

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500) FY 2017 CoC Project Review and Rating Procedure

Project Rating and Review Process:

Renewal Projects

In order to be considered for inclusion in Philadelphia’s Continuum of Care (CoC) Consolidated Application, organizations must have submitted the local 2017 Continuum of Care Program Renewals Application, which includes submitting performance data from their most recently submitted APR. This includes domestic violence victim service providers who submitted aggregate data from their comparable HMIS database. Organizations had 4 weeks to complete and submit the CoC Renewals Application to the City of Philadelphia Office of Homeless Services. The Office of Homeless Services (OHS) provides organizations the evaluation tool to be used to score their proposals and hosts a technical assistance briefing for organizations. Proposals received are first reviewed by City of Philadelphia Office of Homeless Services staff to establish whether they pass threshold requirements. All 2017 CoC Program Renewal Applications that pass threshold requirements are reviewed by the CoC Program Renewals Review Panel, a volunteer panel convened to review and score project proposals. Members of the Review Panel are responsible for independently reviewing and scoring proposals using the 2017 CoC Program Renewal Project Proposal Review Instrument, found in Appendix A. Members of the Review Panel are trained on using the review instrument to score renewal project proposals.

Proposal Evaluation and Scoring

All renewal project applications, except for first time renewals, were independently reviewed and scored by 4 individuals using the local review instrument, developed by members of the CoC Quality Improvement and Evaluation Subcommittee (QIES). The review instrument includes the scoring criteria described in the table below and is found in Appendix A. The performance data used to review renewal project proposals is from the project’s APR for the HUD Reporting Period 10/1/2015 – 9/30/2016. Once all reviewer scores are submitted to the Office of Homeless Services, renewal project proposal scores are analyzed to identify any proposals with a significantly wide range in scores in an effort to adjust outlier scores for said proposals. Once reviewer scores are finalized, the reviewer scores are averaged, which forms the basis for the preliminary ranking of projects within the local priorities.

Criteria	Max Points
Project Description and Case Study	5
Housing First Approach	10
Data Quality: Standard is less than 10% “Don’t Know/Refused” and “Missing” values	10
Unit Utilization Rates: Local standard is 90% or above for the 4 points in time	10
Residence Prior to Entry: Participants entering from appropriate locations; majority from literally homeless situations	10
Increase in Earned Income: Local standard: 10% of adults increase or gain earned income	10
Increase in Other Cash Income: Local standard: 35% of adults increase or gain other	10

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
FY 2017 CoC Project Review and Rating Procedure

income	
Non-Cash Benefits: Local standard: 82% of participants connected to 1+ mainstream benefit	10
Housing Stability: Local Standard for PSH: 93% retain or exit to permanent, RRH:80% leavers exit to PH, TH:80% of leavers exit to PH, SH:55% of leavers exit to PH	15
Serving HUD's Priority Population: 75% or more of the Heads of Households (HoHs) served are representative of HUD's priority populations (Unaccompanied or Parenting Youth 18-24, Victims fleeing Domestic Violence, people experiencing Chronic Homelessness, and Veterans)	10
Total	100

In addition to the evaluation tool, 1 point is deducted from the proposal if at least two members from the applicant's organization did not participate in the January 2017 unsheltered PIT count, ten points are deducted from proposals received after the submission deadline, and 5 points are deducted from proposals that did not pass threshold upon original submission.

New Projects

In order to be considered for inclusion in Philadelphia's Continuum of Care Consolidated Application, local organizations must respond to the City of Philadelphia RFP for new CoC projects. Proposals received are first reviewed by City of Philadelphia Office of Homeless Services staff to establish whether they pass threshold requirements. All proposals that pass threshold requirements are then independently reviewed and scored by a volunteer panel convened to review and score project proposals. Proposal are reviewed and scored by 5 individuals using the local evaluation tool created by the City of Philadelphia Office of Homeless Services, found in Appendix B. Individual reviewer scores are averaged, and the volunteer panel convenes a review session to discuss all proposals to make final funding recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest

Every effort is made to avoid conflict, or the appearance thereof, when assigning proposals to reviewers. Before reviewers score proposals, they are asked to determine whether a conflict of interest exists with any application that has been assigned to them. If a conflict or the appearance of a conflict exists, the proposal will be assigned to another reviewer and a replacement proposal will be provided. Renewal project proposals are distributed anonymously so that reviewers are unaware of the name of the organization and the project whose proposal they are reviewing.

