Rank and Review Committee Charter

I. Purpose

The Review and Ranking Committee (the "Committee") shall be a Committee of the Corporation. The purpose of the Committee shall be to ensure there are collaborative and transparent processes for non-profit and units of local government within the CoC geographic area to apply for HUD Continuum of Care funding. This includes coordination of an annual local application process beginning with the solicitation of applications, development and revisions as needed to application forms, scoring rubrics and other required documents, ranking of projects based on score and the submission of the project applications and the Consolidated Application to HUD.

II. Composition

The Committee shall be comprised of at least three (3) members of the Board of Directors and may include at-large stakeholders and/or other individuals with program and funding application review experience/expertise. No more than one-third of the members can be representatives of the Public Sector. Committee members must be non-conflicted meaning members may not be employees, owners, stakeholders, directors, officers, funders, board members, or independent contractors to any organization that submits or will benefit from the local application that is being reviewed, scored, and ranked.

III. Meetings

The Committee shall meet at least four times a year, or when necessary. The Committee may meet privately with independent advisors and members of management.

All meetings of the committee shall be held pursuant to the by-laws of the Corporation with regard to notice and waiver thereof, and written minutes of each meeting shall be duly filed in the Corporation's records. Reports of meetings of the committee, including committee actions and recommendations, shall be made to the board at its next regularly scheduled meeting following the committee meeting.

IV. Authority

The Committee shall have full access to all management and authority to consult with independent advisors.

V. Responsibilities

The Committee shall:

A. Review and make recommendations for revisions to Policies and Procedures related to the submission of the annual Consolidated Application for CoC Funding to HUD.
B. Review and revise all documents related to the annual application process:
C. Committee members will attend any necessary or required CoC meetings.
D. Review and recommend capital expenditures and unbudgeted operating expenditures that exceed management's spending authority.
E. Review and approve capital expenditures and unbudgeted operating expenses that, per board-approved policy, are above management's authority but below the threshold required for board approval.
F. Review the financial aspects of major proposed transactions, new programs and services, as well as proposals to discontinue programs or services, and make action recommendations to the board.
G. Review and recommend to the board policies governing employee benefits plans.
H. Monitor the financial performance of the organization as a whole and its major funding sources or business lines against approved budgets, long-term trends, and industry benchmarks.
I. Recommend and monitor corrective actions to bring the CoC into compliance with its budget, other financial targets and funding source(s) requirements.

J. Review CoC’s policies and strategies with respect to insurance and risk management.
K. Ensure timely and accurate financial reporting to the board.
L. Undertake such other matters as may be referred to by the Board of Directors from time to time.

VI. Limitation on Committee Duties

The Committee is not responsible for the submission of the HUD CoC Funding application. The Corporation’s management, as the Lead Agency for the CoC, is responsible for the preparation and submission of the Consolidated Application to HUD and is responsible for ensuring the application process is compliant with HUD regulations describing the role of a CoC.

VII. Review of Charter

The committee will review this charter on an annual basis and will submit any revisions to the charter to the board for approval.

Continuum of Care Written Standard for Rankings and Ratings Protocol NY-500 – Rochester/Monroe County

I. Purpose & Process

Partners Ending Homelessness (PEH) is the designated U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Continuum of Care (CoC) Collaborative Applicant for the City of Rochester and Monroe County. Through this designation, PEH is required to establish protocols for the (CoC) Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO), which includes a transparent framework for its annual scoring, ranking, and approval process. To best serve our community members with effective projects, those that most closely align with HUD and CoC priorities will be prioritized for funding. This document will be reviewed and approved by PEH staff, PEH stakeholders, also known as the Homeless Services Network (HSN), and the Rank and Review Committee, as outlined below.

The Rank and Review Committee ("the Committee") consists only of non-conflicted PEH Board of Directors Members, staff from the City of Rochester and Monroe County, community members, and non-voting members of the PEH staff. Please see Appendix A for a list of the current participating agencies of the Rank and Review Committee. The duties are to perform ratings and rankings for all applications to the HUD CoC NOFO. PEH also works with People with Lived Experience and Expertise to obtain their feedback on community priorities and application questions.

A second committee, the CoC's Program Monitoring Committee, is tasked with conducting an annual on-site monitoring visit to each of the HUD CoC-funded projects. PEH provides committee members with training on how to conduct site visits. Projects are evaluated for performance, achieving the outcomes specified in the grant application through the review of participant files, policies and procedures, data quality, Coordinated Entry usage, and case management entries. Additional documents, such as homeless and/or disability documentation, housing inspection forms, and rent calculations, are also reviewed.

Approximately 1-2 Committee members attend site visits, along with 2-3 PEH staff members. Committee members may speak with project staff if they have questions or need to find specific documents, etc. Site visits occur annually following the end of the program's contract year, so they can review the project's Annual Performance Report (APR) to have a point of reference to evaluate performance. PEH reserves the right to conduct a site visit at any point during the contract year.

