

Cabell-Huntington Wayne Continuum of Care  
Prioritization and Evaluation Subcommittee  
Ranking and Review Information 2019

***Objective of the Prioritization & Evaluation Subcommittee.***

The purpose of this committee is objectively rank all renewal and new (bonus, reallocation and consolidation) projects for this year's NOFA application.

***NOFA Project Ranking Information***

**Project Ranking.** Project applications submitted to the CoC for inclusion on the FY 2019 CoC Priority Listing as part of the CoC Consolidated Application must be reviewed and either accepted and ranked or rejected by the CoC. All project applications approved by the CoC must be listed on the CoC Priority Listing in rank order, except project applications for CoC planning and UFA Costs which will not be ranked, to establish the project applications located within Tier 1 and the project applications located within Tier 2. The purpose of this two-tiered approach is for CoCs to indicate to HUD which projects are prioritized for funding.

The P&E subcommittee will rank all projects (excluding Planning and UFA Costs projects) applying for funding in the 2019 Consolidated Application. This is an ordered ranking of all renewal and new projects the CoC is submitting in the application for funding. The project ranking *must* reflect HUD funding priorities, local need, and a data-driven process for evaluating individual project performance.

Prior to the ranking process, the CoC completes a full performance evaluation of all renewal projects and determines whether to include each individual project in the ranking. The Steering Coordinator provides data and pertinent project information to the subcommittee. This information is used during the ranking process. Using this data, the subcommittee meets to rank all new (reallocated and bonus) and renewal project applications in order of priority and to identify any project applications rejected by the CoC.

**Projects Fully in Tier 1.** HUD will conditionally select project applications that are fully within Tier 1, pass eligibility and threshold, based on CoC score, beginning with the highest scoring CoC to the lowest scoring CoC. If the available funding under this NOFA is reduced, a reduction will be made to all CoC's Tier 1 amount proportionately which would result in lower ranked Tier 1 project applications falling into Tier 2.

**Projects in Tier 2.** HUD will conditionally select project applications that pass eligibility and threshold review in Tier 2. HUD will select projects in order of point value until there are no more funds available. In the case of a tie, HUD will fund the projects in the order of CoC application score. In case there is still a tie, HUD will select the project from the CoC that has the highest score on the rating factors described in this NOFA.

**Projects Straddling Tiers.** If a project application straddles the Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding line, HUD will conditionally select the project application up to the amount of funding that falls within Tier 1. Using the CoC score and other factors described in this NOFA, HUD may then fund the Tier 2 portion of the project. If HUD does not fund the Tier 2 portion of the project, HUD may award the project at the reduced amount, provided the project is still feasible with the reduced funding (e.g., is able to continue serving homeless program participants effectively).

***CHWCoC's FY2019 Available Funds.***

**Estimated ARD: \$2,581,428.00**

Cabell-Huntington Wayne Continuum of Care  
Prioritization and Evaluation Subcommittee  
Ranking and Review Information 2019

**Tier 1:** 100% of the ARA for all projects eligible for first time renewal + 94% of the combined ARA for all other eligible renewals = **\$2,434,082.00**

**Tier 2:** Estimated ARD – Tier 1 (\$147,346) + CoC Bonus Projects (\$129,071) = **\$276,417**

**Additional Funds Available:** DV Bonus = **\$146,426.00**

**TOTAL: \$2,856,925.00**

### ***HUD's Policy Priorities.***

This section provides additional context regarding the selection criteria found in this NOFA and is included here to help applicants better understand how the selection criteria support the goal of ending homelessness:

