

**Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Continuum of Care  
2015 Renewal Project Performance Rating Factors Rubric<sup>i</sup>**

*The Renewal Project Performance Rating Factors Rubric was adopted by the Homeless Council for use in prior CoC competitions and updated in 2015 to reflect current HUD CoC policy/program requirements, CoC performance measures, and APR questions/data. The majority of data collected for this process comes from the HMIS APR and the data reflects project performance between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015, for Transitional Housing (TH), Permanent Housing (PH), and Supportive Service Only (SSO) projects.*

<b>Threshold Review</b>	The WS/FC Rating Panel conducts a threshold review of each project prior to performance rating to make sure it meets eligibility requirements as stated in the <i>Notice of Funding Availability for the 2015 Continuum of Care Program Competition FR-5900-N-25</i> .
-------------------------	--

Rating Factor	Explanation of Rating Factor	Points			
		0	2	4	6
1a. Housing Performance -- <b>TH projects</b> : % of "Persons exiting to permanent housing (subsidized or unsubsidized) during the operating year."	Actual # of persons exiting to permanent housing divided by the total # of persons served by the program during the operating year (CoC Project Performance Measure, APR item 36b, Measure 1)	<10%	10-39%	40-65%	>65%
1b. Housing Performance -- <b>PH projects</b> : % of participants achieving housing stability OR "The % of persons who remained in the permanent housing program as of the end of the operating year or exited to permanent housing (subsidized or unsubsidized) during the operating year."	[# who remained in PSH + # who exited to other PH] divided by [# of persons who exited PH project + # of persons who did not leave the project (i.e., total # served in operating year)] (CoC Project Performance Measure, APR item 36a, Measure 1; CoC Objective 2)	<80%	80-89%	90-99%	100%
1c. Additional Performance – <b>CIC/SSO projects</b> : % of households presenting at coordinated CIC for whom Assessment Team Housing Plans are developed and presented to them.	Actual # of households who have a Housing Plan developed and presented to them by CIC divided by the total # of households served by the program during the operating year				>95%

Rating Factor	Explanation of Rating Factor	Points			
		0	1	2	3
2. Total Income -- <b>TH projects:</b> % of Adult participants who Increased Total Income <b>PH projects:</b> % of Adult participants who Maintained or Increased Total Income <b>CIC/SSO projects:</b> N/A	TH: The % of participants age 18 or older who increased their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the operating year or program exit. (CoC Project Performance Measure, APR item 36b, Measure 2a) PH: The % of participants age 18 or older who maintained or increased their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the operating year or program exit. (CoC Project Performance Measure, APR item 36a, Measure 2a)	<20%	20-40%	41-60%	>60%
3. % of Adult participants who Increased Employment Income	Employment Income: The # of Adults who had “Retained Income Category and Increased \$ at Follow-up/Exit” OR “Did Not Have Income Category at Entry and Gained it at Follow-up/Exit”. (Leavers & Stayers) divided by Total # of Adults Served (APR Q24b3)	0%	1-15%	16-39%	>39%
4. % of Adult participants who Increased Cash Income from Sources Other Than Employment	Income Other Than Employment: # of Adults who had “Retained Income Category and Increased \$ at Follow-up/Exit” OR “Did Not Have Income Category at Entry and Gained it at Follow-up/Exit”. (Leavers & Stayers) divided by Total # of Adults Served (APRQ24b3)	<11%	11-25%	26-39%	>39%
5. % of Participants with 1+ Sources of Non-Cash Income at Exit	[# of all participants (adults and children) with 1+Source of non-cash benefit]/[# of all leavers (adults and children)] from APRQ26a2. Leavers Only (Tab K - Q 26 Column B, Row 25)/(Tab K - Q 26 Column B, Row 28)	<41%	41-61%	62-85%	>85%
6a. % of Chronically Homeless Participants Served	# of CH participants served by project/ total # of participants served by project	<26%	26-50%	51-75%	>75%
6b. CH Bed Prioritization for <b>PSH projects not dedicated to CH Participants</b>	% of non-dedicated CH beds prioritized for CH participants	0-49%	50-99%	100%	
7. HMIS Project Data Completeness (DV excluded) - 2015 rubric includes 2 HMIS grades for each project, with each grade evaluated across the 3-point scale (see next column for details)	Rating of data completeness from 0252 Data Completeness Report Card (DCRC) HUD UDE ONLY Grade for first 11 elements to account for client data entry prior to Oct. 1, 2014	<88%	88-94.99%	95-98.99%	>99%
	Rating of data completeness from 0252 Data Completeness Report Card (DCRC) HUD UDE ONLY Grade for all 18 elements to account for transition to new data standards effective Oct. 1, 2014	<88%	88-94.99%	95-98.99%	>99%

Rating Factor	Explanation of Rating Factor	Points			
		0	1	2	3
8a. Cost per PH Success – <b>TH &amp; SSO projects</b>	TH: Grant dollars/PH Exit (i.e., # of participants exiting to PH from 1a); SSO: Grant dollars/Housing Plan Success (i.e., # of hh with housing plan from 1c)	>\$5,000	\$2,000-5,000	\$1,000-1,999	<\$1000
8b. Cost per PH Success – <b>PH projects</b>	PH: Grant dollars/PH Success (i.e., # of participants achieving housing stability from 1b)	>\$9,000	\$6,001-9,000	\$3,000-6,000	<\$3,000

Rating Factor	Explanation of Rating Factor	Points			
		0	2	4	6
9. Housing First/Low Barrier Project	Project quickly moves participants into PH and has NO barriers for participation.	NO			YES

**Total possible points for projects:** 33 Points for SSO; 36 Points for TH; 30 Points for DV TH; 36 Points for PH; 38 Points for non-dedicated CH PSH; and Minus 3 Points if Rating Factor 5 is N/A.

**Tiebreaker: Rating Panel Member Grant Application Scores**

<sup>i</sup> Performance Ranking is used to rank projects within their individual project type. The WS/FC Rating Panel approved on June 24, 2015, the following priority order for ranking projects by project type, and then performance ranking is used within each project type category. On October 15, 2015, the WS/FC Rating Panel approved and further clarified that Category 6 is for 2015 Bonus Projects.

**2015 CoC Project Type Priority Order Ranking**

- 1 System Information (HMIS—required by HUD for all agencies receiving HUD funding)
- 2 System Coordination (Coordinated Intake and Assessment now required by HUD)
- 3 Permanent supportive housing for the disabled homeless
- 4 Rapid Re-Housing
- 5 Other supportive and transitional services
- 6 Bonus Projects
- 7 Planning project (excluded from tiering)