

Allegheny County Continuum of Care (PA-600) 2017 Review, Ranking and Reallocation Process and Criteria

This document describes the 2017 Review, Ranking and Reallocation Process and Criteria utilized by the [Allegheny County Continuum of Care \(CoC\), PA-600](#), for the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Continuum of Care Program Competition (2017 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.

Review, Ranking and Reallocation

Eligibility for Ranking

Projects that sought renewal for funding in 2017 were required to submit their Performance Outcome Tools (Appendix A) and their HUD Project Application documentation with written changes to DHS by May 22, 2017.¹ 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 2017 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 (May 24, 2017). 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 2017 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tool was developed to evaluate HUD CoC and ESG funded projects, and was used to rank HUD CoC renewal projects for the 2017 NOFA.

The tool is organized around nine performance measures: (a) unit utilization; (b) housing performance housing; (c) income, employment, health insurance and non-cash benefits; (d) length of time in program; (e) recidivism; (f) data quality; (g) fiscal; (h) cost effectiveness; and (i) 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 (g), (h), and (i). Fiscal data maintained through DHS was used to complete sections (g) and (h), and the Housing First Monitoring Checklist was used to complete section (i).

¹ The HUD Project Application documentation was not used in the ranking process; DHS staff used the information from it to complete applications in eSNAPS, and a meeting was held with project staff to review what was needed to complete the applications in eSNAPS. This information was not considered by the evaluation committee and was collected solely to complete the eSNAPS application.

Once the tool was populated with data it was shared with the respective project; the projects reviewed the completed tools, included justification for requests to adjust any scores and described plans to address any low performance measures.

Reallocation Strategy

On May 8, 2017, the HAB approved the following strategy for identifying and distributing funds to be reallocated, citing the CoC's commitment to being a high performing system positioned to meet the needs of the region:

- Based on a review of data from coordinated entry and HMIS regarding the availability and occupancy of units and beds across the CoC, reallocated funds were directed toward Permanent Supportive Housing for persons with Disabilities and Rapid Re-Housing for households without children.
- The identification of funds to be reallocated was guided by the following:
 - Projects scoring 60% or lower on the 2017 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tool
 - Underspent funds from programs that have underspent for the past 2 or more consecutive years. When multiple consecutive years of underspending are identified, the amount reallocated from the program would reflect the lowest underspent amount for a year so as not to take away funds that were underspent for unique circumstances, but rather the amount that is consistently underspent.
 - Projects that volunteer to give up their projects/funding; and
 - The overall reallocation will be 3% to 5% (lower and upper limits) of the entire application amount.

Ranking Strategy

On May 8, 2017, the HAB approved the following performance-based and needs-oriented strategy for ranking projects for inclusion in the 2017 NOFA:

- All renewal projects that were operational in calendar year 2016 were ranked in order of score using the 2017 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tool. The HUD 2015 projects that became operational in 2016 received modified scoring to address the non-operational months by giving them full points for the missing data points. A data dictionary was included as a part of the overall distribution of the tool.
 - The 2017 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.
 - Final scores were used to rank projects in order of score, and final review and approval is conducted by the Homeless Advisory Board (HAB).
- Renewal projects that were not operational in calendar year 2016, were ranked based on consideration of their 2016 HUD application score and their current performance.
- 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 projects using the reallocated funds would be ranked at the top of Tier 2 (*amendment to ranking strategy made by HAB on June 14, 2017*)

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 2017 NOFA:

- Completing the Performance Outcome Tool
 - DHS met with Renewal Projects to review the Performance Outcomes Tool
 - DHS generated the Performance Outcome Tool for each project and distributed them to service providers along with NOFA application materials for review and comment
 - Service providers returned reviewed Performance Outcome Tools, including any score adjustment requests and justification, to DHS for Evaluation Committee review
- Reallocation Identification
 - Funding amount to be reallocated determined
 - Project receiving a score below 60 on the Performance Outcome Tool was notified
 - Projects whose funding amount would be reduced due to underspending were notified
 - Projects not seeking renewal were identified by the service provider
 - Request for Proposals issued
- Evaluation Committee Review
 - Each Evaluation Committee member received one half of the 2017 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tools to review. *Providers involved in the review process did not receive their own projects 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: determine renewal score changes; incorporate new projects, reallocation projects, and bonus projects; and confirm the recommended ranking list to put forward.
- Posting and Appeal
 - Ranking list publicly posted; projects notified of acceptance, provided the ranking list, and informed of appeal process
 - Appeals reviewed by the Appeal Review Team and recommended response to the appeals are put forward.
- Final Ranking List
 - HAB reviews recommended ranking list and any recommended adjustments, including results of appeal process.
 - HAB's final ranking list is publicly posted.

Ranking Appeal Process

All projects were notified of their ranking on September 1, 2017. A project may appeal their ranking by submitting a complete appeal form (Appendix B) by email to Hilary Scherer (hilary.scherer@allegHENYcounty.us) no later than 12:00pm on September 8, 2017. Appeals submitted on time and in full will be reviewed by the Appeal Review Team. The Appeal Review Team consists of non-provider 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 2017 Continuum of Care Program Competition beginning in August 2016 and continuing monthly thereafter. Through these discussions, recommendations were put forward on the tool to be used to evaluate projects, how projects should be ranked, and how funds should be reallocated (included what funds should be reallocated and what those funds should be reallocated to). Each recommendation was then shared with the full CoC and a corresponding public comment period was open. Comments were collected and shared with CoC and the HAB. The HAB then reviewed the recommendations and all comments received, and made final decisions.

