

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

AGENCY NAME:	Community	/ Counseling	Services of MS (CCSM)	
PROGRAM(S) INCLUDED:	Community Counseling - ESG-CV RRH			
	Community C	ounseling CoC F	RH	
ANALYSIS DATE RANGE:	7/1/23	THRU	7/31/23	

PART I - PLACEMENTS

	I: PLACEMENTS VS. ADMISSION	-			
0	expected to place 95% of all project entries nto. The discrepancy gives evidence of perso	0		his gives information concerning placements from the w racticing CES process.	aitlist against
PLACEME	ENTS FROM THE WAITLIST	11		ADMISSIONS INTO PROGRAM	11
100.00% of agency admission ut		lized the system path correctly.			
95.00% is the CES standard for Project Enrollment via CES.					
	POINTS OBTAINED	40.00	of 40.00		

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.



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):



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).

		# of scores		
PROGRAM(S) INCLUDED:	Scores 0-3	Scores 4-7	Scores 8+	TOTAL ASSESSMENT SCORES
Community Counseling - ESG-CV RRH Community Counseling CoC RRH	0	5	6	11

POINTS OBTAINED 12.73 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.

				Point	s Key
CALCULATED AVERAGE:		Q		Scoring Range	Points for
CALCOLATED AVERAGE.		0		Score 0-3	5
			-	Score 4-7	10
				Score 8+	15
POINTS OBTAINED	15.00	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.

Placed any Non-CES assigned client? NO

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

PART I - PLACEMENT POINTS				
SECTION I: CES PROJECT ENROLLMENT RATE:	40.00	POINTS (of 40)		
SECTION II: PLACEMENT + ADMISSION, SAME	10.00	POINTS (of 10)		
DAY	10.00	POINTS (01 10)		
PART II - PRIORITIZATION POINTS				
SECTION III: AVERAGE LIST POSITION	13.40	POINTS (of 20)		
SECTION IV: VI-SPDAT SCORE RANGE:	12.73	POINTS (of 15)		
SECTION V: AVERAGE VI-SPDAT SCORE	15.00	POINTS (of 15)		
SECTION VI: SCORE DEDUCTIONS	0.00	POINTS		
OVERALL PROGRAM GRADE	91.13	Α	7	
of	100.00 p	oints		

MONTHLY METRIC ANANLYSIS NOTES:

Range



MISSISSIPPI MMA INFORMATION KEY

(INCLUDING SCORING & FORMULAS)

SECTION I: PLACEMENTS VS. ADMISSIONS

% of agency admissions utilized the	Total # of Placements From t	he Waitlist
system path correctly	Total # of Admissions into Program	
	POINTS	

VALUE = 40% of Overall Grade

POINTS		
FACTOR	MAX POINT VALUE	
lf>=95%	20 Points	
lf < 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.

* Admitted, Same Day		ed, Same Day he Waitlist		
	PO	POINTS		
VALUE = 10% of Overall Grade	FACTOR	FACTOR MAX POINT VALUE		
	lf n% 0-20%	10 Points		
	lf n% 21-40%	8 Points		
	lf n% 41-60%	6 Points		
	lf n% 61-80%	4 Points		
	lf n% 61-80%	2 Points		

SECTION III: AVERAGE PRIORITY LIST POSITION

Г

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

Average List Position Percentage - IND	Average List P	Average List Position for the Agency's Assigned Individuals			
(ALP% - I)	Longest Regio	onal List Length for In	liviuals Across the BoS	— x 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		
Average List Position Percentage - FAM					
Average List Position Percentage - FAM	Average List	Position for the Agen	cy's Assigned Families	100	
Average List Position Percentage - FAM (ALP% - F)			cy's Assigned Families milies Across the BoS	— x 100	
5			, ,	— x 100	
5		onal List Length for Fa	, ,	— x 100	
5	Longest Regi	onal List Length for Fa	milies Across the BoS	— x 100	
5	E Longest Regi	onal List Length for Fa POINTS TIER LEVEL	MAX POINT VALUE	— x 100	

PLANNING FOR LACK OF SCORES OR CUMULATING BOTH SCORES

If there is an instance where an agency has either served all individuals preidetermined 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.

Total Points for Section III	_	(ALP% - IND points) + (ALP% - FAM points)
Total Points for Section III	—	2

SECTION IV: VI-SPDAT SCORE RANGES

Score ranges are dictated by the vairous 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
SCORES 0-3	(# of 0-3 scores n / total assessments) x 0.005
SCORES 4-7	(# of 4-7 scores n / total assessments) x 0.10
SCORES 8+	(# of 8+ scores n / total assessments) x 0.15

Total Points for Section IV

(0-3 Score Calculation) + (4-7 Score Calculation) + (8+ Score Calculation)

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

Average VI-SPDAT Score	_	Culumative Sum of Agency's VI-SPDAT scores
Average VI-SPDAT Score	=	Total # of assessments

=

COMPARISON KEY	
SCORE RANGE	POINTS FOR RANGE
Score 0-3	5
Score 4-7	10
Score 8+	15

CALCULATING OVERALL PROGRAM GRADE

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

rglenn@msbos.org Hannah Maharrey, CoC Director hmaharrey@msbos.org

