

# DE COC REVIEW OF 2020 COC FUNDING POLICY & RENEWAL EVALUATION

---

July 30, 2020

Christy Rubenstein, Senior Associate

Diana T. Myers & Associates



Delaware Continuum of Care



# TODAY'S TOPICS

## ➤ Review 2020 CoC Funding Policy

- Focus on changes from 2019
- Covers: Prioritization & Ranking; New Project Solicitation, Evaluation & Selection; Renewal Project Evaluation; Reallocation; Appeals; Conflicts of Interest

## ➤ Review of Evaluation & Scoring Tools

- Project Types to be covered: PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH
- Focus on changes from 2019

## ➤ Q&A

*We will take questions throughout but will also reserve time at the end for Q&A  
Reminder – everyone is muted so if you have a question, you can use chat box  
and/or use “raise hand” feature to be unmuted.*

# REVIEW OF 2020 COC FUNDING POLICY

---

Prioritization & Ranking  
New Project Solicitation, Evaluation & Selection  
Renewal Project Evaluation  
Reallocation  
Appeals  
Conflicts of Interest

# FUNDING POLICY FOR 2020

- Drew from FY19 policies covering Prioritization of Projects, Threshold Review, Evaluation, Reallocation and descriptions of the CoC's NOFA processes
- Consolidated into a single document

## Contains sections covering:

- Background
- Prioritization & Ranking
- New Project Solicitation, Evaluation & Selection
- Renewal Project Evaluation
- Reallocation
- Appeals
- Conflicts of Interest

# COC PROGRAM COMPETITION BACKGROUND

- Provides a brief overview of the CoC NOFA
- Reviews need for CoC to review/rank projects
- Outlines role of various CoC decision-making bodies, such as Scoring Committee and CoC Board

# PROJECT PRIORITIZATION & RANKING POLICY

- Carried over the FY19 Prioritization of Projects document with minimal changes
- Assigns duties to Scoring Committee and provides a basic overview of areas for which projects will be reviewed, both renewal and new
- Most significant change: clarify which specific projects to be ranked in Tier 1
  - First-year renewals because CoC cannot reallocate these projects due to CoC NOFA rules or score the projects because they don't have a full year of data to review and score on
  - SSO-CE & HMIS because these projects fund the CoC's basic infrastructure. Projects will submit evaluations and be scored. Additionally, the CoC Board will look to conduct year-round monitoring.
- Ranking within tiers will be based on:
  - Scores from the DE-CoC scoring tool
  - Project performance
  - CoC priorities and local need

# NEW PROJECT SOLICITATION, EVALUATION & SELECTION

- Clarifies the process used to select new projects – no significant changes
- Outlines the documents to be submitted by applicants and general process for handling of the applications
- Assigns duties to HAD, the Scoring Committee and the CoC Board
  - HAD - collect and review for eligibility requirements
  - Scoring Committee - review eligibility; score projects; meet to make selection and ranking recommendations for Board
  - CoC Board - reviews Scoring Committee recommendations and makes final decisions regarding selection and ranking

## New project evaluation factors:

- Addresses an unmet need
- Quality of organization and management plan to administer project
- Capacity to operate project type using best practices
- Experience/capacity with grant administration
- Ability to move households into permanent housing
- Factors identified in RFP

# RENEWAL PROJECT EVALUATION

- Took description of process and clarified it further, working in threshold review items
- Outlines the documents to be submitted by applicants
- Assigns duties to HAD, the Scoring Committee and the CoC Board
  - HAD - collect and review for threshold requirements
  - Scoring Committee - evaluate all projects using scoring tools; make recommendations for ranking, reallocation and projects needing a Corrective Action Plan
  - CoC Board - reviews Scoring Committee recommendations and makes final decisions regarding reallocation, scoring and ranking
- Agencies provided with right to appeal scoring

## Renewal project evaluation factors:

- Meets renewal project threshold requirements
  - Application submission - all required materials submitted on time
  - Financials – no significant unresolved audit or monitoring findings and <0.25% funds recaptured
  - Compliance – follows CoC Interim Rule and HEARTH regulations, agency serving eligible clients and is eligible for CoC funds
- Performance – evaluated through use of evaluation and scoring tools



