



For Kane County

**Federal FY2019 CoC Program
Project Evaluations**

**CONTINUUM OF CARE FOR KANE COUNTY
Federal FY2019 CoC Program**

AVAILABLE FUNDING

Annual Renewal Demand (ARD)	\$1,769,946
Tier One (94% of ARD for current projects + 100% of ARD for first-time renewals.)	\$1,666,843
Tier Two (Difference between ARD and Tier One amount + bonus amount of \$90,234.)	\$193,337
Total (Tiers One and Two)	\$1,860,180
Bonus Funds (Domestic Violence)	\$180,468

APPLICATIONS

Sponsor Agency	Project Name	New or Renewal	Total Preliminary Score	Amount Requested
Kane County (on behalf of COC)	HMIS	Renewal	N/A	\$111,945
PADS	Light House Consol.	Renewal	95	\$363,185
Lazarus House	PH3 Consol.	Renewal	94	\$202,587
Lazarus House	CTL	Renewal	89	\$55,366
Ecker Center for Mental Health	Hunters Ridge	Renewal	86	\$264,816
Ecker Center for Mental Health	Abbott	Renewal	85	\$180,584
Ecker Center for Mental Health	Leasing	Renewal	77	\$200,458
PADS	The Harbor	Renewal	76	\$241,315
PADS	Light House 7	Renewal	75	\$51,552
PADS	Light House 8	New	75	\$90,234
Midwest Shelter for Homeless Veterans	Enduring Hope	Renewal	66	\$98,138
Grand Total				\$1,860,180

COC PROGRAM NOFA APPLICATION EVALUATION SHEET – Renewal






Project Name	LIGHT-House Consolidated	
Agency	PADs Inc (Hesed)	
Proposed Service	Permanent Supportive Housing	
Total Participants to be Served	24 Households	
Budget Summary	Grant Request:	\$363,185.00
	Documented Match:	\$21,529.00
	Total Cost:	\$384,714.00






THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS	RATING	COMMENTS
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">● Pass</div> <div style="text-align: center;">○ Fail</div> </div>
<p><i>Outstanding audit findings: Successful applicants will not have any outstanding HUD, state and local government monitoring and/or audit findings.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Participation: Successful applicants will be members in good standing of the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Interim Rule Compliance: Successful applicants will be in full compliance with all applicable requirements of the CoC Interim Rule (24 CFR part 578), including participation in (or willingness to participate in) the Coordinated Entry System.</i></p> <p><i>The project has a housing first model.</i></p> <p>1. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a program screens out program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Having too little or no income</i> ● <i>Active or history of substance abuse</i> ● <i>Having a criminal record¹</i> ● <i>Having an eviction record</i> ● <i>Having a history of domestic violence</i> <p>2. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a project terminates program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Failure to participate in program services</i> ● <i>Failure to make progress on a service plan</i> ● <i>Loss of, or failure to improve income</i> ● <i>Being a victim of domestic violence</i> ● <i>Activities not covered in a lease agreement</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Pass/Fail</i> 	●	Project meets all of the threshold requirements.






¹ With exceptions for state mandated restrictions

Project Design

The Continuum of Care will give preference to projects that are based on Housing First principles and focus on populations and needs that have been prioritized by the Continuum of Care. Applicants will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well the application addresses each Design criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on information included in the project application and the Applicant Questionnaire.






DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS			
1. Severity of Needs (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10 points	 Fair 5 points	 Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project serves people who have experienced:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Low or no income</i> • <i>Current or past substance abuse</i> • <i>History of victimization</i> • <i>Criminal histories</i> • <i>Chronic homelessness</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – all these groups</i> • <i>Good – three or four of these groups</i> • <i>Fair – two of these groups</i> • <i>Poor – none or one of these groups</i> 	 15/15	Project will serve all of the mentioned groups.			






2. Local Priorities / Special Populations (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15				
		 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10 points	 Fair 5 points	 Poor 0 points
<p><i>Preference will be given to projects that serve one or more of the following local priority populations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Chronically homeless</i> • <i>Members of households with children</i> • <i>Veterans</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – serves 3 listed populations</i> • <i>Good – serves 2 listed populations</i> • <i>Fair – serves 1 listed population</i> • <i>Poor – serves none of the listed populations</i> 	 15/15	Project will serve all of the populations.			






