



**East St. Louis/Belleville/St. Clair County Continuum of Care
IL-508**

**RATING AND REVIEW PROCEDURE
(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**. For questions regarding the application process, please submit your question to the following email: ljohnson@co.st-clair.il.us.

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-2S)* 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/#general-resources>.

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 FY2017

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 FY2017 CoC Competition.

The criteria are balanced, using four major factors:

- Project Management Criteria (20 maximum points, 34% of score)
 - APR submission (3 points)
 - Spending (5)
 - HMIS data quality (2)
 - HMIS Timeliness (3)
 - Utilization (5)
 - PIT/HIC participation (2)
- Priority Population Criteria (10 maximum points, 17% of score)
 - Number of chronically homeless served (5)
 - Percentage of participants with 2 or more barriers (5)
- Participant Outcome Criteria (15 maximum points, 26% 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)
 - Returns to homelessness (not scored this year)
- Best Practice Criteria (13 maximum points, 22% of score)
 - Project type (5)
 - Housing First compliance (5)
 - SOAR training (3)

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, 2016 to March 31, 2017.

Project Ranking Scorecard

Factor		APR submission	Spending: non-rent/lease funds	HMIS data quality	HMIS timeliness	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 this year)	Project type	Housing First	SOAR training	TOTAL SCORE	RANKING
Maximum Score		3	5	2	3	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	3	58	
Bethany Place	Bethany Place Permanent Housing																0	
	Bethany Place Transitional Housing																0	
	Jump Start																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 County IGD	Home at Last																0	
	Journey Home																0	
	Next Step Up																0	
	Reach for Recovery																0	
	Road Home																0	

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

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 17 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 13-15 received 2 points.
- Projects 16 and 17 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 17 projects in order, with the lowest percentage of null, missing, "doesn't know", and refused at the top of the list.

- The nine projects (1-9) with the lowest percentage received 2 points.
- The other eight projects (10-17) received 1 point.

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

- 3 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 17 projects in order, with the lowest average number of days at the top of the list.

- The six projects (1-6) with the lowest average number of days received 3 points.
- The six projects with the next lowest average (7-12) received 2 points.
- The other five projects (13-17) received 1 point.

Data source: SAGE item 6e.

- 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 17 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 9-12 received 3 points.
- Projects 13-15 received 2 points.
- Projects 16 and 17 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 2017. 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].

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 17 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 9-12 received 3 points.
- Projects 13-15 received 2 points.
- Projects 16 and 17 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 17 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 9-12 received 3 points.
- Projects 13-15 received 2 points.
- Projects 16 and 17 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).

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 17 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 9-12 received 3 points.
- Projects 13-15 received 2 points.
- Projects 16 and 17 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 17 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 9-12 received 3 points.
- Projects 13-15 received 2 points.
- Projects 16 and 17 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).

- 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 17 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 9-12 received 3 points.
- Projects 13-15 received 2 points.
- Projects 16 and 17 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).

- 0 points – Returns to Homelessness

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 on System Performance Measures. [NOTE: HMIS will not be able to generate a customized project-level report on this criterion until sometime after October 2017, so this factor was not scored in the FY 2017 round].

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:

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

Data source: Project Application

- 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.

- 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 persons with SOAR training in the past 24 months received 3 points.
- All other projects received 0 points

Data source: Project questionnaire.

Notes:

TIEBREAKERS

Ties were broken by the date and time of email submission of the project questionnaire. The projects that submitted its questionnaire earlier won 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 Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will consider all appeals based on their merit.