# REALLOCATION POLICY

- Revised the FY19 policy to provide more details regarding reallocation
- Voluntary reallocation
  - Voluntary reallocation process: Agency notifies CoC Lead Agency in writing stating reasons, CoC Lead Agency notifies and provides information to CoC Board
- Project does not meet threshold requirements OR CoC's established needs/priorities or HUD priorities
  - Scoring Committee determines which projects do not meet threshold and/or no longer meet needs or priorities of CoC and/or HUD and send list of recommended reallocations to CoC Board with reasons outlined
  - CoC Board meets to review reallocation recommendations and make final determination regarding reallocations, both full and partial
- Agencies provided with right to appeal reallocation decision

## REALLOCATION POLICY cont.

- Outlines process for using any reallocated funds
  - Board may allow agency that is voluntarily reallocating or where funds were reallocated due to the project no longer meeting CoC/HUD needs/priorities to use the funds for another CoC project
  - Otherwise funds will be released as new project funds and agencies operating in the DE CoC region will be able to bid on them
    - CoC may utilize the new project bidding/solicitation process used for the CoC Bonus funds
    - CoC may issue a separate bidding/solicitation process for the reallocated funds
- Recusal language
  - HAD cannot participate in discussions/deliberations regarding their own projects
  - CoC Board members with conflicts cannot participate in reallocation decisions

# APPEAL POLICY

- Created a general Appeal Policy instead of the policies being embedded in the Compliance and Evaluation Tools
- Appeals allowed for
  1. Project Scoring errors
  2. Reallocation of CoC funding (partial or full)
  3. Improper application/interpretation of HUD/CoC rules/regulations concerning the participation of the applicant in the CoC Application process
- Agencies will have 3 days from decision to submit appeal in writing using the CoC Funding Appeal Form
- CoC Board (non-conflicted members) will have 7 days to investigate, follow up with appellant and respond in writing.
  - Due to time constraints, this may be done electronically
- Agencies not satisfied can appeal to HUD in accordance with the directions provided in the pertinent CoC NOFA

# CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

- Embedded Conflict of Interest Policy in the document
- Provides examples of conflicts of interest that may arise
- Requires that CoC Board members complete the Conflict of Interest Form no less than annually and to disclose any conflicts that arise immediately
- Where there is a conflict, the CoC Board member with the conflict is barred from participating in discussion or voting on matters in which they have a conflict
- The CoC Lead Agency – HAD – is barred from from participating in discussion or voting on matters in which HAD receives funding

# CORRECTIVE ACTION PLANS

- Outlines process by which agencies are given a corrective action plan (CAP) for a project
- HAD responsible for assisting in developing the CAP, which will clearly identify performance issue(s), defined performance goal(s), specify activities needed to address performance issue(s) and by whom and set completion deadlines for activities
- Agency is responsible for implementing the changes to address performance issues
- HAD to meet w/agency to discuss CAP contents, plan , deadlines, etc.,
- HAD may provide additional TA and will perform regular check ins with agency
- Scoring Committee notified when agency placed on CAP and of continuing progress, and will use CAP information to inform funding recommendations

QUESTIONS?



# 2020 COC RENEWAL PROJECT EVALUATION & SCORING TOOLS

---

PSH

RRH

TH

TH-RRH

# RENEWAL PROJECT EVALUATION TOOLS

## Evaluation Tools:

- Specific tools for each project type
  - TH-RRH new this year
- Covers project performance
- Agencies will use pertinent tool to submit project data to CoC
  - Tables throughout which agencies will use to enter data
  - Spaces for narratives for some questions
- Agencies to use APR run by HAD and provided to them



# EVALUATION TOOLS: TOPICS COVERED & SCORING BY PROJECT TYPE

Criterion	PSH	RRH	TH	TH-RRH
Data Quality	10	10	10	10
Housing Stability	20	20	20	20
Average Length of Stay: Leavers	N/A	N/A	10	5
Average Length of Stay: Stayers	N/A	N/A	0	N/A
Income: Entry to Exit	5	15	10	10
Income: Entry to Annual Assessment for Stayers	0	0	0	0
Bed/Unit Utilization Rate	5 <small>(site-based only)</small>	N/A	5	5
Length of Time from Project Enrollment to Housing Move-In	N/A	10	N/A	10
Housing First	10	10	10	10
Low Barrier	10	10	10	10
Severity of Need: Rate of Adults Served with Disabling Condition	10	N/A	N/A	N/A
Severity of Need: Rate of households served fleeing DV	N/A	5	5	5
Severity of Need: Rate of Adults with \$0 cash income at entry	N/A	5	5	5
Participation in CoC Planning	5	5	5	5
Chronic Homeless Beds/Priority	10	N/A	N/A	N/A
Chronically Homeless Households Served	5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Support Services	10	10	10	5
Rate of Safety Plans (DV ONLY)	N/A	0	N/A	N/A
Cost Effectiveness	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

