COC Name: St. Clair Shores, Warren/Macomb County COC

COC Number: MI-503

This document summarizes the scores your COC received in the FY 2016 Continuum of Care Program Competition application. It provides three sets of information:

- The CoC's score on several high priority questions;
- A summary of the CoC's scores on the four sections of the application; and
- A summary of the average COC score, including the highest and lowest scores.

The scores are organized in the same manner as the COC application. In a separate document, we are publishing a crosswalk showing how the questions in the COC application were related to the questions in the NOFA.

High Priority COC Application Questions

Below is a selection of high priority COC Application questions that includes the total points available for each of the questions listed and the points received by the COC for the question. The chart below indicates the maximum amount of points available for each scoring category and the actual score your COC received.

High Priority COC Application Questions			
COC Application Questions	Maximum Score Available	coc Score Received	
IF. Continuum of Care (COC) Project Review,		
Ranking, and	l Selection		
This question assessed whether a COC used objective criteria and past performance to review and rank projects. To receive full points, CoCs would have had to use performance-based criteria to at least partially evaluate and rank projects. Examples of performance criteria include reducing the length of time people experienced homelessness and the degree to which people exited programs for permanent housing destinations. IF-2. In the sections below, check the appropriate box(s) for each section to indicate how project applications were reviewed and ranked for the FY 2016 COC Program Competition. (Written documentation of the COCs publicly announced Rating and Review procedure must be attached.)	10	10	

_	i O	
High Priority COC App	Discation Questions	
COC Application Questions	Maximum Score Available	coc Score Received
IF-2a. Describe how the COC considered the	4	4
severity of needs and vulnerabilities of		
participants that are, or will be, served by the		
project applications when determining		
project application priority.		
Homeless Management	Information System	
(HMIS) Bed (Coverage	
2C-2. Per the 2016 Housing Inventory Count (HIC),	4	
indicate the number of beds in the 2016 HIC and		
in HMIS for each project type within the COC. If a		
particular project type does not exist in the COC		
then enter "O" for all cells in that project type.		
3A. Continuum of Ca	are (COC) System	
Perform	ance	
This question captured the change in PIT counts of	7	7
Sheltered and Unsheltered Homeless Persons		
3A-1a. Using the table provided, indicate the		
number of persons who were homeless at the		
Point-in-Time (PIT) based on the 2015 and 2016		
PIT counts (or the two most recent years' PIT		
counts were conducted) as recorded in the		
Homelessness Data Exchange (HDX)		
3A-3. Performance Measure: Length of Time	7	7
Homeless. Describe the CoCs efforts to reduce the		
length of time individuals and families remain		
homeless. Specifically, describe how the COC has		
reduced the average length of time homeless,		
including how the COC identifies and houses		
individuals and families with the longest lengths of		
time homeless.		

4	4
3	3
	3

High Priority COC Application Questions COC **COC Application Questions** Maximum Score Available Score Received Rehousing (RRH) to permanent housing destinations or retained their permanent housing between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015 3A-5. Performance Measure: Returns to 4 Homelessness: Describe the CoCs efforts to reduce the rate of individuals and families who return to homelessness. Specifically, describe strategies your COC has implemented to identify and minimize the returns to homelessness, and demonstrate the use of HMIS or a comparable database to monitor and record returns to homelessness. 3A.8. Enter the date the COC submitted the 10 10 system performance measure data into HDX. The System Performance Report generated by HDX must be attached. 3B. Continuum of Care (COC) Performance and

Strategic Planning Objectives

Comp	Compension Deorieting		
3+1.2. Compare the total number of PSH beds (COC program and non-CoC program funded) that were identified as dedicated for use by chronically homeless persons on the 2016	10		
Housing Inventory Count, as compared to those identified on the 2015 Housing Inventory count.			
3B-23. Compare the number of RRH units available to serve families from the 2015 and 2016 HIC.	5	5	
3B-3.1 Compare the total number of homeless Veterans in the COC as reported by the COC for the 2016 PIT count compared to 2015 (or 2014 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2015.)	8	2	
4B. Additional Policies			
4B-1. Based on the CoCs FY 2016 new and renewal project applications, what percentage of Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH), Transitional Housing (TH), and SSO (non-Coordinated Entry) projects in the COC are low barrier?	6	6	
4B-2. What percentage of COC Program-funded Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Rapid RE-	6	6	

COC Application Questions Maximum Score Available Score Received Housing (RRH), SSO (non-coordinated entry) and Transitional Housing (TH) FY 2016 projects have adopted a Housing First approach, meaning that the project quickly houses clients without preconditions or service participation requirements? 48-4. Compare the number of RRH units

High Priority COC Application Questions

COC Scoring Summary

available to serve all populations from the 2015

and 2016 HIC,

<u></u>		
	Maximum	Your COC
Scoring Category	Score (Points)	Score
		(Points)
Part 1: COC Structure and Governance	51	50.75
Part 2: Data Collection and Quality	27	22
Part 3: COC Performance and Strategic Planning	101	73.5
Part 4: Cross-Cutting Policies	21	21
Total COC Application Score	200	167.25

Overall Scores for all CoCs

Highest Score for any COC: 187.75 Lowest Score for any COC: 79 Median Score for all CoCs: 154.5

Weighted Mean Score for all CoCs: 160.7

^{*}The weighted mean score is the mean COC score weighted by Annual Renewal Demand. COCs that scored higher than the weighted mean score were more likely to gain funding relative to their Annual Renewal Demand, while CoCs that scored lower than the weighted mean were more likely to lose money relative to their Annual Renewal Demand.