

# **Project Ranking System Guide Grant Year 2021**

## **St. Clair, Illinois Continuum of Care (IL-508)**

### **Overview**

Each year, HUD awards Continuum of Care (CoC) Program funds competitively to nonprofit organizations, States, units of local governments, and instrumentalities of State or local government through a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFA). These awards cover all projects beginning the next calendar year. The St. Clair County Continuum of Care (SCCCoC) requires an annual project ranking and quarterly review of all projects under the CoC Program. It has charged the Rank & Review Committee with the task of using objective, performance based scoring criteria and selection priorities to determine the extent to which each project addresses HUD's policies and the Continuum's priorities. The Committee is responsible for project review, scoring, ranking, and reallocation in concert with SCCCoc policy guidelines.

It is the policy of SCCCoc to have an objective and transparent process for the ranking and review of its projects. To ensure fair and equitable treatment for all projects, the Rank & Review Committee consists of volunteers from the CoC. Members cannot be affiliated with any organization or group receiving funds under the CoC Program, or cannot have any decision-making role or responsibility with any organization or group funded under the CoC Program.

### **Purpose**

HUD requires each CoC to review the performance of projects applying for CoC funds, and to prioritize projects for funding by ranking them in order of priority to receive funds. Any agency applying for funds within the SCCCoc competition must comply with the published deadlines or risk point loss and ineligibility to compete in that year's competition.

### **Objectives**

The goal is to use HUD resources as effectively as possible to serve the homeless population in St. Clair County. To do this, HUD requires all project applications to be reviewed and ranked or rejected by the CoC. All projects approved are listed on the CoC Priority List in rank order and assigned to Tier 1 or Tier 2. Higher ranked projects are assigned to Tier 1 and lower ranked projects are assigned to Tier 2. Tier 1 projects are considered more likely to be renewed. Tier 2 projects are conditional and will depend on how HUD scores the CoC and how the project was ranked by the CoC based on its performance and other factors determined by the Rank & Review Committee. Tier 2 funds are at risk of being cut if HUD does not have sufficient dollars.

The rank and review process is intended to accomplish the following objectives:

1. To prioritize those activities that are most successful in preventing or ending homelessness.
2. To maximize funding available to end homelessness in St. Clair County.
3. To direct new resources toward the most pressing needs in the community.
4. To address populations that have been underserved, and prioritize assistance toward those with the greatest need; and
5. To provide an incentive for all funded providers to improve their performance in order to ensure continued funding with CoC resources.

## **Ranking Process**

Ranking is the process of prioritizing projects for funding based on CoC local priorities and HUD requirements. It results in a listing of projects needed to satisfy the needs of the CoC and which are eligible to compete for CoC Program funds. The Rank & Review Committee is responsible for developing and distributing the ranking criteria to the SCCCoC Membership for review and approval each year. These criteria align with the strategic direction of the CoC defined in the Gaps Analysis Report.

Projects are ranked using the scoring scale in place at the time of the ranking process. Projects of the same type with the same score will be ranked by the number of persons served. As new project lack these measurement, they are ranked based on the application and eligibility standards set forth in SCCCoC and HUD guidelines.

When all projects have been ranked, the Committee votes on the final Priority Listing of all projects accepted and rejected. The Committee indicates in comments why the project is ranked in its position and why a project was rejected. After the ranking, the Committee places each in Tier 1 or Tier 2. Committee may straddle projects across Tier 1 and Tier 2. The approved list is then sent to the Board for approval.

### **Priority Groups (to be used when two or more projects have the same score)**

#### *Group 1: Required Infrastructure Projects*

1. Renewal Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)
2. Renewal SSO Project for Coordinated Entry

#### *Group 2: Permanent Supportive Housing (PH)*

1. Renewal of Permanent Support Housing (PSH) Projects
2. Renewal of Rapid Rehousing (RRH) Projects
3. Expanded and new PSH Projects
4. Expanded and new RRH Projects

#### *Group 3: Transitional Housing (TH)*

1. Renewal of TH Projects

#### *Group 4: Joint TH and PH-RRH*

1. Renewal Joint TH and PH-RRH Projects
2. New and expanded Joint TH and PH-RRH Projects

## **Scoring Process**

Scoring is the process of measuring the effectiveness and output of a project based on its type. The process utilizes non-biased criteria based on the HUD ranking tool, established CoC priorities and project performance. The Committee uses an objective Score Card to aid in the assessment of project's performance and contribution to CoC priorities, CoC policies, and HUD requirements. The maximum score is 83 points based on the following scoring scale.