1. **Ending homelessness for all persons.** To end homelessness, CoCs should identify, engage, and effectively serve all persons experiencing homelessness. CoCs should measure their performance based on local data that consider the challenges faced by all subpopulations experiencing homelessness in the geographic area (e.g., veterans, youth, families, or those experiencing chronic homelessness). CoCs should have a comprehensive outreach strategy in place to identify and continuously engage all unsheltered individuals and families. Additionally, CoCs should use local data to determine the characteristics of individuals and families with the highest needs and long experiences of unsheltered homelessness to develop housing and supportive services tailored to their needs. Finally, CoCs should use the reallocation process to create new projects that improve their overall performance and better respond to their needs.
2. **Creating a systemic response to homelessness.** CoCs should be using system performance measures such as the average length of homeless episodes, rates of return to homelessness, and rates of exit to permanent housing destinations to determine how effectively they are serving people experiencing homelessness. Additionally, CoCs should use their Coordinated Entry process to promote participant choice, coordinate homeless assistance and mainstream housing and services to ensure people experiencing homelessness receive assistance quickly, and make homelessness assistance open, inclusive, and transparent.
3. **Strategically allocating and using resources.** Using cost, performance, and outcome data, CoCs should improve how resources are utilized to end homelessness. CoCs should review project quality, performance, and cost effectiveness. HUD also encourages CoCs to maximize the use of mainstream and other community-based resources when serving persons experiencing homelessness. CoCs should also work to develop partnerships to help CoC Program participants sustainably exit permanent supportive housing, such as through partnerships with Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) and other government, faith-based, and nonprofit resources specializing in areas such as treating mental illness, treating substance abuse, job training, life skills, or similar activities, including those that help CoC Program participants, whenever possible, reach recovery, self-sufficiency, and independence. Finally, CoCs should review all projects eligible for renewal in FY 2019 to determine their effectiveness in serving people experiencing homelessness, including cost effectiveness.
4. **Using an Evidence-Based Approach.** CoCs should prioritize projects that employ strong use of data and evidence, including the cost-effectiveness and impact of homelessness programs on positive housing outcomes, recovery, self-sufficiency, and

Cabell-Huntington Wayne Continuum of Care  
Prioritization and Evaluation Subcommittee  
Ranking and Review Information 2019

reducing homelessness. Examples of measures that CoCs may use to evaluate projects include, but are not limited to: rates of positive housing outcomes, such as reduced length of time homeless and reduced rates of return to homelessness; improvements in employment and income; and improvements in overall well-being, such as improvements in mental health, physical health, connections to family, and safety.

5. **Increasing employment.** Employment provides people experiencing homelessness with income to afford housing. Employment also improves recovery outcomes for individuals with mental illness or addiction. CoCs and CoC-funded projects should work with local employment agencies and employers to prioritize training and employment opportunities for people experiencing homelessness. CoC's should also promote partnerships with public and private organizations that promote employment.
6. **Providing Flexibility for Housing First with Service Participation Requirements.** The traditional Housing First approach has two basic parts: First, individuals are rapidly placed and stabilized in permanent housing without any preconditions regarding income, work effort, sobriety or any other factor. Second, once in housing, individuals never face requirements to participate in services as a condition of retaining their housing. The first part, placement into permanent housing without preconditions, is an important priority to ensure that federal funds are allocated to providers that serve the most vulnerable homeless individuals. This NOFA maintains the commitment to unconditional acceptance of individuals into housing, especially for people with a high degree of vulnerability. At the same time, allowing service participation requirements once a person has been stably housed may promote important outcomes (e.g., employment, increased income, reduced substance use, and strengthened social connection), so this NOFA also provides communities and programs with flexibility, without penalty, to use service participation requirements after people have been stabilized in housing (consistent with 24 CFR 578.75(h)).

### ***CHWCoC's Project Ranking Process.***

**Renewal Project Scoring.** Renewal projects approved by the Prioritization and Evaluation subcommittee (P&E) for inclusion in the CoC project ranking will be scored according to an objective scoring tool based on their individual project performance, alignment with HUD and CoC policy priorities, and compliance. Performance and HMIS elements are heavily weighted measures used by HUD in determining the overall CoC score for the NOFA. Data used in the project scoring tool comes largely from the most recently submitted Annual Performance Report (APR) for each project. See attached sample scoring tools.

First-time renewals are projects that have not yet completed their first operating year, and thus, cannot be scored for their performance due to not having a completed Annual Performance Report (APR). P&E will evaluate each first-time renewal project's year-to-date data to ensure that each project is on track for implementation and anticipated outcomes.

