

Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500) FY 2019 Process for Project Review, Selection, and Ranking

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 2019 Continuum of Care Program Renewals Application, which includes submitting performance data from their most recently submitted APR and a completed HUD-designed Housing First Assessment. Organizations were given a total of 8 weeks, with staggered deadlines, to complete and submit the various components of the Philadelphia 2019 Local CoC Renewal Application to the City of Philadelphia Office of Homeless Services (OHS) through the SurveyMonkey platform. They worked separately with OHS Housing staff to complete the Housing First Assessment. OHS hosted a Pre-Application Workshop, a Technical Briefing, and 2 practical technical assistance sessions to support organizations in completing their applications properly. Providers had access to the threshold review tool and scoring rubrics reflecting the project scoring tool on the OHS website, to which they were emailed links. Proposals received were first reviewed by OHS staff to establish whether they pass threshold requirements. All 2019 CoC Program Renewal Applications that pass threshold requirements are reviewed by the CoC Program Renewals Reviewers, this year including OHS staff and CoC Board members. Reviewers were responsible for independently reviewing and scoring proposals using a dynamic 2019 CoC Program Renewal Project Proposal Review Instrument, found in Appendix A. OHS offered a webinar training to support reviewers to use the review instrument.

Proposal Evaluation and Scoring

In January 2019, before they vacated their seats to allow reconfiguration of CoC governance, the former CoC Board approved a set of CoC Program Values to guide Philadelphia's approach to the 2019 Local CoC Renewal Competition and the FY2019 HUD CoC Program Funding Competition. The values were:

1. Promote our goals of making homelessness rare, brief, and non-recurring in Philadelphia and our guiding principles:
 - a. *Housing First* – housing people quickly, without preconditions or service participation requirements
 - b. *Housing Focused* – assistance focused on moving to and maintaining permanent housing
 - c. *Prioritization* – assistance prioritized based on vulnerability and severity of service needs

- d. *Person-Centered* – using a dignified, safe, trauma-informed approach that allows participant choice
2. Maintain adequate HUD Continuum of Care Program funding to provide homeless services in our CoC:
 - a. Reallocate funds from projects that are underspending to support new projects
 - b. Reallocate funds based on relative cost-effectiveness of projects
 - c. Reallocate funds from projects that are historically low performing/ consistently scoring low in the local renewal competition to support new higher-performing projects
 3. Maintain an inventory of options appropriate for the needs of various household types:
 - a. Households with children
 - b. Youth 18-24
 - c. Households without children, including couples
 - d. Veterans
 4. Evaluate projects based on:
 - a. Adoption of Housing First Approach
 - b. Data quality: <10% Error Rate for each data element
 - c. Targeting of HUD and local Priority Populations, including serving people who are experiencing chronic homelessness, veterans, youth ages 18-24, and persons fleeing domestic violence
 - d. Positive contribution to CoC performance on HUD System Performance Measures by meeting or exceeding local standards for:
 - i. Housing Stability or Exits to Permanent Housing
 - ii. Increased Income
 - iii. Connection to Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits
 - iv. Connection to Health Insurance
 - v. Length of stay in TH
 - vi. Participant involvement in program/organizational decision making
 - vii. Equal Access Alignment
 - viii. Change Management
 5. Develop ranking strategy through participatory process, utilizing data to inform decisions to the greatest extent possible

Based on these values and building on the local review instrument developed by members of the former CoC Quality Improvement and Evaluation Subcommittee (QIES) for 2018, Office of Homeless Services staff members developed a local review scoring instrument, with which all renewal project applications, except for first time renewals, were independently reviewed and scored by 3 individuals using the local review instrument. (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.) The review instrument includes the point values described in the table below and the performance standards by project type; corresponding scoring rubrics can be found in Appendix A. The performance data used to review renewal project proposals is from the project’s most recently submitted APR from period October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2019. Once all reviewer scores were submitted to the Office of Homeless Services, scores were analyzed to identify possible errors requiring adjustments. Once finalized, reviewer scores were averaged. A relative score from the Housing First Assessment was added to the reviewers’ average to produce a preliminary basis on which to rank renewal projects in accordance with local priorities. (The scales for awarding Housing First points can be found in Appendix B.)