A conflict of interest can be defined as: an actual or perceived interest by a review committee member in an action which results or appears to result in personal, organizational, or professional gain. This may involve a direct or indirect financial or other interest in a decision of the planning body. Examples of possible conflicts of interest include cases where a reviewer:

- Is employed or has a formal association with an agency that has submitted an application;

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)

FY 2017 CoC Project Review and Rating Procedure

- Has recently served as a consultant for an applicant agency;
- Is named as a potential consultant or subcontractor in the application; or
- Has extensive knowledge about the application or proposed project and is unable to objectively review the application.

Confidentiality

Adherence to confidentiality is critical to the integrity of the review process and the protection of reviewers evaluating proposals. All reviewers must agree to abide by the following confidentiality requirements before, during, and after the review process:

- All information related to the proposals should be kept in strict confidence;
- Impressions or judgments concerning the proposals are not to be discussed or shared with anyone prior to, during, or after the review panel's deliberations (exceptions: discussions with other review panel members during panel deliberations and staff discussions during CoC Advisory Committee and CoC Board meetings);
- The proposals, as well as the ideas, concepts, methods, or techniques included in the proposals are to be considered proprietary, and all rights thereby implied are to be respected;
- Proposals, in part or whole, are not to be photocopied; and
- Questions about any specific proposals are not to be directed to the applicant organization, or to a consultant who assisted in the preparation of the application.

Reviewers must adhere to the following requirements during and after the Review Panel meeting:

- Statements and notes of the reviewers should not be shared with anyone outside the review panel;
- Discussions concerning any specific application are to be confined to the review panel meeting room;
- Proceedings of the review panel are to be kept in strict confidence; and
- Proposals and review materials are to be left with the Office of Homeless Services (Collaborative Applicant) staff at the conclusion of the review session.

Philadelphia Ranking Order

Projects are ranked according to the following strategy:

- Ranked according to 2017 local competition scores, recognizing substantial QIES work to improve our local competition scoring process
- For the lowest scoring 10% of renewal projects, since changes to scoring in 2017 were significant, ranking of these projects reflected consideration of their local renewal scores in the 2014-2016 local competitions

Because the primary basis for reviewing and scoring renewal proposals is performance data from the Annual Performance Reports (APRs), first time renewal projects not operating long enough to have a year of performance data are not reviewed by the Renewals Review Panel. To emphasize the importance

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
FY 2017 CoC Project Review and Rating Procedure

of project performance, new projects created through reallocation are ranked above the lowest scoring renewal projects.

The Philadelphia CoC project applications included in the 2017 consolidated application are ranked as follows:

Tier 1

1. Renewals
 - a. Renewal HMIS projects (serves system-wide function)
 - b. Projects that are renewing in 2017 for the first time and/or do not have 1 year of performance data to receive a score
 - c. Renewal projects with the highest scores in the 2017 local renewal competition
2. New Projects funded through Reallocation
 - a. New Supportive Services Only (SSO) project for Coordinated Entry (serves system-wide function)
 - b. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project for households with children - voluntarily reallocating from a TH project for households with children
 - c. New permanent supportive housing (PSH) project for households without children experiencing chronic homelessness
 - d. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project for households with and without children fleeing domestic violence
 - e. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project for unaccompanied young adults ages 18-24 (This project straddles Tier 1 and Tier 2.)

Tier 2

3. Lowest scoring renewal projects
4. New Projects funded through Bonus Funding
 - a. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project for households without children
 - b. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project for households with and without children fleeing domestic violence
 - c. New permanent supportive housing (PSH) project for households without children experiencing chronic homelessness
 - d. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project for households without children
 - e. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project for households with children
 - f. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project for households with children

Selection and Ranking Approval Process

Winter 2016/ 2017: CoC QIES meets to revise the Renewal Project Evaluation Criteria

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)

FY 2017 CoC Project Review and Rating Procedure

March 20, 2017: Mandatory CoC technical assistance briefing meeting to discuss FY2017 CoC Competition

April 13, 2017: Local renewal proposals/ applications due to Office of Homeless Services

April 17, 2017: Local CoC renewal competition reviewer panel training

May 10, 2017: Reviews and scores from local renewal review panel due to Office of Homeless Services

August 16, 2017: CoC Ranking and Reallocation workgroup meets to review project scores and develop ranking and reallocation strategy

September 6, 2017: Office of Homeless Services presents proposed reallocation and ranking strategy to the CoC Advisory Committee for input and feedback.

