

**2010 Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Program
City of Cincinnati/Hamilton County (Ohio)
Large Group Scoring Recommendations
July 2010**

New Projects

This scoring scheme is unchanged from 2009. The ratio of rated (pre-scored) items to ranked (group-scored) items is 50:50. A total score of 60 is the minimum required for inclusion in the CoC application.

*****Scores, percentages, & leverage ratios will not be rounded up (e.g. 1.999% = 1%)**

<i>Scoring element</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<p>Leverage (Measured)</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Less than 1:1 = Ineligible</div> <p>1:1 to 1.9:1 = 4 points 2:0 to 2.9:1 = 6 points (except S+C) 2:0 or more = 10 points (S+C only) 3:0 or more = 10 points (except S+C)</p>	10	<p>Leverage points assigned have been reduced to be consistent with the desired 3:1 ratio. 2:1 is only barely “passing” using this scale and less than that is not.</p> <p>Greater leverage improves CoC application score.</p> <p>Greater leverage results in more effective use of dollars.</p>
<p>Housing Focus (Measured)</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Under 75% = Ineligible</div> <p>75-79% = 25 points 80-89% = 30 points 90-99% = 35 points 100% = 40 points</p>	40	<p>No change from 2009.</p> <p>Greater housing focus improves CoC application score.</p> <p>Housing focus is a direct measure of attention to homelessness <i>per se</i>.</p>
<p>Need/Extent of Problem Addressed</p>	15	<p>Title changed – “Addressed” added.</p> <p>Available points unchanged from 2009.</p>
<p>Impact on Ending Homelessness</p>	10	<p>Title changed from “Soundness of Approach.”</p> <p>Rating level descriptions revised to ensure impact is emphasized.</p> <p>Available points unchanged from 2009.</p>
<p>Cost Effectiveness</p>	10	<p>No change from 2009.</p>
<p>Organizational Capacity</p>	15	<p>No change from 2009.</p>
Total	100	

Renewal Projects WITH Housing and Income Outcomes

The rebalancing of scoring categories and point assignments described below results in 50% of the available points coming from measured results (i.e., pre-scored categories) and 50% from rated categories (i.e., community scoring). A total score of 60 is the minimum required for inclusion in the CoC application.

<i>Scoring element</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Leverage (Measured)	0	Was worth 10 points in 2008. Consensus is that leverage letters are a lot of work, unreliable and don't contribute to project effectiveness. For renewals, leverage is no longer a HUD scoring factor.
Grant Money Drawn (Measured) Under 75% = Ineligible 75-79% = 1 point 80-89% = 3 points 90-110% = 5 points Over 110% = 2 points	5	Reduced from 10 points in 2009. Grant Money Drawn is no longer a HUD scoring factor. Timely use of funds is a HUD requirement. This has not been an issue at all for TH projects, but 4 of 11 PSH programs were below 85% in the 2007-2009 period.
Housing Focus (Measured) Under 50% = 0 points 50-74% = 1 points 75-89% = 3 points 90-100% = 5 points	5	Not used in 2009, but important to the community. During the 2007-2008 cycles only 6 of 17 PSH and TH programs (35%) allocated 75% or more of their money directly to housing. Reduced from 25 points in 2008 because Housing Focus is no longer a HUD scoring factor.

Note: Three different **Housing Results** scoring scales will be used – **one for PSH, one for TH and one for Services Only projects with housing results.** The reason for this is two-fold.

1. The PSH standard is easier to achieve than the TH standard. This is demonstrated by the **85% success rate for PSH versus the 76% success rate for TH reported in the 2009 COC APPLICATION submission.**
2. The HUD national objective is different for PSH and TH (71.5% vs. 63.5%).
3. There is no HUD national objective for Services Only programs.

The scales themselves are based on the principle that achieving the community average should be well rewarded, but there should also be an incentive for doing better than average.

