

Fort Worth/Arlington/Tarrant County
Continuum of Care TX-601
FY2019 CoC Program
Scorecard Overview



Local Scoring & Ranking

Goals & Priorities for the FY2019 CoC Competition

The CoC has identified the following funding priorities for the FY2019 CoC Competition:

- Submit a consolidated application that meets threshold and maximizes available funding
- Fund projects that meet community needs
- Fund projects that are cost effective and maximize program and mainstream resources
- Fund projects that successfully end homelessness
- Promote the use of best practices
- Fund projects that will help the CoC achieve the federal strategic plan goals of ending homelessness for veterans, chronically homeless, families, youth, and all other populations

In addition, the CoC has identified the following goals and priorities to guide final ranking of new and renewal projects in the 2019 CoC Consolidated application:

- Project Ranking Goal: To prioritize activities that are most successful in ending homelessness and maximize funding available to end homelessness in the CoC, while also providing an incentive to all funded providers to monitor and improve their performance, including efficiency with funds and ensure continued funding with CoC resources
- To that end, the following priorities, in no particular order, will help guide development of a final ranking approach:
 - The CoC may seek to preserve low-ranking projects at risk of losing funding where those projects represent the only CoC Program funding in their communities
 - The CoC may seek to preserve low-ranking Permanent Housing (PH) projects at risk of losing funding where those projects represent the only CoC Program funded PH in their communities
 - The CoC may prioritize projects that have demonstrated the use of Housing First practices
 - The CoC may consider reducing funding requests for the lowest ranked projects as a means to preserve funding for higher ranked projects, if needed, and keeping in line with other priorities
 - The CoC may consider ranking new projects higher than some renewal projects, where the CoC believes doing so will better help the CoC meet the ranking goal outlined above

Renewal CoC Projects are subject to performance review via the Renewal Project Scorecard which was adopted by the TX-601 Board of Directors. The scorecard reflects the HUD System Performance Measures, HUD Policy Priorities and local priorities.

New project scores will be entirely derived from the scored elements in the local RFP.

The TX-601 Board of Directors adopted the [FY2019 Project Ranking Policy](#) and the [FY2019 Reallocation Policy](#), which provides guidance to the Allocation Committee when determining project rank order.

A. HUD Ranking Requirements

The CoC must assign a unique rank to each project that it intends to submit to HUD for FY2019 funding except for the CoC Planning Grant. Ranking of renewal projects must incorporate scoring on project performance, system performance and effectiveness. Each CoC must comprehensively review both new and renewal projects within its geographic area, using CoC-approved scoring criteria and selection priorities, to determine the extent to which each project

is still necessary and addresses the listed policy priorities. Funds for projects that are determined to be underperforming, obsolete, or ineffective should be reallocated to new projects that are based on proven or promising models.

Any new or renewal project may be placed in Tier 1. CoCs should carefully consider the priority and ranking for all projects in Tier 1 and Tier 2. Projects in Tier 1 will be conditionally selected if applications pass both HUD's eligibility and threshold review.

Projects placed in Tier 2 will be assessed for eligibility threshold and threshold requirements and funding will be determined using the CoC Applications score as well as factors listed in the NOFA.

B. Policy Priorities

CoCs should consider the policy priorities established in the NOFA in conjunction with local priorities to determine the ranking of new projects created through reallocation, CoC planning, and renewal project requests.

Project Evaluation Process

The Allocations Committee reviews and approves the evaluation process and project ranking approach. The evaluation process and related project ranking helps TX-601 fully maximize CoC Program funds, make informed funding decisions and continue to move the CoC toward our goal of ending homelessness.

Renewal Project Scorecards

Renewing projects are evaluated utilizing performance and financial data, data quality elements, grant management efforts and CoC participation. The evaluation is used to establish which programs have been most successful in achieving HUD and locally determined performance standards; and to identify how programs are contributing to the overall System Performance of the CoC.

Performance data is gathered via an Annual Performance Report (APR) for each program with the date range of May 1, 2018 – April 30, 2019. The aggregate data provides a CoC-wide average baseline performance for the related scorecard measures. After calculating average performance of each applicable measure, a +/-5% deviation is established for the scoring range. The range nearest the average percentage is eligible for 5 points; project percentages above the specified average will receive 10 points; and project percentages below the specified average range will receive 0 points. This method allows programs to be compared and scored specifically to other programs of the same project component type and identify which projects are most improving the CoC System Performance. Ranges not related to APR measures were obtained from information derived from other sources including but not limited to local priorities, NAEH, HUD and eSNAPS project applications.

Before using project reports to establish scored, TCHC notifies renewing projects of the performance date range and deadlines to complete all data corrections in HMIS. In FY2019, projects were notified on May 1st of the data parameters and expectations and were given a deadline of May 15th to have all data corrections complete. TCHC provided technical assistance via email and an in-person Data Clean-Up Session, held on June May 8th. Finalized APR data was generated on May 15th to represent data used for

the score cards and to establish baseline community performance averaged. Non-HMIS users submit data from a comparable database with the same deadline of May 15th. Data from the comparable database is be used to generate score cards for these projects.