Philadelphia’s 2019 Local CoC Renewal Competition: Point Values	
Area of Assessment	Max Points
Target Population Served	10
Participant Inclusion	5
Performance Management	5
Impact	5
Change Management	5
Data Quality	10
Increase in Earned Income	5
Increase in Other Income	5
Connection to Non-Cash Benefits	5
Connection to Health Insurance	5
Housing Stability (PSH)/ Destination (RRH/TH/SH)	15
Length of Time (TH/SH only)	5
Housing First Assessment	10
Total	85-90, depending on project type

Submission Requirements:

The following were the submission requirements for each component of Philadelphia’s 2019 Local Renewal Application:

- Applications that do not meet the threshold conditions will be returned to the Applicant.
- The Applicant will have 24 hours after the designated deadline to submit corrections. If corrections are not submitted, then the application containing errors will be scored.
- No points will be deducted after the first request for corrections.
- If the application is submitted a second time still containing errors, 5 points will be deducted from the application's score.
 - 5 points will continue to be deducted from the application's score each time the application is sent back to the applicant in need of necessary corrections.
- Any part of the application received within 24 hours after designated deadline will be deducted 10 points.
- No part of the application will be accepted after 24 hours after the designated 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 at least 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, which provides a starting place for the conversation among the Review Panel members about final project selection and prioritization.

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. A conflict of interest includes, but is not limited to, a situation in which the reviewer or a member of the reviewer's immediate family have a financial or other interest with an applicant responding to the RFP, such as, but not limited to cases in which they:

- Are employed or have a formal association with an agency that has submitted an application;
- Have recently served as a consultant for an applicant agency;
- Are named as a potential consultant or subcontractor in the application; or
- Have extensive knowledge about the application or proposed project and is unable to objectively review the application.

If the reviewer or a member of the reviewer's immediate family has such a relationship with any applicant who submitted a proposal in response to the RFP, the reviewer must recuse themselves from reviewing and evaluating any proposals submitted by said applicant.

All reviewers agreed to base their review and evaluation only on factors and information that the Office of Homeless Services and the City have determined are relevant to the proposal review process, as described in the RFP.

Confidentiality

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

- All information related to the proposals (including the proposals themselves and any related materials supporting the selection process) should be kept in strict confidence and may not be disclosed to any person or entity without the express authorization of the appropriate department personnel.
- Reviewers may not release, transmit or otherwise disclose any information contained in any proposal, any information about the RFP evaluation process beyond the description within the RFP, and/or any other information about the review process or selection of an applicant.
- 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).
- Reviewers may not use information obtained in the review process for any financial benefit to themselves, their immediate families or any business with which they or their immediate families are associated. 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.

PHILADELPHIA RANKING STRATEGY

In order to establish a “collaborative process for the development of applications and [to] approve the submission of applications in response to a NOFA published by HUD” 24 CFR 578.9(a)(1), the Office of Homeless Services solicited volunteers from the CoC Board and homeless assistance system to create the HUD Alignment Committee, which serves as the Continuum's Ranking and Reallocation Workgroup. No Homeless Service Providers participate in this committee, to avoid conflict of interest. This Committee's mission is to develop a local strategy to ensure that policies, procedures and general direction of Philadelphia's homeless assistance system align with federal requirements and HUD priorities. The Committee is tasked with increasing the Philadelphia community's competitiveness in securing HUD resources and ensuring the strategic allocation of HUD funds, including by:

- Proposing strategies for reallocation of HUD funding and ranking of CoC projects;
- Project-level assessment of performance and system gaps analysis.

In its role as Ranking and Reallocation Workgroup for the Philadelphia CoC and with analytical support from the Office of Homeless Services, the HUD Alignment Committee developed a recommended strategy for ranking the projects in the CoC's FY2019 Consolidated Application for HUD CoC program funds. The Committee developed its not-bonus project ranking strategy over the course of meetings on August 8 and August 22, 2019. The HUD Alignment Co-Chairs attended meetings of the Service Provider Commission and the Lived Experience Commission on August 27 and 29, respectively, to inform Commission members about their proposal and gather any input about additional considerations before finalizing a recommendation.

