

Pikes Peak Continuum of Care CoC Competition Ranking & Prioritization Process

Purpose: The Pikes Peak Continuum of Care (CoC) ranking and prioritization protocols are the foundation of a transparent decision-making process for projects submitted through the HUD CoC Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) competition. The process was designed to promote the submission and competitive ranking of projects that serve both CoC and HUD priorities with the intent of promoting successful housing solutions and leveraging maximum funds available.

The process will focus on HUD CoC NOFA Competition priorities. Additionally, maximizing application of Housing First principles and increasing Rapid Re-Housing and Permanent Supportive Service resources will be considered.

Decision-Making Collective:

- I. Review of previous year's process: Following the conclusion of the previous year's CoC NOFA competition, a survey will be sent to all participating agencies asking for feedback on the process. Review of the process with feedback received will be a part of the process for ensuing years.
- II. Committee Membership: An open invitation for Ranking & Prioritization (R&P) committee members will be made in the spring prior to the anticipated release of the current year's CoC NOFA. Goals for committee membership include (1) housing and supportive service experts, (2) service provider applicants, and (3) non-provider CoC members, including Governing Board members..
- III. Decision-Making Responsibility: While service providers/applicants are key to the work of the CoC and provide needed expertise during the review of projects, a sub-committee of the R&P committee, comprised of non-provider CoC members, will be designated to perform the final R&P of projects. This independence will help mitigate potential conflicts of interest. Additionally, non-provider CoC Governing Board members will provide the final review and approval of the sub-committee project ranking.
- IV. Pre-Competition Planning: Prior to the application being posted in *e-snaps*, interested R&P (NOFA) committee non-provider members and all service providers will be invited to a meeting to discuss the R&P process for the upcoming NOFA release. This first step will be designed to promote collective input into the decision-making process and build the framework to guide the ranking and prioritization. Items covered include but are not limited to:
 - Overview of HUD NOFA process and guidance
 - Review/revision of CoC Renewal and New Project Evaluation tools
 - Creation of CoC NOFA timeline draft
 - Discussion of performance factors, weighting, text contributors, and other issues
- V. HUD Competition Training/Preparation: To best prepare the committee for the responsibilities of project submission and ranking, CoC members and R&P committee

members, in particular, will be encouraged to familiarize themselves with the HUD process and priorities through a variety of training exposures such as:

- Monthly Governing Board and CHAP Membership meeting updates
- Self-guided training materials routinely posted on HUD Exchange
- Self-guided training materials routinely posted on PPUW website as they become available www.ppunitedway.org
- Project applicants (providers) and R&P committee members will be invited to attend one or more mandatory meeting(s) scheduled once the application is posted in e-snaps. The following information will be discussed:
 - o Consolidated Application amounts
 - o Current CoC NOFA Competition documents
 - o Final Timeline and deadlines
 - o Current NOFA Evaluation Tool for Renewal and New Project Applications
 - o Open discussion on actions to support the application

Application Process:

- I. Timeline: Once the HUD CoC NOFA competition opens, a final timeline will be created scheduling the weeks of the competition to incorporate CoC and HUD deadlines for the competition.
- II. New Project Solicitation/Evaluation:
 - An updated New Project Evaluation form will be used for New Projects being submitted for the NEW Bonus funding opportunity if Bonus funding is available. This form includes the rubric for project scoring/evaluation.
 - Letters of Interest (LOI):
 - o Request for LOI's for new projects will be issued
 - o LOI's reviewed by the CoC Administrator (Pikes Peak United Way) with projects deemed eligible will be asked to submit the New Project Evaluation form. New projects will be scored using the New Project Evaluation form rubric. Approved projects and amounts will be included in NOFA R&P process.
- III. Renewal Project Evaluation:
 - o An updated NOFA Evaluation Tool for Renewal Project Applications form will be available for all Renewal Projects to submit.
 - o Projects awarded for the first time in the most recent previous HUD CoC NOFA, that have not been operational for 12 months will not be required to submit a current NOFA Evaluation Tool for Renewal Project Applications form. The New Project Evaluation and New Project Application submitted with the previous years competition will be considered in the final R&P of these renewal projects. (See Ranking & Prioritization Committee Process: III Ranking Protocol.)
 - o Evaluation Tool uses base points spread across various categories.

- Feedback will be solicited after the CoC Consolidated Application is submitted for consideration in the evolution of the Evaluation form for the next CoC NOFA Competition
- Completed Renewal Project Evaluations along with the Annual Performance Report (APR) for the common reporting period will be due by deadline in timeline.
- Copies of the completed Evaluation and APR's will be sent to the R&P non-providers for review.
- Once the CoC Administrator has reviewed Evaluations and APR's and created preliminary scores, the preliminary scores will be sent to the R&P non-providers for review and verification of score. Once verified, individual preliminary scores will be transmitted to all applicants.

IV. Project Entry into HUD e-SNAPS:

Applicants will submit their HUD project application in the HUD e-snaps system by deadline in timeline.

V. Appeals Process Overview:

Applicants who have specific concerns regarding the review and scoring of their evaluation may file an appeal. **NOTE:** *Appeals will only be considered in cases where applicants have concerns specific to the process of reviewing and scoring of their evaluation.* All notices of appeal must be based on the information submitted by the Evaluation due date. No new, additional or omitted information will be considered during an appeal.

A notice to appeal must include a written statement specifying in detail each issue of appeal. The appeal must be signed by an individual authorized to act on behalf the agency submitting the appeal (i.e., Executive Director or his/her designated representative) and must highlight/cite the specific section(s) of the evaluation on which the appeal is based. The appealing agency must specify facts and evidence sufficient for the R&P Non-Provider Sub-Committee to determine the validity of the appeal. More specifically, the appeal must explain the specific areas of the evaluation being appealed and must clearly explain why the information provided is adequate to gain additional points in project scoring.