3 . Mainstream Benefits (Section 7)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 4 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides transportation assistance to enable clients to attend mainstream benefit appointments and/or employment training, or to travel to work Follows up with participants at least annually to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed Provides program participants with access to SSI/SSDI technical assistance, either by the applicant, a subrecipient, or partner agency <p><i>Criterion Scoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – provides all three of the services above Good – provides only two of the above services Fair – provides only one of the above services Poor – provides none of the services listed above 	 10/10	Project will provide all of the services.

Project Performance

The Continuum of Care will give preference to high performing projects. New Applications and Renewals will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well they address each performance criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on projections included in the project application and information in the Applicant Questionnaire.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS						
1. Cost Effectiveness (Section 10)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 3 points  Poor 0 points						
<p><i>Cost effectiveness will be determined based on costs per successful outcome (clients retained in project or exited to permanent housing) compared with similar costs of similar projects within the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>Scoring criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – above costs are lower than similar projects Good – above costs are no more than 5% higher than similar projects Fair – above costs are no more than 15% higher than similar projects Poor - above costs are more than 15% higher than similar projects 	 10/10	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="813 1415 1159 1444"><u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u></td> <td data-bbox="1203 1415 1317 1444"><u>This Project</u></td> <td data-bbox="1328 1415 1477 1444"><u>Similar Projects</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="813 1457 1003 1486">Total Cost Per Client</td> <td data-bbox="1230 1457 1312 1486">\$15,132</td> <td data-bbox="1393 1457 1477 1486">\$15,660</td> </tr> </table>	<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>	Total Cost Per Client	\$15,132	\$15,660
<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>						
Total Cost Per Client	\$15,132	\$15,660						

2. Project Performance (See APR)	Max: 35	 Excellent 35 points	 Good 29-34 points	 Fair 20-28 points	 Poor 0-19 points																																	
<p>Projects' effectiveness will be demonstrated through the following metrics:</p> <p>Financial Drawdowns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Completed quarterly drawdowns Good – Missed 1 quarterly drawdown Fair – Missed 2 quarterly drawdowns Poor – Missed 3 quarterly drawdowns <p>Percentage of Funds Expended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% or more of grant expended Good – 90-94% of grant expended Fair – 85-89% of grant expended Poor – less than 85% of the grant expended <p>Annual Performance Report Submitted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Submitted on time and accepted with 0-1 returns for corrections Good – Submitted on time and accepted with 2 returns for corrections Fair – Submitted on time and accepted with 3 returns for corrections Poor – Submitted late, or accepted with 4 or more returns for corrections <p>Exits to Permanent Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% (PH), 90% (others) Good – 90% (PH), 85% (others) Fair – 80% (PH), 75% (others) Poor – less than 80% (PH), less than 75% (others) <p>Unit Utilization Rate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 100% Good – 95% Fair – 90% Poor – less than 90% <p>Income Growth (all leavers, and stayers who have been in the project for more than 365 days) (+)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 50% Good – 45% Fair – 40% Poor – less than 40% <p>Returns to Homelessness within 6 months</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 5% Good – 10% Fair – 15% Poor – greater than 15% 	<p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p style="text-align: center;">30/35</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p>	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 6 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 2 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 6 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 2 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 4 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 2 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center;">*Projects in their first year who have not submitted an APR (because it is not yet due) will be awarded 2 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 5 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 4 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 5 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 3 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 2 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 5 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 3 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center;">* Income growth was 25% percent.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 4 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 3 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> </table>	Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Excellent 4 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	*Projects in their first year who have not submitted an APR (because it is not yet due) will be awarded 2 points				Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	* Income growth was 25% percent.				Excellent 4 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points
Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																																			
Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																																			
Excellent 4 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																																			
*Projects in their first year who have not submitted an APR (because it is not yet due) will be awarded 2 points																																						
Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																																			
Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points																																			
Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																																			
* Income growth was 25% percent.																																						
Excellent 4 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																																			

