LOUISVILLE CONTINUUM OF CARE RATING AND REVIEW PROCEDURE FY2018

On July 10, 2018 all CoC Members were notified of preliminary rating and review criteria. This notification gave all programs to opportunity to self-evaluate their performance and correct any data errors as needed by August 3, 2018

Upon release of the Optional Rating and Ranking Tool by HUD the Louisville CoC opted to use this tool as it incorporated most of preliminary measures given to the CoC as well as some additional criteria important to performance. The Louisville CoC also added some additional criteria to the HUD tool based on local need. The original Rating and Ranking tool is available here:
 https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/5292/project-rating-and-ranking-tool/

In order to be considered for funding consideration all projects were required to submit the first draft of their application in eSnaps no later than August 18, 2018.

The review and ranking criteria assigned points based on positive housing outcomes by measuring exits to permanent housing. Five criteria were used to assess the severity of program participant needs. Points were awarded based on the percent of participants with zero income at entry, percent of participants with more than one disability type, percent of participants entering the project from a place not meant for human habitation, percent of participants reporting a substance abuse disorder at entry, and percent of participants reporting being a victim or domestic violence at entry.

The Louisville CoC did not receive any applications for projects from victim's service providers during the FY18 funding competition. If there had been any received, the CoC would have used data from a comparable database when available. If data was not available from a comparable database the victim service provider would have automatically received full points for that metric.

All CoC programs were notified of their project score on September 6, 2018 and given the opportunity to appeal any individual metrics or scores they felt were inaccurate.

The final project ranking was determined by the Continuum of Care Board of Directors. For more information on this see the 2018 Final Ranking Explanation.

RATING AND REVIEW CRITERIA

The following are the criteria used to rank programs, their source and calculation, and their possible scoring range. Unless otherwise noted, they were all taken from CoC APR reports run for the programs with a date range of July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018.

Questions about rating and review criteria should be directed to Erin Rutherford at erutherford@louhomeless.org.

Performance Measures

Length of Stay (used for TH and RRH programs only). The data comes from question 22b and is the average length of stay for all program participants. The high score was 10 points.

A RRH project scored 10 points if their LOS was 270 days or less. They scored 0 points if their length of stay was 366 days or more. Those with LOS between 270 and 366 days had their scores prorated to correspond to that range so that a LOS of 318days would receive 5 out of 10 points.

Exit to Permanent Housing. The data came from question 23a. It is the total of participants who stayed in the program and those who left to a permanent destination divided by total participants and taken as a percentage. The total points were 25. Projects scored 25 if they had 95% and 0 points if they had 75%. Those between 95% and 75% were prorated so that a program with 80% received 6.25 out of 25 points.

New or Increased Income and Earned Income. This data came from question 19a1. It is the total number of participants with a change in income divided by the total number of stayers or leavers in the program, respectively, and taken as a percentage. The CoC measured changes in earned income and non-employee income for program stayers and program leavers for a total of 4 measures. Each was worth 2.5 points. Projects received full points in earned income change for stayers and leavers at 10% and in non-employee income at 15%. They received 0 points if 0% of stayers or leavers, respectively, had any change. Those in between were prorated so that a program that had 5% of stayers increase their earned income received 1.25 of 2.5 points and a program that had 10% of leavers increase their non-employee income received 1.66 of 2.5 points.

Serve High Need Populations

Participants with Zero Income at Entry. This data came from question 16. It is the number of participants who had zero income and entry divided by the total number of participants and taken as a percentage. There were 5 possible points awarded. Projects received 5 points if there were 50% or more with zero income at entry and received 0 points if there were less than 25% at entry. Projects that fell between 50% and 25% were prorated so that a project with 40% at entry received 3 of 5.

Participants with more than one disability type. This data came from question 13a2. It is the number of participants with 2 or more disability types at entry divided by the total number of adults and taken as a percentage. There were 5 possible points awarded. Projects received 5 points if there were 50% or more with more than one disability type and received 0 points if there were less than 25% at entry. Projects that fell between 50% and 25% were prorated so that a project with 40% at entry received 3 of 5.

Participants entering project from a place not meant for human habitation. This data came from question 15. It is the total number of people who came from a place not meant for human habitation at entry divided by the total number of participants and taken as a percentage. There were 5 possible points awarded. Projects received 5 points if there were 50% or more entering project from a place not meant for human habitation and received 0 points if there were less than 25% entering project from a place not meant for human habitation. Projects that fell between 50% and 25% were prorated so that a project with 40% at entry received 3 of 5.

Project Effectiveness

Coordinated Entry Participation. Projects were ranked on their participation in the coordinated entry system. Projects who participated were awarded 10 points. Those who do not were awarded 0 points. This data came from the project applications.

Project commits to applying the housing first model. Projects received 10 points for applying the housing first model. This data came from the project applications.

Other and Local Criteria

CoC Participation. The CoC Monitoring Score was re-assigned so that projects were scored on their participation in the Continuum of Care. Points were awarded based on an internal assessment by CoC leadership and the CoC Board of Directors. There were 5 possible points.

Returns to Homelessness. The CoC elected to score projects on returns to homelessness for all three time frames rather than the one score in the original HUD Optional Rating and Ranking Tool. Each score was worth 5 points and data came from a custom modification of the 703 report. Projects were scored on returns in 0-180 days, 181-365 days, and 366-730 days looking back from March 1, 2017. A project scored 5 points if 15% or less of leavers returned to a CoC program. A project received zero points of 40% or more of leavers returned to a CoC program. Projects with between 15% and 40% returned were prorated so that a project with 25% returns received 3 of 5 points.

Substance Abuse at Entry. The CoC elected to add substance abuse as a "Serve High Need Populations" criteria. This data came from question 13a1. It is the total number of participants who had a history of alcohol, drug abuse, or both, at entry divided by the total number of adults and taken as a percentage. There were 5 possible points awarded. Projects received 5 points if there were 50% or more entering project with a history of substance abuse and received 0 points if there were less than 25%. Projects that fell between 50% and 25% were prorated so that a project with 40% at entry received 3 of 5.

Domestic Violence. The CoC elected to add history of domestic violence as a "Serve High Need Populations" criteria. This data came from question 14a. It is the total number of participants who had a history of domestic violence at entry divided by the total number of adults and taken as a percentage. There were 5 possible points awarded. Projects received 5 points if there were 50% or more entering project with a history of domestic violence and received 0 points if there were less than 25%. Projects that fell between 50% and 25% were prorated so that a project with 40% at entry received 3 of 5.

Funding Returned. Projects were graded on the amount of their funding request they returned. This data came from their ELOCCS reports. Projects received 10points if 0% of funding was returned and 0 points if 25% or more was returned. Projects with between 0% and 25% returned were prorated so that a project with 10% of funding returned earned 6 points out of 10.