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

August 10, 2016—CoC Analysis and Planning Committee begins targeted conversations around the review, ranking, and reallocation process for 2017.

January 24, 2017—CoC Analysis and Planning Committee presents recommendation for the 2017 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tool at the bi-monthly CoC/HAB meeting. Public Comment period open through February 1, 2017.

February 21, 2017—HAB approves 2017 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Tool.

March 28, 2017—CoC Analysis and Planning Committee presents preliminary recommendations on ranking and reallocation process at the bi-monthly CoC/HAB meeting for discussion.

April 25, 2017—CoC Analysis and Planning Committee's final recommendations on the ranking and reallocation process are shared with the CoC and a Public Comment period is open through May 1, 2017.

May 8, 2017—HAB approves the Ranking and Reallocation process for 2017.

Appendix A
2017 Performance Outcome Tool

**Allegheny County Continuum of Care Evaluation
2017 Renewal Application Project
Performance Outcomes**

Agency: [Redacted]

Project Name: [Redacted]

Evaluation Data Review Period: 1/1/2016 to 12/31/2016

Total HUD 2015 Grant Award: [Redacted]

Type of Program: [Redacted]

Housing Programs: No. of Units	[Redacted]	No. of Beds	[Redacted]
Subpopulation Target A Served:	[Redacted]	Subpopulation Target B Served:	[Redacted]

Summary of Persons Served during Evaluation Period:

	Households without Children		Households with Children	
Total Households Served :	Number of Households without Children	[Redacted]	Number of Households with Children	[Redacted]
Total Persons Served:	Adults	[Redacted]	Adults	[Redacted]
			Children	[Redacted]
Total Persons:	Leavers		Stayers	
	Leavers	[Redacted]	Stayers	[Redacted]

Total Adults:	Exiting		Staying	

All Performance Measures are generated from HMIS for the purpose of reviewing and ranking 2017 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 and ESG process.

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

5 = 85% & above
4 = 75% - 84%
3 = 60% - 74%
2 = 50% - 59%
1 = 25% - 49%
0 = 24% & below

b. Housing Performance	Specific Measure by Program Type	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
------------------------	----------------------------------	---	-------------------	-----------------	---------------------------	----------------------------	--------------

**Emergency Shelters:
Consumers exiting to any TH or
PH option**

**TH: Consumers exiting to any
HUD-defined PH option**

**RRH: Consumers exiting to any
HUD-defined PH option**

**PSH: Consumers remaining in
PSH or exiting to any HUD-
defined PH option**

**Prevention: Consumers remain
in housing unit or move to a PH
option during program
participation**

#DIV/0!		3	0	#DIV/0!	5 = 100% 4 = 85% & above 3 = 75% - 84% 2 = 60% - 74% 1 = 59% - 25% 0 = 24% & below
#DIV/0!		3			
#DIV/0!		3			
#DIV/0!		3			
#DIV/0!		3			

**c. Income, Employment,
Health Insurance & Non
Cash Benefits (Leavers) -
Non Permanent
Supportive Housing
Programs**

**1. ADULT consumers who
increase income from all
sources**

Specific Outcome Measure	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
#DIV/0!			0.75	0	#DIV/0!	5 = 85% & above 4 = 75% - 84% 3 = 60% - 74% 2 = 50% - 59%

2. **ADULT** consumers become or remain employed during program

3. **ADULT & CHILD** consumers who have health insurance

4. **ADULT** consumers who maintain or increase non-cash benefits

	#DIV/0!		0.75			1 = 25% - 49% 0 = 24% & below
	#DIV/0!		0.75			
	#DIV/0!		0.75			

c. Income, Employment, Health Insurance & Non Cash Benefits (Leavers and Stayers) - Permanent Supportive Housing Programs

1. **ADULT** consumers who increase income from all sources

2. **ADULT** consumers become or remain employed during program

3. **ADULT & CHILD** consumers who have health insurance

Specific Outcome Measure	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
	#DIV/0!	0	0.75	0	#DIV/0!	Question 2 Employment 5 = 20 % & above 4 = 11% - 19% 3 = 6% - 10% 2 = 3% - 5% 1 = 1% - 3% 0 = 0% employed
	#DIV/0!	0	0.75			
	#DIV/0!		0.75			Questions 1, 3 and 4 5 = 85% & above 4 = 75% - 84% 3 = 60% - 74%

4. ADULT consumers who maintain or increase non-cash benefits

	#DIV/0!		0.75			2 = 50% - 59% 1 = 25% - 49% 0 = 24% & below
--	---------	--	------	--	--	---

d. Length of Time in Program: Applies to Specific Programs

Specific Measure by Program Type	% of Total Served	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
Emergency Shelter: Consumers stay 30 days or less & exit to TH, RRH, PSH or PH as defined by HUD	#DIV/0!		1	0	#DIV/0!	5 = 85% & above 4 = 80% - 84% 3 = 70% - 79% 2 = 50% - 69% 1 = 25% - 49% 0 = 24% & below
Transitional Housing: Consumers staying or exiting program in 9 months or less	#DIV/0!		1			
Permanent Housing: Consumers stay in PSH program or exit to PH	#DIV/0!		1			
Rapid Rehousing: Consumers staying or exiting program in 9 months or less	#DIV/0!		1			
Prevention: Consumers staying or exiting program in 9 months or less	#DIV/0!		1			

