

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
2016 CoC Program Review, Rating and Ranking Procedure

Project Rating and Review Process:

Renewal Projects

In order to be considered for inclusion in Philadelphia’s Continuum of Care Consolidated Application, local organizations must submit the local 2016 Continuum of Care Program Renewals Application Proposal, which includes submitting performance data from their most recently submitted APR. Organizations are given 6 weeks to complete and submit the CoC Renewals Application to the City of Philadelphia Office of Homeless Services. The Office of Homeless Services 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 2016 CoC Program Renewals Proposals 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 2016 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, are independently reviewed and scored by 5 individuals using the local review instrument, developed by members of the CoC Quality Improvement and Evaluation Subcommittee. 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 most recently submitted APR. Once all reviewer scores are submitted to the Office of Homeless Services, renewal project proposals scores are analyzed to identify any proposals with a significantly wide range in scores. The Review Panel is brought together for a session to discuss and potentially 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 Participant Information	10
Case Study	10
Housing First Approach and Prioritizing Households Most In Need	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
Change in Earned Income: Local standard: 10% of adults increase or gain earned income	5

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
2016 CoC Program Review, Rating and Ranking Procedure

Change in Other Cash Income: Local standard: 35% of adults increase or gain other income	5
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	10
Overall responsiveness, strength, and completeness of application	15
Total	105

In addition to the evaluation tool, proposals lose 1 point if at least two members from the applicant's organization did not participate in the January 2016 unsheltered PIT count. *Ten points are removed from proposals received after the submission deadline.*

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 3 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, which forms the basis for preliminary ranking within the local priorities.

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 anonymized 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;
- 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.

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
2016 CoC Program Review, Rating and Ranking Procedure

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 grouped according to program type (PH, SH, and TH) and are ranked according to the average score received during the renewal proposal review process. The Philadelphia CoC has a long-standing commitment to rank permanent housing renewal projects higher than safe haven and transitional housing renewal projects, with the exception of low-scoring permanent housing projects. 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 Committee. These projects are ranked below the reviewed renewal PH projects, but above safe haven renewal projects. To emphasize the importance of project performance, new projects created through reallocation are ranked above the lowest scoring renewal projects.

The Philadelphia CoC project applications included in the 2016 consolidated application are ranked as follows:

1. Renewal HMIS project
2. Renewal permanent housing (PSH and RRH) projects that scored 82 and above
3. First Time Renewal PH projects not operating long enough to have a year of performance data

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
2016 CoC Program Review, Rating and Ranking Procedure

4. New permanent supportive housing (PSH) project voluntarily reallocating from a TH project
5. Renewal safe haven (SH) projects
6. Renewal transitional housing (TH) projects that scored 82 and above
7. New permanent supportive housing (PSH) project for Chronic – created through reallocation
8. New permanent supportive housing (PSH) project for Chronic and HIV/AIDS – created through reallocation
9. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project for families fleeing domestic violence - created through reallocation (This project straddles Tier 1 and Tier 2.)
10. New HMIS project for Coordinated Entry – created through reallocation
11. Lowest scoring renewal permanent housing (PH) projects scoring 81 and below
12. Lowest scoring transition housing (TH) projects scoring 81 and below
13. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project for youth and families - created through Bonus funds
14. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project for singles - created through Bonus funds
15. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project for youth - created through Bonus funds

Selection and Ranking Approval Process

On Thursday, August 18, 2016, the City of Philadelphia Office of Homeless Services presented the proposed ranking strategy to the Philadelphia CoC Advisory Committee for their input. On Monday, August 29, 2016, the Office of Homeless Services presented the proposed project selection and ranking order to the CoC Board, along with the input of the CoC Advisory Committee. The CoC Board approved the proposed project selection and ranking order for the FY 2016 CoC Consolidated Application on Monday, August 29, 2016.

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
 2016 CoC Program Renewal Project Proposal Review Instrument

All FY 2016 renewal project applications with at least one year of performance data were de-identified/ anonymized and scored by 5 individual reviewers using the following evaluation tool.

