OFFICE OF COMMUNITY &
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Collaborative solutions for a promising future

415 W. Michigan Avenue
Ypsilanti, MI 48197

734.544.6748 (P)
734.544.6749 (F)

www.washtenaw.org/oced
twitter@WashtenawOCED

facebook.com/washtenawoced
www.opportunitywashtenaw.org

2020 Rubric Review Summary and Proposal

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care

Background

As part of our annual application for HUD Continuum of Care Funding, Washtenaw CoC is required to review, select, and rank renewal projects. The requirements include:

- Using objective criteria, such as cost effectiveness, performance data, type of population served, or type of housing provided, and
- Including at least one factor related to improving system performance, such as exits to permanent housing destinations

Washtenaw CoC developed the currently used rubric through a community process in 2017. A rubric review process is conducted annually by OCED staff with input from grantees, FRT members, and other stakeholders. This process has led to only minor changes since 2017.

2020 Rubric Review Process

Goals

Based on a review of previous rubrics and results, as well as scoring, feedback, and notes from prior HUD CoC Funding submissions , OCED proposed the following goals for the 2020 Rubric:

- **Create a Cost Effectiveness Measure:**
  - Cost effectiveness is specifically mentioned each year in the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) which outlines the application process.
  - Both OCED staff and consultants who have reviewed our application believe that we lose points each year in the overall competition because we don't include cost effectiveness in our rubric.
- **Review rubric to make sure all criteria are still helpful and appropriate**
- **Adjust scoring with two goals**:
  - Make sure the criteria is helping to distinguish between projects
  - Make sure that each criteria has 2 point values above the 60% threshold
  - These adjustments should reduce the number of ties produced by the rubric

Timeline

January

- OCED staff researched cost effectiveness measures used in other COCs
- OCED staff reviewed local data and rubric outcomes from the last three competitions
- OCED staff created a draft rubric proposal to present to grantees, FRT members, and other stakeholders to meet the above goals.

- On 2/13/20, OCED held a Rubric Review Meeting for stakeholders to present the draft rubric and gather initial feedback.
- After the meeting, further comment was gathered from attendees through an online survey.

MARCH

- OCED staff collected feedback in early March and began revising the draft rubric based on feedback.
- At this point the process was disrupted by the emergence of the Coronavirus. Shifting priorities and limited staff time at both OCED and agencies prevented further follow-up with stakeholders

MAY

- OCED Staff revised the draft rubric based on feedback gathered at the 2/13 meeting and through the online survey
- OCED is presenting the revised rubric for approval by the CoC Board for use in this year's CoC application process

Summary of Changes from 2019 Rubric

- **Section 1: Threshold**
  - No changes
- **Section 2: Project Outcomes:**
  - **PSH**
    - **Criterion A) Occupancy/Average Bed Utilization Rate**
      - This criterion was removed entirely
      - All projects scored above 100% in this measure in all years, so it wasn't serving any purpose
      - Per community feedback, OCED will research alternate measures for future use
    - **Criteria B) – E)**
      - Scoring was adjusted to better fit community data in a way that helps to distinguish between projects
      - Based on community feedback, scoring was further revised from the original OCED draft proposal
  - **RRH**
    - **Criteria A) – D)**
      - Scoring was adjusted to better fit community data and to match total points from the PSH rubric.
  - **Cost Effectiveness**
    - A new cost effectiveness measure was added for both PSH and RRH
    - It will be calculated by dividing the total grant amount by the number of successful outcomes (stayers and exits to permanent housing)
    - It will not be scored, but will help us figure out how we might be able to use information like this in the future

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY &
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Collaborative solutions for a promising future

415 W. Michigan Avenue 734.544.6748 (P)
Ypsilanti, MI 48197 734.544.6749 (F)

www.washtenaw.org/oced facebook.com/washtenawoced
twitter@WashtenawOCED www.opportunitywashtenaw.org

- Additional measures will be calculated to see if they are more helpful. See Appendix B of the 2020 Draft Rubric
- **Section 3: Consumer Feedback**
  - A fourth criteria was added to help measure the use of client feedback.
  - Points remain the same (12), but each is now worth 3 points maximum
  - This change is meant to clarify the intent of this section, not to make changes to agency expectations
- **Section 4: Compliance**
  - No changes
- **Section 5: Budget**
  - No changes
- **Section 6: HMIS Data Quality**
  - *For 2020 Only:* Adjust the SSN data quality threshold up to 10% to reflect the current state of local data quality