3. Data (APR)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10-14 points	 Fair 7-10 points	 Poor 0-6 points
<p>Applicants will be expected to meet or exceed the following data quality standards, as detailed in the CoC's HMIS Policies and Procedures:</p> <p><i>Completeness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – no more than 5% missing PII (personally identifying information) • Good – no more than 7% missing PII • Fair - no more than 10% missing PII • Poor – more than 10% missing PII <p><i>Timeliness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – majority of records entered on the same day that client received services • Good – majority of records entered within 3 days of the day client received services • Fair - majority of records entered within 10 days of the day client received services • Poor – majority of records entered more than 10 days after the day client received services 		15/15			
	9				
	6	Excellent 6 points	Good 4 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points

Evaluation Outcome

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Proposer Score	Total Score: <u>95/100</u>
Design Criteria	40	40	
Performance Criteria	60	55	

COC PROGRAM NOFA APPLICATION EVALUATION SHEET – Renewal






Project Name	PH3	
Agency	Lazarus House	
Proposed Service	Permanent Supportive Housing	
Total Participants to be Served	16	
Budget Summary	Grant Request:	\$202,587.00
	Documented Match:	\$11,446.00
	Total Cost:	\$214,033.00


THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS	RATING	COMMENTS
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">● Pass</div> <div style="text-align: center;">○ Fail</div> </div>
<p><i>Outstanding audit findings: Successful applicants will not have any outstanding HUD, state and local government monitoring and/or audit findings.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Participation: Successful applicants will be members in good standing of the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Interim Rule Compliance: Successful applicants will be in full compliance with all applicable requirements of the CoC Interim Rule (24 CFR part 578), including participation in (or willingness to participate in) the Coordinated Entry System.</i></p> <p><i>The project has a housing first model.</i></p> <p>1. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a program screens out program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Having too little or no income</i> • <i>Active or history of substance abuse</i> • <i>Having a criminal record¹</i> • <i>Having an eviction record</i> • <i>Having a history of domestic violence</i> <p>2. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a project terminates program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Failure to participate in program services</i> • <i>Failure to make progress on a service plan</i> • <i>Loss of, or failure to improve income</i> • <i>Being a victim of domestic violence</i> • <i>Activities not covered in a lease agreement</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pass/Fail</i> 	●	Project meets all of the threshold requirements.






¹ With exceptions for state mandated restrictions

Project Design

The Continuum of Care will give preference to projects that are based on Housing First principles and focus on populations and needs that have been prioritized by the Continuum of Care. Applicants will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well the application addresses each Design criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on information included in the project application and the Applicant Questionnaire.






DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS			
1. Severity of Needs (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10 points	 Fair 5 points	 Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project serves people who have experienced:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Low or no income</i> • <i>Current or past substance abuse</i> • <i>History of victimization</i> • <i>Criminal histories</i> • <i>Chronic homelessness</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – all these groups</i> • <i>Good – three or four of these groups</i> • <i>Fair – two of these groups</i> • <i>Poor – none or one of these groups</i> 	 15/15	Project serves all of the mentioned groups.			






2. Local Priorities / Special Populations (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15				
<p><i>Preference will be given to projects that serve one or more of the following local priority populations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Chronically homeless</i> • <i>Members of households with children</i> • <i>Veterans</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – serves 3 listed populations</i> • <i>Good – serves 2 listed populations</i> • <i>Fair – serves 1 listed population</i> • <i>Poor – serves none of the listed populations</i> 	 15/15	Project serves all of the populations.			






3 . Mainstream Benefits (Section 7)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 4 points  Poor 0 points			
<p><i>The project:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides transportation assistance to enable clients to attend mainstream benefit appointments and/or employment training, or to travel to work • Follows up with participants at least annually to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed • Provides program participants with access to SSI/SSDI technical assistance, either by the applicant, a subrecipient, or partner agency <p><i>Criterion Scoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – provides all three of the services above • Good – provides only two of the above services • Fair – provides only one of the above services • Poor – provides none of the services listed above 	 10/10	Project provides all of the services.			