<p><u>PSH</u> Housing Results (Measured)</p> <p>Under 50% = 0 points 50-69% = 6 points 70-79% = 12 points 80-84% = 14 points 85-89% = 16 points 90-100% = 20 points</p>	<p>20</p>	<p><u>Definition:</u> The percentage of people participating in the program who remained in the program for over 6 months.</p> <p>Total unchanged from 2009</p> <p>Point assignments changed to reward meeting 90% as a community target.</p> <p>HUD national objective is 71.5% for PSH.</p>
<p><u>TH</u> Housing Results (Measured)</p> <p>Under 50% = 0 points 50-59% = 6 points 60-69% = 12 points 70-74% = 14 points 75-79% = 16 points 80-100% = 20 points</p>	<p>20</p>	<p><u>Definition:</u> The percentage of people leaving the program during the most recent APR timeframe who moved to permanent housing.</p> <p>Total unchanged from 2009</p> <p>Point assignments changed to reward meeting 80% as a community target.</p> <p>HUD national objective is 63.5% for TH.</p>
<p><u>SSQ</u> Housing Results (Measured)</p> <p>Under 50% = 0 points 50-59% = 6 points 60-64% = 8 points 65-74% = 12 points 75-79% = 16 points 80- 100% = 20 points</p>	<p>20</p>	<p><u>Definition:</u> The percentage of people leaving the program during the most recent APR timeframe who moved to housing (permanent, PSH or TH).</p> <p>Total points unchanged from 2009.</p> <p>The typical % for 2006 – 2009 is approximately 69%.</p> <p>Point assignments changed to reward meeting 75% as a community target.</p> <p>There is no HUD national objective for this category.</p>
<p>Income Results (Measured)</p> <p>Under 50% = 0 points 50-59% = 3 points 60-69% = 5 points 70-79% = 7 points 80-89% = 9 points 90-100% = 10 points</p>	<p>10</p>	<p><u>Definition:</u> The percentage of people leaving the program who had any income, whether from employment or another source, at exit.</p> <p>Decreased from 15 points in 2009 to balance with Employment Results.</p> <p>HUD mentions income results, but does not have a national standard for income results, per se.</p> <p>The community outcome for Income Results reported in the 2009 CoC application was 83%.</p>

Employment Results (Measured) Under 10% = 0 points 10-18% = 2 points 19-24% = 4 points 25-34% = 7 points 35-100% = 10 points	10	Definition: The percentage of people who had employment income at exit. Added because HUD has an established national standard of 19%. The community outcome for Employment Results reported in the 2009 CoC application was 30%.
Comprehensiveness and Coordination	10	“Are the services provided related to other activities in the community and coordinated with other homeless service providers?”
Need/Extent of Problem Addressed	10	Title changed – “Addressed” added. Available points unchanged from 2009.
Impact on Ending Homelessness	10	Title changed from “Soundness of Approach.” Available points increased from 5 in 2009.
Cost Effectiveness	10	Available points increased from 5 in 2009.
Organizational Capacity	10	No change from 2009.
Total	100	

Supportive Services Only Renewals WITHOUT Housing & Income Outcomes

A total score of 60 is the minimum required for inclusion in the CoC application.

[Note: This scoring system reverts back to the dimensions originally considered critical when community scoring was first initiated with the addition of “Grant Money Drawn.” Although the NOFA no longer discriminates directly against SSO programs, since there are no objective measures of the success of such programs which are directly related to homelessness per se, it seems appropriate for the community to need to compellingly agree that the services offered are of value in order for an SSO program to be highly ranked. Therefore, the total point opportunity for SSO programs is lowered to 80 as compared to 100 for those projects which can directly measure their impact on homelessness and the status of homeless persons in the areas of income and employment.]

<i>Scoring element</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Leverage (Measured)	0	Was worth 10 points in 2008. Consensus is that leverage letters are a lot of work, unreliable and don't contribute to project effectiveness. For renewals, leverage is no longer a HUD scoring factor.
Grant Money Drawn (Measured) Under 75% = Ineligible 75-79% = 1 point 80-89% = 3 points 90-110% = 5 points Over 110% = 2 points	5	Reduced from 10 points in 2009. Timely use of funds is a HUD requirement. This has not been an issue for SSO projects. Grant money drawn is no longer a HUD scoring factor.
Comprehensiveness and Coordination	15	“Are the services provided related to other activities in the community and coordinated with other homeless service providers?”
Need/Extent of Problem Addressed	15	Title changed – “addressed” added. Available points increased.
Impact on Ending Homelessness	15	Title changed from “Soundness of Approach.” Rating level descriptions to be revised to ensure impact is emphasized. Available points increased.
Cost Effectiveness	15	Available points increased.
Organizational Capacity	15	Available points increased.
Total	80	

New HMIS Grants

As having an HMIS system is a HUD mandate and dollars used for HMIS are not considered as a part of HUD's housing emphasis criteria, our community's HMIS grant is not scored. It is included in the CoC application as the last program funded at the bottom of the priority list.

An expansion HMIS grant would dedicate additional CoC funds to furthering the community's HMIS system and will be scored on a PASS/FAIL basis.

PASS: If a majority of scorers at the CoC Large Group Scoring event indicate that a new HMIS grant should be funded, it will be handled in a fashion identical to the original HMIS grant. It will be included as a last program funded at the bottom of the CoC's priority list.

FAIL: If a majority of scorers at the CoC Large Group Scoring event feel a new HMIS grant should NOT be funded, it will be excluded from the CoC's priority list and application all together.