Committee members calculate their scores for the section(s) of the monitoring report that they were assigned and are provided to PEH staff. Once all scores are tabulated, PEH will send a copy of the completed Monitoring form to the Committee Member for their feedback. At the conclusion of the process, the Committee refers to PEH staff any competitive project requiring improvement.

PEH staff provides performance improvement support to projects referred to staff by the Committee.

After an appropriate time as agreed upon by the Committee and PEH staff, the Committee conducts a performance review of each project that has received performance improvement support.

The Committee, in collaboration with PEH staff, refers to the Board of Directors any project that has received performance improvement support but has not shown an improvement. The Committee will include its recommendations with a referral to the Board of Directors.

This process is consistent with HUD regulations through 24 CFR 578.7(a) that "The Continuum must:
Consult with recipients and subrecipients to establish performance targets appropriate for population and program type, monitor recipient and subrecipient performance, evaluate outcomes, and take action against poor performers; and Evaluate outcomes of projects funded under the Emergency Solutions Grants program and the Continuum of Care program, and report to HUD."

PEH's monitoring, application review, and ranking informs HUD's CoC program on which projects high performing, effective, and deserve to receive annual funding in order to best serve the homeless population in Rochester and Monroe County.

II. New Project Application Process

Annually, PEH issues new applications for agencies seeking HUD CoC funding. Applications are publicly distributed through a local RFP process and are advertised on social media, the HSN full listserv, and the CoC's website. Application instructions are also distributed alongside the applications. The application instructions include all relevant due dates, threshold requirements, submission protocol, and attachment requirements.

New funding can be created in two ways: through bonus funding issued by HUD during the CoC competition, which is communicated by HUD and PEH (amounts, eligible priorities, etc.), and through current CoC funding that has been reallocated from a current project, which will add funding for any new and eligible projects. This will be further discussed in this document.

New funding applications also encompass expansion applications for existing CoC projects. Only projects that scored in Tier 1in the previous year's competition are eligible to apply for an expansion of the existing project. Projects that had a significant finding during CoC annual monitoring are ineligible to submit expansion applications. Significant findings include a history of unspent funds and/or misuse of funds, non-compliance in serving the target population, significant data errors, and unwillingness to accept technical assistance from the CoC.

Applications are split into three sections: threshold requirements, program design narrative, and performance measures. Projects and agencies must meet threshold requirements to be considered in the funding competition. Program design and performance measures will be used to determine ranking in the funding competition.

III. Renewal Project Application Process

Renewal projects are scored according to the rubric described in the renewal application. Renewal projects are scored on HUD compliance, CoC compliance, program narratives, performance measures, and monitoring scores.

Much of the information in the renewal application is reported to HUD on the Annual Performance Report (APR), during project monitoring by CoC staff and Rank and Review Committee volunteers, or is otherwise available through HMIS. Projects serving domestic violence survivors are asked to submit data in a CSV from their comparable database for the renewal process. *As of June 2026, the CoC does not have a DV CoC-funded agency.

Projects that have been operational for less than an entire program year will receive full points for performance measures.

The CoC-funded projects' monitoring scores are compiled into a Scoring Report by CoC staff that is made available to all funded projects as soon as the funding competition opens. Monitoring scores are a combination of information received from annual monitoring site visits and projects' APRs.

The Scoring Report will be released to all funded projects at the same time as the new application. Projects will have until the application due date to review and dispute or accept the Scoring Report and respond to narrative questions.

If a project seeks to dispute the competition report, project representatives can give written or verbal justification of the dispute to the Rank and Review Committee. The Committee will then vote to accept or reject the dispute.

IV. Review & Selection Process

The Committee reviews and scores all renewal and new applications. The committee is given a detailed rubric and reports scores through email. Scores are compiled and reviewed in a committee meeting to ensure accuracy and limit discrepancies between reviewers.

Projects that fail to meet threshold requirements as outlined in the local application will be held out of the competition. These projects may request that the CoC provide them with technical assistance to assist in improving their application for future competitions. This process ensures that organizations that may lack the current capacity to receive a federal grant can build their capacity for a future year.

All renewal projects will be selected to move forward in the competition, unless subject to reallocation. The reallocation process can be found in Section V.

All projects will receive written notice on the outcome of the initial review process and the justification of the decision by email, when possible, no later than 15 days before the CoC Program Competition application submission deadline.

