

CoC Name: Kansas Balance of State CoC

CoC Number: KS-507

National Scoring Information

High Score: 92.0

Low Score: 35.75

Median Score: 78.5

Funding Line: 78.25

The below chart indicates the maximum amount of points available for each scoring category and the actual score a CoC received.

Scoring Category	Maximum Score (Points)	CoC Score (Points)
<i>CoC Housing, Services, and Structure</i>	14	11.75
<i>Homeless Needs and Data Collection</i>	24	12.5
<i>CoC Strategic Planning</i>	16	10
<i>CoC Performance</i>	28	20
<i>Emphasis on Housing Activities</i>	18	17
Total CoC Score	100	71.25

Competition Summary:

- An unprecedented number of local programs received more than \$1.4 billion.
- 1,110 of the project awards target individuals experiencing chronic homelessness.
- More than \$783 million was awarded to projects that provide permanent housing solutions for homeless persons.
- 3,364 local projects that serve families with children received \$812.5 million.
- To receive competitive funding, a CoC must have scored at least 78.25. There was no minimum score in 2008; therefore all CoCs that submitted renewal project applications received some funding.

Points to Consider:

- Changes are made to the NOFA on an annual basis. The categories and scoring issues discussed in [this](#) debriefing apply specifically to the 2008 competition.
- Language in the NOFA and Exhibit 1 application may place more emphasis on certain sections than previous years.
- All application forms in **e-snaps** are important and should have been filled out completely and accurately in order to receive full credit for the answers. Additionally, CoCs should have attached all requested documentation, as appropriate. SNAPS provided detailed instructions and training materials to ensure applicants' ability to accurately complete the exhibit.
- In 2008, the points available for CoC scoring were 100 points versus 60 as in previous competitions, with the majority of points going to the data collection and performance sections. This resulted in a wider point spread for scoring categories.
- At the project level, renewal project budgets should have been consistent with the approved grant inventory worksheets. Also, project applicants needed to carefully make selections regarding component type as this determined which questions were made visible to them.

For the 2008 Competition, HUD awarded up to 100 total points for all five scoring categories: CoC Housing, Services and Structure, CoC Strategic Planning, CoC Performance, CoC Enrollment and Participation in Mainstream Programs, Housing Emphasis, and Housing and Employment Performance. A detailed explanation of each category is provided below to assist your continuum in its self-evaluation.

2008 Point Structure:

Part I: CoC Housing, Services, and Structure—14 total points

- The extent in which a CoC's application demonstrated:
 - The existence of a coordinated, inclusive, and outcome-oriented community process;
 - Process includes nonprofit organizations, state and local governmental agencies, public housing agencies, housing developers and service providers, school systems, law enforcement, hospital and medical entities, funding providers, private businesses and business associations, jurisdictional ten-year planning bodies, and homeless or formerly homeless persons;
 - CoC has a process in place to achieve fair and impartial project review and selection, with representation and input from diverse parties;
 - A well-defined and comprehensive strategy developed to address the components of a CoC system, and that the strategy has been designed to serve all homeless subpopulations in the community;
 - That a CoC has created, maintained, and built upon a community-wide inventory of housing and services for homeless families and individuals; identified the full spectrum of needs of homeless families and individuals; and coordinated efforts to fill gaps between the current inventory and existing needs.

- Summary of CoC Results on Part I:
 - Most CoCs attached the correct version of the electronic Housing Inventory Chart.
 - Although monthly or more was ideal, the primary decision making group for almost all CoCs met at least quarterly.
 - CoC Committees, Subcommittees and Workgroups should have been limited to only those groups involved in CoC wide planning activities.

Part II: Homeless Needs and Data Collection—24 total points

- The extent to which a CoC's application demonstrated:
 - An understanding of the number of homeless individuals and families within the CoC and their needs, including an accurate and timely count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons. The frequency and methods used to conduct the point in time count of sheltered, unsheltered and subpopulations were considered.
 - Progress in the implementation and operation of an HMIS, including data quality and usage, bed coverage (excluding domestic violence providers), Data Standards compliance and HMIS training.
 - AHAR participation assessed by the number of table shells included in the 2007 AHAR. It was not a requirement that CoC-wide data be used; table shell data from at least one jurisdiction within the CoC qualified the entire CoC as participating in AHAR. The greater the number of table shells used in the 2007 AHAR, the higher the CoC's score.