Destination at Exit	#DIV/0!					
Residential Move-In Date (RRH)	#DIV/0!					
Housing Assessment at Exit (HP)	#DIV/0!					

g. Fiscal

	Amount / Number	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
Grant expended all funding (Amount Returned in HUD 2015)	\$ -	#DIV/0!		1			5 = 0-2% return of funds 4 = 3-4% return of funds 3 = 5-8% return of funds 2 = 9-10% return of funds 1 = 11-13% return of funds 0 = > 13% return of funds
Accuracy-Billing reports are submitted accurately and timely during 2016		0%		1	0	#DIV/0!	5 = All billings submitted correctly w/ support documentation & on time 4 = 2-3 billings submitted late and/or required minor documentation changes 3 = 4-6 billings submitted late and/or required documentation changes 2 = 7-9 billings submitted late and/or required major documentation changes 1 = 10-11 billings submitted late and/or required major documentation changes 0 = All billings late and/or incorrect requiring major changes & adjustments

h. Cost Effectiveness of Program

	Amount	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
Cost per unit	#DIV/0!		1	0	#DIV/0!	5 = Cost/Successful outcome fall within or below estimated level of funding or exit within comparison of like programs 4 = Cost/successful outcome fall within 5% of acceptable rate within comparison of like programs 3 = Cost/successful outcome fall within 10% of acceptable rate within comparison of like programs 2 = Cost/successful outcome fall within 15% of acceptable rate within comparison of like programs 1= Cost/successful outcome fall within 20% of acceptable rate within comparison of like programs 0 =Cost/successful outcome exceed 20 % or higher within comparison of like programs
Cost per successful outcome	#DIV/0!		1			

i. Housing First Monitoring

Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
-------------------	-----------------	---------------------------	----------------------------	--------------

Compliance with Housing First Principles

0	1	0.0	#DIV/0!	Evaluation to meet Housing First: HUD 10-point Monitoring Tool utilized to determine score. Example: if answering "Yes" to all questions, then the score is 10. If answering 5 of 10 questions as "Yes" then 5 points awarded. If no questions answered as "Yes" then 0 points awarded.
---	---	-----	----------------	---

TOTALS

	Total Points for All Categories	Percentage of Total Points
Total Score (non-PSH programs)	0.00	#DIV/0!
Total Score (PSH programs)	0.00	#DIV/0!

Project Response to Performance Outcomes

Name of Person Reviewing Outcomes:

Date of Review:

Did the program meet all the Performance Measures listed in Sections a to i?

Yes No

If no, please address the following questions in a brief and concise answer:

1. Comments on Performance

Performance	Did the project receive 4 or 5 points? Yes or No. If yes, do not need to explain.	Please explain if you would like to tell the evaluators the issues encountered for the low score.
a. Unit Utilization		

b. Housing Performance		
c1. Income		
c2. Employment		
c3. Health Insurance		
c4. Non-Cash Benefits		
d. Length of Time in Program		
e. Recidivism		
f. Data Quality		
g. Fiscal		
h. Cost Effectiveness		
i. Housing First		

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

2017 Renewal Project Performance Outcome Worksheet Calculations Guide

The Renewal Project Performance Outcome Worksheet is a project scoring tool developed by the HAB'S CoC, Analysis and Planning Committee and adopted by the HAB for use in the 2017 HUD CoC competition on February 21, 2017. Its purpose is to provide an evaluative score for projects funded through the HUD CoC and ESG competitions. Please refer to the *2017 Ranking and Renewal Process for Evaluation Committee* for additional information about how these scores will be used by the HAB for these funding competitions.

The scoring tool measures performance based on 9 key areas:

- unit utilization
- housing performance
- changes in income/employment/non-cash benefits/health insurance
- length of time in program
- recidivism
- data quality
- fiscal performance
- cost effectiveness
- adherence to housing first principles

Data used to assign points in the scoring tool come from multiple sources – HMIS, grantee fiscal records and Housing First monitoring records. DHS developed a data dashboard tool (in the Tableau software) to make calculations for most of the performance measures that are based on HMIS data entered by providers in the Allegheny County HMIS. For projects that were active for all of 2016, the HMIS data used to calculate these measures was from March 7, 2017 (any data entered into HMIS after this day would not be reflected in the scoresheet). For projects that were active for less than all of 2016, the HMIS data used to calculate these measures was from April 3, 2017. The numbers generated by these calculations are applied to a scoring rubric for each measure which was developed as part of the tool. For example, a project will receive 5 points for unit utilization of 85% or higher, 4 points for unit utilization between 75-85%, etc. All sections of the scoring tool have a point spread of 0 to 5 except the Housing First Monitoring section, which has a point spread of 0-10. Further, each performance area mentioned above also has a weight applied to its scoring to reflect the HAB's priorities.

For projects that were active for less than 1 year (only part of 2016), projects were given scores of 5 for the sections where there was insufficient data to evaluate the measure. DHS recommends that the HAB consider changing this approach next year.

