

Decatur/Macon County Continuum of Care
IL-516

RATING AND REVIEW PROCEDURE
(E.G., RFP)

REQUEST FOR PROJECTS

DATE: JULY 25, 2017

**TO: CURRENT AND POTENTIAL PROJECT APPLICANTS
FOR HUD CONTINUUM OF CARE FUNDING**

RE: PROJECT APPLICATION PROCESS

Current and potential project applicants are **encouraged to apply for new or renewal projects**. Completed project applications must be submitted via the HUD e-snaps website no later than 8:00 p.m. Central Daylight Time on **Friday, August 17, 2017**.

New and existing providers are specifically encouraged to apply for projects that can be created by **reallocating funds from existing projects** that are considered to be low-performing.

All projects and applicants will undergo a threshold review. Projects must be eligible under HUD regulations and the *Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Continuum of Care Program Competition (FR-6100-N-25)* which can be downloaded at <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/5419/fy-2017-coc-program-nofa/>.

Additional resources, which are critical to the project application process, are available at <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/e-snaps/guides/coc-program-competition-resources/#coc-program-competition--project-applicants>.

Potential applicants are strongly urged to download and read the entire NOFA and use the above resources before proceeding, as HUD has placed clear limitations on project types, and it has created specific processes for completing and submitting project applications.

Once projects are determined to be eligible, they will be reviewed and ranked locally. The **review and ranking procedure** is contained on the following pages.

Project Ranking System Guide

Macon County, Illinois Continuum of Care (IL-516)

Introduction

CoC IL-516 utilized a well-defined set of objective criteria to review, score, and rank projects in the FY2017 CoC Competition. The criteria are balanced, using four major factors:

- Performance Outcome Criteria (10 maximum points, 17% of score)
 - Retention in, or exits to permanent housing
 - Increases in cash income

- Logistical Criteria (13 maximum points, 22% of score)
 - Utilization
 - Drawdowns and recapture
 - HMIS data timeliness
 - HMIS data quality

- Priority Population Criteria (26 maximum points, 44% of score)
 - Chronic Homelessness
 - Multiple barriers

- Best Practice Criteria (10 maximum points, 17% of score)
 - Housing First compliance
 - Project type

The remainder of this guide contains the process, the scoring system and a description of each element and how the score is computed.

Process

The CoC appointed a **Review & Ranking Committee**, consisting of well-qualified people who had no affiliation with any CoC funded program. Among them are a college professor, a consultant, and a formerly homeless ex-client who is now in graduate school. Minutes of every meeting are posted on the website of the Collaborative Applicant. The Committee elected to rank the “unrankable projects” (SSO and HMIS) at the bottom of Tier 1 to protect their funding, and new projects at the bottom, while reserving the right to place new projects higher based on circumstances.

The committee created a **Scoring System** with a scale, using criteria suggested from HUD documents and local research. Among the HUD documents are ones concerning the System Performance Measures, the FY2017 NOFA, the CoC Application instructions, and the debriefing summary from the FY2016 competition.

For **data sources**, the committee used customized APRs in the SAGE format and brief questionnaires. We used the same 121-month period– July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 – for each project.

No subjective data were permitted. The committee devised a scale for each criteria, and rated each project for every criteria.

Scoring System

We use a 59-point scale. The table below shows the criteria across the top, with individual projects listed on the left side.

Factor		Retention or exits to PH	Increases in income	Utilization	Drawdowns	Recapture	HMIS timeliness	HMIS data quality	Chronically Homeless	Multiple barriers	Housing First compliance	Project type	TOTAL SCORE	RANKING
Maximum Score		5	5	5	3	-5	5	5	13	13	5	5	59	
DHA	CH LEASING 07												0	0
	DECATUR COC RENTAL												0	0
DOVE, INC.	TRANSITIONAL HOUSING LEASING												0	0
	PERMANENT HOUSING LEASING												0	0
	HL LEASING 10												0	0
	CH LEASING 13												0	0
	DECATUR RAPID RE-HOUSING												0	0
	DECATUR RAPID RE-HOUSING 15												0	0
													0	0
													0	0

Performance Outcome Criteria

- 5 points – Exits to / retention of permanent housing

How scored: This measures housing stability. For transitional housing projects, the Ranking Committee obtained the percentage of all exits that were to permanent housing. For permanent housing projects including RRH, the committee obtained the number of adults who retained housing plus those who exited to other permanent housing, and computed the total as a percentage of all adult participants. We listed all 8 projects in order, with the highest percentage at the top of the list.

- The two projects with the highest percentage (1-2) received 5 points.
- The two with the next highest percentage (3-4) received 4 points.
- The two with the next highest percentage (5-6) received 3 points.
- Project 7 received 2 points.
- Project 8 received 1 point.

Data source: For transitional housing, the total persons who exited to positive housing destinations in SAGE items 23a and 23b, divided by number of leavers in item 5a(5).

For permanent housing including RRH, the total stayers from SAGE item 5a(8), plus the total persons who exited to positive housing destinations in SAGE items 23a and 23b; all divided by the total number of persons served in item 5a(1).

- 5 points – Increases in Income

How scored: This measures increased resources. The committee looked at the percentage of adult participants who increased their income from employment and non-employment sources during the 12 month period, including those who started with no income and gained some. We listed all 8 projects in order, with the highest percentage of adults gaining employment income at the top of the list.