**New or Bonus Project Selection.** New project applicants will be assessed on the following: project design, how the project addresses local priority needs, how the project aligns with local strategies and HUD's priority to end homelessness, budget appropriateness and accuracy, project match, leveraging, CoC participation, community collaboration, organizational capacity, use of Housing First, and implementation timeline. There may be new projects that fail to score well

Cabell-Huntington Wayne Continuum of Care  
Prioritization and Evaluation Subcommittee  
Ranking and Review Information 2019

enough to be included in the NOFA submission, or there may not be enough new project funding to fund all requests.

**Domestic Violence Projects.** Domestic Violence (DV) projects are ranked along with other projects of the same project type but are scored utilizing a separate scoring tool, which places emphasis on safety planning. For further details, see Renewal Project Scoring and New or Bonus Project Selection (above). All outcome data is gleaned from APR data that is pulled from an HMIS comparable data base and recorded on a spreadsheet with no personally identifiable information.

**Ranking Order.** New and renewal projects approved for inclusion in the CoC's project ranking will be ranked in the following order:

1. CoC infrastructure projects:
  - a. HMIS Renewal Projects
  - b. Coordinated Entry Supportive Services Only (SSO) project
  - c. All other SSO projects
2. Renewal Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Rapid Rehousing (RRH), and Safe Haven (SH) projects, ranked in order of highest to lowest percentage score
3. New projects approved for inclusion in ranking

**Tie Breakers.** Ties within the same project type will be broken in the following order:

1. Highest % of clients exiting to or retaining permanent housing
2. Highest utilization rate
3. Largest grant amount

The P&E Committee may adjust individual projects up or down in the ranking or reallocate funds to other projects to fulfill HUD priorities, prevent potential loss of funding, and maximize the overall CoC application score.

# DV Rapid Rehousing – Ranking and Scoring Tool

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Grant ID: \_\_\_\_\_

Outcome	Max Points	Scoring Thresholds	Awarded Points
<b>1. Permanent Housing Placements</b> Source: APR Data Tracking Spreadsheet The % of persons who remained in or exited to permanent housing destinations.	20	20 Points: 80 – 100% 15 Points: 70 – 79% 10 Points: 55 – 69% 0 Points: 54% or less	
<b>2. Length of Time to Move-In</b> Source: APR Data Tracking Spreadsheet The average length of time for persons to move into housing.	10	10 Points: 30 days or less 5 Points: 31 – 60 days 0 Points: 61 days or longer	
<b>3. Employment Income</b> Source: APR Data Tracking Spreadsheet The % of persons age 18 and older that maintained or increased earned income at program exit.	10	10 Points: 50% or more 5 Points: 40 – 49% 3 Points: 30 – 39% 0 Points: 29% or less	
<b>4. Cash Benefits</b> Source: APR Data Tracking Spreadsheet The % of persons age 18 and older that maintained or increased cash income (non-employment) at program exit.	5	5 Points: 75% or more 3 Points: 40 – 74% 0 Points: 39% or less	
<b>5. Mainstream Benefits (Non-Cash)</b> Source: APR Data Tracking Spreadsheet The % of households that maintained or increased non-cash benefits at program exit.	5	5 Points: 75% or more 3 Points: 40 – 74% 0 Points: 39% or less	
<b>6. Safety Planning</b> Source: Osnum Data Percent of clients that entered the project during the operating year who participated in safety planning.	10	10 Points: 95% or more 5 Points: 90 – 94% 0 Points: 89% or less	
<b>7. Focused and Dedicated Chronic Homeless Beds</b> Source: Project Application The % of beds in the project that are dedicated chronic homeless beds (based on projects application).	5	5 Points: 50% or more 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>8. Returns to Homelessness</b> Source: APR Data Tracking Spreadsheet Percentage of households who exit to permanent housing destinations and return to homelessness within 1 year.	10	10 Points: 5% or less 5 Points: 6 – 10% 0 Points: 11% or more	
<b>9. Severity of Needs</b> Source: APR Data Tracking Spreadsheet Percentage of clients with at least one condition at entry (including SMI, SUD, chronic health conditions, HIV/AIDS, developmental and physical disabilities).	10	10 Points: 90% or more 5 Points: 89 - 50% 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>10. HMIS Comparable Database</b> Source: Osnum/APR Data Tracking Spreadsheet The extent to which the project: 1. Enters all client data into database, 2. Has satisfactory data quality, and 3. Has satisfactory data timeliness.	15	15 Points: 3 factors met 10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>Total Possible Points</b>		<b>100</b>	