This guide explains how each section of the tool is populated and a score generated, including which specific data is being used and how the calculations are made. The guide includes images from an "example project" for each section of the scoring tool to help the reader understand the data and calculations for each section. At the end of each section, the amount of possible points for that section of the performance outcome worksheet is listed. For the entire project performance outcome worksheet, there is a possible 100 points possible.

Questions about this guide should be sent to andy.halfhill@alleghenycounty.us or terri.laver@alleghenycounty.us.

Project Information, Housing Units/Beds and Summary of Persons Served:

Allegheny County Continuum of Care Evaluation				
2017 Renewal Application Project				
Performance Outcomes				
Agency: Example Agency				
Project Name: Permanent Housing Project				
Evaluation Data Review Period:	1/1/2016	to	12/31/2016	
Total HUD 2015 Grant Award:	\$250,000.00			
Type of Program:	PSH			
Housing Programs: No. of Units	50		No. of Beds	50
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	55	Number of Households with Children	0
Total Persons Served:	Adults	55	Adults	0
			Children	0
	Leavers		Stayers	
Total Persons:	Leavers	5	Stayers	50
Total Adults:	Exiting	5	Staying	50

Project Information – Each project has a performance worksheet generated for it, and the worksheets are then shared with the provider. Project details are manually entered by the person completing the scoring tool.

- HUD CoC projects – worksheets are completed by DHS staff
- ESG projects – worksheets are completed by Allegheny County and City of Pittsburgh ESG administrators

Housing Program Units/Beds – The number of units and beds, as well as targeted subpopulations (if any) are entered per the HUD approved amount identified in the project’s DHS grant.

- HUD CoC projects – number of units and Beds are determined by HUD 2016 Application
- ESG projects – number of units and beds as set up in the DHS MPER system, to be verified during ESG FY2017 contract period

Summary of Persons Served during Evaluation Period – Person and household served numbers are generated from HMIS data entered by providers. Counts are for the specified evaluation period. Adults are any client age 18 or older, regardless of their relationship to the head of household (i.e. if they are a child to a parent who is also served in the project). Children are defined as persons age 0 to 17.

Total Households Served – Sum of all households who were active by having a project entry and/or project exit date occur during the evaluation period. This measure counts distinct HMIS household IDs.

Total Persons Served – Sum of all persons who were active by having a project entry and/or project exit date occur during evaluation period. This measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs.

Total Leavers - Sum of all persons active during evaluation period, where program exit date occurs during evaluation period (program entry date can be before or during evaluation period). This measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs.

Total Stayers - Sum of all persons who were active during evaluation period, where there is no program exit date occurring during evaluation period (program entry date can be before or during evaluation period). This measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs.

a. Unit Utilization

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR SECTION = 15

a. Unit Utilization	Specific Households in Units - Last Wednesday of given Month	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
January Utilization of Units	48	96%	5	0.75	15.00	100%	5 = 85% & above 4 = 75% - 84% 3 = 60% - 74% 2 = 50% - 59% 1 = 25% - 49% 0 = 24% & below
April Utilization of Units	49	98%	5	0.75			
July Utilization of Units	50	100%	5	0.75			
October Utilization of Units	49	98%	5	0.75			

Utilization of Units – This measure calculates unit utilization on the last Wednesday of the months of January, April, July and October. Unit utilization is calculated as a percentage. It is calculated by dividing the Number of households (with or without children) active in the program on that day by the total number of contracted units for evaluation period. The number of contracted units is as per set up in DHS MPER system and verified by HUD 2016 contract.

The project receives 0 to 5 points for performance on of each of the 4 months’ utilization. Refer to the rubric in the picture above to understand the point spread. The points awarded for utilization for each month are multiplied by the assigned weight for this measure (0.75). These points are then added together to produce the total points awarded for this section of the scorecard.

b. Housing Performance

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR SECTION = 15

b. Housing Performance	Specific Measure by Program Type	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
Emergency Shelters: Consumers exiting to any TH or PH option		0%		3	0	0%	5 = 100% 4 = 85% & above 3 = 75% - 84% 2 = 60% - 74% 1 = 59% - 25% 0 = 24% & below
TH: Consumers exiting to any HUD-defined PH option		0%		3			
RRH: Consumers exiting to any HUD-defined PH option		0%		3			
PSH: Consumers remaining in PSH or exiting to any HUD-defined PH option		0%		3			
Prevention: Consumers remain in housing unit or move to a PH option during program participation		0%		3			

A project will receive a score for the measure corresponding to its project type (emergency shelter, transitional housing, rapid rehousing, etc.). The performance measures vary between project types, based on the CoC’s desired housing outcome of the project type.

The project receives 0 to 5 points for performance based on the percentage of clients that exit (or remained enrolled for PSH projects) to the desired exit destination. Refer to rubric in the picture above to understand the point spread. The points awarded for housing performance are multiplied by the assigned weight (3) for this section.

Performance by project type is calculated as follows:

Emergency Shelters – Sum of all persons whose program exit destination, occurring during evaluation period, was to a destination defined by HUD as transitional (“Transitional housing for homeless persons”) or permanent housing (see list below). The measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs.

Transitional Housing, Rapid Rehousing (RRH) and Homeless Prevention - Sum of all persons whose program exit destination, occurring during evaluation period, was to a destination defined by HUD as permanent housing (see list below). The measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs.

