**SMAC Ranking Committee Overview of Scoring/Ranking Process**

The following describes the process used by the SMAC ranking committee to score and rank projects for 2015 CoC funding. It should be noted that the Ranking Committee used “scoring” and “ranking” as two distinct steps. Scoring informed but did not dictate the final ranking decisions. Where ranking and scoring did not correlate, the Ranking Committee provided comments to indicate why the project was ranked in their position.

7/1/15 Pre-applications due to SMAC coordinators

10/1/15 Ranking Committee Meeting #1: Pre-applications scored, ranked, and selected

* In Attendance: Jeremy Galley, Courtney Knoll, Abby Guilford, Michele Reid, Mike Manhard, Mallory Birch, Dana Scarlett
* Process
  + SMAC had outlined priorities for funding Coordinated Entry, youth projects and projects that served the whole region.
  + The Link had the highest scoring project and aligned with the priority for a youth project.
  + LSS Streetworks was selected as the Coordinated Entry project based on score. The proposal also outlines a model that will serve SMAC as a region.

Pre-application Final Ranking

| **RANK** | **Score** | **Agency** | **Project** | | **Comments** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Selected Projects | | | | | *Rationale provided only for the projects that ranked differently than they had scored.* |
|  | Not selected, but invited to apply | | | | |
| 1 | 1 | **The Link** | | **RRH** | | Selected for Bonus Project |
| 2 | 2 | **LSS Streetworks** | | **Coordinated Entry** | | Selected for funding through reallocation |
| 3 | 3 | **Commonbond** | | **PSH** | | No Comment |
| 4 | 4 | **Scott-Carver-Dakota CAP** | | **Coordinated Entry** | | No Comment |
| 5 | 5 | **The Bridge** | | **Youth Shelter/Housing** | | No Comment |

10/2-10/5 Pre-applicants notified.

All applicants were invited to apply for the 2015 competition, but low ranking projects were notified that it was possible their applications would be rejected if sufficient funding could not be identified through renewal project reallocations/rejections.

10/14/15 Project Applications due to SMAC coordinator

25 competitive project and one planning grants were received.

10/14-10/19 MESH conducted technical review of Project Applications and conducted initial scoring. In addition to project applications, the following items were used to inform scoring:

* Project APRs
* Organizational Audit
* Recent HUD audits and findings
* LOCCS Drawdown and unspent funds
* Project Educational and Early Childhood documents (for family/youth projects)

10/20/15 Ranking Committee Meeting #2: Project scores reviewed

* In Attendance: Dana Scarlett, Mallory Birch, Mike Manhard, Trisha Kauffman, Abby Guilford, Jen Romero, Michele Reid
* Process
  + Reviewed technical reviews and scoring of SMAC projects
  + Members assigned projects to call and review their initial scores
  + Initial score sheet will be emailed to applicant prior to scheduled call with ranking committee member.

10/21-10/27 One-on-one interview were conducted with each Project.

Ranking committee conducted one-one interviews which each program to clarify any concerns and to make recommendations to improving scoring. Projects were invited to amend applications based upon initial scoring. Amended applications were reviewed and scoring was adjusted.

10/28/15 Ranking Committee Meeting #3: Initial ranking deliberation

* In Attendance: Dana Scarlett, Mallory Birch, Mike Manhard, Trisha Kauffman, Abby Guilford, Jen Romero, Michele Reid, Courtney Knoll, Jeremy Galley
* Process
  + Confirmed scoring of SMAC projects
  + Reviewed “site visit” highlights – any items that might suggest ranking should be different than scoring.
  + Final scoring was determined.
    - In lieu of “total score”, the ranking committee opted to go with a scaled-score based on percentages and removed Veterans question in the scores (prioritization for serving Veterans is being implemented and evaluated through Coordinated Entry system-wide performance, not per project.