V. Reallocation protocol

Per the CoC Program, "Reallocation is a process that the CoC uses to shift funds in whole or part from existing eligible renewal projects to create one or more new projects without decreasing the CoC's ARD" that will better address the needs of the homeless. Conversely, reallocation can reduce or eliminate funding from existing renewal projects. The CoC Ranking and Review Committee, a non-conflicted group of CoC Board and community members (i.e., does not receive HUD CoC funding), makes final reallocation decisions based on the following:

- Project has not expended 100% of grant funds for two or more consecutive years
  - Unspent funds are reallocated for new projects
- A project voluntarily decides not to renew its project
- A project voluntarily requests its existing program(s) funding to be reallocated to create a new project that meets community needs.
- A program has a history of not meeting performance measures and has not followed through a performance improvement plan. This may include both outcome measures and utilization.
- A project that has deficiencies in the ongoing operation of the programs.
- Projects have been in the bottom 40% of CoC Ranking (i.e., Tier 2 for FY26) due to low performance for two or more consecutive years, as evidenced by the project's Annual Performance Report, performance measures, and CoC Ranking Process.
- An agency does not complete the local renewal application process.

VI. Ranking Protocol

A project ranking list is generated using scores outlined in Sections IV and V of this Ranking Protocol, in alignment with HUD and local CoC priorities. Projects that have passed threshold requirements and have been selected for funding are ranked based on application score and local priority. They will then be placed into Tier 1 until all Tier 1 funds are allocated. The remaining projects selected for funding will be ranked and placed into Tier 2 until all Tier 2 funds are allocated.

The Planning Grant is not ranked in the NOFO process. Coordinated Entry and HMIS Grants will not be scored and protected due to the necessity of the projects to the operation of the CoC and will be ranked in Tier 1. They are, however, monitored by the Project Monitoring Committee and reviewed for usage of funds, project efficacy, and written standards, current and upheld.

Once the Committee has ranked applicants' renewal applications, the preliminary ranking will be emailed to all member agencies, with specific scoring forwarded to the related applicant. If there are no successful appeals, the preliminary ranking becomes the final ranking.

Tier 1 and Tier 2 structures will be reviewed with the Committee and sent to the Board of Directors. Recommendations of the Committee will be voted on by the Board no later than 15 days prior to the CoC submission deadline.

The final Consolidated Application, which includes the Project Priority List and the Collaborative Application, will be posted publicly no later than 48 hours prior to its submission.

The Committee's recommendation will be presented to the PEH Board for approval. An applicant may challenge the Committee's recommendation to the Board by emailing the PEH Deputy Director with a Notice of Appeal as outlined in section VII.

VII. Appeals Process

An applicant must submit a request for an appeal in writing to PEH within three days of notification from the Committee. Possible grounds for appeal are: the applicant was denied the right to participate in or eliminated from the local application process; the applicant believes that decisions made regarding their ranking, amount of awarded funding, or elimination of their program were unsubstantiated based on project performance or other factors that can be documented. Decisions made regarding applications that were not submitted by the deadline(s) or were incomplete cannot be appealed.

The total score for the application is provided to the Applicant at the time of award notification. At no time during the appeals process will the scores of individual reviewers be discussed. At all points during the Appeal process, the discussion will be respectful and fact-based.

Phase I of the Appeal Process will be a discussion between the Applicant, PEH staff, and at least three representatives of the Committee (Phase I members). The applicant will present their case, which will be followed by questions and discussion. The intended goal of this phase is to reach an agreement on a resolution of all appealable issues presented.

If issues are not resolved during Phase I, **Phase II** of the Appeal Process will ensue. The Phase I Committee will be joined by two independent participants (Appeal Committee). The independent members of the Appeal Committee will be PEH Board members who did not participate in the Application Review process and whose organization that they represent did not receive or did not apply for CoC funding for the 2026 funding round. The Appeal Committee will again review the grounds of the appeal and the basis of the actions taken. They will then either uphold or revoke the decision(s) of the Application Review Committee. Corrective action(s) will then be developed.

Decisions made during either Phase I or Phase II are final.

If Applicant is still not in agreement with the results of Phase II, they should review the HUD NOFO and follow instructions on how and on what grounds they can make an appeal to HUD. Should the project decide to pursue a formal appeal to HUD, the applicant will be referred to page 116 of the FY2026 NOFO to follow HUD's appeals process and how to submit a solo application outside of the CoC.

NOTE: Appeals will only be considered in cases where applicants have concerns specific to the review process and scoring of their application. Appeals specific to the ranking or funding recommendation will not be considered. All notices of appeal must be based on the information submitted by the application due date. No new or additional information will be considered. Omissions to the application cannot be appealed.

Appendix A

Rank & Review Committee Participating Agencies

City of Rochester
East House
SEAC (Southeast Area Coalition)
Soldier On
Eagle Star Housing
Veterans' Administration (VA)
Villa of Hope
Together Now *
Monroe County *
Greater Rochester Housing Partnership
Huther Doyle *
Rochester Regional
United Way of Rochester
Genesee Land Trust *
Dimitri House *
Monroe County Office of Mental Health (OMH) *
Community Volunteer
(Street Outreach)
Episcopal Senior Life (55+)

*CoC Board Member