Permanent Supportive Housing - Sum of all persons who either a) remained enrolled in the project (did not have program exit date before end of evaluation period); or b) whose program

exit destination, occurring during the evaluation period, was to a destination defined by HUD as permanent housing (see list below). The measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs.

HUD-defined Permanent Housing Destinations (as defined by HUD System Performance Measures and Annual Performance Report specifications):

- Owned by client, no ongoing housing subsidy
- Owned by client, with ongoing housing subsidy
- Permanent housing for formerly homeless persons
- Rental by client, no ongoing housing subsidy
- Rental by client, with GPD TIP housing subsidy
- Rental by client, with other ongoing housing subsidy
- Rental by client, with VASH housing subsidy
- Staying of living with family, permanent tenure
- Staying of living with family, permanent tenure

c. Income, Employment, Health Insurance & Non-Cash Benefits

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR SECTION = 15

For measures in section C, the universe of clients for PSH projects includes clients who remain enrolled in a program (did not have program exit date before end of evaluation period), or who exited (program exit date occurred during evaluation period). All other project types include only clients who exited projects during the program period, regardless of exit destination. For PSH projects, performance is measured based on data from the client’s most recent* annual, update or exit assessment. For all other project types, performance is measured based on data from the client’s HMIS exit assessment.

* “most recent” = last assessment with assessment “Completion Date” by 12/31/16. Assessments with assessment “Completion Dates” after 12/31/16 were not included because the evaluation period is 1/1/16 – 12/31/16.

The project receives 0 to 5 points for performance on each of the four measures about income, employment, health insurance and non-cash benefits. Refer to the rubric in the picture below to understand the point spread. Please note that measure C-2 (employment) has its own point spread, while measures C-1, 3 and 4 use a different one because the target percentages for these measures are different. The points awarded for each of these four measures are multiplied by the assigned weight for this section (0.75) and added together to produce the total points awarded for this section of the scorecard. The total possible points for this section is 15 points.

c. Income, Employment, Health Insurance & Non Cash Benefits (Leavers) - Non Permanent Supportive Housing Programs	Specific Outcome Measure	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
--	--------------------------	---	-------------------	-----------------	---------------------------	----------------------------	--------------

c. Income, Employment, Health Insurance & Non Cash Benefits (Leavers and Stayers) - Permanent Supportive Housing Programs	Specific Outcome Measure	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
1. ADULT consumers who increase income from all sources	11	58%	2	0.75	12	14%	Question 2 Employment 5 = 20% & above 4 = 11% - 19% 3 = 6% - 10% 2 = 3% - 5% 1 = 1% - 3% 0 = 0% employed
2. ADULT consumers become or remain employed during program	7	37%	5	0.75			
3. ADULT & CHILD consumers who have health insurance	59	95%	5	0.75			
4. ADULT consumers who maintain or increase non-cash benefits	16	84%	4	0.75			
							Questions 1, 3 and 4 5 = 85% & above 4 = 75% - 84% 3 = 60% - 74% 2 = 50% - 59% 1 = 25% - 49% 0 = 24% & below

1. Adult consumers who increase income from all sources – Sum of all clients with HMIS assessments (update, annual, exit for PSH projects; exit for all other housing programs) that show an increase in income from the income amount on the client’s program entry assessment. The measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs, for all clients whose age at program entry is 18+. For permanent supportive housing projects, the number of clients with increased income is divided by the total number of leavers and stayers. For all other project types, the number of clients with increased income is divided by the number of leavers.
2. Adult consumers who become or remain employed during program – Sum of all clients with HMIS assessments (update, annual, exit for PSH projects; exit for all other housing programs) indicating that clients established new earned income or maintained some level of earned income (if client had earned income present on their entry assessment) at project exit compared to project entry. Earned income refers to the “Earned income (i.e. employment income)” data entered under “Income and Sources” found on a client’s Income assessment. The measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs, for all clients whose age at program entry is 18+. For permanent supportive housing projects, the number of clients who become or remain employed is divided by the total number of leavers and stayers. For all other project types, the number of clients who become employed is divided by the number of leavers.
3. Adult & Child consumers who have health insurance – Sum of all clients with an HMIS assessment (update, annual, exit for PSH projects; exit for all other housing programs) that indicate the client has health insurance. The measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs, for all clients regardless of age. For PSH projects, the number of clients who have health insurance is divided by the total number of leavers and stayers. For all other project types, the number of clients who have health insurance is divided by the number of leavers.
4. Adult consumers who maintain or increase non-cash benefits - Sum of all clients with HMIS assessments (update, annual, exit for PSH projects; exit for all other housing programs) that indicate client non-cash benefits remain the same as at program entry or client added new non-cash benefits during project enrollment compared to what was on the client’s program entry assessment. The measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs, for all clients whose age at program entry is 18+. For PSH projects, the number of clients who maintain or increase non-cash benefits is divided by the total number of leavers and stayers. For all other project types, the number of clients who maintain or increase non-cash benefits is divided by the number of leavers.

d. Length of Time in Program

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR SECTION = 5

d. Length of Time in Program: Applies to Specific Programs	Specific Measure by Program Type	% of Total Served	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
Emergency Shelter: Consumers stay 30 days or less & exit to TH, RRH, PSH or PH as defined by HUD		0%		1	0	0%	5 = 85% & above 4 = 80% - 84% 3 = 70% - 79% 2 = 50% - 69% 1 = 25% - 49% 0 = 24% & below
Transitional Housing: Consumers staying or exiting program in 9 months or less		0%		1			
Permanent Housing: Consumers stay in PSH program or exit to PH		0%		1			
Rapid Rehousing: Consumers staying or exiting program in 9 months or less		0%		1			
Prevention: Consumers staying or exiting program in 9 months or less		0%		1			