Project Performance

The Continuum of Care will give preference to high performing projects. New Applications and Renewals will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well they address each performance criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on projections included in the project application and information in the Applicant Questionnaire.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS													
1. Cost Effectiveness (Section 10)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 3 points  Poor 0 points													
<p><i>Cost effectiveness will be determined based on costs per successful outcome (clients retained in project or exited to permanent housing) compared with similar costs of similar projects within the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>Scoring criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – above costs are lower than similar projects • Good – above costs are no more than 5% higher than similar projects • Fair – above costs are no more than 15% higher than similar projects • Poor - above costs are more than 15% higher than similar projects 	 10/10	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="815 1415 1159 1444"><u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u></td> <td data-bbox="1205 1415 1321 1444"><u>This Project</u></td> <td data-bbox="1334 1415 1481 1444"><u>Similar Projects</u></td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="815 1457 1003 1486">Total Cost Per Client</td> <td data-bbox="1237 1457 1321 1486">\$12,661</td> <td data-bbox="1399 1457 1481 1486">\$15,660</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> </table>				<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>			Total Cost Per Client	\$12,661	\$15,660		
<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>													
Total Cost Per Client	\$12,661	\$15,660													

2. Project Performance (See APR)	Max: 35	 Excellent 35 points	 Good 29-34 points	 Fair 20-28 points	 Poor 0-19 points
<p><i>Projects' effectiveness will be demonstrated through the following metrics:</i></p> <p><i>Financial Drawdowns</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – Completed quarterly drawdowns</i> • <i>Good – Missed 1 quarterly drawdown</i> • <i>Fair – Missed 2 quarterly drawdowns</i> • <i>Poor – Missed 3 quarterly drawdowns</i> <p><i>Percentage of Funds Expended</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – 95% or more of grant expended</i> • <i>Good – 90-94% of grant expended</i> • <i>Fair – 85-89% of grant expended</i> • <i>Poor – less than 85% of the grant expended</i> <p><i>Annual Performance Report Submitted</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – Submitted on time and accepted with 0-1 returns for corrections</i> • <i>Good – Submitted on time and accepted with 2 returns for corrections</i> • <i>Fair – Submitted on time and accepted with 3 returns for corrections</i> • <i>Poor – Submitted late, or accepted with 4 or more returns for corrections</i> <p><i>Exits to Permanent Housing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – 95% (PH), 90% (others)</i> • <i>Good – 90% (PH), 85% (others)</i> • <i>Fair – 80% (PH), 75% (others)</i> • <i>Poor – less than 80% (PH), less than 75% (others)</i> <p><i>Unit Utilization Rate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – 100%</i> • <i>Good – 95%</i> • <i>Fair – 90%</i> • <i>Poor – less than 90%</i> <p><i>Income Growth (all leavers, and stayers who have been in the project for more than 365 days) (+)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – 50%</i> • <i>Good – 45%</i> • <i>Fair – 40%</i> • <i>Poor – less than 40%</i> <p><i>Returns to Homelessness within 6 months</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – 5%</i> • <i>Good – 10%</i> • <i>Fair – 15%</i> • <i>Poor – greater than 15%</i> 	<p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p style="text-align: center;">35/35</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Excellent 6 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Good 2 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Excellent 6 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Good 2 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Excellent 4 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Good 2 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">*Projects in their first year who have not submitted an APR (because it is not yet due) will be awarded 2 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Excellent 5 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Good 4 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Excellent 5 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Good 3 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Fair 2 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Excellent 5 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Good 3 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Excellent 4 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Good 3 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</p>			

3. Data (APR)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10-14 points	 Fair 7-10 points	 Poor 0-6 points					
<p>Applicants will be expected to meet or exceed the following data quality standards, as detailed in the CoC's HMIS Policies and Procedures:</p> <p><i>Completeness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – no more than 5% missing PII (personally identifying information) • Good – no more than 7% missing PII • Fair - no more than 10% missing PII • Poor – more than 10% missing PII <p><i>Timeliness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – majority of records entered on the same day that client received services • Good – majority of records entered within 3 days of the day client received services • Fair - majority of records entered within 10 days of the day client received services • Poor – majority of records entered more than 10 days after the day client received services 										
	9/15					9	Excellent 9 points	Good 7 points	Fair 5 points	Poor 0 points
	0					Excellent 6 points	Good 4 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	Project entered data more than 10 days after the client received services.

