

Continuum of Care Written Standard for Rankings and Ratings Protocol

NY-505 Syracuse/Auburn, Onondaga, Oswego and Cayuga Counties

I. Purpose

The Housing and Homeless Coalition of Central New York (HHC) NOFO protocols for the Continuum of Care (CoC) establishes a transparent framework for the annual CoC NOFO scoring, ranking and approval process. In order to best serve our community members through provision of effective projects, projects which most closely align with the HUD and CoC priorities will be prioritized for funding. This document will be reviewed and approved by both the NOFO workgroup, made up of representatives of currently funded agencies and HHC stakeholders, and by the Performance Evaluation and Selection Committee, outlined below. Both the NOFO workgroup and the Performance Evaluation and Selection Committee are designated by the CoC's full membership body to oversee the ranking and rating process.

The HUD Performance Evaluation and Selection Committee ("the Committee") consists only of non-CoC or ESG funded Advisory Board Members, members of the CoC's Lived Experience Boards and also non-voting members of the Housing and Homeless Coalition staff. Please see Appendix A for a list of the current participating agencies of the Performance Evaluation Committee. The duties are to oversee all monitoring of funding agencies (which is performed by the HHC staff), develop and revise the monitoring tool and perform ratings and rankings for all applications to the NOFO.

II. New Project Application Process

On behalf of the CoC, the HHC issues new applications for agencies seeking CoC funding. Applications are publicly distributed through the RFP process and are advertised on social media, the CoC's full listserv, and the CoC's website. Application instructions are also distributed alongside the applications. The application instructions include all relevant due dates, threshold requirements, submission protocol, and attachment requirements.

New funding applications also encompass expansion applications for existing CoC projects. Only projects that scored in Tier 1 in the previous year's competition are eligible to apply for an expansion of the existing project. Projects that had a significant finding during CoC annual monitoring are ineligible from submitting expansion applications.

Applications are split into four sections: threshold requirements, program design narrative, performance measures, and project specific bonus questions. Projects and agencies must meet threshold requirements to be

considered in the funding competition. Program design, performance measures, and bonus questions will be used to determine ranking in the funding competition.

III. Renewal Project Application Process

Renewal projects are scored according to the rubric described in the renewal application. Renewal projects are scored on HUD compliance, CoC compliance, program narratives, and performance measures which accounts for 75% of the renewal project score through a Competition Report.

The majority of the information in the renewal application is information that is reported to HUD on the Annual Performance Report, during project monitoring by CoC staff, or is otherwise available through HMIS. Projects serving domestic violence survivors are asked to submit data in a CSV from their comparable database for the renewal process.

Projects that have not been operational for an entire program year will receive full points for performance measures in the Competition Report.

The objective rating criteria is compiled into a Competition Report by CoC staff that is made available to all funded projects as soon as the funding competition opens.

The Competition Report will be released to all funded projects at the same time as the new application. Projects will have until the application due date to review and dispute or accept the Competition Report and respond to narrative questions. An acknowledgement of the acceptance or dispute must be submitted by the due date.

If a project seeks to dispute the competition report, project representatives can give written or verbal justification of the dispute to the Performance Evaluation and Selection Committee. The Committee will then vote to accept or reject the dispute.

IV. Review & Selection Process

The Committee reviews and scores all renewal and new applications. The committee is given a detailed rubric and reports scores through an online platform. Scores are compiled and reviewed in a committee meeting to ensure accuracy and limit discrepancies between reviewers.

Projects which fail to meet threshold requirements will be held out of the competition. These projects may request that the CoC provide them with technical assistance to assist them in improving their interest in applying in future competitions. This process ensures that organizations that may lack the current capacity to receive a federal grant can build their capacity for a future year.

All renewal projects will be selected to move forward in the competition, unless subject to reallocation. The reallocation process can be found in Section VI.