For measures in section D, the universe of clients for permanent supportive housing projects includes clients who remain enrolled in a program (did not have program exit date before end of evaluation period), or who exited (program exit date occurred during evaluation period). All other project types include only clients who exited projects during the program period, regardless of exit destination. For PSH projects, performance is measured based on data from the client’s most recent HMIS assessment (as of the date that the data was pulled in the Tableau data dashboard tool for the calculation). For all other project types, performance is measured based on data from the client’s HMIS exit assessment.

The project receives 0 to 5 points for performance based on the percentage of clients that exit (or remained enrolled for PSH projects) within the desired length of time for each project type. Refer to the rubric in the picture above to understand the point spread. The total possible points for this section is 5 points.

Emergency Shelters – Sum of all clients whose length of stay in program (measured by calculating difference (in number of days) between program exit date and program entry date) is equal to or less than 30 days AND whose exit destination from emergency shelter was to a transitional housing, rapid re-housing or permanent supportive housing program or to one of the HUD-defined permanent housing destinations as listed for measure B. The universe of clients for this measure is all clients who have a program exit date during the evaluation period, regardless of when program entry occurs. The measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs, for all clients regardless of age.

Transitional Housing, RRH, Homeless Prevention - Sum of all clients who either a) remained enrolled in program (did not have a program exit date before end of evaluation period) and had been enrolled in the program less than 9 months as of the last day of the evaluation period; or b) whose length of stay in the project (measured by calculating the difference (in number of days) between the client's program exit date and program entry date) is equal to or less than 9 months (274.5 days). The measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs, for all clients regardless of age.

Permanent Supportive Housing – Sum of all clients who either a) remained enrolled in program (did not have program exit date before end of evaluation period); or b) whose program exit destination, occurring during evaluation period, was to a destination defined by HUD as permanent housing (see list above in measure B). The measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs, for all clients regardless of age.

e. Recidivism

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR SECTION = 5

e. Recidivism	Specific Outcome by Program	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
Consumers exiting from a program to PH destination but return to homeless system (street outreach or ES or TH) in 6 months		0%		1	0	0%	5 = 0% - 24% 4 = 25% - 49% 3 = 50% - 59% 2 = 60% - 74% 1 = 75% - 84% 0 = 85% - 100%

The universe of clients for this measure is all clients who exited during the evaluation period (have a project exit date during the evaluation period), and whose exit destination was to a destination defined by HUD as permanent housing (see list above in measure B).

This measure calculates the sum of all clients in the above defined universe who have at least one subsequent program enrollment into any street outreach, emergency shelter or transitional housing program in the CoC (which participates in HMIS), AND whose program entry date for this subsequent program enrollment occurred in 6 months or less from the client’s exit date where they had exited to a permanent destination. The measure counts distinct HMIS client IDs, for all clients regardless of age.

The project receives 0 to 5 points for performance based on the percentage of clients that re-enter the homeless system per the calculation explained above. Refer to the rubric in the picture above to understand the point spread. The total possible points for this section is 5 points.

f. **Data Quality**

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR SECTION = 15

f. Data Quality	Number of Missing Records	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
Program had no data quality missing values			4.5	3	13.5	14%	5 = 10/10 fields have less than 5% missing data 4.5 = 9/10 fields have less than 5% missing data 4 = 8/10 fields have less than 5% missing data 3.5 = 7/10 fields have less than 5% missing data 3 = 6/10 fields have less than 5% missing data 2.5 = 5/10 fields have less than 5% missing data 2 = 4/10 fields have less than 5% missing data 1.5 = 3/10 fields have less than 5% missing data 1 = 2/10 fields have less than 5% missing data 0.5 = 1/10 fields have less than 5% missing data 0 = 0/10 fields have less than 5% missing data
Data Quality Category List							
First Name		0%					
Last Name		0%					
Social Security Number	3	5%					
Date of Birth		0%					
Race		0%					
Ethnicity		0%					
Gender		0%					
Veteran Status (at entry) <u>ADULT</u>		0%					
Disabling Condition	10	16%					
Relationship to Head of Household		0%					
Destination at Exit		0%					
Residential Move-In Date (RRH)		0%					
Housing Assessment at Exit (HP)		0%					

For each data element, the value is the sum of all client records where there is a null (missing) value on the client’s HMIS record (entry or exit assessment) for the project being evaluated. Refer to the following chart to understand which assessment and the client universe considered:

HMIS Data Element	Assessment Used for Measure	Client universe included
First Name	Entry	leavers + stayers
Last Name	Entry	leavers + stayers
Social Security Number	Entry	leavers + stayers
Date of Birth	Entry	leavers + stayers
Race	Entry	leavers + stayers
Ethnicity	Entry	leavers + stayers
Gender	Entry	leavers + stayers
Veteran Status (at entry) <u>ADULT</u>	Entry	Leavers + stayers (adults)
Disabling Condition	Entry	leavers + stayers
Relationship to Head of Household	Entry	leavers + stayers
Destination at Exit	Exit	leavers
Residential Move-In Date (RRH)	Exit	leavers
Housing Assessment at Exit (HP)	Exit	leavers

The “Residential Move in Date” data element applies only to rapid re-housing projects. The “Housing Assessment at Exit” data element applies only to homeless prevention projects, and is an actual data field in HMIS (see below). This is not to be confused with the completion of a client’s actual Exit Assessment and all the questions that are contained within the exit assessment.