The HUD Alignment Committee discussions were grounded in previous years' strategies. In accordance with recent years, they decided to split the renewals into two groups and rank new projects using reallocated funds in between. They considered a number of splitting points: top 90% of scores, top 85% of scores, top 80% of scores, top 75% of scores. The Committee wants to increase our system's housing supply, and the first two options did not ensure that all reallocation projects would end up in Tier 1, so focus narrowed to 80% and 75%. For each split, 4 different ways of ranking the bottom-scorers were considered, in terms of the lowest estimated HUD Tier 2 score for each scenario, the number of renewal units in Tier 2, the number of units of each project type in Tier 2, the target population served by the projects falling in Tier 2. A main priority that emerged for the committee members was preserving the existing supply of housing units, especially for families with children. Ranking the smallest projects at the bottom of the ranking of renewals minimizes the risk, as even if the CoC loses renewal projects, they will be the fewest possible renewal units lost. The Committee voted to approve the following recommendations on August 22:

- Unscored projects at the top of the ranking, as in past years, followed by
- Projects with the top 75% of local renewal scores, with Rapid Rehousing projects at the top and Transitional Housing projects at the bottom but otherwise in descending order of local score, then
- New projects to be funded through reallocation, then
- Projects with the bottom 25% of local renewal scores, by the number of units in the project, from most to least

The Committee did not make a recommendation about Bonus projects because the New Project Review Panel had not yet met for deliberations, so there was no information available about the perceived strength of the applications. On September 4, 2019, the HUD Alignment Committee had a conference call to decide where to rank bonus projects, specifically DV bonus projects. The New Project Review Panel had selected three DV-focused Rapid Rehousing projects for funding and ranked them in order of proposal strength. The question before the HUD Alignment Committee was whether to virtually guarantee funding for the project determined to be strongest by placing it in Tier 1. The New Project Review Panel had recommended that reallocated funds be used for this project, the option with the smallest risk. The HUD Alignment Committee had previously discussed ranking a project applying for DV

Bonus funds in Tier 1, with the hope that its strength as a proposal would result in it being selected for DV Bonus and removed from the ranking, which would keep it from increasing the risk of losing renewal projects ranked below. Ultimately, the Committee decided to avoid leaving new money on the table by playing it safe with reallocated funding. They voted to recommend:

- Applying for DV Bonus funding for all 3 of the DV-focused RRH proposals selected by the New Project Review Panel;
- Ranking the strongest DV-focused RRH project in Tier 1, with the reallocation projects;
- Ranking renewals above DV Bonus projects and DV Bonus projects above CoC Bonus projects, which would be subject to RFP, in Tier 2.

Because DV Bonus is the only source of funds for which SSO-CE projects are eligible to apply and because ranking does not affect DV Bonus scoring, the new DV SSO-CE application will be ranked at the very bottom.

Based on these strategic decisions by the HUD Alignment Committee, the Philadelphia CoC project applications included in the 2019 consolidated application will be ranked as follows:

1. Renewal projects that support the entire system's operations (HMIS and SSO-CE)
2. First-Time Renewal PH projects not operating long enough to have a year of performance data
3. Other renewal projects that have not been operating long enough to have a year of performance data
4. Rapid Re-Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing, Safe Haven, and Transitional Housing projects with the highest 75% of scores in the local renewal competition, in descending order by score, but with RRH prioritized and TH de-prioritized
5. New Permanent Supportive Housing and Rapid Re-Housing projects to be funded through reallocation
6. New DV-focused Rapid Re-Housing project determined to have the strongest application for DV Bonus funds
7. Rapid Re-Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing, Safe Haven, and Transitional Housing projects with the lowest 25% of scores in the local renewal competition, in descending order by number of units (most to fewest)
8. New Rapid Re-Housing project applications for DV Bonus funding
9. New Rapid Re-Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing, and Joint TH-RRH applications for CoC Bonus funding
10. New Supportive Services Only for Coordinated Entry (SSO-CE) project application for DV Bonus funding

