



2017 SCORING TOOL DEVELOPMENT
Question and Answers
UPDATE APRIL 8, 2017

Topic	Question	Response	Q & A Follow-up
TH Tool	<p><i>Data sources:</i> The committee should look at the columns and rows referenced from the APR Questions. It is inconsistent as to whether the category headers are included in the row and column counts</p> <p>This is an issue throughout the document and could affect the numbers that are used in the tool.</p>	<p>Agreed. In past years the tools have not counted the header rows or columns. References in tools will be updated for clarity and consistency.</p>	<p>Response complete. Update in process.</p>
TH CES/ CAHP	<p><i>Threshold: Has the Agency formally committed to use CAHP:</i> Some agencies that operate TH and or TH for youth have not completed an agreement of application for CAHP because participation is not yet an option for all these providers. How do these agencies begin the formal process of committing?</p>	<p>Although the full CES/ CAHP system is not in operation for TH programs, any TH renewal project has already been asked for commitment in at least two ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 2016 TH Renewal Scoring Tool Section V, Q.22 asked for this commitment. 2) Section 3B of the 2015 TH renewal applications documented commitment to CES/ CAHP. During this process all renewal applicants, except for three DV providers, committed to participation when the system became available in their area. 3) In 2016 renewal applications, the HUD detailed instructions noted that although HUD had removed questions related to CES for CoC renewal applications, the McKinney Act as amended required a CE system. 	<p>Response Complete.</p>

Topic	Question	Response	Q & A Follow-up
		(Note: renewal and new project applicants for PSH or RRH in 2016 were asked for commitment in Part 1: Eligibility, item 2 on last year's Scoring tools and in Item #16 on the <i>2016 Eligibility and Threshold Requirement Checklist</i> .)	
TH CES/ CAHP	<i>Threshold: Have one or more agency staff participated in formal CAHP Training:</i> Again, for the reasons stated above, some agencies have not been able to participate in CAHP training.	Although the CES/CAHP system is not fully functioning for all project types, CES/CAHP 101 training is available through RTFH website. http://www.rtfhsd.org/ces-staff-resources/	Response complete.
TH Tool	#1b, #5, #6, #7, #19: raw data cells in this section are read only and don't seem to prepopulate.	Data entry challenges were addressed in Q & A Update #1 (March 27, 2017). Subsequently unlocked versions of the tools were made available by the RTFH. Please contact Amanda Patterson for access to the tools, if needed.	Response complete.
TH Tool	# 1b. Percent leavers who accomplished this measure in 2016: Item indicates a % should be entered but the source is a whole #, not a %.	The 2016 data for this item is the percentage from the 2017 tool, line 29 C in comparison with the 2016 tool, row 22 cell C. Both pieces of data are percentages that were calculated from the raw numbers is items 1 and 1a.	Response complete.
TH Scoring	#6 Rapid Return- Leavers to PH: For Transitional Programs serving some special populations, such as youth, a LOS of <90 days is not necessarily appropriate. HUD has released support of this idea. These programs will lose points here.	While the LOS should be determined at the individual client level, the CoC Interim rules indicate that brief LOS and the HUD CoC application 'quick return' to PH are favored, as a result, the local process awards points for reduced LOS. Projects serving special populations such as TAY are awarded extra point in the acuity and special needs sections.	Response complete
TH Scoring	#7 Reduction in Average Length of Stay (2016 vs. 2015) Clarification needed: What year/APR are we supposed to look at for this section? Are we looking at program APR as submitted to HUD for 2015 and 2016 program years or are we supposed to run APRs on 2015 and 2016 Calendar years, like we did for the rest of the tool?	The data sources for TH renewals are the 2016 TH Renewal Scoring Tool completed last year which measured your 2015 outcome (available in your 2016 drop box) and the APR/ 0625 report data for the 2016 calendar year which is the same source for many other items in this year's process. In summary - using the data source for last year's local process in comparison with the data source for this year's local process.	Response complete.
	#12 Best Practice Housing Usage- Transitional Housing: Total Number Adults Served: This item	This item is addressed in Q & A Update #2 (March 31, 2017) available on the CoC website.	Response complete.