September 11, 2017:

- Office of Homeless Services and Advisory Committee representative presents the proposed reallocation, project selection and ranking order, as well as the input of the CoC Advisory Committee, to the CoC Board of Directors for consideration.
- The CoC Board of Directors approves the proposed project selection and ranking order for the FY 2017 CoC Consolidated Application

September 13, 2017

- Office of Homeless Services notifies all organizations of their rank for Philadelphia's FY 2017 CoC Consolidated Application to HUD.

APPLICATION AND REVIEWER INFORMATION	
APPLICATION ID	
PROJECT TYPE	Please enter an application ID
REVIEW'S NAME	
REVIEWER'S EMAIL ADDRESS	
DATE PROJECT APPLICATION SCORED	

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND CASE STUDY

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND CASE STUDY	Scoring Criteria	Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
	<p><i>NOTE: The purpose of the case study is not to illustrate a "Happy Ending" participant story. The purpose is to illustrate how the project attempts to engage with the participant and address the participant's challenges and needs.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Clear and comprehensive, includes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) description of the target population(s) to be served, (2) the plan for addressing the identified needs/issues of the CoC target population(s), (3) projected outcome(s), (4) description of the supportive services provided, and (5) coordination with other source(s)/ partner(s). CASE STUDY: clearly and completely describes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) how the participant is representative of the project's target population, (2) the participant's challenges and needs, (3) the efforts made by the project to address the participant's challenges and needs, and (4) the outcomes for the participant. 	4-5	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PROJECT DESCRIPTION does NOT clearly and comprehensively address all of the above mentioned required categories of information. CASE STUDY does NOT clearly and completely describe the above mentioned required categories of information. 	2-3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PROJECT DESCRIPTION is lacking content, does not present a clear picture of the project, its target population, and the services provided by the project. CASE STUDY is lacking in content, does not present a clear picture of the challenges and needs of the participant and how the project attempts to serve the participant. 	0-1	
	Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewed		

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

ADOPTING A HOUSING FIRST APPROACH (Automatically assign SH projects 10 points)

FIRST APPROACH	<p>To be considered as following a "Housing First" Approach, ALL three conditions must be met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responded "Yes" to Question 1 of Housing First Approach Section Selected the first FOUR boxes in Question 2 of Housing First Approach Section Selected the first FIVE boxes in Question 3 of Housing First Approach Section 		
	Scoring Criteria	Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
	Project follows a "Housing First" approach (met ALL three conditions)	10	
	Project does not follow a "Housing First" approach, but met 2 conditions	5	
Project does not follow a "Housing First" approach (met 1 or none of the conditions)	0		

HOUSING I

Bonus point: A sound explanation for why the project does not follow "Housing First" Approach was provided. <i>(Maximum possible score is still 10)</i> Examples of sound explanations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other funding sources require project to follow certain processes or criteria • Project is a recovery program and commits to maintaining a sober living environment for participants 	1	
Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewer		0

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

DATA QUALITY

DATA QUALITY	• Use the "Yes/No/-" in Column G (highlighted in yellow) to score this section. IMPORTANT NOTE: If a project has NO LEAVERS, Rows 36, 38, and 46 will not calculate. Please add up all the "Yes" and "-" to calculate the number of data elements that meet the standard.		
	• <i>Standard: Less than 10%</i> "Don't Know/Refused" and less than 10% "Missing Values" for each data element.		
	• There are a total of 22 data elements. For each data element to be considered meeting HUD's standard, BOTH "Don't Know/Refused" and "Missing Values" must each be less than 10%. Score the application with the following points according to the number of data elements that meet the standard.		
	Scoring Criteria		
	# of data elements with less than 10% "Don't Know/ Refused AND less than 10% "Missing" values	Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
	22	10	
	20-21	9	
	17-19	8	
	13-16	7	
	11-12	6	
	9-10	5	
	7-8	4	
5-6	3		
3-4	2		
1-2	1		
0	0		
Bonus point: A sound explanation and plan to cure the missing data was supplied if there are data elements with more than 10% of "Don't Know/Refused" or "Missing" values. <i>(Maximum possible score is still 10)</i>		1	
Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewer		0	