	Scoring Criteria		Max Points
Project Description and Participant Information	Clear and comprehensive project description that describes the target population(s) to be served, the plan for addressing the identified needs/issues of the CoC target population(s), projected outcome(s), supportive services provided and coordination with other source(s)/partner(s). The project participant chart is fully consistent with the description. If not, a sound explanation was provided.	8-10	10
	Project description provides a limited description of the population served and services provided. The project participant chart is somewhat consistent with the description.	5-7	
	Project description is lacking in content and does not present a clear picture of the project for reviewer. The project participant chart is not consistent with the description.	0-4	
Comments			
Case Study	One case study of client challenges was provided. The individual described is representative of the target population. The case clearly and completely illustrates efforts made by the housing and service providers to address the client’s identified issues/needs. The outcome is clear.	8-10	10
	Case study briefly highlights efforts made by both the housing and service providers to address the client’s identified issues/needs and client’s outcomes are clear.	5-7	
	Case study is lacking in content and does not present a clear picture of client challenges and staff interventions.	0-4	
Comments			
Housing First Approach (PSH, RRH, and TH only). Award SH projects full 5 points	Project follows a “Housing First” approach (met ALL three conditions)	5	5
	Project does not follow a “Housing First” approach, but met 2 conditions	3	
	Project does not follow a “Housing First” approach (met 1 or none of the conditions)	0	
	Bonus points: A sound explanation for why the project does not follow “Housing First” Approach was provided. Examples of sound explanations include: - Other funding sources require project to follow certain processes or criteria	1-3	

APPENDIX A

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
2016 CoC Program Renewal Project Proposal Review Instrument

	- Project is a recovery program and commits to maintaining a sober living environment for participants																										
Comments																											
Prioritizing Households Most in Need	51% or more of project participants are HUD’s priority populations: chronically homeless individuals or families, veterans, youth (ages 24 and below), and/or victims of domestic violence	5	5																								
	50% or less of project participants are HUD’s priority populations: chronically homeless individuals or families, veterans, youth (ages 24 and below), and/or victims of domestic violence	0																									
Comments																											
Data Quality HUD/Local Standard: Less than 10% “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%.		10																								
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>0</th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> <th>6</th> <th>7</th> <th>8</th> <th>9</th> <th>10</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td># of data elements with less than 10% “Don’t Know/Refused AND less than 10% “Missing” values</td> <td>0</td> <td>1-2</td> <td>3-4</td> <td>5-6</td> <td>7-8</td> <td>9-10</td> <td>11-12</td> <td>13-16</td> <td>17-19</td> <td>20-21</td> <td>22</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Points		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	# of data elements with less than 10% “Don’t Know/Refused AND less than 10% “Missing” values	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-12	13-16	17-19	20-21	22	0-10
	Points	0		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10														
# of data elements with less than 10% “Don’t Know/Refused AND less than 10% “Missing” values	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11-12	13-16	17-19	20-21	22																
Bonus points: 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.		1-3																									
Comments																											
Unit Utilization Rates	<i>Local standard: 90% or above</i> for the 4 points in time		10																								
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Point Value for each Point-in-Time</th> <th>0</th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>2.5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Utilization Rate</td> <td>Below 75%</td> <td>75 - 79%</td> <td>80 - 89%</td> <td>90% and above</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Point Value for each Point-in-Time		0	1	2	2.5	Utilization Rate	Below 75%	75 - 79%	80 - 89%	90% and above	0-10														
	Point Value for each Point-in-Time	0		1	2	2.5																					
Utilization Rate	Below 75%	75 - 79%	80 - 89%	90% and above																							
Add up the scores for each Point in Time to calculate the overall score: January ___ + April ___ + July ___ + October ___ = Overall Score: ____																											
Bonus points: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in achieving higher utilization rates, and plan to address them was provided.		1-3																									
Comments																											

APPENDIX A

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
2016 CoC Program Renewal Project Proposal Review Instrument