Selection and Ranking Approval Process

January 25, 2019: Philadelphia Local CoC Renewal Competition Pre-Application Workshop

February 20, 2019: FY2019 Local CoC Competition OPENS

February 22, 2019: Mandatory Provider Briefing

March 12, 2019: Local Competition Technical Assistance Session # 1

March 20, 2019: *Part 1: Project Application* due

March 26, 2019: Local Competition Technical Assistance Session # 2

March 28, 2019: CoC Board meeting

April 3, 2019: *Part 2: Performance Data* due

April 4, 2019: First e-Learning module posted to orient Board members to local competition

April 10, 2019: All local renewal competition technical assistance ends

April 17, 2019: *Part 3: Full Program Budget* due

April 23, 2019: Second e-Learning module posted to orient Board members to local competition

April 25, 2019: Internal OHS reviewers receive project assignments

May 2, 2019: Webinar training for local renewal reviewers from the Board

May 9-10, 2019: CoC Board members receive project assignments

May 30, 2019: Completed Scoring Tools due to OHS

June 17, 2019: HUD Alignment Committee Meeting: Review of 2018 Competition Debrief, Local Funding Criteria for CoC-funded project

July 3, 2019: HUD CoC Program Funding Competition Notice of Funding Availability released

July 18, 2019: HUD Alignment Committee Meeting:

July 22, 2019: HUD CoC Competition Mandatory Briefing for CoC-Funded Providers

July 22, 2019: City of Philadelphia Office of Homeless Services 2019 Request for Proposals (RFP) for New HUD Continuum of Care (CoC) Projects released

July 30, 2019: Optional Pre-Proposal meeting about New Project RFP

August 2, 2019: Deadline to submit questions about New Project RFP

August 5, 2019: Questions and answers posted on City of Philadelphia website's RFP page

August 8, 2019: HUD Alignment Committee Meeting: Finalizing reduction strategy recommendation and beginning development of ranking strategy

August 15, 2019: Notification of proposed reductions sent to providers via email and USPS

August 16, 2019: Local deadline to submit project applications in eSnaps

August 19, 2019: New Project Proposals due to Office of Homeless Services by 5pm

August 20, 2019: New Project Proposal review assignments

August 21, 2019: Webinar training for New Project Proposal reviewers

August 22, 2019: HUD Alignment Committee Meeting: Finalizing ranking strategy for renewal projects

August 26-27, 2019: Release of submitted project applications with requests for revisions/corrections

August 27, 2019: Service Provider Commission meeting featuring presentation from HUD Alignment Committee

August 28, 2019: Deadline for re-submission of revised/corrected renewal project applications in eSnaps

August 29, 2019: Mandatory New Project Review Panel Meeting for project selection

August 29, 2019: Lived Experience Commission meeting featuring presentation from HUD Alignment Committee

September 6, 2019: Finalized reduction amounts allow finalization of new reallocation project budgets and finalization of Tiers

September 10, 2019: CoC Board meeting to consider approval of ranking and reallocation strategy and resulting ranked project listing

By September 13, 2019: Notification of project approval, rejection, reduction, and rank to all service providers

**Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
FY 2019 Process for Project Review, Selection, and Ranking
APPENDIX A: Local Competition Scoring Rubrics**

Part 1: TARGET POPULATION SERVED (All project types)	
Scoring Criteria	Possible Points
If the project targets at least 1 priority population	10
If project targets no priority populations (N/A - N/A)	0

Part 1: PARTICIPANT INCLUSION - Question 1 (All project types)	
Scoring Criteria	Possible Points
Checked Yes to question	3
Checked No to question	0

Part 1: PARTICIPANT INCLUSION - Question 2 (All project types)	
Scoring Criteria	Possible Points
Provided clear and comprehensive description of specific processes or methods by which the organization solicits suggestions, from a person with lived experience, for changes to policy, programming and operations.	2
Provided unclear or incomplete description of specific processes or methods by which the organization solicits suggestions, from a person with lived experience, for changes to policy, programming and operations.	1
Did not describe specific processes or methods by which the organization solicits suggestions, from a person with lived experience, for changes to policy, programming and operations.	0

