2017 Project Ranking Methodology
Used by the Homeless Continuum of Care of Stark County (HCCSC)

1. In its local competition to determine which projects the HCCSC would endorse for HUD's 2017 Continuum of Care (CoC) grant funds, the HCCSC's Recipient Approval and Evaluation Committee scored all projects using the 2017 HCCSC Scoring Criteria and Score Sheet approved by the HCCSC Board of Directors at its June 13, 2017 meeting. As much as possible, scoring was based on objective criteria, including:

    a. Severity of need/vulnerability of those to be served as measured by average SPDAT score;

    b. Serving populations targeted in *Opening Doors,* the federal government's plan for ending homelessness;

    c. Compliance with HEARTH regulations, central intake and assessment (CI & A) policies and HUD expectations such as housing first implementation, adoption of low barriers, linking to mainstream benefits, up to date policies and procedures that reflect compliance with CI & A.

    d. Performance outcomes;

    e. Budget – cost per client, amount of leverage, budget's emphasis on housing provision and operations rather than services; and

    f. Findings during monitoring (renewal projects only).

2. Each project received a final numerical score equal to the percentage of the total points it earned divided by the total points for which it was eligible. (Not all scoring criteria applied to every project. New projects, for example, were scored on fewer and different criteria than those used to score renewal projects: criteria designed to rate the quality of their project plans and their readiness to execute those, rather than on actual project performance.)

3. Ultimately, all projects that applied for funding in the HCCSC's local competition were included in the priority listing that a CoC must submit to HUD as part of its Consolidated Application for CoC funding. That listing names all the projects a CoC is recommending for funding through HUD's national CoC grant competition. This year, the HCCSC was able to include in its priority listing all the local projects that applied for 2017 CoC funding because the total amount requested by applicants did not exceed the $2,822,777 which Stark County is eligible to receive. This $2,822,777 includes the HCCSC's Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) of $2,662,997[1] and $159,780 (6% of ARD) in potential bonus funding.

---

[1] A CoC's Annual Renewal Demand for a particular year is the sum of all the amounts available to fund the qualified activities of all projects in the CoC that are eligible for underlined renewed funding in that year.

4. HUD requires every CoC to rank the projects it includes on its priority listing and divide them into Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects. Ordinarily, HUD funding will go first to Tier 1 projects in the order in which they are ranked, while Tier 2 projects will receive funding, also in the order in which they are ranked, only (a) if additional grant money is available after Tier 1 projects have been funded and (2) if a CoC and its Tier 2 projects score well on their applications compared with others around the country. In 2017, HUD instructed CoCs to (a) include projects in Tier 1 whose total requested funding would equal no more than 94% the CoC's ARD and (b) include projects in Tier 2 whose total requested funding would equal no more than the remaining 6% of ARD plus available bonus funding.

5. In ranking projects on its 2017 priority list, the HCCSC followed the following principles:

   - All projects seeking renewed funding were ranked by their scores with higher scoring projects receiving higher ranking than lower scoring projects;

   - New projects selected to receive funds reallocated from renewal projects were ranked by their scores along with renewal projects;

   - Projects applying for bonus funds that satisfied priorities for use of bonus and reallocated funds that the HCCSC Board had approved at its May 9, 2017 meeting[2] were ranked according to their scores ahead of projects applying for bonus funds that did not meet those Board-approved priorities; and

   - Projects applying for bonus funds that did not meet the Board-approved priorities for reallocated or bonus funds but were nonetheless included on the priority listing as needed projects that would fill gaps in services were ranked last.

---

[2] The priorities approved by the Board for use of reallocated and bonus funds included rapid re-housing projects, coordinated entry projects, and HMIS enhancement projects.