**Total Points Awarded:**

## DV Rapid Rehousing – CHWCoC Ranking Deductions Tool

Outcome	Max Deduction	Scoring Thresholds	Deducted Points
<b>1. Housing First Approach</b> Source: Housing First Subcommittee The extent to which the project follows a housing first approach: 1. Individuals are placed and stabilized in permanent housing without preconditions, and 2. Individuals never face requirements to participate in services as a condition to retain their housing.	-10	Does the project operate using the Housing First Approach? -10 Points: 0 factors met - 5 Points: 1 factor met - 0 Points: 2 factors met	
<b>2. Grant Spending</b> Source: eLOCCS Up to 5 points deducted for failure to spend grant funds in the most recently ended grant year.	-5	- 5 Points: spent 79% or less - 3 Points: spent 80 – 89% - 0 Points: spent 90% or more	
<b>3. History of Recaptures</b> Source: eLOCCS Up to 5 points deducted for failure to spend grant funds in the previous 3 years.	-5	- 5 Points: spent 79% or less - 3 Points: spent 80 – 89% - 0 Points: spent 90% or more	
<b>4. APR Submission</b> Source: SAGE 10 points deducted if the APR was submitted late or if the APR was rejected by HUD and not amended and corrected within 30 days.	-10	Did the project submit APR in a timely manner? -10 Points: No - 0 Points: Yes	
<b>5. Coordinated Entry</b> Source: CE Subcommittee 5 points deducted if the program did not coordinate and collaborate with the CoC’s Coordinated Entry system.	-5	-10 Points: No - 0 Points: Yes	
<b>6. Exits to Streets</b> Source: APR Data Tracking Spreadsheet 10 points deducted if the percentage of the program’s exits to Places Not Meant for Human Habitation was greater than 5% during the most recently ended grant year.	-5	Are exits to the street greater than 5%? -10 Points: Yes - 0 Points: No	
<b>Total Possible Points Deductions</b>	<b>40</b>		

<b>Total Points Deducted: --</b>
----------------------------------

TOTAL	
<b>Points Awarded</b>	
<b>Points Deducted</b>	—
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	

# Permanent Supportive Housing – Ranking and Scoring Tool

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Grant ID: \_\_\_\_\_

Outcome	Max Points	Scoring Thresholds	Awarded Points
<b>1. Permanent Housing Placements</b> Source: APR Report The % of persons who remained in or exited to permanent housing destinations.	20	20 Points: 80 – 100% 15 Points: 70 – 79% 10 Points: 55 – 69% 0 Points: 54% or less	
<b>2. Utilization Rate</b> Source: APR Report The average % of units that were utilized nightly on all PIT dates.	10	10 Points: 90% or more 5 Points: 80 – 89% 0 Points: 79% or less	
<b>3. Employment Income</b> Source: APR Report The % of persons age 18 and older that maintained or increased earned income at program exit.	10	10 Points: 50% or more 5 Points: 40 – 49% 3 Points: 30 – 39% 0 Points: 29% or less	
<b>4. Cash Benefits</b> Source: APR Report The % of persons age 18 and older that maintained or increased cash income (non-employment) at program exit.	5	5 Points: 75% or more 3 Points: 40 – 74% 0 Points: 39% or less	
<b>5. Mainstream Benefits (Non-Cash)</b> Source: APR Report The % of households that maintained or increased non-cash benefits at program exit.	5	5 Points: 75% or more 3 Points: 40 – 74% 0 Points: 39% or less	
<b>6. Chronic Homelessness</b> Source: APR Report Percent of clients that entered the project during the operating year that were chronically homeless.	10	10 Points: 65% or more 5 Points: 50 – 64% 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>7. Focused/Dedicated Chronic Beds</b> Source: Project Application The % of beds in the project that are dedicated chronic homeless beds.	5	5 Points: 50% or more 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>8. Returns to Homelessness</b> Source: Sys PM Report Percentage of households who exit to permanent housing destinations and return to homelessness within 1 year.	10	10 Points: 5% or less 5 Points: 6 – 10% 0 Points: 11% or more	
<b>9. Severity of Needs</b> Source: APR Report Percentage of clients with at least one condition at entry (including SMI, SUD, chronic health conditions, HIV/AIDS, developmental and physical disabilities).	10	10 Points: 90% or more 5 Points: 89 - 50% 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>10. HMIS</b> Source: HMIS Administrator The extent to which the project: 1. Enters all client data into HMIS, 2. Has satisfactory data quality, and 3. Has satisfactory data timeliness.	15	15 Points: 3 factors met 10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	

