## Project Rating and Review Process:

### Renewal Projects

In order to be considered for inclusion in Philadelphia's Continuum of Care Consolidated Application, local agencies must submit the 2015 Continuum of Care Program Renewals Application. Proposals received are first reviewed by City staff to establish whether they pass threshold requirements. All proposals that pass threshold requirements are reviewed by a local review committee, and, if selected, ranked for inclusion in Philadelphia's Consolidated Application.

The CoC Program Renewals Review Committee is a volunteer panel convened to review and rank project proposals. Members of the Review Committee are responsible for the following:

- Independently review and score proposals using the 2015 CoC Renewal Project Evaluation Tool found in Appendix A;
- Provide recommendations on whether a project should be included in the CoC Consolidated Application and how it should be ranked among other projects.

Individual reviewer scores are averaged, which forms the basis for preliminary ranking within the local priorities.

Proposal Evaluation and Scoring

All renewal project applications, except for first time renewals, are reviewed and scored by 5 individuals using the evaluation tool found in Appendix A. The reviewer scores are averaged, which forms the basis for preliminary ranking within the local priorities. The evaluation tool was developed by members of the CoC Quality Improvement and Evaluation Subcommittee.

In addition to the evaluation tool, proposals earn 1 additional point if at least two members from the applicant's organization participated in the 2015 unsheltered PIT count. *Ten points are removed from proposals received after the submission deadline.*

Based on the CoC's Underperforming Policy, a project is classified as "underperforming" if the renewal project application receives a score of 70 or below. These projects are provided with additional technical assistance to improve their performance. In 2015, two (2) permanent supportive housing projects and two (2) transitional housing projects received a score below 70 points and classified as underperforming.

### New Projects

In order to be considered for inclusion in Philadelphia's Continuum of Care Consolidated Application, local agencies must respond to the RFP for new projects. Proposals received are first reviewed by City staff to establish whether they pass threshold requirements. All proposals that pass threshold requirements are then reviewed and scored by 5 individuals using the evaluation tool 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.

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.

**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 committee's deliberations (exceptions: discussions with other review committee members during committee 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 Committee meeting:

- Statements and notes of the reviewers should not be shared with anyone outside the review committee;
- Discussions concerning any specific application are to be confined to the review committee meeting room;
- Proceedings of the review committee are to be kept in strict confidence; and
- Proposals and review materials are to be left with the Office of Supportive Housing (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 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 been 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.

**Ranking Approval Process:**

On Monday, November 2, 2015, the CoC Advisory Committee endorsed the following project ranking order and on Thursday, November 5, 2015, the CoC Board approved the following ranking order:

Tier 1:

1. Renewal permanent housing (PH) projects scoring between 100-80 points
2. First Time Renewal PH projects not operating long enough to have a year of performance data
3. New permanent supportive housing (PSH) project voluntarily reallocating from a TH project
4. Renewal safe haven (SH) projects
5. Renewal transitional housing (TH) projects except for the lowest scoring TH project serving youth
6. Renewal HMIS project (partial amount)

Tier 2:

7. Remaining HMIS project amount
8. Lowest scoring renewal TH project exclusively serving youth
9. Renewal PH projects that scored 79 or below
10. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project created through reallocation funds
11. New PSH project created through bonus funds
12. New RRH projects created through bonus funds

On Thursday, November 12, 2015 the Collaborative Applicant was notified of the ability to shift more supportive service costs to mainstream resources. This provided the opportunity to move a renewal PSH project from Tier 2 to Tier 1 use reallocated funds instead of bonus funds to create a new PSH project.

The revised project ranking order is as follows:

Tier 1:

1. Renewal permanent housing (PH) projects scoring between 100-80 points
2. First Time Renewal PH projects not operating long enough to have a year of performance data
3. New permanent supportive housing (PSH) project voluntarily reallocating from a TH project
4. Renewal safe haven (SH) projects
5. Renewal transitional housing (TH) projects except for the lowest scoring TH project serving youth
6. Renewal PSH project with no CoC funded supportive service costs scoring below 79
7. Renewal HMIS project (partial amount)

Tier 2:

8. Remaining HMIS project amount
9. Lowest scoring renewal TH project exclusively serving youth
10. Renewal PH projects that scored 79 or below
11. New PSH project created through reallocation funds
12. New rapid re-housing (RRH) project created through reallocation funds
13. New RRH projects created through bonus funds

On Saturday, November 14, 2015, the CoC Advisory Committee was notified of this change via email and the CoC Board approved the revised ranking order via email on Tuesday, November 17, 2015.

Appendix A:

Philadelphia Continuum of Care
2015 CoC Renewal Project Evaluation Tool

All renewal project applications are reviewed and scored by 5 individuals using the following evaluation tool:

| | **Scoring Criteria** | | **Max. Points** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Project Description and Participant Information | Project description clearly 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's chart is fully consistent with the description. If not, an explanation was provided. | 8-10 | 10 |
| | Project description provides a brief description of the population served and services provided. The project participant's 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's chart is not consistent with the description. | 0-4 | |
| Case Study | One case study of client challenges was provided. The individual described is representative of the target population. The case clearly 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 | |
| Housing First | Program selected "Yes" to all three statements. | 5 | 5 |
| | Program selected "Yes" to two of the statements. | 3-4 | |
| | Program selected "Yes" to one of the statements. | 1-2 | |
| | Program selected "No" to all three statements. | 0 | |
| Data Quality | Most of the data elements had 10% or less Don't Know/Refused and Missing Values and/or supplied sound explanation and plan to cure if the goal was not achieved. | 8-10 | 10 |
| | Only a few of the data elements had 10% or less Don't Know/Refused and Missing Values | 5-7 | |
| | None of the data elements had 10% or less Don't Know/Refused and Missing Values and/or there is no explanation for missing data. | 0-4 | |
| Unit Utilization Rates | Unit Utilization Rate is 90% or above for the 4 points in time. | 8-10 | 10 |
| | Unit Utilization Rate is 75 – 89% for 3-4 points in time. | 5-7 | |
| | Unit Utilization Rate is below 75% for 2-3 points in time. | 0-4 | |