# AGENCY & PROJECT INFORMATION

- Covers general agency and project information
- Different project types ask for different information
- Be sure to complete all questions/tables
- Signed certification also needed

Data Element	Error Rate
Name (6a.2.Column F)	
SSN (6a.3. Column F)	
Date of Birth (6a.4. Column F)	
Race (6a.5. Column F)	
Ethnicity (6a.6. Column F)	
Gender (6a.7. Column F)	
Veteran Status (6b.2. Column C)	
Project Entry/Start Date (6b.3. Column C)	
Relationship to Head of Household (6b.4. Column C)	
Client Location (6b.5. Column C)	
Disabling Condition (6b.6. Column C)	
Destination (6c.2. Column C)	
Income at entry/start (6c.3. Column C)	
Income at annual assessment (6c.4. Column C)	
Income at exit (6c.5. Column C)	

## DATA QUALITY

### PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH

- Data elements included in APR Q6a, Q6b and Q6c
- Scoring: Project has less than 5% missing/refused/ don't know for data elements:
  - 10: all identified data elements meet <5% benchmark
  - 5: 10 -14 data elements meet <5% benchmark
  - 0: Fewer than 10 data elements meet <5% benchmark
- Differences from 2019:
  - Added "Income at Annual Assessment
  - Scoring changed from all or nothing

# HOUSING STABILITY

PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH

PSH

## 2. Housing Stability [20 points]

Rate of persons achieving housing stability (exiting to a positive housing destination or retained in project)

a.	Total number of persons exiting to positive housing destinations (23c.44):	
b.	Total persons whose destinations excluded them from the calculation (23c.45):	
c.	Number of leavers (5a.5.):	
d.	Number of stayers (5a.8.):	
e.	% of participants that achieved housing stability $((a - b) + d) / (c + d)$ :	

RRH, TH,  
TH-RRH

## 2. Housing Stability [20 Points]

Rate of participants who achieved housing stability

a.	Total number of persons exiting to positive housing destinations (23c.44):	
b.	Total persons whose destinations excluded them from the calculation (23c.45):	
c.	Number of leavers (5a.5.):	
d.	Percentage (of persons exiting to positive housing destination) (23c.46):	

# HOUSING STABILITY

## PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH

- Rate of persons achieving housing stability: exiting to a positive housing destination  
AND FOR PSH ONLY retained in project
- Scoring - 20: > 80%; 10: 79%-70%; 5: 69%-65%; 0: <65%
- APR Q5a and Q23c (previously, data pulled from two APR tables, Q23a and Q23b, that have been discontinued)
- Persons whose destinations excluded them from the Percentage calculation include those who exited to the following destinations:
  - Foster care home or group foster care home
  - Hospital or other residential non-psychiatric medical facility
  - Long-term care facility or nursing home
  - Deceased
- No significant changes from 2019

# LENGTH OF STAY

## TH, TH-RRH

- APR Q22c – using the Average Days for Length of Stay
  - Average Length of Stay for Leavers is scored
  - New for 2020 - collecting data on Average Length of Stay for Stayers but is unscored
- Scoring
  - TH - 10: < 180 days; 5: 180 - 365 days; 0: > 365 days
  - TH-RRH - 5: < 180 days; 2.5: 180 - 365 days; 0: > 365 days

### 3. Length of Stay [10 points]

Average length of stay in the project for leavers

a.	Average Length of Stay for Leavers (in Days) (22b, Column B, Row 2):	
----	--	--

#### **\*\*Not Scored for FY2020:\*\***

Average length of stay in the project for stayers

b.	Average Length of Stay for Leavers (in Days) (22b, Column C, Row 2):	
----	--	--

# INCREASED INCOME LEAVERS

PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH

PSH

### 3. Increased or Maintained Income [5 points]

± Rate of adult participants who increased or maintained cash income from entry to exit

a.	Number of adult leavers (5a.6):	
b.	Number of Adult Leavers with Any Income who Retained Income Category and Same \$ at Exit as at Start (19a.2., column 4/D, row 6):	
c.	Number of Adult Leavers with Any Income who Gained or Increased Income from Start to Exit (19a.2., column I/9, row 6):	
d.	Rate of adult leavers who maintained or increased income from Entry to Exit (b + c) / (a):	

