



**COORDINATED ENTRY SYSTEMS - RAPID REHOUSING  
MONTHLY METRIC ANALYSIS (MMA)**

**AGENCY NAME:** USM - Institute for Disability Studies  
**PROGRAM(S) INCLUDED:** IDS Project Recovery RRH  
**ANALYSIS DATE RANGE:** 2/1/23 THRU 2/28/23

**PART I - PLACEMENTS**

**SECTION I: PLACEMENTS VS. ADMISSIONS**


Agencies are expected to place 95% of all project entries from regional waitlists in HMIS. This gives information concerning placements from the waitlist against admissions into. The discrepancy gives evidence of persons admitted in program without practicing CES process.

|                                     |   |                                |          |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|----------|
| <b>PLACEMENTS FROM THE WAITLIST</b> | <b>3</b>  | <b>ADMISSIONS INTO PROGRAM</b> | <b>3</b> |
| <b>100.00%</b>                      | of agency admission utilized the system path correctly. |                                |          |
| <b>95.00%</b>                       | is the CES standard for Project Enrollment via CES.     |                                |          |
| <b>POINTS OBTAINED</b>              | <b>40.00</b>  | <b>of 40.00</b>                |          |

**SECTION II: ADDED TO HOUSING WAITLIST AND ADMITTED IN THE SAME DAY**

The prescribed method for placing admissions into program is allowing the client to remain on the waitlist for 1 business day. This allows for HMIS reporting and CES compliance reporting.

|          |                                       |              |   |
|----------|---------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| <b>0</b> | <b>Added &amp; Admitted, Same Day</b> | <b>0.00%</b> | <b>% of Entrants Added to WL + Admitted into Agency Program, Same Day</b> |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Placements from the WL</b>         |              |   |



**POINTS OBTAINED 10.00 of 10.00**

**PART II - PRIORITIZATION**

**SECTION III: AVERAGE PRIORITY LIST POSITION**

Based on this month's admissions into your agency's programs, the average list position of your client(s):

|  |           |  |           |
|--|-----------|--|-----------|
| <b>Average Priority List Position - Assigned Individual Clients:</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>Longest Regional List Length for Individuals:</b> | <b>37</b> |
| <b>Average Priority List Position Assigned Family Clients:</b>       | <b>2</b>  | <b>Longest Regional List Length for Families:</b>    | <b>9</b>  |

**POINTS OBTAINED 20.00 of 20.00**

**SECTION IV: VI-SPDAT SCORE RANGES**

The following table displays the amount of VI-SPDAT scores falling within recommended ranges.

Scores 0-3 usually recommended for Rapid Resolution/Diversion. Scores 4-7 usually recommended for Rapid Rehousing (RRH). Scores 8 or above are usually recommended for Rapid Rehousing (RRH) or Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH).

| PROGRAM(S) INCLUDED:     | # of scores |            |           | TOTAL ASSESSMENT SCORES |
|--------------------------|-------------|------------|-----------|-------------------------|
|                          | Scores 0-3  | Scores 4-7 | Scores 8+ |                         |
| IDS Project Recovery RRH | 0           | 3          | 0         | 3                       |

**POINTS OBTAINED 10.00 of 15.00**

**SECTION V: AVERAGE VI-SPDAT SCORE**

This number is compiled by the averaging the scores from those persons placed in your programs from regional housing waitlists. Points given correlate to the VI-SPDAT Score recommendations.

|                            |          |
|----------------------------|----------|
| <b>CALCULATED AVERAGE:</b> | <b>7</b> |
|----------------------------|----------|

**Points Key**

| Scoring Range | Points for Range |
|---------------|------------------|
| Score 0-3     | 5                |
| Score 4-7     | 10               |
| Score 8+      | 15               |

**POINTS OBTAINED 10.00 of 15.00**

**SECTION VI: SCORE DEDUCTIONS**

This section includes point penalties for announced measures regarding the Coordinated Entry process. Any penalties incurred will reduce your overall score.

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Placed any Non-CES assigned client?</b> | <b>NO</b> |
|--|-----------|

All RRH and PSH clients should be assigned via CoC CES staff. This EXCLUDES HIV/AIDS+, DV, and Veteran service programs. If the question is answered YES, there is a 10 POINT DEDUCTION.