### **Project Supports the Needs of the CoC Community Criteria – 20 Maximum Points**

- Project Type – Maximum 4 Points

*How scored:* This criterion measures the need for the various project type in the CoC based on the demographics of the homeless population and subpopulation groups. Score ranges from 1 point to 4 points with the minimum score indicating over-saturation of project type in CoC, and the maximum score indicating a critical shortage or need for project type in CoC.  
*Data source:* SAGE, HUD Annual Continuum of Care Population and Subpopulation Report, and Project Application

- Project Location - Maximum 4 Points (Not measured)

*How scored:* This criterion measures the geographical area served by the various project types. Score ranges from 1 point to 4 points with the minimum score indicating over-saturation of type of project in a defined geographical area, and the maximum score indicating a critical shortage for type of project in the geographical area.

*Data source:* Grantee Disclosure

- Population Served - Maximum 4 Points

*How scored:* This criterion measures the subpopulation group served within the CoC by the project type. Score ranges from 1 point to 4 points with the minimum score indicating that there are too many of a project type serving the population group, and the maximum score indicating there is a critical shortage of project type to serve the population group.

*Data source:* SAGE, HUD Annual Continuum of Care Population and Subpopulation Report, and Project Application

- Bed Utilization - Maximum 4 Points

*How scored:* This criterion measures the effectiveness of projects using project housing assets. Score ranges from 1 point to 4 points with the minimum score indicating under-utilization of assets at 50% or less, and the maximum score indicating effective utilization of assets at 90% or more.

*Data source:* SAGE

- Homeless Eligibility – Maximum 4 Points

*How scored:* This criterion measures the percentage of the literally homeless population served by project. Score ranges from 1 point to 4 points with the minimum score indicating under-serving of the literally homeless population at 50% or less, and the maximum score indicating that 90% or more of literally homeless population served.

*Data source:* SAGE

### **Project Complies with CoC Policies and Procedures Criteria - 43 Maximum Points**

- Project Compliance - Maximum 3 Points

*How scored:* This criterion measures project compliance to CoC guidelines and HUD standards based on four (4) areas: Application Population Matches Actual Population Served, Maximum Participation Time Limit Enforced based on Project Type, Annual Assessments Conducted, and Quarterly Drawdowns Conducted. Each area receives 0 or 1 point for compliance and non-compliance, respectively. Points from the four (4) areas are summed. Summed score ranges from 0 point to 3 points with the minimum score identifying 3 or more discrepancies found, and the maximum score indicating no discrepancies found.

Projects with one (1) discrepancy receives 2 points, while projects with two (2) discrepancies receive 1 point.

*Data source:* SAGE, Project Application

- CoC Participation – Maximum 3 Points

*How scored:* This criterion measures representative participation in meetings and committees. Score ranges from 0 point to 3 points with the minimum score indicating a participation rate less than 50%, and the maximum score indicating a participation rate at or greater than 90%.

*Data source:* Attendance rosters and meeting minutes

- PIT/HIC Reporting – Maximum 3 Points

*How scored:* This criterion measures whether projects submitted data for annual Point-in-Time Count and Housing Inventory Count. Score ranges from 0 point to 3 points with the minimum score indicating a failure to submit a count, and the maximum score indicating on-time count reporting or participation.

*Data source:* PIT/HIC Reporting Roster

- APR Reporting – Maximum 3 Points

*How scored:* This criterion measures the timeliness of submitting annual performance report (APRs) to HUD. Score ranges from 0 point to 3 points with the minimum score reflecting late reporting by 5 or more days, and the maximum score indicating on-time reporting.