Residence Prior to Program Entry – <u>Permanent Supportive Housing</u>	<i>Local / HUD Standard: BOTH of the following conditions must be met:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of participants MUST enter from either literally homeless situations (20a) or institutional settings (20b); AND 51% or more of participants MUST enter from literally homeless situations (20a). 		
	Project met local standard (met both conditions)	10	10
	Project met the following condition ONLY : 51% or more of participants enter from literally homeless situations (20a).	5	
	Project met no conditions of the local standard	0	
Bonus points: 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 was provided.	1-3		
Residence Prior to Program Entry – <u>Transitional Housing</u>	<i>Local Standard:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 51% or more of participants MUST enter from literally homeless situations (20a). TH Projects serving youth under 25 or domestic violence survivors may have participants enter from other locations (20c), such as their own rental housing, family or friends. 		
	51% or more of participants enter from literally homeless situations (20a).	10	10
	50% or less of participants enter from literally homeless situations (20a).	0	
	Bonus points: 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 was provided.	1-3	
Residence Prior to Program Entry – <u>Rapid Re-Housing</u>	<i>Local / HUD Standard: BOTH of the following conditions must be met:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of participants MUST enter from either literally homeless situations (20a) or institutional settings (20b); AND 51% or more of participants MUST enter from literally homeless situations (20a). 		
	Project met local standard (met both conditions)	10	10
	Project met the following condition ONLY : 51% or more of participants enter from literally homeless situations (20a).	5	
	Project met no conditions of the local standard	0	
Bonus points: 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 was provided.	1-3		

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
2016 CoC Program Renewal Project Proposal Review Instrument

Comments								
Residence Prior to Entry – Safe Haven	<i>Local/ HUD Standard:</i> 100% of participants enter from an emergency shelter, a safe haven, a place not meant for human habitation (20a), or an Institutional Setting (20b).							10
	100% of participants enter from an emergency shelter, a safe haven, a place not meant for human habitation (20a), or an Institutional Setting (20b).						10	
	Less than 100% of participants enter from an emergency shelter, a safe haven, a place not meant for human habitation (20a), or an Institutional Setting (20b).						0	
	Bonus points: 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 was provided.						1-3	
Change in Earned/ Employment Income	<i>Local Standard: 10% or more</i> of all adults (Leavers and Stayers) will have <i>more</i> earned income than at entry.							5
	Points	0	1	2	3	4	5	
	% of adults with more earned income than at program entry	5% and below	6%	7%	8%	9%	10% and above	
Bonus Points: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in achieving higher rates of adults improving their income, and plan to address them was supplied. Please consider the project’s target population and potential challenges the population would have when seeking employment.							1-3	
Change in Other Income	<i>Local Standard: 35% or more</i> of all Adults (Leavers + Stayers) will have <i>more</i> income than at entry from sources other than employment.							5
	Points	0	1	2	3	4	5	
	% of adults with more income from sources other than employment	23% and below	24-25%	26-28%	29-31%	32-34%	35% and above	
Bonus Points: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in achieving higher rates of adults improving their income, and plan to address them was supplied. Please consider the project’s target population and potential challenges the population would have when seeking employment.							1-3	

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
2016 CoC Program Renewal Project Proposal Review Instrument

Comments														
Non-Cash Benefit Sources	Local Standard: 82% or more of Leavers and Stayers (adults + children) will be connected to at least one mainstream benefit.												0-10	10
	Points	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
	% of participants with at least one non-cash benefit	69% and below	70%	71%	72%	73%	74%	75%	76-77%	78-79%	80-81%	82% and above		
Bonus points: 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 was provided.												1-3		
Comments														
Housing Stability – Permanent Supportive Housing	Local Standard: 93% or more of all participants (<i>Leavers and Stayers</i>) remain in the program at the end of the operating year or exit to a different permanent housing destination.												0-10	10
	Points	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
	% participants remaining in program or exiting to permanent housing	69% and below	70-73%	74-76%	77%	78%	79%	80-82%	83-85%	86-88%	89-92%	93% and above		
Bonus points: 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 was provided.												1-3		
Housing Stability – Transitional Housing	HUD/ Local Standard: 80% or more of <i>leavers</i> will exit to a permanent housing destination. If no leavers, score “0”.												0-10	10
	Points	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
	% of leavers who exit to permanent housing	64% and below	65%	66%	67%	68-69%	70-71%	72-73%	74-75%	76-77%	78-79%	80% and above		
Bonus points: 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 was supplied												1-3		

