

Project Ranking System Guide FY2019
St. Clair, Illinois Continuum of Care (IL-508)

Introduction

CoC IL-508 utilized a well-defined set of objective criteria to review, score, and rank projects in the FY2019 CoC Competition.

The criteria are balanced, using four major factors for a maximum score of 55:

- Project Management Criteria (12 maximum points, 22% of score)
 - APR submission (3 points)
 - Spending (5)-Not ranked FY19
 - HMIS data quality (2)
 - Utilization (5)
 - PIT/HIC participation (2)
- Priority Population Criteria (10 maximum points, 18% of score)
 - Number of chronically homeless served (5)
 - Percentage of participants with 2 or more barriers (5)
- Participant Outcome Criteria (15 maximum points, 27% of score)
 - Retention in, or exits to permanent housing (5)
 - Increases in cash income from employment (5)
 - Increases in cash income from non-employment (5)
 - Project Referral Rejections for non-viable reasons (5)-Not ranked FY19
- Best Practice Criteria (18 maximum points, 33% of score)
 - Project type (5)
 - Housing First compliance (5)
 - Participation and attendance at CoC's Homeless Action Council monthly meetings (5)-Not ranked FY19
 - Active Participation and compliance with quarterly project evaluation and monitoring (5)
 - SOAR training (3)

****Three factors were not ranked as previously indicated due to insufficient data documentation. The Ranking and Review Committee made the decision to not measure this factors at its meeting 08/22/2019.**

To assure fairness, the committee used data from HMIS that were custom generated in SAGE format for the same 12-month period for all projects. We used the period from April 1, 2018 to March 31, 2019.

Project Ranking System Guide FY2019
St. Clair, Illinois Continuum of Care (IL-508)

Project Ranking Scorecard		Project Management				Priority Pop		Outcomes				Best Practices				TOTAL SCORE		
Factor		APR submission	Spending: non-rent/lease funds	HMIS data quality	Utilization	PIT/PHC participation	Service to chronically homeless	Serving persons with multiple barriers	Exits to/retention of permanent housing	Income gains from employment	Income gains from non-employment	Returns (not scored) will look at program referrals/rejections FY19	Project type	Housing First Self-Assessment	Participation and attendance at monthly HAC meetings		Participation and compliance with quarterly project monitoring	SOAR training
Maximum Score		3	5	2	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	3	65
Bethany Place	Bethany Place Permanent Housing																	0
	New Horizon																	0
Call For Help	Jobe Center																	0
	Step Up to Independence II																	0
CDBG Operations	Beacon Place																	0
	Family Living Center																	0
	New Beginnings																	0
Chestnut	Chestnut Connections - St. Clair																	0
	Fairview Heights																	0
East St. Louis HA	Lighthouse																	0
St. Clair Co. IGD	Home at Last																	0
	Journey Home																	0
	Next Step Up																	0
	Road Home																	0
Violence Prevention Center	Domestic Violence TH/RRH																	0

Project Ranking System Guide FY2019
St. Clair, Illinois Continuum of Care (IL-508)

Factors and Scoring Scales

PROJECT MANAGEMENT CRITERIA

- 3 points – APR Submission

How scored: This measures the timeliness of submission. Projects which submitted their most recent APR within 90 days of their project ending dates were awarded 3 points. Projects which filed late but received extensions from HUD were also awarded 3 points. All other projects received 0 points.

Data source: Project questionnaire; documentation of submission and extensions.

- 5 points – Spending **Not ranked FY19**

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 15 projects in order, with the highest percentage of expended funds at the top of the list.

- The four projects with the highest percentage (1-4) received 5 points.
- The four with the next highest percentage (5-8) received 4 points.
- Projects 9-12 received 3 points.
- Projects 13-14 received 2 points.
- Projects 15 received 1 point.

Data source: Project questionnaire.

- 2 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 15 projects in order, with the lowest percentage of null, missing, "doesn't know", and refused at the top of the list.

- Projects with 0-5% received 2 points.
- Projects with 6-10% received 1 point.
- Projects with more than 10% received 0 point.

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

Project Ranking System Guide FY2019
St. Clair, Illinois Continuum of Care (IL-508)

- 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 15 projects in order, with the highest percentage of utilized units at the top of the list.

- The four projects with the highest percentage (1-4) received 5 points.
- The four with the next highest percentage (5-8) received 4 points.
- Projects 9-11 received 3 points.
- Projects 12-14 received 2 points.
- Projects 15 received 1 point.

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

- 2 points – PIT/PHC Participation

How scored: This measures whether projects participated in the Point-in-Time count and Project Homeless Connect in January 2018. PIT participation includes planning, providing PIT volunteers, and canvassing for unsheltered. Project Homeless Connect participation includes planning for the event or volunteering, but it does not include staffing your vendor booth at the event.

- Projects that participated in PIT and PHC received 2 points.
- Projects that participated only in PIT or only in PHC received 1 point.
- Projects that participated in neither PIT nor PHC received 0 points.

Data source: Project questionnaire. [NOTE: In future years, the accuracy and timeliness of HIC data may be scored].

Project Ranking System Guide FY2019
St. Clair, Illinois Continuum of Care (IL-508)

PRIORITY POPULATION CRITERIA

- 5 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 15 projects in order, with the projects serving the highest number of chronically homeless at the top.

- The four projects with the highest number of CH participants (1-4) received 5 points.
- The four with the next highest number (5-8) received 4 points.
- Projects 9-11 received 3 points.
- Projects 12-14 received 2 points.
- Projects 15 received 1 point.

Data source: SAGE item 5a(11).

- 5 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 16 projects in order, with the highest percentage of multiple barrier participants at the top of the list.

