

CoC Review, Score, and Ranking Procedures
IL-508

Notice to Citizens and Organizations in St. Clair County, Illinois

Date: August 22, 2016

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) issues funding opportunities for homeless projects annually. This notice is posted pursuant to the "Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 Continuum of Care Program Competition" (FR-6000-N-25).¹

HUD requires local Continuum of Care to rank all projects in priority order. This notice details the process for reviewing, scoring, and ranking projects.

New projects will be ranked and scored. New projects will be reviewed based on the following objective criteria:

- Estimated project performance measures
- Severity of needs and vulnerabilities of project participants
- Type of project
- No or few barriers to participation
- Housing First

Renewal projects will be reviewed based on the following objective criteria:

- Project performance measures
- Monitoring results
- Severity of needs and vulnerabilities of project participants
- Type of project
- No or few barriers to participation
- Housing First

The specific objective ranking criteria and scoring rubric begin on the following page.

1. Review, scoring, and ranking will be conducted by the Review and Ranking Committee of the Homeless Action Council.
2. All projects included in the CoC application will be ranked in order of priority.
3. Final project rankings must be approved by the HAC as provided in the governing documents.
4. Minutes of the meeting(s) where projects are reviewed, scored, and ranked will be posted on this website.

Persons with questions about this notice should send them by email to this address:

ljohnson@co.st-clair.il.us.

¹ For complete information about this competition, including the entire Notice of Funding Availability, please go to <https://www.hudexchange.info/e-snaps/fy-2016-coc-program-nofa-coc-program-competition/>

Project Ranking System Guide

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 FY2016 CoC Competition. The criteria are balanced, using four major factors:

- Performance Outcome Criteria (10 maximum points, 16% of score)
 - Retention in, or exits to permanent housing
 - Increases in cash income
- Monitoring Criteria (12 maximum points, 20% of score)
 - Utilization
 - Drawdowns
 - Recapture
 - HMIS data quality
- Priority Population Criteria (approximately 25 maximum points, 40% of score)
 - Youth
 - Families with children
 - Chronically homeless
 - Veterans
 - Domestic violence survivors
 - Low or no income
 - Serious and persistent mental illness and/or substance use disorders
 - Criminal history
- Best Practice Criteria (15 maximum points, 24% of score)
 - Housing First compliance
 - Project type
 - Project capacity
 - CoC participation

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 ...

Minutes of every meeting are posted on the website of the Collaborative Applicant.

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 FY2016 NOFA, the CoC Application instructions, and the debriefing summary from the FY2015 competition.

For **data sources**, the committee used APRs, customized HMIS reports, reports from the HUD Chicago Field Office, and CoC applications. Because HUD has delayed submission of APRs during the introduction of new APR formatting, the HMIS lead generated faux APRs using both the old and new HUD formatting for each project. To make things even fairer, we used the same year – July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 – for each faux APR.

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 62-point scale. The table below displays the criteria.

Criteria	Where Found	Old APR	Points in FY2016
<i>Performance Outcome Criteria:</i>			10
Retention or exits to PH	APR Q23a; HMIS	Q29a1 & Q29a2	7
Increases in income	APR Q19a3; HMIS	Q24b3	3
<i>Monitoring Criteria:</i>			12
Utilization	HMIS	Q10 & Q11	3
Drawdowns	HUD Field Office Report		3
Recapture	HUD Field Office Report	Q31a4	3
HMIS data quality	Quality APR Q5A; HMIS	Q7	3
<i>Priority Population Criteria:</i>			25
Youth	From project applications	Q8	4
Families with children	From project applications	Q8	4
Chronically homeless	From project applications		4
Veterans	From project applications	Q21	4
DV	From project applications	Q19	2
Low or no income	From project applications		2
MI/SA (current/past/etc)	From project applications		2
Criminal history	From project applications		1
Only project targeting a group	From project applications		1
Project targets only one group	From project applications		1
<i>Best Practice Criteria:</i>			15
Housing First	CoC Application		5
Project type	CoC Application		5
# of beds	HMIS	Q5	5
CoC participation	Attendance logs		tiebreaker
TOTAL POINTS:			62

Performance Outcome Criteria

- 5 points – Length of Homelessness

How scored: The Review and Ranking Committee creates a scale based on length of homelessness. This is the same measurement used in the HUD System Performance Measure metric 1.2

The data are found in the APR (new APR Q22a1, old APR Q27), or by running the HUD System Performance Measures in HMIS for the specified 12-month period ended June 30, 2016.