*Data source:* SAGE

- Fund Management – Maximum 3 Points

*How scored:* This criterion measures the effectiveness of managing and spending allocated funds. Score ranges from 0 point to 3 points with the minimum score reflecting 25% or more of awarded funds remained unspent at end of grant, while the maximum score reflects all funds spent during grant year.

*Data source:* SAGE

- Data Quality – Maximum 3 Points

*How scored:* This criterion measures the completeness of client-level data in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) within the following data elements: Personally Identifying Information (PII), Universal Data Elements, Income and Housing Data Quality, Chronic Homelessness, and Timeliness. Score ranges from 0 point to 3 points with the minimum score indicating a less than 90% data accuracy rate, and the maximum score indicating 100% data accuracy.

*Data Source:* SAGE

- Permanent Housing Placement – Maximum 5 Points

*How scored:* This criterion measures client successful exit to permanent housing or safe housing when participating in DV projects. Score ranges from 0 point to 5 points with the minimum score indicating an exit rate of less than 50%, and the maximum score indicates an exit rate of 90% or more.

*Data Source: SAGE*

- Return to Homelessness – Maximum 5 Points (Not measured)  
*How scored:* This criterion measures client return to homelessness after successfully exiting a project. Score ranges from 0 point to 5 points with the minimum score indicating that a greater than 90% or more returns, and the maximum score indicating less than 10% returns.  
*Data Source: SAGE*
- Percentage of Adults with Earned Income – Maximum 5 points  
*How scored:* This criterion measures the number of adult clients earning income while participating in the project. Score ranges from 0 point to 5 points with the minimum score indicating a rate of less than 10%, and the maximum score indicating a rate of 90% or more.  
*Data Source: SAGE*
- Percentage of Adults with Gain in Earned Income – Maximum 5 Points  
*How scored:* This criterion measures the number of clients increasing or maintaining income while participating in the project. Score ranges from 0 point to 5 points with the minimum score indicating a rate less than 10%, and the maximum score indicating a rate 90% or more.  
*Data Source: SAGE*
- Use of Mainstream Services – Maximum 5 Points  
*How scored:* This criterion measures the use of mainstream sources to help stabilize the client. Score ranges from 0 point to 5 points with the minimum score indicating a rate less than 5%, and the maximum score indicating a rate 50% or more.  
*Data Source: SAGE*

### **Severity of Needs Criteria – 20 Maximum Points**

- Adults with No or Low Income – Maximum 4 Points  
*How scored:* This criterion measures the percentage of adults who had no income or very low incomes when they entered the project. Score ranges from 0 point to 4 points with the minimum score indicating a rate less than 20%, and the maximum score indicating a rate 80% or more.  
*Data source: SAGE*
- Adults with Mental Illness – Maximum 4 Points  
*How scored:* This criterion measures the percentage of adults who had mental illness when they entered the project. Score ranges from 0 point to 4 points with the minimum score indicating a rate less than 20%, and the maximum score indicating a rate 80% or more.  
*Data source: SAGE*
- Adults with Alcohol and/or Drug Abuse – Maximum 4 Points  
*How scored:* This criterion measures the percentage of adults who had alcohol or drug abuse when they entered the project. Score ranges from 0 point to 4 points with the minimum score

indicating a rate less than 5%, and the maximum score indicating a rate 60% or more.

*Data source:* SAGE

- Chronically Homeless – Maximum 4 Points

*How scored:* This criterion measures the percentage of adults who were chronically homeless when they entered the project. Score ranges from 0 point to 4 points with the minimum score indicating a rate less than 5%, and the maximum score indicating a rate 60% or more.

*Data source:* SAGE

- Person with History or Fleeing DV – Maximum 4 Points

*How scored:* This criterion measures the percentage of adults who were fleeing domestic violence or had a history of domestic violence when they entered the project. Score ranges from 0 point to 4 points with the minimum score indicating a rate less than 5%, and the maximum score indicating a rate 60% or more.

*Data source:* SAGE