RRH, TH,  
TH-RRH

### 3. Increased Income

Rate of adults who increased income from any source, from project entry to exit

a.	Number of adult leavers (5a.6):	
b.	Number of Adult Leavers with Any Income who Gained or Increased Income from Start to Exit (19a.2., column I/9, row 6):	
c.	Rate of adult leavers who maintained or increased income from Entry to Exit (b / a):	

# INCREASED INCOME STAYERS

PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH

PSH

**\*\* Not Scored for FY2020:\*\***

Rate of adults who maintained or increased cash income from any source, from project entry to annual assessment

a.	Number of adult stayers (5a.8):	
b.	Number of adult Number of adult stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment (16.12):	
c.	Number of Adult Stayers with Any Income who Retained Income Category and Same \$ at Exit as at Start (19a.1., column 4/D, row 6):	
d.	Number of Adult Stayers with Any Income who Gained or Increased Income from Start to Exit (19a.1., column I/9, row 6):	
e.	Rate of adult stayers who maintained or increased income from Entry to Exit (c + d) / (a - b):	

**\*\*Not Scored for FY2020:\*\***

Rate of adults who increased cash income from any source, from project entry to annual assessment

a.	Number of adult stayers (5a.8):	
b.	Number of adult Number of adult stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment (16.12):	
c.	Number of Adult Stayers with Any Income who Gained or Increased Income from Start to Exit (19a.1., column I/9, row 6):	
d.	Rate of adult stayers who maintained or increased income from Entry to Exit (c) / (a - b):	

RRH, TH,  
TH-RRH



# INCREASED INCOME

## PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH

- Rate of ADULT LEAVERS who increased their income AND FOR PSH ONLY maintained income
- Scoring
  - PSH: 5: 100%-85%; 3: 84%-70%; 0: <70%
  - RRH: 15: >80%; 10: 80%-50%; 5: 49%-30%; 0: <30%
  - TH/TH-RRH: 10: >50%; 5: 50%-30%; 0: <30%
- APR Q5a and Q19a2
- New - will gather data on income increases for STAYERS but it will be UNSCORED
  - APR Q5a, Q19a1 and Q16
  - Stayers who are not yet due for annual assessment will be excluded

# BED/UNIT UTILIZATION

## PSH, TH & TH-RRH

- This data will be pulled from CMIS
- For PSH, Unit Utilization; for TH & TH-RRH, Bed Utilization
- Scoring
  - 5: 100%-85%; 3: 84%-65%; 0:<65%



### **Bed/Unit Utilization Rate [5 Points]**

*Your project's bed utilization rate for the calendar year 2019 will be calculated by Housing Alliance Delaware using data from CMIS. You do not need to respond to this question.*

**Length of Time from Project Enrollment to Housing Move-In [10 Points]**

Use the data in APR Q22c and Q5a to complete the chart below.

A	B	C	D
Length of Time from start date to Permanent Housing Move-In	Total # of people (22.c.)	Total # of people served in project (5a.1.)	Rate of people housed within given timeframe (B/C)
Less than 30 days			
Less than 60 days <i>(including the "less than 30 days" cohort)</i>			
Greater than 60 days			
Data Not Collected			

**LENGTH OF TIME FROM PROJECT ENROLLMENT TO MOVE IN  
RRH, TH-RRH**

- Rate of persons housed within 30 days and 60 days
- Scoring
  - % PERSONS HOUSED WITHIN 30 DAYS - 10: 40%+
  - % PERSONS HOUSED WITHIN 60 DAYS - 5: 40%+
- APR Q5a and Q22c

# HOUSING FIRST

PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH

- Agency to submit policies and procedures
- Policies and procedures and narrative to be reviewed by Scoring Committee
- Scoring description updated
  - 10: Agency answers Yes to the Evaluation Tool housing first question, AND detailed description of program policies, procedures, and approach are provided that clearly align with housing first and it is reflected in attached policies and procedures;
  - 5: Agency answers Yes to Evaluation Tool housing first question, BUT description lacks specific policies, procedures, and approach, and/or policies and procedures do not clearly reflect housing first;
  - 0: The agency answers No to the Evaluation Tool housing first question.

### Housing First [10 Points]

Does your project have policies and procedures in place that ensure program staff follow a Housing First model, offers quick access to permanent housing with permanent housing as the primary focus, without preconditions such as programmatic compliance, clinical treatment, sobriety, etc., and does not terminate housing assistance for reasons outside of what would be in a standard lease agreement.