The image shows a screenshot of a web-based form titled "Project Exit Details". The form has a blue header bar with the title. Below the header, there are three dropdown menu fields. The first field is labeled "Housing Assessment", the second is "Exit Destination Type", and the third is "Funding Source for Exit Destination". The first two fields are highlighted with a yellow background, indicating they are the focus of the text. Each field has a small downward-pointing triangle on the right side, indicating it is a dropdown menu.

For the HUD CoC projects, DHS did not count missing data values for the “Disabling Condition” or “Residential Move in Date (RRH)” fields for the 2016 evaluation period. These two data fields are highlighted in the picture above and on the project’s scoring worksheet. DHS discovered that for both of these fields, for some period of time in 2016, HMIS did not require users to enter data to a client’s assessment. To be clear, both data fields existed in HMIS for all of 2016 and users were trained on the need to enter data for these fields. But because these two fields were not highlighted as mandatory for some period of time in 2016, DHS is not counting missing values against a project. For the Social Security Number, Race and Ethnicity fields, while HMIS did not force users to enter data for these fields in 2016, they were marked in HMIS in yellow as being mandatory, so users should have completed these fields. For this reason, DHS is counting missing data for these three data fields against a project on their scoring worksheet. With “Disabling Condition” and “Residential Move in Date (RRH)” not being used in the scoring, this left 10 data fields for which a project could be evaluated for data quality. While completing the scoring worksheets, DHS found that the earlier proposed rubric of giving 0 to 5 points based on one or more data elements having missing data at a certain percentage was not an equitable or logical approach. That approach inadvertently caused programs with fewer clients to be scored in an inequitable way as just 1 or 2 clients having missing data could result in a data quality score of 0. DHS also found that if a program, large or small, had even one data field with over 20% missing data, then the project received a data quality score of 0/15. Thus, DHS used a scoring rubric that was equitable to programs of all sizes, and which did not cause projects to lose all points for this section due to a single data field in HMIS having too high of a percentage of missing data.

The project receives 0 to 5 points for performance based on both the number of data fields with missing information and the percentage of clients in the project during the evaluation period that had missing data in HMIS. A missing data rate of less than 5% was used as this is the common HUD threshold for acceptable missing data. The points awarded for utilization are multiplied by the assigned weight (3) for this section. Refer to the rubric in the picture above to understand the point spread. The total possible points for this section is 15 points.

g. Fiscal

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR SECTION = 10

g. Fiscal	Amount / Number	%	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
Grant expended all funding (Amount Returned in HUD 2015)	\$ -	0.00%	5	1	7	11%	5 = 0-2% return of funds 4 = 3-4% return of funds 3 = 5-8% return of funds 2 = 9-10% return of funds 1 = 11-13% return of funds 0 = > 13% return of funds
Accuracy-Billing reports are submitted accurately and timely during 2016	5	42%	2	1			5 = All billings submitted correctly w/ support documentation & on time 4 = 2-3 billings submitted late and/or required minor documentation changes 3 = 4-6 billings submitted late and/or required documentation changes 2 = 7-9 billings submitted late and/or required major documentation changes 1 = 10-11 billings submitted late and/or required major documentation changes 0 = All billings late and/or incorrect requiring major changes & adjustments

This measure assesses the project’s fiscal performance related to expending all awarded project funds in the most recently completed grant year (if applicable) and the accuracy and timeliness of submitted billing reports.

- HUD CoC projects - scoring tools are completed by DHS staff
- ESG projects - scoring tools are completed by Allegheny County and City of Pittsburgh ESG administrators

Grant expended all funding – This applies to the HUD 2015 Contract period, and is determined by each project’s HUD 2015 grant award amount and the total amount of project funds that the project did not draw down at the end of the 2015 grant period. This figure is tracked by the DHS Bureau of Homeless Services monthly.

Accuracy and Timeliness of Billing – This applies to billing submitted during calendar year 2016 for all projects at each provider. This Information is tracked by the DHS Bureau of Homeless Services monthly.

The project receives 0 to 5 points for performance on of each of these two measures about fiscal performance. Refer to the rubric in the picture above to understand the point spread. The points awarded for each of these two measures are added together to produce the total points awarded for this section of the scorecard. The total possible points for this section is 10 points.

h. Cost Effectiveness of Program:

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR SECTION = 10

This measure assesses the project’s cost per unit and cost per successful outcome as compared to other projects in the same project types category (i.e. PSH, RRH, etc.).