**Total Possible Points 100**

**Total Points Awarded:**

## Permanent Supportive Housing – CHWCoC Ranking Deductions Tool

Outcome	Max Deduction	Scoring Thresholds	Deducted Points
<b>1. Housing First Approach</b> Source: Housing First Subcommittee The extent to which the project follows a housing first approach: 1. Individuals are placed and stabilized in permanent housing without preconditions, and 2. Individuals never face requirements to participate in services as a condition to retain their housing.	-10	Does the project operate using the Housing First Approach? -10 Points: 0 factors met - 5 Points: 1 factor met - 0 Points: 2 factors met	
<b>2. Grant Spending</b> Source: eLOCCS Up to 5 points deducted for failure to spend grant funds in the most recently ended grant year.	-5	- 5 Points: spent 79% or less - 3 Points: spent 80 – 89% - 0 Points: spent 90% or more	
<b>3. History of Recaptures</b> Source: eLOCCS Up to 5 points deducted for failure to spend grant funds in the previous 3 years.	-5	- 5 Points: spent 79% or less - 3 Points: spent 80 – 89% - 0 Points: spent 90% or more	
<b>4. APR Submission</b> Source: SAGE 10 points deducted if the APR was submitted late or if the APR was rejected by HUD and not amended and corrected within 30 days.	-10	Did the project submit APR in a timely manner? -10 Points: No - 0 Points: Yes	
<b>5. Coordinated Entry</b> Source: CE Subcommittee 5 points deducted if the program did not coordinate and collaborate with the CoC’s Coordinated Entry system.	-5	-10 Points: No - 0 Points: Yes	
<b>6. Exits to Streets</b> Source: APR Data Tracking Spreadsheet 10 points deducted if the percentage of the program’s exits to Places Not Meant for Human Habitation was greater than 5% during the most recently ended grant year.	-5	Are exits to the street greater than 5%? -10 Points: Yes - 0 Points: No	
<b>Total Possible Points Deductions</b>		<b>40</b>	