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
 2016 CoC Program Renewal Project Proposal Review Instrument

Housing Stability – Rapid Re-Housing	HUD/ Local Standard: 80% or more of leavers will exit to a permanent housing destination.											0-10	10
	Points	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
	% of leavers exiting to permanent housing	64% and below	65%	66%	67%	68-69%	70-71%	72-73%	74-75%	76-77%	78-79%	80% and above	
Bonus points: 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.											1-3		
Comments													
Housings Stability - Safe Haven	Local Standard: 55% or more of leavers will exit to permanent housing If no leavers, score “0”.											0-10	10
	Points	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
	% of leavers exiting to permanent housing	41% and below	42%	43%	44%	45%	46%	47-48%	49-50%	51-52%	53-54%	55% and above	
Bonus points: 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.											1-3		
Comments													
Overall responsiveness to RFP /Explanations and plans to address deficiencies	All sections of proposal (budget, tables and narratives) are clear and complete – program structure is easy to understand, population served is explicit. Data is complete and if there are narrative explanations, they are clear and convincing. If participants exited the program, most destinations are positive. Those who remained appeared to be on track for positive outcomes (same/increased income, connected to mainstream benefits).											11-15	15
	Fairly clear proposal. Complete with some details.											6-10	
	Proposal unclear, sections or responses missing, hard to understand program or population to be served.											0-5	
Comments													
TOTAL SCORE												105	

APPENDIX B

2016 CoC Program New Rapid Re-Housing Project Proposal Review Instrument

NEW RRH PROJECT PROPOSAL REVIEW INSTRUMENT

Score, Rank, and Overall Evaluation / Comments:

This review tool is divided into 5 sections, each with its own point value. Please enter your score for each section on the lines below. Each section contains a series of questions to consider when scoring. Please read through all questions and assign a total score for that section based on your answers to the questions. Space is provided for notes, if needed.

- 1. _____ Housing component: appropriateness and effectiveness (25 points maximum)
- 2. _____ Services component: appropriateness and effectiveness (20 points maximum)
- 3. _____ Experience of the applicant agency and other involved agencies (25 points maximum)
- 4. _____ Budget, financial resources, and leveraging (20 points maximum)
- 5. _____ Responsiveness to RFP and Local Needs (10 points maximum)
- _____ **Total (100 points maximum)**

OVERALL COMMENTS:

1. Housing Component

[Maximum Score: 25 points Reviewer Score: _____]

- a. Does the applicant clearly and completely respond to *all* applicable content areas;
- b. How well does the applicant demonstrate an understanding of the housing needs of the target population, the neighborhoods and markets in which the project(s) will be located?
- c. How strong and reasonable are the methods used for determining type, amount, and duration of assistance (RRH uses the Sufficiency Assessment to create Self Sufficiency Plans and financial assistance not to exceed \$5,000 per household)?
- d. How appropriate is the proposed method of providing housing through the program for meeting participants’ housing needs?
- e. How well will the proposed program meet participants’ “community amenity” needs – housing in proximity to shopping, schools, public transportation, health care, recreation, social services, etc.?

COMMENTS:

2. Services Component

[Maximum Score: 20 points Reviewer Score: _____]

- a. How well does the applicant demonstrate an understanding of the service needs of the target population when they enter the program, and as they change over time?
- b. How well will the proposed services meet the needs of participants (consider types of services, how often/long they will be provided, location of services, transportation

APPENDIX B

2016 CoC Program New Rapid Re-Housing Project Proposal Review Instrument
assistance, who/what agency is providing the services, who/if anyone is coordinating
services received from multiple entities)

- c. How effective will the proposed services program be to serve the required population, (homeless individuals and/or families, including youth)?
- d. How effectively will the program, as described, assist participants in “increasing their incomes and maximizing their ability to live independently”?
- e. Does the applicant provide sufficient detail on the proposed supportive services partnerships and proposed coordination among the participating entities?