Yes

No

If yes, this must be clearly reflected in the project's policies and procedures in order to receive full credit.

**Explanation:** Please provide a detailed explanation below of how your project utilizes a housing first approach when working with clients served by the project. Please make reference to specific policies, procedures, or clinical/programmatic approaches adopted and in place at the project-level that clearly reflect housing first.

Enter text here

# LOW BARRIER ACCESS

PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH

- Agency to submit policies and procedures
- Policies and procedures and narrative to be reviewed by Scoring Committee
- Scoring description updated
  - 10: Agency answers Yes to the Evaluation Tool low barrier access question, AND description clearly reflects low barriers to entry and policies and procedures clearly reflect this;
  - 5: Agency answers Yes to the Evaluation Tool low barrier access question, BUT description and/or policies and procedures do not clearly reflect low barriers to entry;
  - 0: The agency answers No to the Evaluation Tool low barrier access question.

## Low Barrier Access [10 Points]

Does your project provide low barrier access to services and housing assistance for all clients eligible for assistance, regardless of income, active or history of substance abuse, criminal records (with the exception of state mandates), etc.?

Yes

No

If yes, this must be clearly reflected in the project's policies and procedures in order to receive full credit.

**Explanation:** Please provide a detailed description of the policies and procedures in place that ensure clients are not screened out of being able to access assistance due to programmatic preconditions.

Enter text here

**Severity of Need: Rate of Adults Served with Disabling Condition [10 points]**

Rate of adult participants with 1 or more disabling conditions.

a.	Adults Without Children with 1 Condition (13a2., Column C/3, Row 3)	
b.	Adults Without Children with 2 Conditions (13a2., Column C/3, Row 4)	
c.	Adults Without Children with 3+ Conditions (13a2., Column C/3, Row 5)	
d.	Adults Without Children with Condition Unknown (13a2., Column C/3, Row 6)	
e.	Total Adults Without Children (13a2., Column C/3, Row 9)	
f.	Adults in HH with Children & Adults with 1 Condition (13a2., Column D/4, Row 3)	
g.	Adults in HH with Children & Adults with 2 Conditions (13a2., Column D/4, Row 4)	
h.	Adults in HH with Children & Adults with 3+ Conditions (13a2., Column D/4, Row 5)	
i.	Adults in HH with Children & Adults with Condition Unknown (13a2., Column D/4, Row 6)	
j.	Total Adults in HH with Children & Adults (13a2., Column D/4, Row 9)	
k.	Rate of adult participants with 1 or more disabling conditions $(a + b + c + d + f + g + h + i) / (e + j)$	

## SEVERITY OF NEED: DISABLING CONDITIONS PSH

- Does not apply to TH anymore
- Rate of adults with 1+ Disabling Conditions at START
- APR Q8a - # households of each household type served
- APR Q13a2 - table significantly changed from prior APR
- Scoring – different from 2019
  - Projects primarily serving Adult-Child Households - 10: 100%-80%; 5: 79%-60%; 0: <60%;
  - Projects primarily serving Adult-Only Households - 10: 100%-90%; 5: 89%-80%; 0: <80%

# SEVERITY OF NEED: FLEEING DV

## RRH, TH, TH-RRH

- Rate of adults/heads of households Fleeing DV (at Project Start)
- Scoring: 5: >5%; 3: 5%-2%; 0: <2%
- APR Q5a and Q14b (make sure you don't use Q14a)

### Severity of Need: Rate of households served fleeing domestic violence [5 Points]

a.	Total Heads of Households and Adults Who Reported Yes (14b.2):	
b.	Number of adults (5a.2):	
c.	Rate of HHs fleeing DV (a / b):	

# SEVERITY OF NEED: ZERO INCOME AT ENTRY

## RRH, TH & TH-RRH

- Rate of adults with \$0 cash income at Project Start
- APR Q5a and Q16
- Scoring: 5: >20%; 3: 20%-10%; 0: <10%

### Severity of Need: Rate of Adults served with \$0 cash income at entry [5 Points]

a.	Total Adults No Income <u>At</u> Project Start (16, Column B/2, Row 2):	
b.	Number of adults (5a.2):	
c.	Rate of Adult with no income at project start (a / b):	



**Participation in CoC Planning [5 Points]**

Does your agency have an individual with voting membership on the Delaware CoC?

Yes  No

How many quarterly CoC membership meetings did a representative of your agency attend in 2019 and 2020?:

For each meeting attended, please provide the date of attendance.