Evaluation Outcome

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Proposer Score	Total Score: <u>94/100</u>
Design Criteria	40	40	
Performance Criteria	60	54	

COC PROGRAM NOFA APPLICATION EVALUATION SHEET – Renewal






Project Name	CTL	
Agency	Lazarus House	
Proposed Service	Transitional Housing	
Total Participants to be Served	18	
Budget Summary	Grant Request:	\$55,366.00
	Documented Match:	\$13,842.00
	Total Cost:	\$69,208.00






THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS	RATING	COMMENTS
		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pass <input type="radio"/> Fail
<p><i>Outstanding audit findings: Successful applicants will not have any outstanding HUD, state and local government monitoring and/or audit findings.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Participation: Successful applicants will be members in good standing of the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Interim Rule Compliance: Successful applicants will be in full compliance with all applicable requirements of the CoC Interim Rule (24 CFR part 578), including participation in (or willingness to participate in) the Coordinated Entry System.</i></p> <p><i>The project has a housing first model.</i></p> <p>1. An applicant will be penalized if a program screens out program participants for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Having too little or no income</i> • <i>Active or history of substance abuse</i> • <i>Having a criminal record¹</i> • <i>Having an eviction record</i> • <i>Having a history of domestic violence</i> <p>2. An applicant will be penalized if a project terminates program participants for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Failure to participate in program services</i> • <i>Failure to make progress on a service plan</i> • <i>Loss of, or failure to improve income</i> • <i>Being a victim of domestic violence</i> • <i>Activities not covered in a lease agreement</i> <p>Criterion scoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pass/Fail</i> 	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<p>Project meets all of the threshold requirements.</p>






¹ With exceptions for state mandated restrictions

Project Design

The Continuum of Care will give preference to projects that are based on Housing First principles and focus on populations and needs that have been prioritized by the Continuum of Care. Applicants will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well the application addresses each Design criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on information included in the project application and the Applicant Questionnaire.






DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
1. Severity of Needs (Section 4 and 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points  Good 10 points  Fair 5 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project serves people who have experienced:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Low or no income</i> • <i>Current or past substance abuse</i> • <i>History of victimization</i> • <i>Criminal histories</i> • <i>Chronic homelessness</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – all these groups</i> • <i>Good – three or four of these groups</i> • <i>Fair – two of these groups</i> • <i>Poor – none or one of these groups</i> 	<p style="text-align: center;"> 15/15</p>	Project serves all of the mentioned groups.






DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
2. Local Priorities / Special Populations (Section 4 and 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points  Good 10 points  Fair 5 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>Preference will be given to projects that serve one or more of the following local priority populations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Chronically homeless</i> • <i>Members of households with children</i> • <i>Veterans</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – serves 3 listed populations</i> • <i>Good – serves 2 listed populations</i> • <i>Fair – serves 1 listed population</i> • <i>Poor – serves none of the listed populations</i> 	<p style="text-align: center;"> 15/15</p>	Project serves all of the populations.

3 . Mainstream Benefits (Section 7)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 4 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides transportation assistance to enable clients to attend mainstream benefit appointments and/or employment training, or to travel to work Follows up with participants at least annually to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed Provides program participants with access to SSI/SSDI technical assistance, either by the applicant, a subrecipient, or partner agency <p><i>Criterion Scoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – provides all three of the services above Good – provides only two of the above services Fair – provides only one of the above services Poor – provides none of the services listed above 	 10/10	Project provides of the services.