- The two projects with the highest percentage (1-2) received 5 points.
- The two with the next highest percentage (3-4) received 4 points.
- The two with the next highest percentage (5-6) received 3 points.
- Project 7 received 2 points.
- Project 8 received 1 point.

Data source: SAGE item 19a, line 3 (total income) columns 4 and 5 (retained and increased, and no income and gained; divided by total adults in item 5a(2)).

Logistical Criteria

- 5 points – Utilization

How scored: This measures how efficiently projects use their housing assets. The Review and Ranking Committee used a customized HMIS report that divides the average number of households by the number of units. We listed all 8 projects in order, with the highest percentage of utilized units at the top of the list.

- The two projects with the highest percentage (1-2) received 5 points.
- The two with the next highest percentage (3-4) received 4 points.
- The two with the next highest percentage (5-6) received 3 points.
- Project 7 received 2 points.
- Project 8 received 1 point

Data source: SAGE #8b (average number of households served), divided by number of units reported in HUD application.

- 3 points – Drawdowns

How scored: The Review and Ranking Committee creates a scale based on regular drawdowns during the most recent project year. We listed all 8 projects in order, with the highest percentage drawdowns at the top of the list.

- The two projects with the highest percentage (1-2) received 5 points.
- The two with the next highest percentage (3-4) received 4 points.
- The two with the next highest percentage (5-6) received 3 points.
- Project 7 received 2 points.
- Project 8 received 1 point

Data Source: The data are found in the LOCCS system, to which the HMIS Lead has access. The HMIS Lead creates a custom report showing percentage of grant award funds drawn down quarterly.

- Up to -5 points – Recapture

How scored: This measures the extent to which projects spent their non-housing money. The Ranking and Review Committee looked at the percentage of total budget expended in the most recent project year for three line items: Operations, Supportive Services, and Administration. We did not include Rental Assistance and Leasing, as they can be affected by participant contributions to rent, which should not count against projects. We listed all 8 projects in order, with the highest percentage of expended funds at the top of the list.

- The two projects with the highest percentage (1-2) received -1 point.
- The two with the next highest percentage (3-4) received -2 points.
- The two with the next highest percentage (5-6) received -3 points.
- Project 7 received -4 points.
- Project 8 received -5 points.

Data source: Project questionnaire.

- 5 points – HMIS Timeliness

How scored: This measures the number of days between client entry and the recording of client data in HMIS. The committee computed the average number of days for each project. We listed all 8 projects in order, with the lowest average number of days at the top of the list.

- The two projects with the lowest percentage (1-2) received 5 points.
- The two with the next lowest percentage (3-4) received 4 points.
- The two with the next lowest percentage (5-6) received 3 points.
- Project 7 received 2 points.
- Project 8 received 1 point

Data source: SAGE item 6e.

- 5 points – HMIS Data Quality

How scored: This measures the completeness of client-level HMIS data. The committee looked at the percentage of unduplicated client records with null or missing values and the percentage of "Client Doesn't Know" or "Client Refused" during the 12 month period. We listed all 8 projects in order, with the lowest percentage of null, missing, "doesn't know", and refused at the top of the list.

- The two projects with the lowest percentage (1-2) received 5 points.
- The two with the next lowest percentage (3-4) received 4 points.
- The two with the next lowest percentage (5-6) received 3 points.
- Project 7 received 2 points.
- Project 8 received 1 point

Data source: SAGE items 6a, 6b, and 6c.

Priority Population Criteria

- 13 points – Chronic Homelessness

How scored: This rewards projects that serve high numbers of persons experiencing chronic homelessness. The Review and Ranking Committee examined the number of persons served during the 12-month period who were chronically homeless when they entered the project. We listed all 8 projects in order, with the projects serving the highest number of chronically homeless at the top.

- The project with the highest percentage (1) received 13 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (2) received 12 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (3) received 11 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (4) received 9 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (5) received 7 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (6) received 5 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (7) received 3 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (8) received 1 point.

Data source: SAGE item 5a(11).

- 13 points – Multiple Barriers

How scored: This measures the extent to which project serve persons with significant barriers. The committee looked at the percentage of participants who had two or more barriers at the time of project entry. We listed all 8 projects in order, with the highest percentage of multiple barrier participants at the top of the list.

- The project with the highest percentage (1) received 13 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (2) received 12 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (3) received 11 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (4) received 9 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (5) received 7 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (6) received 5 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (7) received 3 points.
- The project the next highest percentage (8) received 1 point.

Data source: SAGE item 13a2 (2 conditions and 3+ conditions), divided by total number of adults served in SAGE item 5a(2).

Best Practice Criteria

- 5 points – Housing First Compliance

How scored: This rewards projects that following evidence-based Housing First practices. The committee administered a questionnaire with graduated standards of Housing First practices, including core elements and advanced elements.

Projects following all 7 Core Elements and at least 6 Advanced Elements - 5 points

All 7 Core Elements and at least 4 Advanced Elements - 4 points

At least 6 Core Elements and at least 3 Advanced Elements - 3 points

At least 5 Core Elements and at least 1 Advanced Element - 2 points

At least 4 Core Elements - 1 point

Follow fewer than 4 Core elements - 0 points

Data source: Project questionnaire.

- 5 points – Project Type

How scored: The Review and Ranking Committee awards points based on the type of project based on the following scale:

- Rapid Re-Housing – 5 points
- Permanent Supportive Housing – 5 points
- Transitional Housing – 0 points
- Transitional Housing for DV – 5 points

The data are found in the Project Application.