Date(s) Attended:

# PARTICIPATION IN COC PLANNING

PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH

- Agency status as Voting Member and # of CoC membership meetings attended
- Data provided by agency in Evaluation Tool to be checked against CoC records or agency can contact CoC for data
- Scoring - 5: Voting member + 4 CoC membership meetings; 2: No voting member, but 2+ membership meetings; 0: No voting member & <2 CoC membership meetings

# SUPPORT SERVICES

PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH

- Agency to submit response on Evaluation Tool
- Agency response to be reviewed by Scoring Committee
- Scoring description
  - PSH, RRH, TH - 10 points/ TH-RRH - 5 points: Support services provided are at sufficient capacity (e.g. client/staff ratio), best practices are utilized, voluntary services model is clearly implemented, services provided are housing focused and able to meet the services needs of the clients;
  - PSH, RRH, TH - 5 points/ TH-RRH - 3 points: Support services are provided but it is not clear how well services implemented;
  - 0 points: There are serious concerns about the capacity of the project to provide sufficient support services to clients in the housing program.

## Support Services

Please describe the service delivery model used in this project. How does this project provide all clients with access to the support services they need to obtain or maintain permanent housing, and the types of support services offered. Please be specific and include, case manager to client ratio, how clients are connected to the support services they need (referred to outside agency, on-site, etc), and the type of service offered in detail.

Enter text here

# CHRONIC HOMELESS PRIORITY

## PSH

- PSH ONLY: Percent of beds dedicated (or prioritized) to chronically homeless
- Scoring: 10: 100%-80%; 5: 79%-60%; 0: <60%

### Chronic Homeless Priority [10 points]

Rate of project beds dedicated or prioritized for chronically homeless

a.	Total number of CoC-funded beds in project:	
b.	Number of beds dedicated to serving the chronically homeless:	
c.	Number of beds prioritized for the chronically homeless upon turnover	
d.	Rate of project beds for the chronically homeless (b + c) / a	

**Chronically Homeless Households Served [5 Points]**

Rate of chronically homeless households served

a.	Number of Chronically Homeless Persons by Household (26.b)	
b.	Number of adult heads of households (5a.14)	
c.	Rate of chronically homeless households served (a / b)	

If your project served households that do not meet the chronic homeless definition according to the project's APR data, please use the space below to provide an explanation of the reason for each non-chronic household served and include the CMIS ID# for each household in your explanation. This information will be checked against Centralized Intake records and CMIS data and, if appropriate, the rate of chronically homeless households served will be adjusted.

Enter text here

**CHRONICALLY HOMELESS  
HOUSEHOLDS SERVED  
PSH**

- PSH ONLY: Percent of chronically homeless households served
- Scoring: 5: 100%-90%; 2: 89%-80%; 0: <80%
- APR Q5a and Q26b
- Agency may provide comments regarding non-chronic served in project

# COST EFFECTIVENESS

PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH

- Agency to submit response on Evaluation Tool
- Scoring Committee to review
- Not Scored

### 13. Cost Effectiveness [Not Scored]

Total CoC Renewal Grant	# of clients that exited to permanent housing in CY2019 (including adults and children)	Cost/ PH Outcome
\$		

Total CoC Renewal Grant	# of client served in CY2019 (including adults and children)	Cost/Client Served
\$		

# RATE OF PROJECT HOUSEHOLDS WITH SAFETY PLAN

## DV RRH ONLY

- DV-Serving RRH ONLY: Rate of project households with a safety plan
- Agency to submit response on Evaluation Tool
- Scoring Committee to review responses
- New, Not Scored for 2020

### **DV Projects Only – Rate of Project Households with Safety Plan [Not Scored]**

Provide the percentage of households in DV-serving RRH projects with whom staff have completed a safety plan:

**CoC Funds (FY2019 Contract Amounts)**

<b>Leasing</b>	\$
<b>Rental Assistance</b>	\$
<b>Supportive Services</b>	\$
<b>Operating Costs</b>	\$
<b>HMIS</b>	\$
<b>Admin</b>	\$
<b>Total Amount Requested</b>	\$

- New table for agencies to fill out regarding the project's CoC budget
- All BLIs should be included
- CoC Funds should be amounts awarded under the FY19 contract

**PROGRAM BUDGET  
PSH, RRH, TH, TH-RRH**

QUESTIONS?





**THANK YOU  
& GOOD LUCK!!**

---

Reach out to Erin if you need help!