Part 1: PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT (All project types)	
Scoring Criteria	Possible Points
Clear and comprehensive response, includes: (1) the specific performance measure addressed; (2) detailed description of the changes made to the project during last fiscal period; (3) description of how the changes were expected to improve performance; and (4) how changes were implemented.	4-5
Does NOT clearly and comprehensively describe the changes, their rationale, or results.	2-3
Lacking content, does not present a clear picture of project changes or a specific performance measure.	0-1

**Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
FY 2019 Process for Project Review, Selection, and Ranking
APPENDIX A: Local Competition Scoring Rubrics**

Part 1: IMPACT (All project types)	
Scoring Criteria	Possible Points
Clearly and completely describes: (1) how the implemented changes have improved the organization AND (2) how the implemented changes have improved the project outcomes.	4-5
Does NOT clearly and completely describe BOTH improvements in the organization and in the project's outcomes.	2-3
Lacking in content, does not present a clear picture of the positive impacts of making the changes.	0-1

Part 1: CHANGE MANAGEMENT (All project types)	
Scoring Criteria	Possible Points
Clearly and completely describes: (1) how the organization is supporting staff in adapting to policy changes; AND (2) how the organization is addressing staff resistance to change; AND (3) at least one specific example of a staff member or the organization as a whole acting as an advocate for change within the CoC.	4-5
Does NOT clearly and completely describe organizational change management supports or a specific example of advocacy for change.	2-3
Lacking content and does not present a clear picture of strategies or example.	0-1

Part 2: DATA QUALITY (All project types)	
Scoring Criteria: # of data elements with less than 10% Error Rate	Possible Points
18	10
17	9
15-16	8
13-14	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 of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in meeting the standard AND a plan to address them were provided. (Maximum possible score is still 10)	1

**Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
FY 2019 Process for Project Review, Selection, and Ranking
APPENDIX A: Local Competition Scoring Rubrics**

Part 2: INCREASE IN EARNED INCOME						
Scoring Criteria: % of adults with more earned income than at program entry						
<i>Project type:</i>	PSH for Families	PSH	RRH	TH	SH	Possible Points
<i>Performance Standard:</i>	35%	10%	15%	26%	10%	
	35%+	10%+	15%+	26%+	10%+	5
	32-34%	9%	13-14%	23-25%	9%	4
	29-31%	8%	11-12%	20-22%	8%	3
	27-29%	7%	9-10%	17-19%	7%	2
	24-26%	6%	7.5-8.9%	14-16%	6%	1
	23% and below	5% and below	7.5% and below	13% and Below	5% and Below	0
Bonus point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in meeting the standard AND a plan to address them were provided. (<i>Maximum possible score is still 5</i>)						1

Part 2: INCREASE IN NON-EMPLOYMENT INCOME (All Project Types)	
Scoring Criteria: % of adults with more cash income from sources other than employment	Possible Points
35% and Above	5
32-34%	4
29-31%	3
27-29%	2
24-26%	1
23% and below	0
Bonus point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in meeting the standard AND a plan to address them were provided. (<i>Maximum possible score is still 10</i>)	1

Part 2: CONNECTION TO NON-CASH BENEFITS						
Scoring Criteria: % of participants connected to at least one non-cash benefit						
<i>Project type:</i>	PSH for Families	PSH	RRH	TH	SH	Possible Points
<i>Performance Standard:</i>	70%	26%				
	70%+	82%+				5
	67-69%	79-81%				4
	64-66%	76-78%				3
	61-63%	73-75%				2
	58-60%	70-72%				1
	58% and below	69% and below				0
Bonus point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in meeting the standard AND a plan to address them were provided. (<i>Maximum possible score is still 5</i>)						1

**Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
FY 2019 Process for Project Review, Selection, and Ranking
APPENDIX A: Local Competition Scoring Rubrics**