COMMENTS:

3. Experience of the Applicant Agency and Other Involved Agencies: Section E

[Maximum Score: 25 points Reviewer Score: _____]

- a. How *exceptional* and/or *extensive* is the organization’s experience [per RFP, 5 years providing services to homeless households, 3 years providing housing and case management services, established partnerships, financial and administrative capacity, equal opportunity employer]; how *comprehensive* and *compelling* is the justification for why the applicant is appropriate entity to receive funding for the proposed project?
- b. How experienced is the applicant organization (and any other entities identified in the proposal) in providing housing and supportive services to homeless persons?
- c. How experienced is the applicant organization (and any other participating entities identified in the proposal) in providing housing and supportive services to the particular priority population to be served by this new program (consider length and type of experience they described, and measures of success if they were provided)?
- d. How well does the proposed program “fit” with the past / current experience of the applicant organization – a wholly new endeavor, an increase in capacity to serve a population already being served in this way, or an additional “next step” project to serve a population already being served but in a new way?
- e. Does the applicant organization have the capacity in terms of current and proposed staffing and workload to deliver the services as described in the proposal? Among other points, consider the information provided in the “HUD grant table”.
- f. What is the applicant’s track record in administering rental subsidies and carrying out projects in a timely manner? Does the applicant demonstrate ability to calculate annual income/tenant rent and work with landlords?
- g. How well does the applicant organization describe its responsibilities and the responsibilities of its partners in administering the proposed project (if applicable)

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX B

2016 CoC Program New Rapid Re-Housing Project Proposal Review Instrument

4. Budget, Financial Resources, and Leveraging: Section F

[Maximum Score: 20 points Reviewer Score: _____]

- a. Is the proposed budget *reasonable* for the level of services provided, based on the type of project, population served, and number of households to be served?
- b. Did the applicant provide *clear* and *accurate* calculations on Budget Forms Attachment ?
- c. Has the applicant secured commitments beyond the required 25% (projects approaching leverage/match of 150% are more competitive)? Is this level of additional cash more substantial than that of other proposals you have reviewed under this competition? If the cash has not been secured, is the explanation of the agency’s efforts sufficient to convince you that it will be secured in the future?
- d. Are there non-CoC program sources of services identified and secured that will be sufficient to meet participants’ services needs? (This is preferable, but only if the sources are secured or clearly will be secured.)
- e. How much of an impact will leveraged services, for which the agency has secured commitments, have on the effectiveness of the proposed program? Consider this particularly as it relates to projects that require rehabilitation of the property prior to utilizing the rental assistance/leasing/service funding. (more=better)

COMMENTS:

5. Responsiveness to RFP

[Maximum Score: 10 points Reviewer Score: _____]

- a. How well did the applicant respond to the RFP? Was the response sufficiently detailed to allow you to adequately understand the proposed program?
- b. Based on written descriptions, how well does the applicant understand the population to be served – where they come from, what their housing and services needs are?
- c. How well does the applicant demonstrate they understand concepts like housing first, rapid rehousing, and operating projects with lower barriers.
- d. How well does the applicant demonstrate a commitment to serving individuals and families who have barriers, including more severe service needs?
- e. How well will program the identified supportive services and housing needs of the participants? Is the project reasonable and achievable?

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX C

2016 CoC Program New Permanent Supportive Housing Project Proposal Review Instrument

NEW PSH PROJECT PROPOSAL REVIEW INSTRUMENT

Score, Rank, and Overall Evaluation / Comments:

This review tool is divided into 5 sections, each with its own point value. Please enter your score for each section on the lines below. Each section contains a series of questions to consider when scoring. Please read through all questions and assign a total score for that section based on your answers to the questions. Space is provided for notes, if needed.

- 1. _____ Housing component: appropriateness and effectiveness (25 points maximum)
- 2. _____ Services component: appropriateness and effectiveness (20 points maximum)
- 3. _____ Experience of the applicant agency and other involved agencies (25 points maximum)
- 4. _____ Budget, financial resources, and leveraging (20 points maximum)
- 5. _____ Responsiveness to RFP and meeting local needs (10 points maximum)
- _____ **Total (100 maximum points)**

OVERALL COMMENTS:

6. Housing Component Section C

[Maximum Score: 25 points Reviewer Score: _____]

- f. Does the applicant clearly and completely respond to *all* applicable content areas;
- g. How well does the applicant demonstrate an understanding of the housing needs of the target population, the neighborhoods and markets in which the project(s) will be located?
- h. How appropriate is the proposed method of providing housing through the program (scattered-site or identified sites) for meeting participants’ housing needs?
- i. How reasonable is the proposed schedule of activities for program implementation, (especially if the proposal includes rehabilitation or a new construction)?
- j. How well will the proposed program meet participants’ “community amenity” needs – housing in proximity to shopping, schools, public transportation, health care, recreation, social services, etc.?

