



NYC COC 2021 PROJECT OBJECTIVE RANKING & SELECTION PROCESS

Threshold Review

All applications for new and renewal projects are reviewed for threshold to ensure compliance with the HEARTH Act, the CoC Program Interim Rule, the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO), NYC CoC Written Standards, and the local CoC Request for Proposals (RFP). Any new or renewal project that does not meet the threshold requirements are not considered for funding.

Renewal Project Performance Scoring & Selection

The NYC CoC Steering Committee determines the evaluation scoring standards for renewal projects annually using the following process: 1) Draft standards are proposed by the Evaluation Workgroup and shared with the Performance Management Committee. 2) Proposed standards are shared with the Steering Committee at a regularly scheduled meeting, on the website, and distributed by email. 3) At a subsequent Steering Committee meeting, stakeholder input is discussed 4) The Steering Committee makes adjustments to the standards and adopts the final standards.

The scoring standards adopted are the objective criteria used by the CoC to review, rate, rank, and select renewal projects for inclusion in or exclusion from the CoC Priority Listing. These objective criteria use APR and HMIS data to evaluate cost effectiveness (e.g. unit utilization and spending of funds), performance (e.g. length of stay, income increases, accessing non-cash benefits & health insurance, & exits to/maintenance of PH), type of population served (e.g. chronically & literally homeless), participation of persons with lived experience, and compliance with local priorities and administrative requirements with the overall goal of achieving positive housing and services outcomes for clients. The NYC Department of Social Services (DSS) analyzes evaluation data and prepares scoring reports, which are distributed to all project applicants and posted publicly on the CoC website.

Renewal projects demonstrating a history of poor performance over multiple years may not be selected for funding. Projects with this history are first referred to the NYC CoC Performance & Quality Improvement (PQI) Committee where the provider is offered technical assistance and support to improve performance. In addition, projects with a history of under-spending may have their grants reduced. Funds previously used to support these projects are reallocated to create new PSH, RRH, and Joint TH/RRH projects.

Applicants have the opportunity to submit appeals related to renewal evaluation scores and/or reallocation decisions to an ad hoc Appeals Committee, which is appointed by the Steering Committee and reviews and approves or denies all requests. Applicants are notified in writing of decisions by the Appeals Committee. Parties with conflicts of interest are disallowed from participation on the Appeals Committee.



New Project Application Scoring & Selection

Annually, the CoC analyzes the most critical gaps in the housing inventory, determines the type of new project applications that will be sought, develops an RFP for new projects funded through both bonus and reallocation that meet the identified need, posts them to the website, and widely distributes them via email. The CoC welcomes and solicits new project applications from organizations that currently receive, have received, and that have never received CoC Program funds. Coalition members distribute the RFP to their membership through email lists and at meetings to ensure a broad outreach effort and to maximize the opportunity to apply for funding by never-funded organizations.

The Steering Committee appoints an RFP review committee of subject matter experts to review, rate, rank, and competitively select new project applications for inclusion in the CoC Priority Listing. Parties with conflicts of interest are disallowed from participation on the review committee. The Committee uses objective criteria to score applications. The committee may give the CoC consultants/DSS direction to work with applicants to make adjustments to strengthen applications and ensure the applications included in the final submission to HUD meet the most critical gaps identified by the CoC. The CoC provides technical assistance to all applicants to ensure that the process is accessible to any applicant, including those that have not previously received funding.

Ranking

In the annual CoC competition, HUD requires communities to rank projects for funding in two tiers. CoCs must rank all new and renewal projects, except CoC Planning. Projects in Tier 1 are generally ensured funding, if the project application meets minimum HUD requirements, and the CoC meets the basic requirements of the annual CoC competition. The amount that CoCs must rank in Tier 1 and Tier 2 is established each year by HUD in the CoC Program Competition NOFO. Tier 2 projects must compete nationally for funding.

Each year the NYC CoC Independent Review Team (IRT) reviews new and renewal project scoring results along with gaps in the housing inventory, critical CoC infrastructure needs, and CoC leadership and membership feedback. The IRT is a small, odd-numbered, and annually appointed body composed of a mixture of non-conflicted Steering Committee members and stakeholders from the broader homeless and housing fields to ensure the group represents diverse and informed perspectives. The IRT discusses ranking strategies and then adopts the final ranking strategy used for the Priority List. Parties with conflicts of interest are disallowed from participation on the IRT and IRT meetings are led by a non-conflicted facilitator external to the NYC CoC.

This year, the IRT chose to approve a general ranking order that placed HMIS and CAPS expansions at the top of new projects, and directly below renewal projects - which were based on their 2021 Annual Evaluation score. For other new projects, the IRT adopted a cohort



approach, grouping non-CoC housing subsidy projects at the top of Tier II, followed by non-CoC healthcare bonus projects, and then, new PH and RRH projects. Within each of these cohorts, the IRT determined that projects would be ranked according to their application scores given by the RFP review committees. The IRT then agreed to place all DV Bonus projects at the bottom of Tier II in order of application score, while emphasizing that this in no way reflects the CoC's commitment to those projects. This decision was made to simplify the ranking process and does not affect the likelihood of DV Bonus projects receiving funding, as they do not compete with CoC Bonus projects for funding.

Projects included in the 2021 NYC CoC Priority Listing were ranked in the following order:

1. Evaluated renewal projects were ranked in order based on annual NYC CoC Evaluation score
2. Followed, in alphabetical order by agency name, by all first-time renewal projects that were not scored
3. Followed, in alphabetical order by agency name, by renewals that were exempt from evaluation
4. Followed by HMIS and Coordinated Entry renewal projects
5. Followed, at the bottom of Tier 1, by HMIS and Coordinated Entry expansion projects
6. Followed, at the top of Tier 2, in order of application score, by new projects planning to leverage non-CoC housing subsidies
7. Followed by the one new project planning to leverage non-CoC healthcare resources
8. Followed, in order of application score, by all other new RRH and PH projects
9. Followed, at the bottom of Tier 2, by projects applying for DV Bonus funding

The CoC's ranking and selection process prioritizes funding for projects serving vulnerable participants, including: youth under age 25, people experiencing chronic homelessness, people with zero income, criminal history, active substance use, and those reluctant to engage in services. For example, the CoC took these actions to ensure consideration of these vulnerabilities:

- Renewal Permanent Supportive Housing projects with 100% of entrants being people experiencing chronic homelessness received up to 5 points;
- New DV Bonus applications were scored on three additional, DV-service-specific questions
- CoC ranked and selected new projects based on:
 1. applicant experience & capacity to serve vulnerable people (e.g., chronically homeless, active substance users, people reluctant to engage, people with criminal history, zero income &/or disabilities, unsheltered)
 2. a clear outreach & supportive services plan to engage & serve the most vulnerable people using a low barrier Housing First approach.
 3. a program budget that is clear and sensible



Projects not targeting vulnerable populations were not funded. Only PSH projects that dedicate 100% of beds for chronic homelessness & PSH-RRH projects using a low-barrier Housing First approach were selected for funding. The NYC CoC chose not to fund Joint TH-RRH projects this NOFO cycle.