Part 2: CONNECTION TO HEALTH INSURANCE						
Scoring Criteria: % of participants connected to at least one health insurance type						
<i>Project type:</i>	PSH for Families	PSH	RRH	TH	SH	Possible Points
<i>Performance Standard:</i>	86%	87%	87%	84%	88%	
	86%+	87%+	87%+	84%+	88%+	5
	83-85%	84-86%	84-86%	81-83%	85-87%	4
	80-82%	81-83%	81-83%	78-80%	82-84%	3
	77-79%	78-80%	78-80%	75-77%	79-81%	2
	74-76%	75-77%	75-77%	72-74%	76-78%	1
	73% and below	74% and below	74% and below	71% and below	75% and below	0
Bonus point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in meeting the standard AND a plan to address them were provided. (<i>Maximum possible score is still 5</i>)						1

Part 2: CONNECTION TO HEALTH INSURANCE	
Scoring Criteria: % of participants connected to at least one health insurance type	Possible Points
84% and Above	5
81-83%	4
78-80%	3
75-77%	2
72-74%	1
71% and below	0
Bonus Point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in meeting the standard AND plan to address them were provided. (<i>Maximum possible score is still 5</i>)	1

**Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
FY 2019 Process for Project Review, Selection, and Ranking
APPENDIX A: Local Competition Scoring Rubrics**

Part 2: HOUSING STABILITY/HOUSING DESTINATIONS						
Scoring Criteria:	% of participants remaining in program or exiting to a different permanent housing destination		% of leavers exit to a permanent housing destination			Points
	PSH for Families	PSH	RRH	TH	SH	
Project type:	PSH for Families	PSH	RRH	TH	SH	Points
Performance Standard:	93%		80%		55%	
	93%+		80%+		55%+	15
	90-92%		79%		54%	14
	87-89%		78%		53%	13
	84-86%		77%		52%	12
	81-83%		76%		51%	11
	78-80%		75%		50%	10
	76-77%		74%		49%	9
	74-75%		73%		48%	8
	72-73%		72%		47%	7
	71%		71%		46%	6
	70%		70%		45%	5
	69%		69%		44%	4
	68%		68%		43%	3
	67%		67%		42%	2
	66%		66%		41%	1
	65% and below		65% and below		40% and below	0
Bonus Point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in meeting the standard AND plan to address them were provided. (<i>Maximum possible score is still 15</i>)						1

Part 2: LENGTH OF STAY (TH and SH ONLY)	
Scoring Criteria: Average Length of Stay in Days	Possible Points
300 or fewer days	5
301-399	4
400-450	3
451-499	2
500-550	1
More than 550 days	0
Bonus Point: A sound explanation of any extenuating circumstances or challenges faced in meeting the standard AND plan to address them were provided. (<i>Maximum possible score is still 5</i>)	1

**Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
FY 2019 Process for Project Review, Selection, and Ranking
APPENDIX B: Scoring of Housing First Assessments**

Housing First Assessment – Scoring Method

The 2019 Local Continuum of Care Renewal Competition prioritizes the Housing First Approach as a federal priority for homeless assistance services. Each renewal project was scored on their project’s alignment to the Housing First Approach through the HUD-created Housing First Assessment Tool.

The Local CoC Renewal Competition provided a 10-point scale on which to score projects most closely aligned to the Housing First approach. The 10 points were administered on a curve and determined to also meet the local priorities of the Philadelphia Continuum.

Points were assigned with respect to allotted points for the Housing First or “green” range on the assessment tool and project type. Within the Housing First range of points, the 10 points were distributed with respect to point differentials and the project type to account for all 10 points. A point value (from 1-10) was assigned to each individual project based on points achieved on the HUD administered Housing First Assessment Tool.

The point distributions are listed below:

PSH Assessment Point Range		Local Competition Points
No Target Population	Target Population	
79-89	90-101	1
90-100	102-113	2
101-111	114-125	3
112-122	126-137	4
123-133	138-149	5
134-144	150-161	6
145-155	162-173	7
156-166	174-185	8
167-177	186-197	9
178-180 Max	198-204 Max	10

RRH Assessment Point Range		Local Competition Points
No Target Population	Target Population	
79-89	90-101	1
90-100	102-113	2
101-111	114-125	3
112-122	126-137	4
123-133	138-149	5
134-144	150-161	6
145-155	162-173	7
156-166	174-185	8
167-177	186-197	9
178-180 Max	198-204 Max	10