- HUD CoC projects - scoring tools are completed by DHS staff
- ESG projects - scoring tools are completed by Allegheny County and City of Pittsburgh ESG administrators

h. Cost Effectiveness of Program	Amount	Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
Cost per unit	\$ 13,349.33	0	1	0	0%	5 = Cost/Successful outcome fall within or below estimated level of funding or exit within comparison of like programs 4 = Cost/successful outcome fall within 5% of acceptable rate within comparison of like programs 3 = Cost/successful outcome fall within 10% of acceptable rate within comparison of like programs 2 = Cost/successful outcome fall within 15% of acceptable rate within comparison of like programs 1 = Cost/successful outcome fall within 20% of acceptable rate within comparison of like programs 0 = Cost/successful outcome exceed 20% or higher within comparison of like
Cost per successful outcome	\$ 14,562.91	0	1			

Cost per unit (HUD CoC projects) = total amount billed during evaluation period/total # of households served during evaluation period

(For ESG programs that were scored as renewal projects for PY17 funds, cost per unit was calculated differently than how it is being calculated for HUD CoC projects. For ESG projects, cost per unit was calculated as the total amount billed in the evaluation period/total number of beds listed for the project in MPER.)

Cost per successful outcome for PSH projects = total amount billed during evaluation period / (# household stayers + # household leavers to permanent housing destinations during evaluation period)

Cost per successful outcome for rapid rehousing projects = total amount billed in evaluation period / (# household leavers to permanent housing destinations during evaluation period)

The project receives 0 to 5 points for performance on of each of these two measures about fiscal performance. Refer to rubric in the picture above to understand the point spread. The

points awarded for each of these two measures are added together to produce the total points awarded for this section of the scorecard. The total possible points for this section is 10 points.

Please note that while the scorecard point spread rubric appears to only apply to the “Cost/Successful outcome” measure, the point spreads shown apply to both the “Cost per unit” and the “Cost per successful outcome” measures. DHS recommends that for next year, the scoring tool rubric be updated to say, for example “5=The Costs fall within...”, “4=Costs fall within”, etc.

To determine an “acceptable rate” (as mentioned in the scoring rubric) for cost per unit and cost per successful outcome, the median cost among “like programs” was calculated. “Like programs” (as mentioned in the scoring rubric) means projects that serve similar household types within the same project type. For example, a PSH project that serves only singles was only compared to other PSH projects that only serve singles to derive a median cost per unit and cost per successful outcome.

The following categories were used for “like programs”:

- PSH singles
- PSH families
- PSH mixed (singles and families)
- RRH existing (operated entire calendar year 2016)

The following charts indicates this year’s median values for these measures and the values needed to receive 0-5 points. Projects can use this information to see where their project’s cost/unit and cost/successful outcome was in relation to the median for “like programs” in the CoC and therefore how their score was calculated.

Cost per unit:

Like Program	Median Cost	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point
PSH mixed	\$7,951	<\$7,951	\$8,348.55	\$8,746.1	\$9,143.65	\$9,541.2
PSH singles	\$6,149	<\$6,149	6,456.45	\$6,763.9	\$7,071.35	\$7,378.8
PSH families	\$11,534	<\$11,534	12,110.7	\$12,687.4	\$13,264.1	\$13,840.8
RRH existing	\$8,290	<\$8,290	\$8704.5	\$9,119	\$9,533.5	\$9,948

Cost per successful outcome:

Like Program	Median Cost	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point
PSH mixed	\$8,518	<\$8,518	\$8,943.9	\$9,369.8	\$9,795.7	\$10,221.6
PSH singles	\$6,198	<\$6,198	\$6,507.9	\$6,817.8	\$7,127.7	\$7,437.6
PSH families	\$11,884	<\$11,884	\$12,478.2	\$13,072.4	\$13,666.6	\$14,260.8
RRH existing	\$35,444	<\$35,444	\$37,216.2	\$38,988.4	\$40,760.6	\$42,532.8

All new rapid rehousing projects, which have been active for less than 1 year, automatically received 5 points for each of the cost/unit and cost/successful outcome measures per guidance from the HAB’s CoC Program Committee. For these metrics, it was not possible to calculate a

meaningful median because the timeframe in which the projects had been operational was so varied.

***DHS recommends that the cost effectiveness scoring point spread rubric be revisited for next year's scoring. The CoC should consider alternatives to assigning points that will create a more even distribution of scores across programs.*

i. Housing First Monitoring:

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS FOR SECTION = 10

i. Housing First Monitoring		Individual Points	Weighted Points	Total Points for Category	Percentage of Total Points	Point Spread
Compliance with Housing First Principles		0	1	0.0	0%	Evaluation to meet Housing First: HUD 10-point Monitoring Tool utilized to determine score. Example: if answering "Yes" to all questions, then the score is 10. If answering 5 of 10 questions as "Yes" then 5 points awarded. If no questions answered as "Yes" then 0 points awarded.

The Housing First Checklist is based on one developed by the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) in September 2016. The checklist assesses whether projects are meeting the core elements of Housing First practices. DHS Program Monitors completed the tool based upon information obtained while monitoring the project. The following are the core elements used to determine the score for the housing first:

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

The project receives 0 to 10 points for performance on housing first compliance. Refer to rubric in the picture above to understand the point spread.

Appendix B
2017 Ranking Appeal Form

**Allegheny County Continuum of Care (PA-600)
2017 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 2017 Review, Ranking and Reallocation Process and Criteria 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, and the public comment and development period for the ranking strategy.

Submit this completed form by 12:00pm on Friday, September 8, 2017 and return to Hilary Scherer at hilary.scherer@alleghenycounty.us

Contact Information

Agency Name: _____

Project Name: _____

Contact Name: _____

Contact Email: _____

Contact Phone: _____

Appeal and Justification (one page)