Total Points Deducted: --
---------------------------

TOTAL	
Points Awarded	
Points Deducted	—
TOTAL SCORE	

# Rapid Rehousing – Ranking and Scoring Tool

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Grant ID: \_\_\_\_\_

Outcome	Max Points	Scoring Thresholds	Awarded Points
<b>1. Permanent Housing Placements</b> Source: APR Report The % of persons who remained in or exited to permanent housing destinations.	20	20 Points: 80 – 100% 15 Points: 70 – 79% 10 Points: 55 – 69% 0 Points: 54% or less	
<b>2. Length of Time to Move-In</b> Source: APR Report The average length of time for persons to move into housing.	10	10 Points: 30 days or less 5 Points: 31 – 60 days 0 Points: 61 days or longer	
<b>3. Employment Income</b> Source: APR Report The % of persons age 18 and older that maintained or increased earned income at program exit.	10	10 Points: 50% or more 5 Points: 40 – 49% 3 Points: 30 – 39% 0 Points: 29% or less	
<b>4. Cash Benefits</b> Source: APR Report The % of persons age 18 and older that maintained or increased cash income (non-employment) at program exit.	5	5 Points: 75% or more 3 Points: 40 – 74% 0 Points: 39% or less	
<b>5. Mainstream Benefits (Non-Cash)</b> Source: APR Report The % of households that maintained or increased non-cash benefits at program exit.	5	5 Points: 75% or more 3 Points: 40 – 74% 0 Points: 39% or less	
<b>6. Chronic Homelessness</b> Source: APR Report Percent of clients that entered the project during the operating year that were chronically homeless.	10	10 Points: 65% or more 5 Points: 50 – 64% 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>7. Focused/Dedicated Chronic Beds</b> Source: Project Application The % of beds in the project that are dedicated chronic homeless beds.	5	5 Points: 50% or more 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>8. Returns to Homelessness</b> Source: Sys PM Report Percentage of households who exit to permanent housing destinations and return to homelessness within 1 year.	10	10 Points: 5% or less 5 Points: 6 – 10% 0 Points: 11% or more	
<b>9. Severity of Needs</b> Source: APR Report Percentage of clients with at least one condition at entry (including SMI, SUD, chronic health conditions, HIV/AIDS, developmental and physical disabilities).	10	10 Points: 90% or more 5 Points: 89 - 50% 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>10. HMIS</b> Source: HMIS Administrator The extent to which the project: 1. Enters all client data into HMIS, 2. Has satisfactory data quality, and 3. Has satisfactory data timeliness.	15	15 Points: 3 factors met 10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>Total Possible Points</b>		<b>100</b>	

**Total Points Awarded:**

## Rapid Rehousing – CHWCoC Ranking Deductions Tool

Outcome	Max Deduction	Scoring Thresholds	Deducted Points
<b>1. Housing First Approach</b> Source: Housing First Subcommittee The extent to which the project follows a housing first approach: 1. Individuals are placed and stabilized in permanent housing without preconditions, and 2. Individuals never face requirements to participate in services as a condition to retain their housing.	-10	Does the project operate using the Housing First Approach? -10 Points: 0 factors met - 5 Points: 1 factor met - 0 Points: 2 factors met	
<b>2. Grant Spending</b> Source: eLOCCS Up to 5 points deducted for failure to spend grant funds in the most recently ended grant year.	-5	- 5 Points: spent 79% or less - 3 Points: spent 80 – 89% - 0 Points: spent 90% or more	
<b>3. History of Recaptures</b> Source: eLOCCS Up to 5 points deducted for failure to spend grant funds in the previous 3 years.	-5	- 5 Points: spent 79% or less - 3 Points: spent 80 – 89% - 0 Points: spent 90% or more	
<b>4. APR Submission</b> Source: SAGE 10 points deducted if the APR was submitted late or if the APR was rejected by HUD and not amended and corrected within 30 days.	-10	Did the project submit APR in a timely manner? -10 Points: No - 0 Points: Yes	
<b>5. Coordinated Entry</b> Source: CE Subcommittee 5 points deducted if the program did not coordinate and collaborate with the CoC's Coordinated Entry system.	-5	-10 Points: No - 0 Points: Yes	
<b>6. Exits to Streets</b> Source: APR Data Tracking Spreadsheet 10 points deducted if the percentage of the program's exits to Places Not Meant for Human Habitation was greater than 5% during the most recently ended grant year.	-5	Are exits to the street greater than 5%? -10 Points: Yes - 0 Points: No	
<b>Total Possible Points Deductions</b>		<b>40</b>	