- 7 points – Exits to / retention of permanent housing

How scored: The Review and Ranking Committee creates a scale based on:

- For SSO and Transitional Housing projects: exits to permanent housing
- For Permanent Housing projects including RRH: Retention in housing plus exits to other permanent housing

These data are found in the APR (new APR Q23a, old APR Q29a1 and Q29a2), or by running the HUD System Performance Measures in HMIS for the specified 12-month period ended June 30, 2016. The Review and Ranking Committee divides the number of clients who exited to and/or retained permanent housing by the total number of clients.

- 3 points – Increases in Income

How scored: The Review and Ranking Committee creates a scale based on retention or gains in earned income and other cash income. This is the same measurement used in the HUD System Performance Measure by combining metrics 4.3 and 4.6.

The data are found in the APR (new APR Q19a3, old APR Q24b3), or by running the HUD System Performance Measures in HMIS for the specified 12-month period ended June 30, 2016. The Review and Ranking Committee divides the number of adults who retained or gained cash income (from employment and non-employment sources) by the total number of adults.

- 5 points – Returns to Homelessness

How scored: The Review and Ranking Committee creates a scale based on the percentage of clients who exited to stable housing in the past 24 months and who later re-entered the homeless system. This is the same measurement used in the HUD System Performance Measure metrics 2a and 3a.

The data are found in customized HMIS reports, or by running the HUD System Performance Measures in HMIS for the specified 12-month period ended June 30, 2016.

Monitoring Criteria

- 3 points – Utilization

How scored: The Review and Ranking Committee creates a scale based on utilization rates.

We use a customized HMIS report that divides the average number of participants by the number of beds in HIC inventory (or slots, for the SSO project).

- 3 points – Drawdowns

How scored: The Review and Ranking Committee creates a scale based on regular drawdowns during the most recently completed project year.

The HUD Chicago Field Office creates a customized report showing drawdowns and unspent funds.

- 3 points – Recapture

How scored: The Review and Ranking Committee creates a scale based percentage of unspent grant funds at the end of the most recently completed project year.

The HUD Chicago Field Office creates a customized report showing drawdowns and unspent funds.

- 3 points – HMIS Data Quality

How scored: The Review and Ranking Committee creates a scale based on data quality, i.e., the percentage of unduplicated client records with null or missing values and the percentage of "Client Doesn't Know" or "Client Refused" during the time period from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

The data are found in the APR (new APR Q 5A, old APR Q7).

Priority Population Criteria

- Up to 25 points – Targeted Populations

How scored: The Review and Ranking Committee awards points for any project targeting the following priority populations:

- Unaccompanied Youth – 4 points
- Domestic violence – 4 points
- Families with children – 4 points
- Chronically homeless – 4 points
- Survivors of domestic violence – 2 points
- Low or no income households – 2 points
- Persons with serious and persistent mental illness and/or substance use disorders – 2 points
- Persons with criminal histories – 1 point

In addition, these are two bonus points available:

- The Review and Ranking Committee awards 1 point to any project that is the only project in the CoC that targets any one of the priority populations listed above.
- The Review and Ranking Committee awards 1 point to any project that exclusively targets one or more of the priority populations for 100% of its units or participants.

The data are found in the Project Application sections 3B-1 and 5B.

Best Practice Criteria

- 5 points – Housing First Compliance

How scored: The Review and Ranking Committee creates a scale based on the ranges of responses to the Housing First item in the Project Application. Points are awarded

The data are found in the Project Application section 3B-3.

- 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
- HMIS – 3 points
- Coordinated Assessment – 0 points
- Transitional Housing – 4 points

The data are found in the Project Application.

- 5 points – Project Capacity

How scored: The Review and Ranking Committee awards points based on the number of beds in the project. This provides an advantage for projects that can house a large number of persons.

The data are found in HMIS.

- Tiebreaker – CoC Participation

How scored: This factor will be used only to resolve ties. The CoC secretary counts the number of times the project was represented by persons at CoC meetings in the period from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

The data are found in based on minute and attendance logs at CoC meetings including regular meetings, committees, subcommittees, task forces, and work groups.