

Policy Title	Scoring & Ranking Procedure	Policy #	GN400-00
Program:	Greater Nashua Continuum of Care	Total Pages	02
Effective Date: August 2016			
Executive Committee Approval: August 2016, August 2017, August 2018, September 2019			
Reviewed: August 2017, August 2018, September 2019			
Revised: August 2017, September 2019, October 2021			

I. Purpose

To ensure an objective and comprehensive process for ranking Continuum of Care (CoC) projects.

II. Policy

The Greater Nashua Continuum of Care (GNCoC) will use objective and clearly defined means to score, review, and rank projects in a timely manner for the Notice of funding.

III. Procedure

A. Collaborative Applicant & TAC Consultant meeting

- a. A meeting will be held every year once a Notice of Funding is released, but prior to project application deadline, if necessary.
- b. Goals/Responsibilities for this meeting are:
 - i. Review the scoring tool and make changes if appropriate. Once scoring tool is finalized, it will be distributed to the GNCoC Executive Committee for review and approval. Once approved, it will be posted on the GNCoC's website in a timely manner.
 - ii. Review the Notice of Funding's tiering process and requirements issued by HUD.
 - iii. Provide GNCoC's Executive Committee with project information spreadsheet, which lists renewal projects, amount required for Tier 1 & 2 and the amount of bonus funds, if any.

B. Scoring Tool

- a. Projects will be scored based on the following:
 - i. Target population dedicated to the chronically homeless, youth populations, veterans, and families.
 - ii. Utilization - capacity being used
 - iii. Housing outcome performance - participants currently live in or are exiting to permanent housing.
 - iv. Income outcome performance – participants increasing non-employment income.

- v. Earned income outcome performance - participants increasing employment income.
 - vi. Financial - timely and complete expenditure of grant funds.
 - vii. HMIS participation - little to no missing or null values.
 - viii. Leveraging - the organization's usage of local and/or mainstream resources.
 - ix. Coordinated Entry Participation
 - x. CoC Participation- recipient/sub recipient attends and/or maintains a leadership role in the GNCoc.
 - xi. Housing First - project follows HUD policies/priorities
- b. Information collected in the Scoring Tool must be verifiable through HMIS data quality reports, program APRs, GNCoc attendance records or any other data sources as required by the Review Committee
- C. Project Applications/Annual Performance Reports/Scoring tool
- a. Project Applications, Annual Reports, and Scoring Tool shall be compiled/completed by the project managers and will be submitted to the GNCoc Coordinator and the Review Committee for independent review.
 - b. If more than one application is submitted for bonus or reallocated funds, a Review Committee will be recruited from non-CoC funded affiliates that are familiar with making funding decisions. This committee will review the applications and select the project(s) based upon HUD priority areas that best fit the needs of the continuum community.
 - c. Projects will be ranked from highest score to lowest score
 - d. Renewal funds for GNCoc Planning funds, HMIS, and Coordinated Entry projects will be included in Tier I as the last projects and will not be included in the Scoring & Ranking process.
 - e. Consolidated projects (if applicable) will be ranked by averaging the total of all projects combined within the consolidation. This will be necessary until the project has an APR available for the consolidated project as a whole. The consolidated project will then be given the score of the average of all and ranked according to that averaged score. The Executive Committee will review the scoring and ranking of that Consolidated Project(s) and vote on the final average.
 - f. Agencies that believe its project was incorrectly scored or ranked can submit a request to the GNCoc Chair to be presented to the Executive Committee to assign one of the GNCoc committees to perform an independent review of the scoring or ranking of that project.