

**PUBLIC NOTICE**  
**South Central Illinois Continuum of Care (IL-515)**

**FY 2018 Continuum of Care Application**  
**Objective Selection and Ranking of Projects**

*This Public Notice complies with the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the FY 2018 Continuum of Care Program Competition FR-6200-N-25, at Section VI E 1 b (1).*

Projects are selected and ranked by the CoC's Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee, which consists of persons who are not connected with any funded agencies or funded projects.

**PROJECT SELECTION**

Projects are selected based on:

1. Meeting project threshold requirements determined by HUD in the FY 2018 NOFA. This can be viewed at <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/5719/fy-2018-coc-program-nofa/>.
2. Applicant agencies being in good standing with HUD, the State of Illinois, and the CoC.
3. Projects proposing activities which are eligible for consideration under the FY 2018 NOFA.

**PROJECT RANKING**

The CoC uses the **attached Ranking Scales**. This CoC provides an alternate method for projects submitted by victim services organizations (page 10).

## Ranking Scales for CoC Projects – FY 2018 South Central Illinois CoC (IL-515)

**NOTES:**

1. All numbers and percentages are rounded to nearest whole number/percentage.
2. SAGE APR reports are generated from HMIS for all projects for a 12-month period ending in the most recently completed calendar quarter (e.g., April to March, or July to June).

<b>RANKING FACTORS FOR RENEWAL PROJECTS</b>	<b>Maximum Points</b>
<p><b>1. Needs and Vulnerabilities</b></p> <p>HOW MEASURED: Percentage of participants who entered the project with high barriers.</p> <p>SOURCE: APR</p> <p>CALCULATION:</p> <p>For RRH Projects, there are three factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% or more adult participants had zero income at entry (from item Q16)</li> <li>• 50% or more adult participants with more than one condition at entry (Q13a2)</li> <li>• 50% or more adult participants entered project from place not meant for human habitation (Q15)</li> </ul> <p>For PSH projects, there are three factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% or more adult participants had zero income at entry (from item Q16)</li> <li>• 75% or more adult participants with more than one condition at entry (Q13a2)</li> <li>• 75% or more adult participants entered project from place not meant for human habitation (Q15)</li> </ul> <p>SCALE:</p> <p>Projects meeting all three factors = 5 points            Projects meeting two factors = 3 points            Projects meeting one factor = 1 point            Projects meeting zero factors = 0 points</p>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>2. Chronic Homelessness</b></p> <p>HOW MEASURED: Percentage of all persons served who were chronically homeless at entry.</p> <p>SOURCE: APR</p> <p>CALCULATION: Number of chronically homeless adults divided by total number of adults (from item Q05a).</p> <p>SCALE:</p> <p>Highest percentage among all projects = 5 points            Second highest percentage = 4 points            Third highest percentage = 3 points            Fourth highest percentage = 2 points            All other projects serving any chronically homeless = 1 point            Any projects serving no chronically homeless = 0 points</p> <p>Ties: Tied projects receive full score, and the next highest project receives the full score for the next level. For example, if two projects are tied for highest percentage, they both get 5 points, and the project(s) with the next highest percentage gets 4 points.</p>	<b>5</b>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>RANKING FACTORS FOR RENEWAL PROJECTS</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Maximum Points</p>
<p><b>3. Housing Stability</b></p> <p>HOW MEASURED: The percentage of participants remaining in or exiting to permanent housing.</p> <p>SOURCE: APR</p> <p>CALCULATION: The number of stayers in permanent housing, including RRH, at the end of the year (from item Q05a), plus the number who exited to permanent housing destinations during the year (from items Q23a and Q23b); divided by the total number of persons (Q05a)</p> <p>SCALE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>92-100% = 5 points</li> <li>84-91% = 4 points</li> <li>76-83% = 3 points</li> <li>68-75% = 2 points</li> <li>60-67% = 1 point</li> <li>Less than 60% = 0 points</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">5</p>
<p><b>4. Housing First</b></p> <p>HOW MEASURED: Housing First Self-Assessment score</p> <p>SCALE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>170-180 = 5 points</li> <li>160-169 = 4 points</li> <li>150-159 = 3 points</li> <li>140-149 = 2 points</li> <li>130-139 = 1 point</li> <li>Under 130 = 0 points</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">5</p>
<p><b>5. Employment Income</b></p> <p>HOW MEASURED: Percentage of adults who increased income from employment</p> <p>SOURCE: APR</p> <p>CALCULATION: From item Q19a3, line 1 (earned income). Number of adults in columns 4 and 5, divided by total adults (column 7).</p> <p>SCALE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20% or more = 4 points</li> <li>13-19% = 3 points</li> <li>6-12% = 2 points</li> <li>1-5% = 1 points</li> <li>Less than 1% = 0 points</li> </ul> <p>(All PSH projects will receive a minimum of 2 points, and may receive 3 or 4 points if their performance is 13% or higher based on the above scale.)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>