New projects that meet threshold requirements will be selected to move forward based on score for performance measures. Scores will be determined using an average of scores given by each member of the Committee. New projects may be asked to scale funding request based on number of applications approved.

All projects will receive written notice on the outcome of the initial review process and the justification of the decision by emailed letter, no later than 15 days before the CoC Program Competition application submission deadline.

V. Reallocation protocol

The CoC will use the reallocation process to shift funds in whole or part from existing renewal projects to new project applications, as needed. Agencies will be subject to reallocation discussion due to the following reasons:

1. Project has not expended 100% of grant funds for two or more consecutive years
2. Projects are out of compliance and have had the same significant finding two or more consecutive years
3. Projects have been in the bottom 10% of CoC Ranking due to low performance for two or more consecutive years, as evidenced by the project's Annual Performance Report, performance measures, and CoC Ranking Process
4. The project no longer meets community need by serving a population not represented in the homeless service system, or project and/or agency is no longer operational
5. An agency does not complete the local renewal application process

Projects meeting any of the specifications above will be brought to the Committee for possible reallocation. Reallocation decisions are voted upon by the Committee and require a 3/4 majority vote. The appeals process in Section VII will be applicable to the reallocation process.

Projects may also chose to self-reallocate during the NOFO process. Request to self-reallocate must be submitted in writing prior to the deadline of the local application process.

All projects will receive written notice on the outcome of the reallocation review process and its justification by emailed letter.

VI. Ranking Protocol

A project ranking list is then generated using scores outlined in Sections IV and V, in alignment with HUD and local CoC priorities. Projects that have passed threshold requirements and have been selected by funding are then ranked by application score.

Projects will be ranked, based on score and local priority, and placed into Tier 1 until all Tier 1 funds are allocated. The remaining projects selected for funding will be ranked and placed into Tier 2 until all Tier 2 funds are allocated.

The Planning Grant is not ranked in the NOFO process. The HMIS and Coordinated Entry Grants will not be scored and protected due to necessity of the projects to the operation of the CoC.

Once the Committee has ranked applicants' renewal applications, the preliminary ranking will be emailed to all member agencies, with specific scoring forwarded to the related applicant.

Tier 1 and Tier 2 structures will be reviewed with the Committee and HHC Advisory Board as designated by the full CoC membership. Recommendations of the Advisory Board will be voted upon no later than 15 days prior to the CoC submission deadline.

The final ranking and CoC application will be posted publicly no later than 48 hours prior to the submission of the CoC application.

VII. Appeals Process

The Committee's recommendation will be presented to the HHC Advisory Board for approval. An applicant may challenge the Committee's recommendation to the Board by emailing the HHC Executive Director a Notice of Appeal. The appellant must attend the HHC Advisory Board meeting where they will be allowed to make a 10-minute presentation to the Board. The Board's decision on the slate is final. No Board Member with a conflict of interest may participate in the discussion or vote on the slate.

NOTE: Appeals will only be considered in cases where applicants have concerns specific to the review process and scoring of their application. Appeals specific to the ranking or funding recommendation will not be considered. All notices of appeal must be based on the information submitted by the application due date. No new or additional information will be considered. Omissions to the application cannot be appealed.

Should the project decide to pursue a formal appeal to HUD, the applicant will be referred to page 116 of the FY2025 NOFO to follow HUD's appeals process for submitting a solo application outside of the CoC.

Appendix A

Performance, Evaluation and Selection Committee Participating Agencies

City of Syracuse, ESG Coordinator
Onondaga County Community Development
Cayuga County Department of Social Services
Auburn Housing Authority
Onondaga County Department of Social Services
Re-Entry Taskforce
City of Auburn
Client Advisory Board
Client Advisory Board
South Side Community Growth Foundation
Youth Action Board
Allyn Family Foundation
Oswego County Department of Social Services

Appendix B

Existing CoC Projects Eligible for Applying for Expansion

No projects are eligible for expansion this year.