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

UNIT UTILIZATION RATE

<i>Standard: 90% or above</i> for the 4 points in time. When scoring, please take into account the responses given to the additional questions. For each point in time, score the application according to the following utilization rates:		
Scoring Criteria		
For each point in time, score the application according to the following utilization rates:	Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
JANUARY SCORE		

UTILIZATION RATE

90% and above	2.5	
80-89%	2	
75-79%	1	
Below 75%	0	
APRIL SCORE		
90% and above	2.5	
80-89%	2	
75-79%	1	
Below 75%	0	
JULY SCORE		
90% and above	2.5	
80-89%	2	
75-79%	1	
Below 75%	0	
OCTOBER SCORE		
90% and above	2.5	
80-89%	2	
75-79%	1	
Below 75%	0	
Bonus point: Applicant provided both a sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in achieving higher utilization rates AND a plan to address these circumstances or challenges were provided. <i>(Maximum possible score is still 10)</i>	0.5	
	1	
Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewer		0

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

RESIDENCE PRIOR TO ENTRY - NOT APPLICABLE			
NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE		
	Scoring Criteria		
	% of Participants Entering from Homeless Situations (20a)	Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
	96-100%	10	
	91-95%	9	
	86-90%	8	
	81-85%	7	
	76-80%	6	
	71-75%	5	
	66-70%	4	
	61-65%	3	
	56-60%	2	
	51-55%	1	
	50% and below	0	
Bonus point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges in achieving required rates of applicants coming from literally homeless situations AND plan to address them were provided. <i>(Maximum possible score is still 10)</i>		1	
Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewer		0	

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

RESIDENCE PRIOR TO ENTRY - SAFE HAVEN			
SAFE HAVEN	<i>Standard: 100% of participants MUST enter from an emergency shelter, safe haven, a place not meant for human habitation (20a), or an Institutional Setting (20b).</i>		
	Scoring Criteria		
		Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
	100% of participants entered from either an emergency shelter, a safe haven, a place not meant for human habitation (20a), or an Institutional Setting (20b) where the participant stayed for less than 90 days and was homeless prior to entering the institutional setting.	10	
	Less than 100% of participants entered from either an emergency shelter, a safe haven, a place not meant for human habitation (20a), or an Institutional Setting (20b) where the participant stayed for less than 90 days and was homeless prior to entering the institutional setting.	0	
	Bonus point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges in achieving required rates of applicants coming from homeless situations, and plan to address them was provided. <i>(Maximum possible score is still 10)</i>	1	
Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewer		0	

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

INCREASE IN EARNED/ EMPLOYMENT INCOME			
INCREASE IN EARNED INCOME	<i>Standard: 10% or more of all adults (Leavers and Stayers) will have more earned income than at entry.</i>		
	Scoring Criteria		
	% of adults with more earned income than at program entry	Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
	10% and Above	10	
	9%	8	
	8%	6	
	7%	4	
	6%	2	
	5% and Below	0	
	Bonus point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in achieving higher rates of adults improving their income AND a plan to address them were provided. <i>(Maximum possible score is still 10)</i>	1	
Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewer		0	

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

INCREASE IN OTHER CASH INCOME	
H	<i>Standard: 35% or more of all adults (Leavers and Stayers) will have more income than at entry from sources other than employment.</i>

INCREASE IN OTHER CAS INCOME	Scoring Criteria		
	% of adults with more income from sources other than employment	Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
	35% and Above	10	
	32-34%	8	
	29-31%	6	
	27-29%	4	
	24-26%	2	
	23% and Below	0	
	Bonus point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in achieving higher rates of adults improving their income AND a plan to address them were provided. <i>(Maximum possible score is still 10)</i>	1	
	Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewer		

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

CONNECTION TO NON-CASH BENEFITS			
<i>Standard: 82% or more of Leavers and Stayers (adults + children) will be connected to at least one mainstream benefit.</i>			
CONNECTION TO NON-CASH BENEFITS	Scoring Criteria		
	% of participants with at least one non-cash benefit	Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
	82% and Above	10	
	80-81%	9	
	78-79%	8	
	76-77%	7	
	75%	6	
	74%	5	
	73%	4	
	72%	3	
	71%	2	
	70%	1	
	69% and Below	0	
	Bonus Point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in achieving higher rates of connection to benefits or better appropriateness AND plan to address them were provided. <i>(Maximum possible score is still 10)</i>	1	
	Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewer		