VI. Appeals Process:

- After the CoC's preliminary score has been individually transmitted to all NOFA applicants, an agency wishing to appeal must do so in writing to the chairman of the Non-Provider Sub-Committee no later than 5 p.m. the day after the preliminary score was transmitted.
- The Non-Provider Sub-Committee will convene and review/evaluate all notices of appeal to determine whether the appeal request meets the criteria for a legitimate appeal (i.e. based on facts and evidence sufficient to determine the validity of the appeal)

- If an appeal is considered legitimate, the Non-Provider Sub-Committee will adjust the preliminary score accordingly, and proceed to the Ranking and Prioritization Meeting with the post appeals final score of all projects.
- At the Final R&P meeting, project applicants will have the opportunity to present a short 5 minute presentation about their project to the entire committee. Once all presentations have been heard, the Applicants will be invited to leave the R&P meeting and the Non-Providers Sub-Committee will continue the ranking process.
- Final recommendation of the Ranking and Prioritization of projects will be decided by the Non-Provider Sub-Committee at the R&P meeting after project applicants have exited.
- Recommendation from the Non-Provider Sub-Committee of the Final Ranking and Prioritization list will be sent to the Governing Board for approval.

Ranking & Prioritization Committee Process:

- I. R&P Committee Meeting: A meeting will be convened to review project submissions and rank/prioritize projects for submission through the HUD NOFA competition. All project applicants will be invited to attend and present on their project.
- II. Materials and Tools: Review of the materials and tools including but not limited to:
 - Renewal project list showing our Annual Renewal Demand
 - New project list
 - Spreadsheet of **renewal** project scores by project category and final total score
 - Spreadsheet of **new** project scores by project category and final total score
 - Spreadsheet with first pass/baseline ranking based on scoring rubric (non-provider review)
 - Copies of both the renewal and new evaluation forms
 - Copy of the HUD Consolidated Application scoring
- III. Ranking Protocol:

A project ranking list will be generated from the scoring rubric designed by the R&P Committee and approved by the CoC Governing Board. This list will be arranged from highest to lowest score based upon the final total of possible points.

Projects will be arranged in first pass/baseline ranking based upon total score, divided between Tiers I and II based on fund allocations per HUD in each tier.

Renewal Projects which were, newly awarded projects in the most recent NOFA, and had less than one year of results/outcomes, will be placed in the bottom of Tier I in first pass/baseline scoring but integrated throughout Tiers I and II based on alignment with priorities, populations served, etc.

New Bonus Application projects will be placed in the bottom of Tier II in first pass/baseline scoring but integrated throughout Tiers I and II based on alignment with priorities, populations served, etc.

The CoC HMIS grant aligns with and will be placed in Tier I in first pass/baseline ranking but integrated throughout Tiers I and II based on its foundational support for the effective reporting, evaluation, and support of all HUD activities.

Renewal Projects will be placed based upon total score and divided between Tier I and Tier II based on fund allocations per HUD in each tier in first pass/baseline ranking but integrated throughout Tiers I and II based on alignment with priorities, populations served, etc.

IV. Reallocation Protocol:

The CoC may use the reallocation process to shift funds in whole or part from existing renewal projects to new project applications without decreasing the CoC's annual renewal demand. HUD encourages CoCs to take advantage of this option.

R&P Committee Process:

Full Committee

- Overview and discussion of HUD priorities, constraints, and regulatory requirements
- Review and discussion of our CoC's priorities– in alignment with HUD's priorities and CoC Strategic Plan.
- All Project Applicants (Renewal, New Bonus and Reallocation) will each have a 5 minute opportunity for presentation to R&P Committee.

Non-provider Sub-Committee

- Initial project ranking discussion:
 - Any appeals will be considered for adjustment to score.
 - Review of the scoring spreadsheet with post appeal final scores from the Non-Providers review of scoring.
 - All first time renewal projects will be included on the bottom of Tier I in first pass/baseline ranking but integrated throughout Tiers I and II based on alignment with priorities, populations served, etc.
 - All New Bonus Projects will be included on the bottom of Tier II and ranked by score in first pass/baseline ranking but integrated throughout Tiers I and II based on alignment with priorities, populations served, etc.
 - All Renewal projects will be ranked by score and divided between Tier I and Tier II as preliminary score places them within the Ranking Protocol.

- CoC HMIS grant will be placed in Tier I in first pass/baseline ranking but integrated throughout Tiers I and II based on alignment with priorities, populations served, etc.
 - Discussion on which projects might reasonably be put in Tier II from Tier I based on scoring, alignment with ranking priorities, populations served, and capacity of the agency to support the project.
 - Discussion on which projects might reasonably be put in Tier I from Tier II based on scoring, alignment with ranking priorities, populations served, and capacity of the agency to support the project.
- Final project ranking discussion:
 - Projects will be divided between Tier 1 and Tier 2 based on:
 - Final project scoring
 - Alignment with HUD priorities, i.e. permanent and rapid re-housing projects
 - CoC capacity to serve a spectrum of vulnerable populations, i.e. veterans and victims of domestic violence
 - Any project rejected will be notified in accordance with HUD deadline.
 - Decision-making considerations and project ranking recommendation will be synopsisized to guide Governing Board review and approval.

V. Recommendation for CoC Funding/Ranking Approval:

- All non-provider Governing Board members will be invited to participate in a review of the sub-committee's recommendations and given the opportunity to participate in the final vote to approve
- Meaningful discussion on the findings including questions and answers with the sub-committee will be offered in support of the final approval of ranking recommendation
- Once a final approval is made, the Final Ranking and Prioritization list for the CoC will be published by deadline.