Topic	Question	Response	Q & A Follow-up
	is pulling data from cell H5 (total clients), not H6 (total Adults)		
TH Tool	# 12 Number of Victims fleeing Domestic Violence (DV) occurring within the past 3-6 months: Why is 0-3 months not also included in this item?	During the initial 90 days (0-3 months) households fleeing DV situations may be assessed and referred directly to RRH or PH rather than being assessed as needing TH. Rapid movement to PH is a central goal for all CoC projects. This item referred to Committee for discussion.	Response complete.
TH Scoring	Q#17 addresses a key factor in the adequate distribution of units/ beds regionally. Respectfully request an increase in point value to 10.	Access throughout the region is a component of CES/ CAHP and the CoC mission statement. This item referred to Committee for discussion.	Response complete.
TH Scoring	#18 <i>Percentage of turnover vacancy filled by (Long Term HMLS or vet) (Chronic)</i> : Is this applicable to all projects? Youth programs would lose points here. Veterans and Chronic status are not typical of the homeless youth population.	For TH projects the populations are long-term homeless or veterans. This reflects Board population priorities. TAY earn points in other questions where TAY are called out (#12 TAY served; #14 gaps in system)	Response complete.
TH Tool	#19 <i>Return to Homelessness from Permanent Housing Exit</i> This whole section needs explanation. How do the cells referenced help determine return to homeless after a permanent exit.	Row 214 at the bottom of Question #9 notes that the data source for this item could change to be the Project Level System Framework Report. The report shows exits to PH and returns to the system after PH placement. RTFH and the Committee are reviewing the best source for this item.	Response complete.
TH Tool	#23 <i>HMIS Participation</i> : Where can agencies get this information?	Q# 23 draws information from the most recent HIC. The HIC is a document available through the RTFH. HICs for prior years are also available in the drop box files for the year in question.	Response complete.
TH Bonus	#24 <i>Bonus Points- SWAP</i> : How do projects know about this option? This issue came up last year. What is this and how to we get it to complete it?	The SWAP Tool was used in the local 2016 review process and discussed during the 2016 community meetings. As a result, agencies with renewal projects have had some exposure to the tool. To earn bonus points in the 2017 process, renewal applicants will need to fully complete the tool for their active projects. There is a related question in the PSH Bonus category.	Response complete.

Topic	Question	Response	Q & A Follow-up
TH Bonus	<p><i>CoC Community Standards:</i> Is this referring to all housing programs within an organization? For example, if my organization has 5 housing programs (3 for foster youth and former foster youth, one crisis shelter and 1 homeless dedicated COC Transitional housing for youth), ALL 5 will have to agree to follow the Community standards to be eligible for these bonus points?</p>	<p>Yes. These bonus points are intended to motivate agency adoption of community standards for non-CoC and non-ESG- funded projects.</p>	<p>Response complete.</p>
	<p><i>#12 Best Practice Housing Usage- Transitional Housing:</i> Programs exclusively serving one of the special populations will not be able to earn points here unless they serve individuals that also fall into one of the other population categories. Programs that serve TAY exclusively, and therefore scores lower in other parts of the tool. This section was typically a way to recoup some points as TAY housing is acknowledged as looking different but is still needed and valuable in the continuum. As is, programs exclusive to youth will not earn points here unless the youth they serve fall into other populations as well, which is NOT part of the eligibility criteria for most of these programs. There is fear that transitional Housing for youth will be pushed out of the CoC because the programs can't earn threshold points. Some have already lost the funding. In the entirety of Section III, some TAY programs would get 1 out of 26 total points.</p>	<p>The scoring tools are designed to reflect the Board established priority populations. These priorities are found throughout the tools. A change to priorities would require Board action. Local priorities are also influenced by the annual NOFA. The 2017 NOFA and its priorities have not yet been released.</p> <p>Currently, TH Q. #12 calls out TAY specifically as one way to garner points for programs. Because of the limited number of TAY programs, it is anticipated that TAY projects will score well on Q#14, filling gaps in the system.</p>	<p>Response complete.</p>