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

HOUSING STABILITY - PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING	
<i>Standard: 93% or more of all participants (Leavers and Stayers) remain in the program at the end of the operating year or exit to a different permanent housing destination.</i>	
Scoring Criteria	

PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

% of participants remaining in program or exiting to a permanent housing destination	Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
93% and Above	15	
90-92%	14	
87-89%	13	
84-86%	12	
81-83%	11	
78-80%	10	
76-77%	9	
74-75%	8	
72-73%	7	
70-71%	6	
69%	5	
68%	4	
67%	3	
66%	2	
65%	1	
64% and Below	0	
Bonus Point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in achieving higher rates of participants remaining or exiting to a different permanent housing destination, AND plan to address them were provided. <i>(Maximum possible score is still 15)</i>	1	
Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewer		0

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

HOUSING STABILITY - RAPID RE-HOUSING

RAPID RE-HOUSING

<i>Standard: 80% or more of leavers will exit to a permanent housing destination.</i>		
Scoring Criteria		
% of leavers exit to a permanent housing destination.	Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
80% and Above	15	
79%	14	
78%	13	
77%	12	
76%	11	
75%	10	
74%	9	
73%	8	
72%	7	
71%	6	
70%	5	
69%	4	
68%	3	
67%	2	
66%	1	
65% and Below	0	
Bonus Point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in achieving higher rates of leavers exiting to a permanent housing destination, AND plan to address them were provided. <i>(Maximum possible score is still 15)</i>	1	

Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewer	0
---	---

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

HOUSING STABILITY - TRANSITIONAL HOUSING			
TRANSITIONAL HOUSING	<p><i>Standard: 80% or more</i> of leavers will exit to a permanent housing destination.</p> <p>If no leavers, score "0". This is in recognition of HUD's emphasis on reducing the average length individuals and families experience homelessness. While residing in a transitional housing program, individuals and families are still considered to be homeless as they are not in a permanent housing situation.</p>		
	Scoring Criteria		
	% of leavers exit to a permanent housing destination	Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
	80% and Above	15	
	79%	14	
	78%	13	
	77%	12	
	76%	11	
	75%	10	
	74%	9	
	73%	8	
	72%	7	
	71%	6	
	70%	5	
	69%	4	
	68%	3	
	67%	2	
66%	1		
65% and Below	0		
<p>Bonus Point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in achieving higher rates of leavers exiting to a permanent housing destination, AND plan to address them were provided. <i>(Maximum possible score is still 15)</i></p>		1	
Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewer		0	

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

HOUSING STABILITY - SAFE HAVEN		
<p><i>Standard: 55% or more</i> of leavers will exit to permanent housing.</p> <p>If no leavers, score "0". This is in recognition of HUD's emphasis on reducing the average length individuals experience homelessness. While residing in a safe haven program, individuals are still considered to be homeless as they are not in a permanent housing situation.</p>		
Scoring Criteria		
% of leavers exiting to a permanent housing destination	Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
55% and Above	15	
54%	14	

SAFE HAVEN	53%	13	
	52%	12	
	51%	11	
	50%	10	
	49%	9	
	48%	8	
	47%	7	
	46%	6	
	45%	5	
	44%	4	
	43%	3	
	42%	2	
	41%	1	
	40% and Below	0	
	Bonus point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in achieving higher rates of participants exiting to a permanent housing destination, and plan to address them was supplied. <i>(Maximum possible score is still 15)</i>		1
Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewer			0

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

SERVING HUD'S PRIORITY POPULATION			
HUD'S PRIORITY POPULATIONS	<i>Standard: 75% or more</i> of the Heads of Households (HoHs) served are representative of HUD's priority populations (Unaccompanied or Parenting Youth 18-24, Victims fleeing Domestic Violence, people experiencing Chronic Homelessness, and Veterans)		
	Scoring Criteria		
	% of Heads of Household (HoHs) that are representative of at least one of HUD's priority populations (Unaccompanied or Parenting Youth 18-24, Victims fleeing Domestic Violence, people experiencing Chronic Homelessness, and Veterans)	Possible Point Values	Point Value Assigned by Reviewer
	75-100%	10	
	50-74%	5	
	49% and Below	0	
Total Point Value Assigned by Reviewer			0