Project Performance

The Continuum of Care will give preference to high performing projects. New Applications and Renewals will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well they address each performance criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on projections included in the project application and information in the Applicant Questionnaire.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS																		
1. Cost Effectiveness (Section 10)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 3 points  Poor 0 points																		
<p><i>Cost effectiveness will be determined based on costs per successful outcome (clients retained in project or exited to permanent housing) compared with similar costs of similar projects within the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>Scoring criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – above costs are lower than similar projects Good – above costs are no more than 5% higher than similar projects Fair – above costs are no more than 15% higher than similar projects Poor - above costs are more than 15% higher than similar projects 	 10/10	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="813 1417 1161 1444"><u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u></td> <td data-bbox="1203 1417 1317 1444"><u>This Project</u></td> <td data-bbox="1328 1417 1481 1444"><u>Similar Projects</u></td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="813 1457 946 1484">Housing Costs</td> <td data-bbox="1247 1457 1317 1484">\$2,914</td> <td data-bbox="1398 1457 1481 1484">\$19,614</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="813 1503 1052 1530">Supportive Services Costs</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1328 1545 1481 1703"> *Based on national average cost of TH from HUD. </td> </tr> </table>				<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>			Housing Costs	\$2,914	\$19,614			Supportive Services Costs			*Based on national average cost of TH from HUD.	
<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>																		
Housing Costs	\$2,914	\$19,614																		
Supportive Services Costs			*Based on national average cost of TH from HUD.																	

2. Project Performance (See Section one and APR)	Max: 35	 Excellent 35 points	 Good 29-34 points	 Fair 20-28 points	 Poor 0-19 points
<p>Projects' effectiveness will be demonstrated through the following metrics:</p> <p>Financial Drawdowns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Completed quarterly drawdowns Good – Missed 1 quarterly drawdown Fair – Missed 2 quarterly drawdowns Poor – Missed 3 quarterly drawdowns <p>Percentage of Funds Expended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% or more of grant expended Good – 90-94% of grant expended Fair – 85-89% of grant expended Poor – less than 85% of the grant expended <p>Annual Performance Report Submitted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Submitted on time and accepted with 0-1 returns for corrections Good – Submitted on time and accepted with 2 returns for corrections Fair – Submitted on time and accepted with 3 returns for corrections Poor – Submitted late, or accepted with 4 or more returns for corrections <p>Exits to Permanent Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% (PH), 90% (others) Good – 90% (PH), 85% (others) Fair – 80% (PH), 75% (others) Poor – less than 80% (PH), less than 75% (others) <p>Unit Utilization Rate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 100% Good – 95% Fair – 90% Poor – less than 90% <p>Income Growth (all leavers, and stayers who have been in the project for more than 365 days) (+)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 50% Good – 45% Fair – 40% Poor – less than 40% <p>Returns to Homelessness within 6 months</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 5% Good – 10% Fair – 15% Poor – greater than 15% 	<p style="text-align: center;">  26/35 6 6 4 0 5 1 4 </p>	<p>Excellent 6 points</p> <p>Excellent 6 points</p> <p>Excellent 4 points</p> <p>Excellent 5 points</p> <p>Excellent 5 points</p> <p>Excellent 5 points</p> <p>Excellent 4 points</p>	<p>Good 2 points</p> <p>Good 2 points</p> <p>Good 2 points</p> <p>Good 4 points</p> <p>Good 3 points</p> <p>Good 3 points</p> <p>Good 3 points</p> <p>Good 3 points</p>	<p>Fair 1 point</p> <p>Fair 1 point</p> <p>Fair 1 point</p> <p>Fair 1 point</p> <p>Fair 2 points</p> <p>Fair 1 point</p> <p>Fair 1 point</p> <p>Fair 1 point</p>	<p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p>

*Projects in their first year who have not submitted an APR (because it is not yet due) will be awarded 2 points

Exits to permanent housing was 62%

40% of all leavers and stayers showed income growth.