Topic	Question	Response	Q & A Follow-up
PSH Tool Data Sources	Tool uses "APR" and "625 Report" interchangeably. These data sources are not the same and should be separate and distinct.	<p>The APR data fields and those in the "0625" report are parallel. Each question on either format is the same question. For example Q7 on the APR asks the same question as Q7 on the "0625" report. The differences are that the APR is typically used to report data for the program operating year, whereas the "0625" report can be generated for any time period. The full APR includes questions not included in the "0625" and which are not used by the local process. HUD is currently implementing a change in which APR reporting will be accomplished through Sage and question numbers in the new format will change.</p> <p>For purposes of completing the local scoring tools, APR or 0625 will be used to mean the data generated by a "0625" report run for the time period established by the committee which in most cases is 2016 calendar year. Any item needing data from another time period will be indicated on the tool.</p>	Response complete.
PSH Tool Data Sources	When answering "no" for TAY populations in row 147/148, the tool indicates continued use of the Entry/ Exit report in scoring, which is not maintained by Bowman and is rife with errors. Scoring admitted it has errors (8.10.16 notice) but tool shows intention to continue to use the report any way.	The 2017 Scoring process will not use the Entry/Exit report as a data source. The narrative in rows 147 and 148 on the tools will be updated to reference the HMIS and the Project Level Systems Framework report.	Response complete. Update in process.
PSH Scoring	<i>Chronic:</i> Having 0 program exits results in a score of 0 for chronic priority (Q 11)=5 lost points. Having no exits should be 100%	This item is measuring the number of units / beds that are newly occupied by chronic persons. A program without turnover receives higher points in housing stability; a program that served a high number of chronic persons will receive higher points in the acuity sections. This item rewards projects for helping move CH persons into vacancies in accordance with the local priority policy.	Response complete.

Topic	Question	Response	Q & A Follow-up
PSH Data Sources	We question the validity of the RTFH “timeliness of data entry” report and previous reports have been found to be inaccurate. HMIS reports are showing many errors or variation between entities pulling same information. Agencies should be given opportunity to view/ correct any report pulled by outside entities before such data sources are used for scoring.	Agencies have the opportunity to view their project data in HMIS at any time. The reports are generated from data in the HMIS, not an outside source. Applicants are encouraged to review the accuracy of their client records frequently, particularly for clients who are shared with other providers.	Response complete.
PSH Data Sources	Use great care with judging “data quality.” Data is now shared and other providers can change another program’s data. Many agencies have had major issues with inaccurate reports and data that does not populate the report. Some data (i.e. resident left without notice) show as “null” or “missing”.	Agencies have the opportunity to view their project data in HMIS at any time. . Applicants are encouraged to review the accuracy of their client records frequently, particularly for clients who are shared with other providers. The agency is responsible for identifying the correct designation for data that “missing” (meaning blank) or “refused” (participant declined to provide the information), or “unknown” data was not available from the client. Please review your client files and contact RTFH if errors are identified.	Response complete.
PSH Scoring	How was "cost effectiveness" in question 9a as average cost of PSH/ program participant determined? How is this statistically valid? Why does this amount change between programs?	<p>The 2017 determination will follow the same process as 2016. For Q 9a, the cost per program participant is a calculation of the number of persons served divided by total the HUD request for the applicant project. That cost is then compared with the average cost for all programs in the same project type (grouped by housing program type and household type).</p> <p>Because the formula does not include a factor for the rate of successful exit which would be a measure of cost <i>effectiveness</i>, the tool narrative may be amended to say “cost comparison”.</p> <p>The amount changes because projects are compared to similar projects. PSH for individuals are compared other PSH for individuals, etc.</p>	Response complete. Update in process.