Score card data is derived from HUD reports including Annual Performance Reviews (APRs), Data Quality Reports, System Performance Reports and HMIS custom reports. Project applications, agency self-report and sign-in sheets will be used for data outside the HMIS.

A complete list of projects eligible for renewal in the FY2019 CoC Competition can be found in Appendix A: 2019 Renewal CoC Projects.

The following areas are evaluated as part of the renewal project evaluation process.

Scorecard Category Weight	
Project Performance	50%
HMIS Data Quality	20%
Coordinated Entry Participation	20%
Grant Management & Financials	10%
Total Score	100%

Project Performance:

1. Quarterly Occupancy Utilization Rate
 - a) Purpose: Indicates efficient use of community resources. High occupancy indicates system efficiency and community demand for services. Project occupancy data is reported to HUD twice a year via the Housing Inventory Chart (HIC) and the Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR).
2. Percentage of chronically homeless households served (PSH projects only)
 - a) Purpose: Indicates project success in ending chronic homelessness by measuring the number of chronically homeless participants served in the project during the measured year.
3. Percentage of participants who remained in PSH or exited to permanent housing
 - a) Purpose: Indicates project success in ending homelessness by measuring the number of participants with a permanent destination at project exit and those who remained in a permanent supportive housing project compared to the total number of participants active in the project during the measured year.
4. Average length of stay of participants (RRH projects only)
 - a) Purpose: Indicates the efficiency of the program and self-sufficiency of participants
5. Percentage of adults at exit or annual assessment who gained or increased employment income
 - a) Purpose: Indicates that the project is assisting households to increase self-sufficiency and stabilize housing by retaining or gaining employment income.
6. Percentage of adults at exit or annual assessment who gained or increased non-employment cash income
 - a) Purpose: Indicates that the project is assisting participants toward self-sufficiency through retaining or increasing income by utilizing all possible resources available to participants.
7. Returns to Homelessness
 - a) Purpose: Indicates the project's long-term success of participants who successfully exited two years ago

HMIS Data Quality:

8. Personal Identifying Information Error Rate
 - a) Purpose: To achieve accurate data collection and to satisfy HUD HMIS data requirements, projects must ensure that data entered into the local HMIS system is complete.
9. Universal Data Elements Error Rate
 - a) Purpose: To achieve accurate data collection and to satisfy HUD HMIS data requirements, projects must ensure that data entered into the local HMIS system is complete.
10. Income and Housing Data Quality
 - a) Purpose: To achieve accurate data collection and to satisfy HUD HMIS data requirements, projects must ensure that data entered in the local HMIS system is complete.

Data provided from non-HMIS participating agencies sent in a CSV format unable to be processed through the electronic database utilized by HMIS participating agencies will be reviewed outside of the system for data quality and completeness.

Coordinated Entry System Participation:

11. Time to Lease Up
 - a) Purpose: TX-601 set a community-wide goal to house clients within 60 days of project enrollment. This metric will allow TX-601 to measure progress towards reaching this goal. **PSH projects with zero new enrollments in the measured timeframe were not measured on this element, the scoring metric was adjusted accordingly.**
12. Accepted Referrals
 - a) Purpose: TX-601 set a community-wide goal of accepting at least 90% of clients referred from Coordinated Entry (no more than 10% denial rate). This metric will allow TX-601 to measure progress towards reaching this goal. **TCHC was unable to measure this element for the FY19 competition with the available data. All projects received full points.**

Grant Management & Financials:

13. Projected Project Spend Down
 - a) Purpose: Ensure the program is on track to spend down all project funds by the end of its current grant term
14. Cost Efficiency
 - a) Purpose: It is important to HUD that programs demonstrate cost efficiency – the annual cost to retain or move someone into permanent housing.
15. Percentage of total grant funds recaptured in the most recent grant closeout
 - a) Purpose: It is important to HUD that programs show agency capacity to spend funds allocated in a timely manner and in full and allows for potential fund reallocation of unspent funds during the HUD CoC Competition.
16. 2019 PIT Count Participation
 - a) Purpose: Indicates if agency is participating in CoC-related activities.
17. CoC General Meeting Attendance
 - a) Purpose: Indicates if agency is participating in CoC-related activities.

Review Only:

This section is **not** part of the FY2019 total project score. These are test questions to begin evaluating performance in the specified areas. These questions may be scored during future competitions.

1. Site Monitoring

- a) Purpose: HUD requires that project meet threshold requirements throughout the life cycle of the project
- 2. CES Rejected Referrals
 - a) Purpose: Ensure all programs are prioritizing services to those that need it most and abiding to fair-housing and anti-discrimination laws.
- 3. PSH Move On
 - a) Purpose: Ensure PSH projects are assisting clients to independent living and effectively utilizing project beds

First Year Renewals

First year renewals will not receive a score card since the project has not had the opportunity to complete a full year of performance. First year renewals will automatically be renewed pending the submission of any requested narrative responses or documentation.