TH Assessment Point Range		Local Competition Points
No Target Population	Target Population	
82-92	92-104	1
93-103	105-117	2
104-114	118-130	3
115-125	131-143	4
126-136	144-156	5
137-147	157-169	6
148-158	170-182	7
159-169	183-195	8
170-180	196-208	9
181-186 Max	209-210 Max	10

EH/SH* Assessment Point Range	Local Competition Points
61-69	2
70-78	3
79-87	4
88-96	5
97-105	6
106-114	7
115-123	8
124-132	9
133-138	10

*Target Population Point Range Did Not Apply

**Philadelphia Continuum of Care (PA-500)
FY 2019 Process for Project Review, Selection, and Ranking
APPENDIX C: Review Instrument for New Project Proposals**

PROPOSAL REVIEW INSTRUMENT

HUD Continuum of Care Program – 2019 City of Philadelphia New Project Proposal

Name of Applicant: _____

Title of Project: _____

Reviewer's Name: _____ Date: _____

Is this project: New Expansion of Existing Project Project Type: PSH RRH TH-RRH

Specialization: Chronic-Dedicated DedicatedPLUS Youth ages 18-24 Domestic Violence

Household Type: Households with Children Households without Children Youth ages 18-24

Amount Requested: _____

Number of **households** to be served at maximum capacity (point in time): _____

Number of **program participants** to be served at maximum capacity (point in time): _____

Please complete and email your review to Leah.Staub@phila.gov by Monday, August 26 at 4pm.
Please plan to attend the panel review meeting on **Thursday, August 29, 10am–12 pm**
in Room B on the 16th Floor of the Municipal Services Building, 1401 JFK Blvd.

Reminder: Objectives for Projects Selected Through this RFP (RFP pp. 14-15)

- Increase community supply of homeless housing by creating new projects that improve Philadelphia's overall performance on HUD System Performance Measures, specifically, for projects to help effectuate:
 - Fewer people on the streets or in temporary housing programs (i.e., emergency shelter, safe haven, or transitional housing);
 - Shorter experience of homelessness;
 - More moves from homelessness to permanent housing;
 - Less time from housing assessment to referral and from referral to permanent housing move-in;
 - More people with increased income;
 - Few people falling back into homelessness after securing housing.
- Increase community capacity to respond to the needs of subpopulations of people experiencing homelessness in Philadelphia, especially:
 - Households without children;
 - Youth ages 18-24, including parenting youth,
 - Survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, human trafficking, and stalking;
 - Households with children;
 - Households experiencing chronic homelessness.
- Invest available resources strategically, including by targeting, prioritizing, or repurposing resources based on need and program performance data and by maximizing leverage of limited available HUD funding, while exploring a range of options and approaches for bringing supply in line with demand.
- Provide a high quality, person-centered experience within the homeless assistance system.
- Establish the Housing First approach as a whole-system orientation and response.
- Connect people in the homeless system to workforce development and employment opportunities.

The Applicant’s proposed scope of work should address each objective specifically and describe in detail how the Applicant will achieve the objective, or how the Applicant will enable the Department to achieve the objective.

Recommendation for _____ (Please insert project name)
<p>Please select one of the following designations based on your review of the proposal:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Recommended for funding</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Recommended with reservations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not recommended for funding</p>

Top Three Strengths of the Proposal:
<p>1.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>3.</p>

Most Significant Challenges of this Proposal:
<p>1.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>3.</p>

Score and Overall Evaluation		
The selection criteria specified in the Request for Proposals have been categorized as follows. Please enter your total score for each category in the “Reviewer Score” column below.		
Evaluation Category	Awarded Points	Available Points
Quality, Efficiency, & Fitness of Project Proposal		35
Capacity to Meet Contract Requirements & Community Needs		15
Organizational Administrative & Operational Efficiency		20
Applicant & Staff Experience		30
TOTAL PROPOSAL SCORE:		100