→ Summary of CoC Results on Part II:

- This section was worth 25 percent of points allocated in Exhibit 1. The majority of points in this section were devoted to those questions about HMIS.
- Although most CoCs indicated an HMIS implementation date prior to October 2006, most CoCs demonstrated low bed coverage on one or more of the housing types. CoCs should strive to have 86 percent or more bed coverage for each housing type within the CoC.
- Many CoCs lost points for either not participating in AHAR or for having a high percentage of null or missing values.
- Although a point-in-time count is only required every two years, many CoCs conducted a point-in-time in 2008 as well. CoCs that indicated a date outside of the last 10 days of January (2007 or 2008) should have received a waiver from HUD.
- CoCs were asked to describe methods used to collect data on sheltered and unsheltered populations and subpopulations. Failure to address each question separately resulted in a loss of points. Responses should have demonstrated consistency with HUD's point-in-time guidelines.

Part III: CoC Strategic Planning—16 total points

→ The extent to which a CoC's application demonstrated:

- The existence of, and alignment with, a performance-based 10-year strategy for ending chronic homelessness that establishes specific action steps to achieve the five objectives indicated in the NOFA;
- The Continuum's progress in working with the appropriate local government entity to develop and implement a discharge policy for persons leaving publicly funded institutions or systems of care;
- Demonstrates leveraging of funds requested under the 2008 NOFA with other resources, including private, other public and mainstream services and housing programs for proposed projects and ongoing efforts.

→ Summary of CoC Results on Part III:

- Overall, failure to read all instruction and training materials that were provided resulted in a loss of points in each section of Part III.
- For the 10-Year Plan, Objectives and Actions Steps, the action steps should have been measurable and directly linked to the objective. Also, CoCs should have only identified one lead person by title and organization. Many CoCs incorrectly provided proposed numeric achievements.
- On the discharge planning section, many CoCs did not fully respond to the questions asked for each level of development. For example, many CoCs that indicated that a formal protocol had been implemented failed to specifically address where persons routinely go following discharge. In addition, although CoCs that selected that a formal protocol for a particular system of care was either finalized or implemented were required to attach the actual protocol, many either failed to attach anything or simply attached a summary of the protocol.
- Most CoCs indicated a high level of coordination with other planning efforts.

Part IV: CoC Performance—28 total points

→ CoC Performance was measured based on the CoC's progress in reducing homelessness, including chronic homelessness as follows:

- The CoC completed the action steps proposed in 2007 and met or exceeded proposed achievements;
 - The CoC has increased the number of permanent housing beds for the chronically homeless and made progress toward eliminating chronic homelessness;
 - Program participants' success in moving to and maintaining permanent housing as reported in the most recent Annual Progress Report (APR) for all projects within the CoC;
 - The extent to which participants successfully become employed and access mainstream programs. Both housing and supportive services-only projects were assessed;
 - Projects within the CoC have policies and practices in place to hire, and have hired, low and very-low income employees and subcontractors under Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968;
 - Projects within the CoC incorporate energy-efficiency measures in the design, construction, rehabilitation, and operation of housing or community facilities; and,
 - The extent to which the CoC's application demonstrated a local plan and/or existing policy to remove regulatory barriers to the production of affordable housing. Applicable activities included the support of state and local efforts to streamline processes, eliminate redundant requirements, statutes, regulations, and codes that impede the availability of affordable housing.
- Summary of CoC Results on Part IV:
- For achievements, CoCs were scored based on how they performed in comparison to the proposed achievements indicated in their 2007 application and the extent to which they met HUD's objectives. CoCs that did not submit an application in 2007 were not expected to have data in this section.
 - CoCs were expected to demonstrate progress with reducing chronic homelessness by showing a reduction in the total number of chronically homeless persons and an increase in the number of beds made available for this population.
 - CoCs were expected to demonstrate that they were moving at least 70 percent of participants from TH into PH and that 80 percent of PH participants were maintaining stable housing.

Part V: Emphasis on Housing Activities

- Points were awarded based on the relationship between funds requested for housing activities and funds requested for supportive service activities among new and renewal projects. Housing activities included all approvable requests for funds for rental assistance and approvable requests for acquisition, rehabilitation, construction, leasing and operations when used in connection with housing. HMIS costs and administrative costs will be excluded from this calculation.