



NEW BEDFORD COC REVIEW & RANKING PROCEDURE.2023

The New Bedford Continuum of Care (CoC), known as the Homeless Service Providers Network (HSPN) has established a Performance Review Committee charged with evaluating the performance of Continuum of Care (CoC) and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funded programs and overseeing the Rank and Review procedures for the annual Continuum of Care funding cycle.

The Performance Review Committee (PRC) is comprised of HSPN members who are knowledgeable about homelessness and housing in our CoC and who are broadly representative of the relevant sectors, subpopulations, and geographic areas. The PRC is comprised of representatives from a cross-section of groups in the HSPN including faith-based providers, private sector, non-profit providers of homeless services and housing, and City of New Bedford staff. The PRC is also comprised of members that have no financial or interest in any CoC-funded program. Both NEW and RENEWAL projects are evaluated on a 100-point basis. For each section of the application, the PRC members will be asked to assign a score that is based on information in the application, the quantitative review, and the site visit (if applicable) for each project.

General Responsibilities of the Performance Review Committee [PRC]:

At a minimum the PRC meets quarterly to review performance and outcomes from CoC and ESG funded programs. The City of New Bedford's Office of Housing and Community Development's (OHCD) who serves as the Collaborative Applicant provides detailed quarterly monitoring reports to the PRC to fully evaluate program performance. The PRC also meets to discuss the annual request for proposals application process and provides feedback and considers information gained on behalf of the CoC over the past year and makes revisions to the application. The committee also considers asking new members to join the committee and participate on the review team.

The Committee's responsibility revolves around the complete review and ranking of CoC applications received through an RFP process that seeks funding through the Continuum of Care Application process and providing a recommendation to the Homeless Service Provider Network (HSPN).

There are four (4) primary responsibilities of the PRC:

- 1. Review all applications** for funding:
 - Review any new project submittals.
 - Review any proposed reallocations.
 - Review all existing CoC Programs that are eligible for renewal.
- 2. Evaluate and assess the proposals** in light of the Continuum's existing needs and gaps, as well as the funding HUD will make available.
- 3. Rank all projects.** The project ranking is established through the PRC review and evaluation procedure. The committee reviews the material and all scoring in order to develop a proposed ranking slate. Review and discussion considering each project and the CoC as a whole is discussed, and the PRC is then charged with ranking projects based on its evaluation.

4. **Make a recommendation** for a slate of projects to be funded in order of priority and by tier in accordance with HUD funding criteria to the full HSPN membership for a formal vote. The final PRC Ranking of Projects slate is then shared with the HSPN membership who are presented with the PRC's explanation of its procedures and recommendations for ranking according to Tiers. In so doing, a vote of the membership is then taken as to whether or not the slate is to be ratified as presented by the PRC.

The final voted-upon/accepted ranking is shared with the HSPN and posted on the www.nbhspn.com website. Each project is notified in writing outside of E-SNAPS as to the results of the ranking and they are given the opportunity to meet with the Collaborative Applicant to debrief upon request.

Review Procedure

The PRC evaluate projects to ensure they meet minimum project eligibility, capacity, timeliness, and performance standards. Information will be evaluated from Annual Performance Reports (APRs), information derived from desktop and on-site monitoring including monitoring reports and audit reports as applicable and performance standards on prior grants in addition to assessing a project on the following criteria:

- Applicant's performance against plans and goals;
- Timeliness standards;
- Applicant's performance in assisting program participants to achieve and maintain independent living and record of success;
- Financial management accounting practices;
- Timely expenditures;
- Capacity; and
- Eligible activities

Project Tiering

When the NOFA is released, the priorities and tiering outlined in the application are strategically applied by the CoC to the project ranking. Reallocation, new projects, and other CoC priorities are considered through CoC discussions. The tiering is presented by the PRC based on projects that meet a high priority, are high performing, and meet the needs and gaps as identified in the CoC.

Bonus Project/DV Bonus Projects

As is the case in the 2023 round, bonus funds are available. Applicants for funding within the New Bedford CoC are permitted to apply for one (1) bonus project, which will compete nationally against other bonus projects on a HUD scoring system set forth in the NOFO. HUD will notify the CoCs as to what the bonus funds may be used for. The bonus project will complement and fill an unmet need.

The application for a bonus project is an option included within the RFP. Those reviewing submitted projects will score and rank the bonus projects in accordance with criteria set forth in the RFP. The bonus projects will be part of the overall project review and ranking procedure completed by the PRC and submitted to the full HSPN for a formal vote. In addition to a new CoC Bonus project, a new DV Bonus project is available in the FY2023 round and may be submitted. DV Bonus projects are limited to PH-RRH and SSO-CE projects and are more fully detailed in the RFP.

Reallocation

Reallocation is the means by which the CoC shifts funds, in whole or in part, from existing eligible renewal grants to create new projects for CoC Program funds. The CoC decides this by looking at projects that may be underperforming and by assessing gaps within the CoC. The Performance Review Committee (PRC) acting on behalf of the continuum can recommend that the CoC repurpose a project to address such unmet need. CoC funded agencies may voluntarily choose to reallocate CoC funds. These will be reviewed by the PRC team as well. Those agencies who choose to voluntarily reallocate will receive priority in the reallocation ranking process.

Detailed discussion as to both the involuntary and voluntary reallocation policy is available as a separate document on the www.nbhspn.com website.

Procedure for Appeals:

Agencies that question the ranking and review and feel that they have been unfairly eliminated from the competition may file an appeal with the CoC through the City's Office of Housing and Community Development. An appeal may not be submitted if the basis of the appeal is one of the following: the applicant did not answer all the questions on the application, the applicant did not submit the application with all required attachments, or the applicant did not submit by the required deadline. Applicants whose project was rejected may appeal the local CoC competition decision to HUD if the project applicant believes it was denied the opportunity to participate in the local CoC planning process in a reasonable manner and they may submit a Solo Application in e-snaps directly to HUD prior to the application deadline.

The CoC's notification of rejection of the project in the local competition must be attached to the Solo Application. If the CoC fails to provide written notification outside of e-snaps, the Solo Applicant must attach evidence that it attempted to participate in the local CoC planning process and submitted a project application that met the local deadlines, along with a statement that the CoC did not provide the Solo Applicant written notification of the CoC rejecting the project in the local CoC competition. The appeal must be based on the fact that a decision made by the PRC regarding the ranking, rejection, or funding of their project was prejudicial, unsubstantiated by project performance, or in violation of the 2023 Continuum of Care Guidelines.