- The four projects with the highest percentage (1-4) received 5 points.
- The four with the next highest percentage (5-8) received 4 points.
- Projects 9-11 received 3 points.
- Projects 12-14 received 2 points.
- Projects 15 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).

Project Ranking System Guide FY2019
St. Clair, Illinois Continuum of Care (IL-508)

PARTICIPANT OUTCOME CRITERIA

- 5 points – Exits to / Retention of Permanent Housing

How scored: This measures housing stability. For transitional housing projects, the Review and 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 16 projects in order, with the highest percentage at the top of the list.

- The four projects with the highest percentage (1-4) received 5 points.
- The four with the next highest percentage (5-8) received 4 points.
- Projects 9-11 received 3 points.
- Projects 12-14 received 2 points.
- Projects 15 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 Cash Income from Employment

How scored: This measures increased resources. The committee looked at the percentage of adult participants who increased their income from employment during the 12-month period, including those who started with no employment income and gained some. We listed all 16 projects in order, with the highest percentage of adults gaining employment income at the top of the list.

- The four projects with the highest percentage (1-4) received 5 points.
- The four with the next highest percentage (5-8) received 4 points.
- Projects 9-11 received 3 points.
- Projects 12-14 received 2 points.
- Projects 15 received 1 point.

Data source: SAGE item 19a, line 1 (earned income) columns 4 and 5 (retained and increased, and no income and gained); divided by total adults in item 5a(2).

Project Ranking System Guide FY2019
St. Clair, Illinois Continuum of Care (IL-508)

- 5 points – Increases in Cash Income from Non-Employment Sources

How scored: This also measures resources. The committee looked at the percentage of adult participants who increased their income from non-employment sources during the 12-month period, including those who started with no non-employment income and gained some. We listed all 16 projects in order, with the highest percentage of adults gaining non-employment income at the top of the list.

- The four projects with the highest percentage (1-4) received 5 points.
- The four with the next highest percentage (5-8) received 4 points.
- Projects 9-11 received 3 points.
- Projects 12-14 received 2 points.
- Projects 15 received 1 point.

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

- 5 points – Project referral rejection % based on non-viable reasons **Not ranked FY19**

How scored: This measures the extent to which people exiting homeless remained housed. The committee wanted to look at the percentage of former participants who returned to homelessness within 24 months of exiting each project.

Data source: Project-level reports from Housing Resource Center.

BEST PRACTICE CRITERIA

- 5 points – Project Type

How scored: This rewards the types of projects that have been shown to be highly effective. The committee awarded points based on the type of project based on the following scale:

- Permanent Supportive Housing – 5 points
- Rapid Re-Housing – 4 points
- Transitional Housing – 3 points

Data source: Project Application

Project Ranking System Guide FY2019
St. Clair, Illinois Continuum of Care (IL-508)

- 5 points – Housing First Compliance

How scored: This rewards projects that following evidence-based Housing First practices. The committee has requested all projects complete the HUD Housing First Self-Assessment form.

Projects percentage utilization of Housing First Standards will determine scoring
Projects with 100% - 5 points
Projects with 95-99% - 4 points
Projects with 90-94% - 3 points
Projects with 85-89% - 2 points
Projects with 80-84% -1 point
Projects with less than 80% - 0 points

Data source: HUD Housing First Self-Assessment.

- 5 points-Participation and Attendance at monthly Homeless Action Council meetings.
Not Ranked in FY19

How scored: This rewards projects that have staff attending monthly Homeless Action Council meetings 80% or higher during the 12-month period.

Data Source: Homeless Action Council monthly meeting minutes.

- 5 points-Active Participation and Compliance with quarterly project evaluation and monitoring.

Data Source: Quarterly monthly monitoring form signed by monitoring staff and project staff noting any issues or non-compliance areas.

- 3 points – SOAR training

How scored: This rewards projects that have staff qualified to assist persons in received mainstream benefits. The committee asked for the names of staff persons or referral agents providing assistance and advocacy with Social Security applications and the date of their most recent SOAR training.

- All projects with at least one person with SOAR training in the past 24 months received 3 points.
- All other projects received 0 points

Data source: Project questionnaire.

Project Ranking System Guide FY2019
St. Clair, Illinois Continuum of Care (IL-508)

Notes

DEADLINE

Projects were given a project questionnaire to be completed for the ranking and review process. A deadline for completion was set for August 2, 2019. Any project that did not meet this deadline would receive 0 points for project ranking. *The Rank and Review Committee made an exception for one project that had indicated an intent for non-renewal. The project reversed their decision and requested the committee to allow them to renew. The committee granted the late renewal, but the project will be ranked last of all renewal projects regardless of ranking score as a consequence of late renewal.

TIEBREAKERS

Ties were broken by project's number of beds with the project with the highest number having priority. If after utilizing the first tie breaker created a secondary tie breaker then bed utilization was used to break the tie.

UNRANKABLE PROJECTS

HMIS and SSO projects cannot be ranked using the same criteria as housing projects. They are essential to the functioning of the entire system. The Ranking and Review Committee placed these projects at the bottom of Tier One to protect their renewal funding.

NEW PROJECTS

All new projects were reviewed for compliance with HUD eligibility standards and HUD threshold requirements. Projects that did not meet wither HUD eligibility or threshold were not ranked. For projects that cleared this review, the Ranking and Review Committee reserved the right to place them appropriately based on HUD priorities and local needs.

APPEAL PROCESS

Project applicants may appeal rankings to the Appeals Committee. The Appeals Committee will consider all appeals based on their merit. The Appeals Committee is comprised of active Homeless Action Council (HAC) members that have non-HUD funding projects.