

2014-2015 Board of Director Project Scoring Tool

Each COC-funded project will be ranked using the WI BOS Project Scoring Tool. The scoring criteria is based on performance – as reported on the e-snaps Annual Performance Report (APR), last calendar year Quarterly APR submission, and timely completion of COC goals. The maximum possible number of points a project can earn varies based on type.*

- Transitional Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing, and Shelter Plus Care can earn a maximum of 39 points.
- Safe Haven can earn a maximum of 34 points.
- Supportive Service Only can earn a maximum of 34 points.
- DV projects can earn a maximum of 31 points.

Where do the points come from?

Part 1	APR, Money Returned, Unit Utilization, and Data Quality	16 pts.	From FY APR submitted to HUD	41% of total
Part 2	PIT, QAPR, & Competition	8 pts.	COC Compliance	20% of total
Part 3	HUD Performance Measures: Housing Stability, Increase Earned Income, Increase Non-Earned Income, Mainstream Benefits	12 pts.	From QAPR #4 (calendar 2013) unless there was an ESNAPS APR submitted for the project in 2014.	31% of total
Part 4	High Risk Pool Score	3 pts.	From HMIS calculation 1/1/12 – 12/31/13	8% of total

Point Breakdown:

***Part 1: 16 points possible*

Criteria	3 points	2 points	1 points	0 points
APR submitted timely to HUD	On time	Less than 1 week late	Between 1 week – 1 month late	More than 1 month late
Money Returned to HUD	0% of grant returned	0.1% - 2.9% of grant returned	3% - 5.9% of grant returned	More than 6% of grant returned

Criteria	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point
Unit Utilization	100%	90 - 99%	80 - 89%	70 - 79%	Less than 69%
Data Quality: Don't Know, Missing, Refused	0% - 1.0%	1.1% - 2%	2.1% - 3%	3.1% - 4%	Greater than 4.1%

****Part 2: 8 points possible**

Criteria	Met	Not Met
COC Goal: Turn in initial January PIT data timely	1 point	0 points
COC Goal: Turn in initial July PIT data timely	1 point	0 points
COC Goal: Quarter 1 APR (2014) submitted on time	1 point	0 points
COC Goal: Quarter 2 APR (2014) submitted on time	1 point	0 points
COC Goal: Quarter 3 APR (2013) submitted on time	1 point	0 points
COC Goal: Quarter 4 APR (2013) submitted on time	1 point	0 points
Turned in Board requested information for the purposes of the competition on time	1 point	0 points
Turned in Exhibit 2 on time	1 point	0 points

****Part 3: 12 points possible**

Criteria	3 points	2 points	1 points	0 points
HUD Goal: Housing Stability (PSH) 80%+	90% or higher	80 – 89%	70 – 79%	Under 69%
HUD Goal: Housing Stability (non-PSH) 65%+	75% or higher	65 – 74%	55 – 64%	Under 54%
HUD Goal: Increase Earned Income (20%)	30% or higher	20-29%	10 – 19%	Under 9%
HUD Goal: Increase Other (Non-Earned) Income (54%)	54% or higher	35 – 53%	20 – 34%	Under 19%
HUD Goal: Increase Mainstream Benefits (56%)	65% or higher	56 – 64%	45 – 55%	Under 44%

****Part 4: 3 points possible**

Criteria	3 points	2 points	1 points
High Risk Pool Score (TH/SH)	Rank 1-7	Rank 8-14	Rank 15-19
High Risk Pool Score (PSH/S+C)	Rank 1-4	Rank 5-8	Rank 9-11
High Risk Pool Score (SSO)	n/a	Rank 1-2	Rank 3-4

***Exceptions:**

There are a few projects that have different maximum points possible, and therefore are exceptions to this general rule.

- (1) HMIS grant will be placed on Tier 1.
- (2) Washington PSH started 6/1/14 and will be placed at the bottom of Tier 1.
- (3) New projects awarded in the FY14 Competition are not included in the ranking as they are not yet renewals.
 - ADVOCAP PSH
 - Western Dairyland PSH
 - WI Balance of State Planning Grant

Penalty Points will be awarded as follows:

Criteria	Subtract
Non-Participation by COC Funded agency in overnight Street Count during the January PIT	10 points
Late submission of Final Deadline for January PIT data	15 points
Non-Participation by COC Funded agency in overnight Street Count during the July PIT	10 points
Late submission of Final Deadline for July PIT data	15 points

Tiebreaker:

Once the total number of points are calculated, the number of points earned will be divided by the total possible points for that project type. The resulting percentage will be placed in descending order, highest at top and lowest at bottom. If there is a tie between projects, a tiebreaker score will be used.

The tiebreaker score will be based on cost effectiveness. This is the same measure that was used two years ago. The total HUD grant award amount will be divided by the number of successful outcomes (leaving to permanent housing).

Example

A program gets \$100,000 grant. 25 households successfully went to permanent housing. The cost per successful outcome is: \$4,000.