| | Scoring Criteria | | Max. Points |
|---|---|---|---|
| Residence Prior to Program Entry | Participants are coming from appropriate sources based on the program type. The majority of participants are coming from literally homeless situations. | 5-10 | 10 |
| | Participants come from eligible places based on the type of project (PH or TH). Some information is missing. | 2-4 | |
| | There is no consistency with the types of places where people are coming from; people appear to be coming from ineligible places (client owned or rental properties) or the percentage of those coming from "other", "don't know/refused" or "missing" is high. | 0-1 | |
| Change in Earned (Employment) Income | 10% or more of all adults (Leavers and Stayers) have more earned income than at program entry. | 5 | 5 |
| | 7-9% of all adults (Leavers and Stayers) have more earned income than at program entry. Explanation is sound | 2-4 | |
| | 6% or below of all adults (Leavers and Stayers) have more earned income than at program entry. Poor explanation or no explanation is given. | 0-1 | |
| Change in Other Income | 34% or more of all adults (Leavers and Stayers) have more non-employment income than at program entry. | 5 | 5 |
| | 25-33% of all adults (Leavers and Stayers) have more non-employment income than at program entry. Explanation is sound. | 2-4 | |
| | 24% or below of all adults (Leavers and Stayers) have more non-employment income than at program entry. Poor explanation or no explanation is given. | 0-1 | |
| Non-Cash Benefit Sources | At least 82% of participants are connected to at least one mainstream benefit. Based on the target population, the benefits attained by participants are appropriate. | 8-10 | 10 |
| | 70% to 81% of participants are connected to at least one mainstream benefit. Based on the population served it is likely that more participants could be connected to additional benefits. Explanations, if provided, appear to be applicable. | 5-7 | |
| | Less than 70% of participants are connected to at least one mainstream benefit. Benefits don't appear to be appropriate and/or there is not adequate connection to benefits based on the population served. No explanation is given. | 0-4 | |

Appendix A:

Philadelphia Continuum of Care
2015 CoC Renewal Project Evaluation Tool

| | Scoring Criteria | | Max. Points |
|---|---|---|---|
| Housing Stability (PSH Only) | 93% or more of participants (Leavers and Stayers) remain in the program at the end of the operating year or exit to a different permanent housing destination. | 8-10 | 10 |
| | 81% - 92% of participants (Leavers and Stayers) remain in the program at the end of the operating year or exit to a different permanent housing destination. | 5-7 | |
| | 80% or less of participants (Leavers and Stayers) remain in the program at the end of the operating year or exit to a different permanent housing destination. | 0-4 | |
| Destination (TH Only) | 77% or more of all leavers exited to a permanent destination. | 8-10 | |
| | 65 - 76% of all leavers exited to a permanent destination. | 5-7 | |
| | 64 % or less of all leavers exited to a permanent destination. | 0-4 | |
| Destination (Safe Haven Only) | 55% or more of all leavers exited to a permanent destination. | 8-10 | |
| | 43-54% of all leavers exited to a permanent destination. | 5-7 | |
| | 42% or less of all leavers exited to a permanent destination. | 0-4 | |
| BONUS – Prioritizing Households Most in Need | Up to 5 points may be awarded for the following:<br>The proposal serves 50% of the priority target populations: chronically homeless individuals/families, veterans, youth (ages 24 and below) and/or victims of domestic violence. There is evidence that the project seeks to serve the individuals/families who are the longest time homeless and/or require the most intensive services. | 0-5 | 5 |
| Overall Responsiveness / Explanations and plans to address deficiencies | Very clear, complete proposal – easy to understand the program structure and population served. 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, connection 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 | |
| | | | |
| | | **TOTAL SCORE** | **105** |

**2015 Federal Continuum of Care Program**
**NEW PSH/RRH PROJECT PROPOSAL REVIEW INSTRUMENT**

**Score, Rank, and Overall Evaluation / Comments:**
This review tool is divided into 6 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.

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. _____ Neighborhood Relations (2 points maximum)
6. _____ Responsiveness to RFP (8 points maximum)

**_____ Total (100 points maximum)**

**1. Housing Component: Sections A & B**

[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 (scattered-site or identified sites) 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.?

**2. Services Component: Section C**

[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 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, (if PSH, chronically homeless individuals; if RRH, 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?

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

[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, if PSH), 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)

**4. Budget, Financial Resources, and Leveraging: Section E**

[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 (rental assistance uses FMR calculations; leasing does not exceed FMR calculations; supportive services does not exceed 20% of the total funding request)?

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)

**5. Neighborhood Relations: Section B (if applicable)**

*(If Not Applicable, award the applicant an automatic 2 points.)*

[Maximum Score: 2 points Reviewer Score: _____]

a. Does the applicant describe in an acceptable level of detail their "community relations efforts" in the neighborhood(s) where the proposed project would be located?

b. Based on the information in the proposal, how effective was the process used to reach out to community residents and organizations?

c. If community concerns were raised in this process, how is the applicant proposing that they be addressed or how have they been addressed?

**6. 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 do you feel the proposed program will meet the identified supportive services and housing needs of the participants? Is the project reasonable and achievable?