Renewal Project submissions:

**Exits to Permanent Housing**: Rating and Ranking Panel members will review APR Q22a1 (*Leavers)*, Q23a, and Q23b.

**Returns to Homelessness**: Rating and Ranking Panel members will review APR/System Performance data Measure 2 by project.

**Earned Income for Project Stayers:** Rating and Ranking Panel members will review APR Q19a1 for all projects.

**Non-Employment Income for Project Stayers:** Rating and Ranking Panel members will review APR Q19a1 for all projects.

**Earned Income for Project Leavers:** Rating and Ranking Panel members will review APR Q19a2 for all projects.

**Non-Employment Income for Project Leavers:** Rating and Ranking Panel members will review APR Q19a2 for all projects.

**More Than One Disability Type:** Rating and Ranking Panel members will review APR Q13a2 for all projects.

**Project Has Reasonable Costs:** Rating and Ranking Panel members will review APR Q3 (Contract/Award Amount) and Q23a/b for all projects in comparison to the average cost per positive housing exit for PSH, as determined by all projects.

**Housing First:** Rating and Ranking Panel members will review FY17 Renewal Project Application Q3d of 3B. Project Description for all projects.

**Applicant Narrative:** Rating and Ranking Panel members will review RFP response.

1. **Score Summary Table – *(see NY-511 Southern Tier Homeless Coalition Rank & Review Application 2020 Part 1: System Performance and Data Quality Questions)***

**Specific Instructions and Data Source – *New Projects – To Be Determined***

**Financial Audit:** A copy of the applicant’s most recently completed audit must be attached to the *New Project RFP* response. Panel members will review for *no exceptions to standard practice, “low- risk”* identification, and *no findings indicated.*

**Score Summary Table – *New Projects – To Be Determined***

1. **Technical Assistance and Contact Information**

For additional questions related to NY-511’s 2018 CoC Program Competition evaluation process, deadlines, and applications, please contact:

Nick Cassaro – CARES Planning Associate – ncassaro@caresny.org; 518-489-4130 x122
Jim Hulse – HMIS System Administrator – jhulse@NY-511hmis.org; 607-760-4914

If you have specific questions regarding HUD project guidelines, you may contact NY-511’s local HUD field office (Buffalo, NY). Please do not contact the HUD office regarding our local application deadlines or process as the individuals identified above are available to answer those questions.

# 2020 NY-511 CoC Evaluation Process Appeal Form

**This form must be completed and sent to CARES (ncassaro@caresny.org) by noon (12 pm) on DATE TBD (*Renewal Projects*) and/or DATE TBD (*New Projects*).**

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, 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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_