Additional Comments

Quality, Efficiency, & Fitness of Project Proposal (35 points maximum)		
<i>This proposal:</i>	Awarded Points	Available Points
Seeks to fill a specific system gaps in resources as compared to local identified needs.		4
Provides a clear picture of the proposed target population and demonstrates a thorough understanding of their housing and service needs, recognizing that needs change over time.		5
Reflects understanding of local prioritization of the most vulnerable households with the longest histories of homelessness and most intensive service needs.		4
Demonstrates understanding and commitment to Housing First, ensuring there are no barriers to entering and sustaining residence in the project and that service delivery reflects understanding of the vulnerabilities and experiences of trauma survivors.		4
Prioritizes achieving positive outcomes related to housing stability, increased income, and connection to mainstream benefits. This includes providing for ongoing follow-ups with participants about mainstream benefits and community supportive services.		4
Integrates evidence-based or best practices into the project plan. This may include incorporating knowledge about trauma into policies, procedures, practices, and service environments.		4
<p>Presents a feasible timeline and detailed strategy for rapid implementation.</p> <p><i>For projects utilizing private market housing units</i>, this includes demonstrated understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing needs of the target population and of the relevant neighborhoods, markets, and “community amenities” that will best meet those needs; • Availability of proposed rental units within current Fair Market Rent limitations; • 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 site-based programs</i>, this includes demonstrated site control and funding commitments.</p>		6
Demonstrates that the Applicant has a system of continuous quality improvement and program evaluation in place.		2
Presents a plan to obtain participant feedback in this new project to assess participant satisfaction and ensure high quality of services.		2
TOTAL		35
Reviewer Comments:		

Capacity to Meet Contract Requirements & Community Needs (15 points maximum)		
<i>This proposal:</i>	Awarded Points	Available Points
Reflects an understanding of the requirements to participate in HMIS and accept referrals into the proposed project from the OHS Clearinghouse (i.e. via CEA-BHRS).		3
Demonstrates capacity to calculate tenant rent and if applicable, work with landlords.		2
Details a thoughtful plan to assist participants to obtain and remain in permanent housing, including consideration of an array of participant needs and of participant choice.		5
Describes how project staff will assist participants to increase employment and/or income and to maximize their ability to live independently,		3
Shows commitment to ensuring equal access to the project, including by people of all gender identities and sexual orientations, households of all configurations, survivors of various forms of trauma, and speakers of various languages.		2
TOTAL		15
Reviewer Comments:		

Organizational Administrative & Operational Efficiency (20 points maximum)		
<i>This proposal:</i>	Awarded Points	Available Points
Demonstrates strong organizational structure and method for assuring effective and timely completion of all work, including internal and external coordination, with no delay in service provision, operation of CoC management systems, or leasing units for reasonable rents.		4
Includes a reasonable budget proposal for the level of services provided, based on the type of project, population served, and number of households to be served, including clear and accurate calculations.		5
Incorporates progressively engagement of participants by assessing their needs on an ongoing basis and providing appropriate assistance as needed, <i>For RRH and TH-RRH projects, this includes a clear, strong method for working with each household to determine the type, amount, and duration of financial assistance.</i>		5
Will leverage Medicaid and non-Medicaid resources to finance supportive services such as case management and behavioral health services.		3
Has an actionable plan for coordinating with other providers and securing commitments for services that will increase the effectiveness of the proposed program.		3
TOTAL		20
Reviewer Comments:		

Applicant & Staff Experience (30 points maximum)		
<i>This proposal:</i>	Awarded Points	Available Points
Describes relevant experience with projects that are similar in nature, size and scope. This should include 5 years successfully providing services to people experiencing homelessness and at least 3 years successfully providing housing and case management services to the target population. If applicable, this should include managing and maintaining residential property.		6
Demonstrates capacity to meet and exceed project performance standards.		4
Demonstrates capacity to administer grants effectively, including by utilizing full grant awards rather than returning resources to HUD or another funder.		5
Shows commitment to continuous quality improvement processes, including quantitative and qualitative outcome data analysis and participant feedback solicitation.		4
Establishes organizational history of skillful collaboration with community partners, including providers of mainstream resources and benefits, and cross-system work to serve the target population.		6
Highlights experience serving the most vulnerable households with the greatest needs and longest histories of homelessness.		5
TOTAL		30
Reviewer Comments:		