**Total Points Deducted: --**

TOTAL	
Points Awarded	
Points Deducted	—
TOTAL SCORE	

# Safe Haven – Ranking and Scoring Tool

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Grant ID: \_\_\_\_\_

Outcome	Max Points	Scoring Thresholds	Awarded Points
<b>1. Permanent Housing Placements</b> Source: APR Report The % of persons who remained in or exited to permanent housing destinations.	20	20 Points: 80 – 100% 15 Points: 70 – 79% 10 Points: 55 – 69% 0 Points: 54% or less	
<b>2. Utilization Rate</b> Source: APR Report The average % of units that were utilized nightly on all PIT dates over the course of the program year.	10	10 Points: 90% or more 5 Points: 80 – 89% 0 Points: 79% or less	
<b>3. Employment Income</b> Source: APR Report The % of persons age 18 and older that maintained or increased earned income at program exit.	10	10 Points: 50% or more 5 Points: 40 – 49% 3 Points: 30 – 39% 0 Points: 29% or less	
<b>4. Cash Benefits</b> Source: APR Report The % of persons age 18 and older that maintained or increased cash income (non-employment) at program exit.	5	5 Points: 75% or more 3 Points: 40 – 74% 0 Points: 39% or less	
<b>5. Mainstream Benefits (Non-Cash)</b> Source: APR Report The % of households that maintained or increased non-cash benefits at program exit.	5	5 Points: 75% or more 3 Points: 40 – 74% 0 Points: 39% or less	
<b>6. Chronic Homelessness</b> Source: APR Report Percent of clients that entered the project during the operating year that were chronically homeless.	10	10 Points: 65% or more 5 Points: 50 – 64% 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>7. Length of Stay</b> Source: APR Report The average length of stay in the program.	10	10 Points – 180 days or less 0 Points – 366+ days	
<b>8. Returns to Homelessness</b> Source: Sys PM Report Percentage of households who exit to permanent housing destinations and return to homelessness within 1 year.	10	10 Points: 5% or less 5 Points: 6 – 10% 0 Points: 11% or more	
<b>9. Severity of Needs</b> Source: APR Report Percentage of clients with at least one condition at entry (including SMI, SUD, chronic health conditions, HIV/AIDS, developmental and physical disabilities).	10	10 Points: 90% or more 5 Points: 89 - 50% 0 Points: 49% or less	
<b>10. HMIS</b> Source: HMIS Administrator The extent to which the project: 1. Enters all client data into HMIS, 2. Has satisfactory data quality, and 3. Has satisfactory data timeliness.	15	15 Points: 3 factors met 10 Points: 2 factors met 5 Points: 1 factor met 0 Points: 0 factors met	
<b>Total Possible Points</b>		<b>100</b>	

**Total Points Awarded:**

## Safe Haven – CHWCoC Ranking Deductions Tool

Outcome	Max Deduction	Scoring Thresholds	Deducted Points
<b>1. Housing First Approach</b> Source: Housing First Subcommittee The extent to which the project follows a housing first approach: 1. Individuals are placed and stabilized in permanent housing without preconditions, and 2. Individuals never face requirements to participate in services as a condition to retain their housing.	-10	Does the project operate using the Housing First Approach? -10 Points: 0 factors met - 5 Points: 1 factor met - 0 Points: 2 factors met	
<b>2. Grant Spending</b> Source: eLOCCS Up to 5 points deducted for failure to spend grant funds in the most recently ended grant year.	-5	- 5 Points: spent 79% or less - 3 Points: spent 80 – 89% - 0 Points: spent 90% or more	
<b>3. History of Recaptures</b> Source: eLOCCS Up to 5 points deducted for failure to spend grant funds in the previous 3 years.	-5	- 5 Points: spent 79% or less - 3 Points: spent 80 – 89% - 0 Points: spent 90% or more	
<b>4. APR Submission</b> Source: SAGE 10 points deducted if the APR was submitted late or if the APR was rejected by HUD and not amended and corrected within 30 days.	-10	Did the project submit APR in a timely manner? -10 Points: No - 0 Points: Yes	
<b>5. Coordinated Entry</b> Source: CE Subcommittee 5 points deducted if the program did not coordinate and collaborate with the CoC’s Coordinated Entry system.	-5	-10 Points: No - 0 Points: Yes	
<b>6. Exits to Streets</b> Source: APR Data Tracking Spreadsheet 10 points deducted if the percentage of the program’s exits to Places Not Meant for Human Habitation was greater than 5% during the most recently ended grant year.	-5	Are exits to the street greater than 5%? -10 Points: Yes - 0 Points: No	
<b>Total Possible Points Deductions</b>	<b>40</b>		

Total Points Deducted: --

TOTAL	
Points Awarded	
Points Deducted	—
TOTAL SCORE	