**POINTS DEDUCTED 0.00**

**SUMMARY OF METRIC ANALYSIS**

**PART I - PLACEMENT POINTS**

|   |              |                |
|---|--------------|----------------|
| SECTION I: CES PROJECT ENROLLMENT RATE:     | <b>40.00</b> | POINTS (of 40) |
| SECTION II: PLACEMENT + ADMISSION, SAME DAY | <b>10.00</b> | POINTS (of 10) |

**PART II - PRIORITIZATION POINTS**

|                                    |              |                |
|------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| SECTION III: AVERAGE LIST POSITION | <b>20.00</b> | POINTS (of 20) |
| SECTION IV: VI-SPDAT SCORE RANGE:  | <b>10.00</b> | POINTS (of 15) |
| SECTION V: AVERAGE VI-SPDAT SCORE  | <b>10.00</b> | POINTS (of 15) |
| SECTION VI: SCORE DEDUCTIONS       | <b>0.00</b>  | POINTS         |

|                              |              |          |
|------------------------------|--------------|----------|
| <b>OVERALL PROGRAM GRADE</b> | <b>90.00</b> | <b>A</b> |
|------------------------------|--------------|----------|

**of 100.00 points**

**MONTHLY METRIC ANALYSIS NOTES:**



**SECTION I: PLACEMENTS VS. ADMISSIONS**

$$\frac{\text{\% of agency admissions utilized the system path correctly}}{\text{\% of agency admissions utilized the system path correctly}} = \frac{\text{Total \# of Placements From the Waitlist}}{\text{Total \# of Admissions into Program}}$$

**VALUE = 40% of Overall Grade**

| POINTS    |                 |
|-----------|-----------------|
| FACTOR    | MAX POINT VALUE |
| If >= 95% | 20 Points       |
| If < 95%  | n% x .40        |

It is prohibited for any CoC-funded, SSVF-funded, or ESG-funded housing project to serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness or at imminent risk of homelessness without the household first going through the Coordinated Entry System and being added to the waitlist.

Per HUD's standard outlined in the CoC program rating and ranking process, 95% of project entries must originate from the Coordinated Entry System (waitlist/prioritization policy). The remaining 5% of project entries must be documented by need and verified with the CES Director.

**SECTION II: ADDED TO HOUSING WAITLIST AND ADMITTED IN THE SAME DAY**

The prescribed method for placing admissions into program is allowing the client to remain on the waitlist for 1 business day. This allows for HMIS reporting and CES compliance reporting.

$$\frac{\text{\% of Entrants Added to the WL + Admitted, Same Day}}{\text{\% of Entrants Added to the WL + Admitted, Same Day}} = \frac{\text{Total \# of Added WL + Admitted, Same Day}}{\text{Total \# of Placements From the Waitlist}}$$

**VALUE = 10% of Overall Grade**

| POINTS       |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|
| FACTOR       | MAX POINT VALUE |
| If n% 0-20%  | 10 Points       |
| If n% 21-40% | 8 Points        |
| If n% 41-60% | 6 Points        |
| If n% 61-80% | 4 Points        |
| If n% 61-80% | 2 Points        |

**SECTION III: AVERAGE PRIORITY LIST POSITION**

This metric is based on the current month's admissions from the waitlist into your agency's programs and the average list position of your client(s). This metric is separated by waitlist for individuals and waitlist for families. The calculations for points are based on whether the average position falls in the top tier (0-33rd percentage), middle tier (34th-65 percentage) or lower tier (66 percentage or more).