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

FINAL SCORE		
FINAL SCORE	Raw Score	0
	Bonus Points	0
	TOTAL Score	0

**CITY OF PHILADELPHIA – OFFICE OF HOMELESS SERVICES
PROPOSAL REVIEW INSTRUMENT**

City of Philadelphia 2017 HUD Continuum of Care Program – New Project Proposal

Name of Applicant: _____

Title of Project: _____

Reviewer's Name: _____ Date: _____

Project Type: RRH – Families with Children RRH – Individuals age 25+

PSH – Individuals experiencing chronic homelessness RRH –Young Adults age 18-24

TH-RRH – Target Population: _____

Amount Requested: _____

Have you ever received a federal grant, directly or through a State or local agency? Yes No

Is this project: New Expansion of Existing Project

of Households to be served in a point in time/ at maximum capacity: _____

of Program Participants to be served in a point in time/ at maximum capacity: _____

Please complete and email your review to lauren.whitleigh@phila.gov by Thursday, August 31st at 3:00pm.

Please plan to attend the panel review meeting on Wednesday, September 6th, 12 – 2 pm.

Score and Overall Evaluation

The review tool is organized into the categories specified for application in the Request for Proposals. Please enter your total score for each category in the "Reviewer Score" column below.

Evaluation Category	Reviewer Score	Points Possible
Applicant Qualifications and Experience		25
Financial Considerations		20
Project Description		35
Supportive Services		20
TOTAL PROPOSAL SCORE:		

Recommendation

Please select one of the following designations based on your review of the proposal:

_____	Recommended for funding
_____	Recommended with reservations
_____	Not recommended for funding

Top Three Strengths of the Proposal:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Most Significant Challenges of this Proposal

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Evaluation Category	Score
---------------------	-------

1. Applicant Qualifications and Experience	Points Assigned by Reviewer	Max Points Available
<p>A. The Applicant demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior prior experience carrying out the activities applicable to the proposed project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ providing services to households experiencing homelessness; ○ providing housing and case management services to the project’s target population; ○ as applicable: identifying housing, administering rental assistance, operating using a Housing First Approach, utilizing HMIS, and managing and maintaining residential property; ○ establishing partnerships with providers of mainstream resources, benefits, and services; ○ connecting participants to community supports most critical to ongoing housing stability; • strong organizational structure for managing operations and for internal and external coordination that supports a reasonable expectation of administrative and operational efficiency, with the capacity to complete this project without excessive City oversight or administration <p>B. Applicants with existing HUD grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History of HMIS participation and timely Annual Performance Report (APR) submissions support a reasonable expectation of timely and quality-controlled compliance with requirements related to program data 	25	
<p>Applicant Qualifications and Experience Comments:</p>		

2. Financial Considerations	Points Assigned	Max Points Available
-----------------------------	-----------------	----------------------

	by Reviewer	
<p>A. The Applicant demonstrates capacity to administer grants effectively. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • experience of the applicant and sub-recipients (if any) in effectively utilizing federal funds; • history (if any) of underspending/returning HUD funds; and • consistency in drawing down funds on HUD CoC grants. <p>B. The proposed budget is reasonable for the level of services provided, based on the type of project, population served, and number of households to be served.</p> <p>C. The Applicant provided clear and <i>accurate</i> calculations on its Budget Detail Forms.</p> <p>D. The Applicant has written commitments of cash and/or in-kind value that meet HUD's 25% match requirements; projects with leveraged commitments of at least 150% of the total request are more competitive</p>		
<p><i>Rapid Rehousing and TH-RRH Project Applications only</i></p> <p>E. The Applicant describes a clear, strong, and reasonable method for working with each head of household to determine the type, amount, and duration of financial assistance needed to secure permanent housing.</p>		
<p>Financial Considerations Comments:</p>		

3. Project Description	Points Assigned by Reviewer	Max Points Available
<p>A. The description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides a clear picture of the proposed target population and their housing needs; • proposes a project of superior quality; • presents a feasible plan for rapid implementation of the program and a detailed strategy for ensuring timely implementation; • prioritizes achieving positive outcomes related to housing stability, increased income, and connection to mainstream benefits; • reflects an understanding of the requirement to accept referrals into the proposed project from the coordinated entry system; • demonstrates commitment to Housing First Approach, participant choice and involvement, and focus on assisting participants achieve and maintain housing stability and well-being, no matter what their needs and vulnerabilities are; • demonstrates capacity to calculate annual income/tenant rent and work with landlords (if applicable); • demonstrates that the Applicant has a system of continuous quality improvement and program evaluation in place. The Applicant involves participants in that system and has a plan to obtain participant feedback in this 		35