Topic	Question	Response	Q & A Follow-up
PSH Tally Sheet	2nd tab called "PSH Tally," line #10, referencing Section #6 on the main tab, is labeled: "Length of Stay Rapid Return - Leavers to PH." Please explain how "rapid placement" of 90 days or less applies to PSH once a person enters housing	The PSH tally sheet will be updated on completion of any edits to the PSH scoring tool. Please disregard the PSH Tally sheet until updates are complete after the April 18 th Community meeting.	Response complete. Update in process.
PSH Tool	CAHP is now called CES and the tool should reflect this.	The PSH draft tool was prepared prior to the formal decision to rename the CAHP to CES. The tools are being updated to reflect CES/CAHP.	Response complete. Update in process.
PSH Bonus	SWAP analysis did not function properly in the 2016 competition. Should ensure that any tool used for scoring functions as intended.	The SWAP tool is available on-line. Applicants are encouraged to become familiar with the tool and instructions prior to the 2017 competition.	Response complete.
PSH Data Sources	Question #8: utilization rates should average the PITC numbers from the 625 report, not reflect one night in January (as used by scoring).	Q. #8 is now designed to collect and create an average of the quarterly PIT numbers from the APR / "0625" report.	Response complete.
General	Show more clearly whether a project is a renewal, reallocation, or new on the final rate/ rank sheet.	The 2016 rating and ranking process notices clustered projects into categories such as first year renewals and system projects placed by Board action; new and bonus projects. The classification for each project submitted to HUD and for each project reduced or eliminated showed the classification for each project: new, reallocated, renewal, and planning. The 2017 lists could identify projects in similar categories with clear designation for each project.	Response complete.
General	Allow new project requests for capital funds for new projects (not yet announced)	This is at the discretion of the Board and would require Board action. The Board has not yet set 2017 competition policies. For the past two years, capital projects could be submitted as long as the acquisition / rehab / new construction costs came from other resources with the CoC request for operating or operating <i>and</i> support services. The HUD rules during these two years only allowed Support Services Only projects for coordinated entry (CAHP).	Response complete.

Topic	Question	Response	Q & A Follow-up
General	Allow/ incentivize new projects requests for multi-year commitments if allowable by HUD. Priorities not yet announced	This is at the discretion of the Board and would require Board action. The Board has not yet set 2017 competition policies. Allowing multi-year projects negatively impacts the Annual Renewal Demand for the years between the first year of funding and when the project becomes	Response complete.
General	Add to Appeals criteria that you can appeal if source data (i.e. RTFH report) is incorrect.	The appeals criteria are at the discretion of the Board. A similar suggestion was made last year.	Response complete.
CES /CAHP PSH	Cell B19 re: CES - what "verification/referral document" is being utilized?	Verification documents for CES are being identified in collaboration with the CES / CAHP advisory committee and will be further described in the April 18 th community meeting.	Response complete
PSH	Section IV, #15 & #16 re: HIC beds reported. The HIC is known to have flaws and should not be used as a data source.	The HIC data is verified through a process between the RTFH and the housing agency. <i>Agencies are strongly encouraged to confirm their unit and bed inventory for the HIC immediately if they have not already done so.</i> The result of this process should be a HIC that is agreed upon by both RTFH and the agency. The HUD national deadline for HIC submittal is rapidly approaching.	Response complete.
PSH Scoring	Q #3, is phrased "increase earned income". The max points set at 60% or high are too much. This should be maintain/ increase/ obtain earned income, not only increasing income. Maximum 1points are not achievable.	HUD has multiple data point for income and mainstream resources. Q #3 looks at earned income, Q #4 looks at other sources. Points are awarded beginning at 12%. The ranges were established based on <i>actual</i> achievement of programs in prior years which means some programs will achieve maximum points.	Response complete.
PSH Scoring	Q #16: Please explain the Subregional gap calculations. How can projects use this information to improve?	<p>The subregional gap calculation is the same as 2016. This measure was added in 2016 to help achieve two goals: 1) HUD's mandate that CoCs evaluate how each project included in the application contributes to the CoC <i>system</i> of care and 2) to support the mission of the CoC / RTFH to ensure access to services in each subregion.</p> <p>The calculation compares the number or units / beds provided by a project by the total number of units / beds in the subregion by project and household type.</p> <p>Agencies can improve scores and help achieve the goals by creating new projects to help fill a gap in a category or subregion where services are needed.</p>	Response complete.