COMMENTS:

7. Services Component: Section D

[Maximum Score: 20 points Reviewer Score: _____]

- a. How well does the applicant demonstrate an understanding of the service needs of the target population when they enter the program, and as they change over time?
- b. How well will the proposed services meet the needs of participants (consider types of services, how often/long they will be provided, location of services, transportation

APPENDIX C

2016 CoC Program New Permanent Supportive Housing Project Proposal Review Instrument
assistance, who/what agency is providing the services, who/if anyone is coordinating
services received from multiple entities)

- c. How effective will the proposed services program be to serve the required population, (chronically homeless individuals)?
- d. How effectively will the program, as described, assist participants in “increasing their incomes and maximizing their ability to live independently”?
- e. Does the applicant provide sufficient detail on the proposed supportive services partnerships and proposed coordination among the participating entities?

COMMENTS:

8. Experience of the Applicant Agency and Other Involved Agencies: Section E

[Maximum Score: 25 points Reviewer Score: _____]

- a. How *exceptional* and/or *extensive* is the organization’s experience [per RFP, 5 years providing services to homeless households with disabilities, 3 years providing housing and case management services, established partnerships, financial and administrative capacity, equal opportunity employer]; how *comprehensive* and *compelling* is the justification for why the applicant is appropriate entity to receive funding for the proposed project?
- b. How experienced is the applicant organization (and any other entities identified in the proposal) in providing housing and supportive services to homeless persons?
- c. How experienced is the applicant organization (and any other participating entities identified in the proposal) in providing housing and supportive services to the particular priority population to be served by this new program (consider length and type of experience they described, and measures of success if they were provided)?
- d. How well does the proposed program “fit” with the past / current experience of the applicant organization – a wholly new endeavor, an increase in capacity to serve a population already being served in this way, or an additional “next step” project to serve a population already being served but in a new way?
- e. Does the applicant organization have the capacity in terms of current and proposed staffing and workload to deliver the services as described in the proposal? Among other points, consider the information provided in the “HUD grant table”.

COMMENTS:

9. Budget, Financial Resources, and Leveraging: Section F

[Maximum Score: 20 points Reviewer Score: _____]

- f. Is the proposed budget *reasonable* for the level of services provided, based on the type of project, population served, and number of households to be served?
- g. Did the applicant provide *clear* and *accurate* calculations on Budget Forms Attachment ?
- h. Has the applicant secured commitments beyond the required 25% (projects approaching leverage/match of 150% are more competitive)? Is this level of

APPENDIX C

2016 CoC Program New Permanent Supportive Housing Project Proposal Review Instrument
additional cash more substantial than that of other proposals you have reviewed under this competition? If the cash has not been secured, is the explanation of the agency’s efforts sufficient to convince you that it will be secured in the future?

- i. How much of an impact will leveraged services, for which the agency has secured commitments, have on the effectiveness of the proposed program? Consider this particularly as it relates to projects that require rehabilitation of the property prior to utilizing the rental assistance/leasing/service funding. (more=better)

COMMENTS:

10. Responsiveness to RFP

[Maximum Score: 10 points Reviewer Score: _____]

- f. How well did the applicant respond to the RFP? Was the response sufficiently detailed to allow you to adequately understand the proposed program?
- g. Based on written descriptions, how well does the applicant understand the population to be served – where they come from, what their housing and services needs are?
- h. How well does the applicant demonstrate they understand concepts like housing first, chronically homeless, and severe service needs?
- i. How well does the applicant demonstrate a commitment to serving individuals and families who have barriers, including more severe service needs and those with long histories of homelessness?
- j. How well will program the identified supportive services and housing needs of the participants? Is the project reasonable and achievable?

COMMENTS: