

## 2013 HUD Grantee SuperNOFA Ranking and Review Process

### Background

The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) released the FY 13 Super Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) on Friday, November 22<sup>nd</sup>. The NOFA states that communities are again required to submit a tiered ranking such that a set of “Tier 2” grants may be defunded, depending on appropriations made by Congress to HUD. This year’s Tier 2 must account for 5% of the Continuum of Care’s Annual Renewal Demand (versus 3.5% last year, though all were funded). HUD offers little guidance in terms of how programs should be ranked or categorized. However, HUD stressed that decisions should be data-driven and strategic, based on the community’s needs and priorities. HUD is also encouraging all communities to prepare to meet the HEARTH Act requirements, which sets a goal of “ensuring that individuals and families who become homeless return to permanent housing within 30 days.” HEARTH also calls for the Continuum of Care to be more involved in prioritizing projects and approving the application.

In 2012, the ranking process was based on the following criteria, each of which HUD has consistently identified as priorities and areas to monitor.

- Completeness/ congruence of HMIS data
- Maintenance of or increase in income among adults in the program
- Exits to permanent housing (from Transitional housing)
- Program stability (in Permanent Supportive Housing)

### Proposed Ranking Criteria for 2013

Working off the goals as outlined in the Strategic Plan as well as the criteria identified last year, The Community Partnership and the Strategic Planning Committee of the Interagency Council on Homelessness (ICH) is proposing the following criteria in order to determine the rank order of grants including those to be put into the Tier 2 category.

Criteria	Total possible value	Details	HUD Target
Data quality in HMIS	100	% of fields complete on Client Profile (i.e. 95% completeness = score of 95)	90%
Increase in income from benefits and/or employment	100	% of adult program participants whose income increased while in program (i.e. 45% of adults increase income = score of 45)	50%
Exits to Permanent Housing from either Transitional Housing OR	200	% of participants who exit that move to permanent or permanent supportive housing i.e. 50% = score of 100 (2 x 50)	65%

Permanent Supportive Housing		NOTE: If no one has exited, the score will be 200. Exits due to death will be factored out (removed from numerator and denominator) so that it has a neutral impact on scoring.	
For Transitional Housing (TH) – Length of stay for those who have exited  OR  For Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), % of participants remaining stably housed	150	For TH – the average for those leaving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 1 year = 150 pts</li> <li>• 1 year to 18 months = 100 pts</li> <li>• 18 months to two years = 50 pts</li> <li>• Over 2 years = 0 points</li> </ul> For PSH, the % of participants in PSH who remained housed in PSH. i.e. 95% = score of 190 (2 x 95)	Leaving TH – 18 months          Stability in PSH – 90%
<b>Total possible score</b>	<b>550</b>		

Data will be pulled from the HMIS for the time period of November 1, 2012 to October 31, 2013 to perform the ranking for the NOFA.

Based on the dollar target that HUD provides, the lowest rated programs will be placed tentatively into Tier 2. Additional considerations for Tier 2 programs will include:

- The opportunity for each program to provide a narrative with any special considerations (i.e. a small sample size that influenced a poor score, etc.).
- History of past performance (i.e. did the program have a bad year or has it historically been ranked low).
- For those programs with a long average length of stay, look at the success of placement into permanent housing.
- Cost per exit to permanent housing with the numerator being the number of participants who exited and the denominator being the HUD grant plus required match.
- Generally Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing programs should not be placed in Tier 2.

At this time, given the gaps in a variety of populations, the Committee did not prioritize any particular population as being in more or less need of continuation (i.e. veterans, youth, families, etc.).

### **Ranking Criteria in Future Years**

After this year’s process is complete, there shall be further conversation about the ranking criteria and the process for decision-making in order to continue to bring DC’s HUD portfolio in line with HEARTH requirements. Future ranking criteria may include:

- Whether or not programs accept families and individuals through the coordinated intake process. For 2014, the singles system is working on a developing a coordinated intake and assessment process per HEARTH requirements. The family system is also working on ways to more closely tie HUD funded programs into the family coordinated intake and assessment process.
- Whether programs target chronically homeless families and individuals in their permanent supportive housing programs.
- The rate at which families or individuals return to homelessness over a longer time period.
- Other criteria that may be developed that will help bring DC in line with HEARTH.

### **Review Process**

The Community Partnership for the Prevention of Homelessness (TCP), as the Collaborative Applicant and Lead Agency, will pull data from HMIS for an initial ranking. They will provide an initial recommendation of programs to be included in Tier 2 funding, or various options. Programs in Tier 2 (approximately bottom 10 programs) will be provided an opportunity to submit a narrative response. Representatives from TCP will present recommendations but shall not have a vote.

The Review Committee will be delegated authority by the Interagency Council on Homelessness to review the recommendations by TCP and make a final decision as to the ranking for the application. The Committee would include the following:

- Director of the Department of Human Services or his designee.
- Representatives of the ICH Executive Committee who do not have a conflict of interest based on receipt of HUD funding through the SuperNOFA process.
- Other interested and knowledgeable individuals in the community who also do not have a conflict of interest with receipt of HUD funding through the SuperNOFA process, as approved by the Co-Chairs of the Executive Committee. Interested individuals should submit an email to Director David Berns at [david.berns@dc.gov](mailto:david.berns@dc.gov) by December 15, 2013 with their interest and verifying that there is not a conflict of interest.

The Review Committee, if the motion is approved by the ICH, will meet on December 18, 2013 at 3:30 at DHS, 64 New York Ave, NE.