Topic	Question	Response	Q & A Follow-up
General - PSH Priority	New project requests for developed PSH units should be ranked above any RRH applications since they will be committed units for an extended period (generally 55 years)	This is at the discretion of the Board and would require Board action. The Board has not yet set 2017 competition policies for new project. As of last year, the CoC competitive funds property restriction was reduced from 20 to 15 years (with no forgiveness of investment until after 10 years of use and 20% forgiveness for each year thereafter. A 55-year restriction is often tied to other sources of funds.	Response complete.
PSH Tool	What are rows 92 - 117 measuring? Why are they there? When I selected a HH type and they auto-populated with specific questions for that HH type. Not a question; just an observation for folks who may also wonder when they see it.	The questions in rows 92-117 measure bed utilization and are an ongoing component of the annual scoring process. Questions and calculations auto populates based on the type of program selected. What is different about this section in 2017 is that the calculation bed utilization has returned to the 2013 tool strategy which includes data for each quarter rather than a single point in time.	Response complete.
CES/ CAHP	Proof of CAHP participation is a "CAHP Agreement/ application". I do not believe we've signed one, but have their approved workflow. Do any agencies have this or what is the mechanism for showing agreement? Does this agreement exist?	Please see response on page 1 for TH CES/ CAHP. Please see CES / CAHP Policies and Procedures for process questions.	Response complete.
PSH Scoring	Much focus is being placed on cost effectiveness. While it is important to look for outliers, we need to be very careful about dedicating 8 points to this area while we require programs to service higher acuity populations who require more intensive supportive services. Recommend reducing available points	As acuity of clients being served increases for PSH programs, the comparison between programs will also adjust. There are other requests for adjusting points for other questions. The Committee will finalize the points and tools after April 18 th subject to Board approval.	Response complete
PSH Tool	None of the cells on the PSH Tally tab have formulas in them.	Please see response on page 7. The Tally sheet will be updated after any edits to the tool is finalized. The tally spreadsheet is not intended to interact with the data entry sheet for the tool. The tally sheet reflects the point allocated for each section of the tool. The total score for each project will be generated by a formula in Cell "D" of the row titled, Project Grand Points Total on the data entry page of the tool.	Response complete.

Topic	Question	Response	Q & A Follow-up
PSH Tool	Formulas in C59, C60, C83, C125, C133, C140, C157, C158, C238, C239 are missing.	<p>There are formulas in each of these cells in the tools forwarded for distribution. Several of the formulas start with If / Then statements which will only populate data when the "if" condition is met. Cells that have the word "Calculation" indicate that the information will automatically populate in Column D.</p> <p>Please use caution when using the unlocked version of the tools. Attempting to enter data, or clicking in the cell will delete the formula. The final versions of the tools will be locked to protect the formulas from accidental changes or deletion.</p>	Response complete.
PSH Tool	Rows 37 and 38 are comparing something between 2016 and 2017 but I don't understand where the 2017 data is coming from.	The 2017 data for rows 37 and 38 are from the 2017 Scoring Tool – the tool that is being completed. The 2017 data pulls from question 1a.	Response complete.
PSH Tool	Cell B36 says "TH"; there is a typo in cell A198.	These items have been corrected.	Response complete.
PSH Tool	Section #10, on grant spend out, comments that if the project start date is between Jan and April, they will use the grant execution date, but there is no place to note project start or end or execution dates.	The grant spend-out information will be taken from the LOCCS Report which has fields for the dates needed, total grant amount, and drawdowns.	Response complete.
PSH	Not sure B262 references the "chronic column" on the HIC. Total dedicated beds may not all be chronic. CoC should use actual CH served, not HIC numbers which reflect what the grants dictate.	HUD scores the CoC Application based on the aggregate number of beds dedicated to chronic. The local process mirrors the HUD data catchment.	Response complete.