RANKING FACTORS FOR RENEWAL PROJECTS	Maximum Points
<p><b>6. Non-Employment Income</b></p> <p>HOW MEASURED: Percentage of adults who increased non-employment income.</p> <p>SOURCE: APR.</p> <p>CALCULATION: From item Q19a3, line 3 (other income). Number of adults in columns 4 and 5, divided by total adults (column 7).</p> <p>SCALE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10% or more = 3 points</li> <li>5-9% = 2 points</li> <li>1-4% = 1 point</li> <li>Less than 1% = 0 points</li> </ul>	3
<p><b>7. APR Submission</b></p> <p>HOW MEASURED: If APR submitted within 90 days of project end date.</p> <p>SOURCE: Grantees provide evidence of submission date.</p> <p>SCALE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>APR submitted within 90 days of project end date = 3 points</li> <li>91 or more days = 0 points</li> <li>Projects in their first year of operation for whom APR is not due by time of ranking will receive 3 points.</li> </ul>	3
<p><b>8. Spending</b></p> <p>HOW MEASURED: Percentage of funds expended at end of project term</p> <p>SOURCE: Grantee</p> <p>SCALE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project spent 90-100% of grant funds in most recent completed year = 4 points</li> <li>80-89% = 3 points</li> <li>70-79% = 2 points</li> <li>60-69% = 1 points</li> <li>Less than 60% = 0 points</li> </ul>	4
<p><b>9. Data Quality and Security</b></p> <p>HOW MEASURED: Accuracy and completeness of HMIS client data, and security measures to protect client data</p> <p>CALCULATION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Average percentage of errors in 15 HMIS data fields (from Q06a, Q06b, and Q06c);</li> <li>(2) Completion of HMIS security checklist.</li> </ul> <p>SCALE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to 2 points for percentage errors in HMIS client data fields: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0.00% error rate = 2 points</li> <li>0.01% to 3.99% error rate = 1 point</li> <li>4.00% and above error rate = 0 points</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	4

RANKING FACTORS FOR RENEWAL PROJECTS	Maximum Points
Up to 2 points for HMIS questionnaire: Follow all Core Elements plus at least 1 Advanced Element = 2 points Follow all Core Elements = 1 point Does not follow all Core Elements = 0 points	
<b>10. Type of Project</b>  WHAT: Type of project (e.g., SSO, TH, RRH, PSH, HMIS).  HOW MEASURED: Incentives for projects that provide permanent housing or meet critical local needs .  SOURCE: Most recent project application. PSH = 5 points RRH = 3 points HMIS and SSO/Coordinated Entry = 2 points All other projects = 0 points	5
<b>11. SOAR Training</b>  WHAT: Participation in SOAR training.  SOURCE: Questionnaire for grantees.  SCALE: Staff of grantee or designated referral agency completed SOAR training in past 24 months = 1 point Staff of grantee or designated referral agency did not complete SOAR training in past 24 months = 0 points	1
<b>MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>44</b>

**Tie Breakers**

If two or more projects receive the exact same score, the tie(s) will be broken as follows:

- Tiebreaker #1 – **Funds available per person by region.** We will compute this as follows: Take the total CoC and ESG funds currently available in each region, and divide it by the PIT count for the region. Projects in the region with the smaller amount of funds available per person win the tie. If projects are still tied because they are in the same region, we will move to Tiebreaker #2.
- Tiebreaker #2 - **Number of beds.** The project with the greater number of beds (from Project Application section 4B) wins the tie. If projects are still tied because they have the same number of beds, we will move to Tiebreaker #3.
- Tiebreaker #3 – **Budget.** The project with the higher total budget (from Project Application section 6I) wins the tie.

			Needs and Vulnerabilities	Chronic Homelessness	Housing Stability	Housing First	Employment Income	Non-Employment Income	APR Submission	Spending	Data Quality and Security	Type of Project	SOAR Training	Total
Grantee	Project	Max Points →	5	5	5	5	4	3	3	4	4	5	1	44
C.E.F.S.	PSH													
C.E.F.S.	RRH (from SSO Reallocation)													
C.E.F.S.	RRH (formerly TH)													
ERBA	Permanent Housing													
ERBA	Rapid Rehousing													
IVEDC	Rapid Rehousing													