11/2/15 Ranking Committee Meeting #4: Initial Project Ranking

* In Attendance: Courtney Knoll, Dana Scarlett, Mallory Birch, Mike Manhard, Abby Guilford, Michele Reid, Jeremy Galley, Jen Romero, Trisha Kauffman
* Process
  + Determined that ranking will match scoring for the top two-thirds of projects. For bottom third, Ranking committee reviewed model, geographic region, current and historic performance, and Tier 2 scoring to determine any variance from scoring to ranking.
  + Wilder was moved from #24 to #22 in the ranking following SMAC’s priority for keeping funding for HMIS in Tier 1.
  + The Link’s new rapid rehousing bonus project was moved from #20 to #25 to reside in the bottom of Tier 2 in order to avoid putting renewal projects at risk.
  + With these initial adjustments to ranking, the bottom 3 projects were all rapid rehousing (RRH). This was a concern and deliberation was had about if the tool was scoring RRH appropriately. It was decided that RRH programs should have better performance outcomes because of the short term of the program and the level of need of clients served by that program type. Therefore, it was agreed the error was not with the scoring tool.
  + Looked at HUD priorities and SMAC identified priorities. It was decided that family programs and youth programs were important to keep in Tier 1 as much as possible. It was also decided that projects that served the entire region should remain in Tier 1.
  + Past performance was reviewed. Historic low performance led the committee to move the Scott-Carver-Dakota CAP RRH from #25 to #22 into Tier 1 and leave Dakota County SHP (three years of underperformance in project outcomes) at #23, straddling the line between Tier 1 and Tier 2.
  + In order to minimize the number of total beds and total projects at risk, the committee decided to move MHR Permanent Housing for Chronic Homelessness from #22 to #24 (2nd in Tier 2). Our rationale for doing this was that it put only 2 beds at risk and it had the lowest scoring of the PSH projects.

11/2/15 Initial ranking was posted to Anoka County’s website. The link was emailed to all project applicants

alerting them to the posting and the appeals process.

11/3/15 SMAC Coordinator received written appeals from both of the projects ranked in Tier 2 (Dakota County

and Mental Health Resources) appealing their ranking.

11/4/15 Appeals Committee met to consider the appeals and decide if ranking would change.

The Ranking Committee unanimously voted to keep the initial ranking order as the final ranking. Rationale was recorded and shared with Projects. **Final ranking was posted publicly on** [**www.mesh-mn.org**](http://www.mesh-mn.org) **and shared with all projects and CoC members.**

**11/2/15 Initial and Final RANKING (Approved unanimously)**

| **RANK** | **Score** | **Agency** | **Project** | **Rationale** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Tier 1 Projects | | | *Rationale provided only for the projects that ranked differently than they had scored.* |
|  | Project Straddles Tier 1 and Tier 2 | | |
|  | Tier 2 | | |
| **1** | **1** | **LSS Streetworks** | Coordinated Entry |  |
| **2** | **2** | **South Metro Human Services** | SMAC RA |  |
| **3** | **3** | **CommonBond Communities** | Granada Lakes Supportive Housing |  |
| **4** | **4** | **The Link** | Supportive Housing Project |  |
| **5** | **5** | **County of Scott** | H238 2103 Renewal |  |
| **6** | **6** | **Scott-Carver-Dakota CAP Agency** | Dakota PS Bryant & 13404 Aldrich Operations |  |
| **7** | **7** | **Washington County HRA** | S+C |  |
| **8** | **8** | **Mental Health Resources, Inc.** | Project Restore |  |
| **9** | **9** | **Metropolitan Council, Minnesota** | Anoka County CoC 2014 |  |
| **10** | **10** | **South Metro Human Services** | Anoka RA |  |
| **11** | **11** | **Carver CDA** | Carver CDA S+C Program |  |
| **12** | **12** | **Dakota County CDA** | S+C 2014 |  |
| **13** | **13** | **Scott-Carver-Dakota CAP Agency** | Scott/Carver PH Combo Grant |  |
| **14** | **14** | **Canvas Health** | Mosaic 2014 |  |
| **15** | **15** | **Scott-Carver-Dakota CAP Agency** | Scott Carver Dakota PSH Project |  |
| **16** | **16** | **Hearth Connection** | Hearth SMAC 2015 |  |
| **17** | **17** | **Canvas Health** | SHARE 2014 |  |
| **18** | **18** | **LSS** | Anoka Supportive Housing |  |
| **19** | **19** | **The Link** | Lincoln Place |  |
| **20** | **21** | **Hearth Connection** | Hearth Expansion |  |
| **21** | **24** | **Wilder Foundation** | SMAC HMIS | Moved from #24 to #22 due to SMAC’s priority to retain HMIS funding in Tier 1. |
| **22** | **25** | **Scott-Carver-Dakota CAP Agency** | Scott/Carver HUD RRH | Moved from #25 to #22 due to:   * Minimizing risks to family and RRH beds (Fewer projects in Tier 2). * Underperformance was a concern, but not as historic of a problem as Dakota Supportive Housing Program. |
| **23** | **23** | **Dakota County** | Supportive Housing Program | Remained at #23 due to:   * Historic underperformance * Appropriate sized project to straddle Tier 1/2 * Fewer projects in Tier 2 at risk |
| **24** | **22** | **Mental Health Resources, Inc.** | Permanent Housing for Chronically Homeless | Moved from #22 to #24 due to:   * Lowest scoring PSH project. We did not to put only RRH in Tier 2. * Put only 2 beds at risk |
| **25** | **20** | **The Link** | New RRH | Moved from #20 to #25 to reside in the bottom of Tier 2 in order to avoid putting renewal projects at risk. |