**VALUE = 20% of Overall Grade**

$$\frac{\text{Average List Position Percentage - IND (ALP\% - I)}}{\text{Average List Position Percentage - IND (ALP\% - I)}} = \frac{\text{Average List Position for the Agency's Assigned Individuals}}{\text{Longest Regional List Length for Individuals Across the BoS}} \times 100$$

| POINTS           |            |                 |
|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| FACTOR           | TIER LEVEL | MAX POINT VALUE |
| If ALP% 0-33%    | TOP        | 20 Points       |
| If ALP% 34-65%   | MIDDLE     | 13.4 Points     |
| If ALP% 66% or > | LOWER      | 6.7 Points      |

$$\frac{\text{Average List Position Percentage - FAM (ALP\% - F)}}{\text{Average List Position Percentage - FAM (ALP\% - F)}} = \frac{\text{Average List Position for the Agency's Assigned Families}}{\text{Longest Regional List Length for Families Across the BoS}} \times 100$$

| POINTS           |            |                 |
|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| FACTOR           | TIER LEVEL | MAX POINT VALUE |
| If ALP% 0-33%    | TOP        | 20 Points       |
| If ALP% 34-65%   | MIDDLE     | 13.4 Points     |
| If ALP% 66% or > | LOWER      | 6.7 Points      |

**PLANNING FOR LACK OF SCORES OR CUMULATING BOTH SCORES**

If there is an instance where an agency has either served all individuals predetermined formulas will calculate the factors to ensure that a lack clients from either lists does not affect the scoring. Additionally, if the agency has clients in both individuals and families served, the overall points total will be averaged based on the two (2) score categories.

|                                     |   |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Total Points for Section III</b> | = | $\frac{(\text{ALP\%} - \text{IND points}) + (\text{ALP\%} - \text{FAM points})}{2}$ |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|

**SECTION IV: VI-SPDAT SCORE RANGES**

Score ranges are dictated by the various intervention levels of the VI-SPDAT. Each score is classified in its range. Scores 0-3 usually recommended for Rapid Resolution/Diversion. Scores 4-7 usually recommended for Rapid Rehousing (RRH). Scores 8 or above are usually recommended for Rapid Rehousing (RRH) or Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH).

As each score is distributed the number of scores in each category is multiplied by the percentage points assigned to each category. The higher the VI-SPDAT score, the closer you move towards the maximum point value (20 points).

**VALUE = 15% of Overall Grade**

| SCORE RANGE       | POINT CALCULATION                               |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>SCORES 0-3</b> | (# of 0-3 scores n / total assessments) x 0.005 |
| <b>SCORES 4-7</b> | (# of 4-7 scores n / total assessments) x 0.10  |
| <b>SCORES 8+</b>  | (# of 8+ scores n / total assessments) x 0.15   |

|                                    |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Total Points for Section IV</b> | = | <b>(0-3 Score Calculation) + (4-7 Score Calculation) + (8+ Score Calculation)</b> |
|------------------------------------|---|---|

**SECTION V: AVERAGE VI-SPDAT SCORE**

This number is compiled by the averaging the scores from those persons placed in your programs from regional housing waitlists. Points given correlate to the VI-SPDAT Score recommendations.

**VALUE = 15% of Overall Grade**

|                               |   |  |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Average VI-SPDAT Score</b> | = | $\frac{\text{Cumulative Sum of Agency's VI-SPDAT scores}}{\text{Total \# of assessments}}$ |
|-------------------------------|---|--|

**COMPARISON KEY**

| SCORE RANGE      | POINTS FOR RANGE |
|------------------|------------------|
| <b>Score 0-3</b> | <b>5</b>         |
| <b>Score 4-7</b> | <b>10</b>        |
| <b>Score 8+</b>  | <b>15</b>        |

**CALCULATING OVERALL PROGRAM GRADE**

Your grade is based on the total scoring compiled from the five (5) scoring criteria:

|                              |   |  |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Overall Program Grade</b> | = | <b>Section I + Section II + Section III + Section IV + Section V</b> |
|------------------------------|---|--|

| SCORING KEY | GRADE    |
|-------------|----------|
| 100 - 90    | <b>A</b> |
| 89 - 80     | <b>B</b> |
| 79 - 70     | <b>C</b> |
| 69 - 60     | <b>D</b> |
| Below 60    | <b>F</b> |

**QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR MMA? CONTACT US!**

**EMAIL:** Reginald Glenn, CES Director  
[rglenn@msbos.org](mailto:rglenn@msbos.org)  
 Hannah Maharrey, CoC Director  
[hmaharrey@msbos.org](mailto:hmaharrey@msbos.org)

**PHONE:** (601) 624-4003  
**FAX:** (601) 487-0984

**WEBSITE:** [www.msbos.org/ces](http://www.msbos.org/ces)