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SPECIAL RANKING FACTORS FOR FIRST-TIME RENEWAL PROJECTS WITH LESS THAN 12 MONTHS HISTORY</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Maximum Points</p>
<p><b>1. Chronic homelessness</b></p> <p>WHAT: Housing for persons who are chronically homeless.</p> <p>HOW MEASURED: Percentage of all beds that are designated or prioritized for chronically homeless.</p> <p>SOURCE: First-year project application (item 4B).</p> <p>SCALE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100% of beds dedicated or prioritized = 5 points</li> <li>90-99% = 4 points</li> <li>80-89% = 3 points</li> <li>70-79% = 2 points</li> <li>60-69% = 1 point</li> <li>Less than 60% = 0 points</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">5</p>
<p><b>2. Housing First</b></p> <p>HOW MEASURED: Housing First Self-Assessment score</p> <p>SCALE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>170-180 = 5 points</li> <li>160-169 = 4 points</li> <li>150-159 = 3 points</li> <li>140-149 = 2 points</li> <li>130-139 = 1 point</li> <li>Under 130 = 0 points</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">5</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SPECIAL RANKING FACTORS FOR FIRST-TIME RENEWAL PROJECTS WITH LESS THAN 12 MONTHS HISTORY</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Maximum Points</p>
<p><b>3. Vulnerabilities</b></p> <p>HOW MEASURED: Types of vulnerabilities that are prioritized</p> <p>SOURCE: First year project application, Item 3B(4)</p> <p>SCALE: Up to 4 points maximum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chronically homeless – 2 points</li> <li>• Veterans – 1 points</li> <li>• Youth (under 25) – 1 point</li> <li>• Families with children – 1 point</li> <li>• Domestic violence – 1 point</li> <li>• Substance use disorders – 2 points</li> <li>• Mental illness – 2 points</li> <li>• HIV-AIDS – 1 point</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>
<p><b>4. Data quality and security</b></p> <p>HOW MEASURED: Completion of HMIS security checklist.</p> <p>SOURCE: Questionnaire.</p> <p>SCALE:</p> <p>Follow all Core Elements plus at least 1 Advanced Element = 2 points  Follow all Core Elements = 1 point  Does not follow all Core Elements = 0 points</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>
<p><b>5. Type of project</b></p> <p>WHAT: Type of project (e.g., SSO, TH, RRH, PSH, HMIS).</p> <p>HOW MEASURED: Incentives for projects that provide permanent housing or meet critical local needs, based on scale to be created.</p> <p>SOURCE: First year project application Items 3a(5) and 3b(4).</p> <p>PSH = 5 points  RRH = 3 points  HMIS and SSO/Coordinated Entry = 2 points  All other projects = 0 points</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">5</p>
<p><b>6. SOAR training</b></p> <p>WHAT: Participation in SOAR training.</p> <p>HOW MEASURED: Did grant staff, or staff of designated referral agency, attend SOAR training in past 24 months?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SPECIAL RANKING FACTORS FOR FIRST-TIME RENEWAL PROJECTS WITH LESS THAN 12 MONTHS HISTORY</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Maximum Points</p>
<p>SOURCE: Grantee.</p> <p>SCALE:  Staff of grantee or designated referral agency completed SOAR training in past 24 months = 1 point  Staff of grantee or designated referral agency did not complete SOAR training in past 24 months = 0 points</p>	
<p style="text-align: right;"><b>MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>20</b></p>

**Adjustment Factor:**

The initial scores for first-time renewal projects are multiplied by the maximum total points of the Renewal Project scales divided by the maximum total points of the First-time Renewal project scale. (Adjusted Score = Initial Score X 44/20). The effect of this is that the highest-scoring first-time renewal projects will land in the middle of the final rankings, and lower-scoring first-time renewals will be in the bottom half.

**NEW PROJECTS:**

All new projects that are eligible for HUD funding and pass threshold reviews are ranked at the bottom, listed in order of bed capacity.

## **Selection & Ranking for Projects Submitted by Victim Services Providers**

Restrictions are in place that protect privacy and foster safety for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, dating violence, and human trafficking. These restrictions prohibit the sharing of data that is used to select and rank projects that are submitted by organizations that do not serve victims of these crimes.

Therefore, the CoC Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee has developed this alternate system of selecting and ranking projects submitted by victim service providers.

### **Project Selection**

The Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee selects projects submitted by victim services providers based on the following criteria:

1. Projects and applicants must meet threshold requirements as required by HUD and the CoC.
2. Projects must serve eligible populations.
3. Projects must be eligible for funding as new or renewal projects, as defined by HUD for the specific CoC competition year.
4. Project expenditures must consist of eligible costs.
5. Projects must adhere to principles of victim safety in all policies and practices, including at a minimum (a) victim-centered services, (b) client choice, and (3) protection of individual data.

Projects meeting the above criteria are selected and ranked.

### **Ranking Process**

The Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee reviews projects submitted by victim services providers and assigns them to rankings in the CoC Project Priority Listing. It takes the following factors into consideration:

- Demonstration of need
- Demonstration of ability to address the need effectively
- Number of persons served
- Use of research-based practices
- Realistic and achievable goals
- Cost per client
- Internal evaluations conducted by or for the grantee
- Positive feedback on client satisfaction surveys
- Positive relationships with local networks, including (a) health care; (b) law enforcement and criminal justice; (c) CoC; (d) human services; (e) advocacy groups; and (f) education
- Standing with state and national associations
- Other factors relevant to the type of project proposed

After considering the above factors, the Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee places each project in appropriate order in the CoC rankings.