<p>new project to assess participant satisfaction and ensure high quality of services</p> <p><i>For tenant-based leasing or rental assistance projects:</i> The Applicant demonstrates an understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the housing needs of the target population and of the relevant neighborhoods, markets, and “community amenities” (i.e., shopping, schools, public transportation, health care, recreation, social services) that will best meet those needs; the availability of proposed rental units within current Fair Market Rent limitations the neighborhood conditions and accessibility of community amenities and the capacity to assist participants to find the widest possible choice of housing units <p><i>For project-based or sponsor-based rental assistance:</i> The Applicant demonstrates an understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the housing needs of the target population and the responsibilities of property ownership and maintenance; the necessary considerations the Applicant has made about neighborhood conditions and accessibility of community amenities 		
<p>Project Description Comments:</p>		

4. Supportive Services	Points Assigned by Reviewer	Max Points Available
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant demonstrates a thorough understanding of the service needs of the target population, including a recognition that needs will change over time. The Applicant provides an actionable plan for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assisting participants to obtain and remain in permanent housing, including a plan for how the applicant will address the anticipated needs of tenants (health, behavioral health, education, employment, life skills, child care, etc.) assisting participants increase employment and/or income, address their anticipated employment/income-related needs, and maximize their ability to live independently building (and/or strengthening) connections to mainstream benefits (e.g. SSI/SSDI, TANF, Medicaid, SNAP, SCHIP, Workforce Investment Act, and Veterans Health Care programs) identifying and enrolling all Medicaid-eligible participants and whenever possible, leveraging Medicaid and non-Medicaid resources to finance supportive services such as case management and behavioral health services Providing transportation to participants to attend mainstream benefit appointments, employment training, or jobs 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting regular follow-ups with participants to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed • Assisting participants access SSI/SSDI technical assistance (SOAR) • leveraging services for which the applicant has secured commitments and coordinating with other providers to impact the effectiveness of the proposed program. 		
<p><i>Project Applications Proposing to Serve Families with Children ONLY</i> The Applicant has designated staff responsible for ensuring children are enrolled in school and connected to the appropriate services.</p>		
<p><i>Rapid Re-housing Project Applications ONLY</i> The proposal reflects the applicant’s understanding of the full set of requirements for rapid re-housing projects and their superior ability or capacity to meet the requirements. Some of these include capacity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • streamline the intake process and rapidly house participants in units of their choice that are inspected for compliance with Housing Quality Standards; • progressively engage households by assessing their needs on an ongoing basis, and providing assistance as needed; • accurately calculate the amount of rental assistance to be provided and the contribution expected from households; • develop housing stability and self-sufficiency plans that reflect the barriers to sustaining housing and include providing linkages/referrals to appropriate resources (education, Medicaid, free credit report, housing counseling); • provide monthly Housing Stabilization case management services; • assist households that are in unsafe housing (i.e., domestic violence or L&I violations) with relocation and/or referrals 		
<p><i>Joint TH-RRH Project Applications only</i> The proposal reflects thorough understanding of the full set of requirements for TH-RRH projects, including that a program participant may choose to receive only the transitional housing assistance or the rapid re-housing assistance and that participants cannot be required to participate in treatment or services to receive assistance.</p> <p>B. Some of these include capacity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide participants the freedom to choose when they are ready to exit the TH portion of the project to the RRH portion of the project; • provide both components, the units supported by the transitional housing component and the tenant-based rental assistance and services provided through the PH-RRH component, to all participants; • use a Housing First approach that accommodates people with possessions, partners, pets, or other needs, with participant-driven service models and a focus on helping people move to permanent housing as quickly as possible; • helps participants find permanent housing based on their unique strengths, needs, preferences, and financial resources; • provide or connect participants to resources that help them improve their safety and well-being and achieve their goals; and • target and prioritize people experiencing homelessness with higher needs and who are most vulnerable. 		
<p>Supportive Services Comments:</p>		