Topic	Question	Response	Q & A Follow-up
PSH Tool	Section #18 looks like it is capturing the same info as Section #11. This needs clarification as to what is materially distinct between the two.	<p>Question #11 is designed to determine if a project is following 'best practices' and local priorities with respect to the type of clients being served. For PSH this includes TAY and chronic, however, for other program types this question identifies other populations. AS a result, there is a higher rate of overlap for PSH vs. other program types.</p> <p>Q# 18 measures the percentage of beds that are filled by chronic at turnover. Q #18 helps determine if the PSH renewal project is following the mandate for PSH vacancies to be filled by chronic persons. The items recognize that older PSH projects may already be serving TAY or CH tenants. PSH Projects serving a high rate of TAY or CH that also have filled vacancies with CH are implementing projects that fill gaps or comply with local priorities.</p>	Response complete.
PSH Bonus	#24 mentions "commit to follow all CoC standards for both HUD and non HUD funded projects" and gives 8 bonus points for this. Much clarity is needed as to the definition of "non-HUD funded project" Does this mean only homeless-dedicated projects? non-homeless dedicated but HUD-funded projects? Also, I do not know of this agreement existing/ we have not signed one (only a draft version exists and no programs are known to have signed this).	The Standards are designed for homeless-dedicated projects. HUD ESG and CoC competitive programs are mandated to comply with the standards whether or not they have signed an agreement. Other projects are being encouraged to follow them. Agencies will receive the bonus points for committing to follow the standards for all its homeless dedicated projects.	Response complete.
PSH Data Sources	Rows 257 and 258: RTFH Timeliness report is known to have errors and varying results based on program type. As such, it should not be used as a data source.	<p>Lines 257 and 258 refer to the timeliness of submitting or confirming your HIC data. The report is being generated by RTFHSD based on the notices to agencies and if the required information was submitted by the deadline, regardless of program type.</p> <p>The Scoring Committee will request a list of projects that did not the deadline at the time that the final versions of tools are released. Agencies will be encouraged to review the list and resolve any data differences in advance of final ranking.</p>	Response complete.

Topic	Question	Response	Q & A Follow-up
PSH Scoring	In #2, the outcome is “88% increasing their income.” This will negatively impact programs who serve higher acuity populations as most are on entitlements and no COLA was given in 2016. Recommend maintain/ increase which I believe is the actual performance measure / outcome.	HUD measures both characteristics (increased income and total income). Outcome points are accrued beginning at 40%. The adoption of a Housing First policy tends to increase the number of clients who have little or no income at entry. Best practices encourage assisting persons with longer terms of housing stability to engage in whatever level of work possible which could also increase income. The choice of increased income vs. total income is under review.	Response complete.
PSH Data Sources	#17 is using our application as a data source for prioritizing CH. Shouldn't this be based on actual persons served? Is this because the entry/ exit report does not work?	HUD scores the CoC Application based on the aggregate number of beds dedicated to chronic. The local process mirrors the HUD data catchment.	Response complete.
PSH Scoring	#22 is also measuring based on HIC beds dedicated to CH. This should be measured by CH persons served because older grants were written for less than 100% CH and many will not voluntarily restrict to dedicating to CH and we don't want to needlessly restrict ourselves for future endeavors.	This item awards points at the agency level for dedicating beds that are not required to serve chronic persons. This allows the agency to change the number of non-CoC-funded beds dedicated to chronic at their discretion. The item is not restricted to CoC –funded beds, as a result the system of care for chronic persons is expanded. This aligns with Board policy priorities.	Response complete.
PSH Data reference	Cell A37 references "If C29 > C32..." but C29 is about persons who died, while C32 is about the # of folks who accomplished the measure, AND the formula in C37 (to which A37 speaks) does not include a calculation using C29. This could be a typo but it should be addressed.	The correct data references for this item are: 2016 Data is from 2016 Scoring Tool, Q#1 row 22, Cell 22c. 2017 Data is from 2017 Scoring tool: Q#1 row 33, Cell 33C. If the comparison of PSH tool for 2017 Cell 33C is 10% or greater than the 2016 PSH tool cell 22 C, the project earns full points. OR, if there was not a 10% increase but 2016 and 2017 outcomes were both 90% or better, the project will also get full points.	Response complete. Update in process.