Request for Proposals

New projects are required to submit a response to the Request for Proposal (RFP) to apply for the local CoC competition. Applicants must submit one RFP per project. The local RFP contains narrative questions that must be completed by all applicants.

Narrative questions are derived from local priorities and FY2019 HUD policies and priorities. Narrative questions vary by project type (i.e. PSH, RRH) and project status (i.e. renewal, new), and serve as an opportunity for applicants to provide more detail regarding their project. The Allocations Committee is responsible for scoring this portion of the local competition. A scoring matrix is provided to the committee to assist with the scoring process.

The local RFP will be developed once the CoC NOFA is released.

Victim Service Provider Projects

Domestic Violence project applications are reviewed, scored and ranked in the manner described in previous sections. All performance related data is provided by the Victim Service provider as generated from the non-HMIS Comparable Database.

All Domestic Violence applicants, whether new or renewing, will be required to describe methods and tools used to ensure and increase client safety while enrolled in the program through the local RFP.

For new projects seeking DV Bonus funding, additional questions will be required on the local RFP to demonstrate unmet community need and a proposed plan to address the unmet need, along with data sources and calculations used to establish the unmet need.

Any DV project specific requirements will be updated and finalized once the CoC NOFA is released.

Total Project Score

The total project score for Renewal Projects with at least one full year of operation is comprised 100% from the project scorecard. TX-601 places an emphasis on project performance to align with HUD priorities.

The total project score for New Projects, First-Time Renewals and Renewal Projects with less than one full year of operation is 100% derived from the local RFP (narrative responses). Score cards are not applicable for these projects.

The local RFP will be developed once the CoC NOFA is released.

Fund Allocations Process

The Allocations Committee, a committee of the TX-601 CoC Board, is comprised of objective community members who score project applications, rank projects as required and make funding recommendations. The committee members are approved by the CoC Board and are not affiliated with applicant agencies. Committee members are provided multiple training opportunities regarding the CoC NOFA, the scoring process and the ranking policy. Members are given materials a minimum of 1 week prior to the deliberations meeting to review, score, accept/reject and rank project applications. The following project application materials are provided to each committee member:

- Renewal Project Score Card
- Local RFP responses for new projects
- Relevant eSNAPS data
- Relevant Project Financial Data
- Local Monitoring Materials

The scores from each member are returned to TCHC for initial project ranking per the CoC policy. Committee members deliberate in a closed meeting to make ranking, funding and reallocation decisions as guided by CoC policy. Additionally, the committee will make decisions related to which projects to accept and/or reject in the local competition. Once a consensus has been met, the committee will provide final ranking recommendations to the CoC Board of Directors for review and instruct the Collaborative Applicant to submit the project ranking within the HUD-required timeframe. The CoC will notify any projects that are rejected or reallocated within the HUD-required timeframe.

Appendix A: 2019 Renewal CoC Projects

Grantee Name	Project Name	Project Type	First Time Renewal / Less than 1 Yr Data
Catholic Charities Fort Worth	Master Lease	PSH	
Center for Transforming Lives	CTL Rapid Rehousing Renewal 1603	RRH	
CitySquare	OnTRAC Tarrant TH/RRH	Joint TH/RRH	Y
Fort Worth Housing Solutions	SPC 1 2018-2019	PSH	
Fort Worth Housing Solutions	SPC 2 2018-2019	PSH	
Fort Worth Housing Solutions	SPC 6 2018-2019	PSH	
Fort Worth Housing Solutions	CHANGE SPC 8 2018-2019	PSH	
Hearts Full of Love	HFOL RRH 2018	RRH	Y
Housing Authority of the City of Arlington	2018 SPC Tenant Based	PSH	
Housing Authority of the City of Arlington	2018 Arlington Housing Rapid Rehousing	RRH	
MHMR of Tarrant County	Gateway to Housing	PSH	
Presbyterian Night Shelter	Housing Solutions Combined	PSH	
Presbyterian Night Shelter	Mimi Hunter Fitzgerald Safe Haven	SH	
Recovery Resource Council	Project New Start	PSH	
SafeHaven of Tarrant County	SafeSolutions for Rapid Rehousing	RRH	
SafeHaven of Tarrant County	SafeFoundations for Rapid Rehousing	RRH	
Tarrant County	CEC 3CP	RRH	
Tarrant County	TBLA 114 Tarrant County	RRH	
Tarrant County	TBLA 13 MHMR	PSH	
Tarrant County	TBLA 15 Samaritan House	PSH	
Tarrant County	TBLA 17 MHMR	PSH	
Tarrant County	Samaritan House Grace Village	PSH	
Tarrant County	Salvation Army Veterans PSH Program	PSH	
Tarrant County	Housing SPC	PSH	
Tarrant County	SafeTomorrows	PSH	
Tarrant County	TSA Housing First PSH	PSH	
Tarrant County	TSA Housing First PSH II	PSH	
Tarrant County	TSA SIMON PSH	PSH	
Tarrant County Homeless Coalition	CoC HMIS	HMIS	
Tarrant County Homeless Coalition	CoC Coordinated Assessment System	SSO	