COC PROGRAM NOFA APPLICATION EVALUATION SHEET – Renewal






Project Name	Hunters Ridge	
Agency	Ecker Center	
Proposed Service	Permanent Supportive Housing	
Total Participants to be Served	15	
Budget Summary	Grant Request:	\$264,816.00
	Documented Match:	\$34,704.00
	Total Cost:	\$299,520.00






THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS	RATING	COMMENTS
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">● Pass</div> <div style="text-align: center;">○ Fail</div> </div>
<p><i>Outstanding audit findings: Successful applicants will not have any outstanding HUD, state and local government monitoring and/or audit findings.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Participation: Successful applicants will be members in good standing of the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Interim Rule Compliance: Successful applicants will be in full compliance with all applicable requirements of the CoC Interim Rule (24 CFR part 578), including participation in (or willingness to participate in) the Coordinated Entry System.</i></p> <p><i>The project has a housing first model.</i></p> <p>1. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a program screens out program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Having too little or no income</i> • <i>Active or history of substance abuse</i> • <i>Having a criminal record¹</i> • <i>Having an eviction record</i> • <i>Having a history of domestic violence</i> <p>2. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a project terminates program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Failure to participate in program services</i> • <i>Failure to make progress on a service plan</i> • <i>Loss of, or failure to improve income</i> • <i>Being a victim of domestic violence</i> • <i>Activities not covered in a lease agreement</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pass/Fail</i> 	●	Project meets all of the threshold requirements.






¹ With exceptions for state mandated restrictions

Project Design

The Continuum of Care will give preference to projects that are based on Housing First principles and focus on populations and needs that have been prioritized by the Continuum of Care. Applicants will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well the application addresses each Design criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on information included in the project application and the Applicant Questionnaire.






DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
1. Severity of Needs (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points  Good 10 points  Fair 5 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project serves people who have experienced:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Low or no income</i> • <i>Current or past substance abuse</i> • <i>History of victimization</i> • <i>Criminal histories</i> • <i>Chronic homelessness</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – all these groups</i> • <i>Good – three or four of these groups</i> • <i>Fair – two of these groups</i> • <i>Poor – none or one of these groups</i> 	<p> 15/15</p>	Project serves people in all of the mentioned groups.






DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
2. Local Priorities / Special Populations (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points  Good 10 points  Fair 5 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>Preference will be given to projects that serve one or more of the following local priority populations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Chronically homeless</i> • <i>Members of households with children</i> • <i>Veterans</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – serves 3 listed populations</i> • <i>Good – serves 2 listed populations</i> • <i>Fair – serves 1 listed population</i> • <i>Poor – serves none of the listed populations</i> 	<p> 10/15</p>	Project does not serve families with children.






3 . Mainstream Benefits (Section 7)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 4 points  Poor 0 points			
<p><i>The project:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides transportation assistance to enable clients to attend mainstream benefit appointments and/or employment training, or to travel to work • Follows up with participants at least annually to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed • Provides program participants with access to SSI/SSDI technical assistance, either by the applicant, a subrecipient, or partner agency <p><i>Criterion Scoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – provides all three of the services above • Good – provides only two of the above services • Fair – provides only one of the above services • Poor – provides none of the services listed above 	 10/10	Project provides all the mentioned services.			

Project Performance

The Continuum of Care will give preference to high performing projects. New Applications and Renewals will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well they address each performance criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on projections included in the project application and information in the Applicant Questionnaire.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS															
1. Cost Effectiveness (Section 10)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 3 points  Poor 0 points															
<p><i>Cost effectiveness will be determined based on costs per successful outcome (clients retained in project or exited to permanent housing) compared with similar costs of similar projects within the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>Scoring criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – above costs are lower than similar projects • Good – above costs are no more than 5% higher than similar projects • Fair – above costs are no more than 15% higher than similar projects • Poor - above costs are more than 15% higher than similar projects 	 3/10	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="813 1415 1159 1444"><u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u></td> <td data-bbox="1203 1415 1317 1444"><u>This Project</u></td> <td data-bbox="1328 1415 1481 1444"><u>Similar Projects</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="813 1457 1003 1486">Total Cost Per Client</td> <td data-bbox="1230 1457 1317 1486">\$17,654</td> <td data-bbox="1393 1457 1481 1486">\$15,660</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4" data-bbox="813 1549 1481 1621">Project exceeds the Kane County average cost of PSH by less than 15%.</td> </tr> </table>				<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>		<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>	Total Cost Per Client	\$17,654	\$15,660		Project exceeds the Kane County average cost of PSH by less than 15%.			
<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>		<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>														
Total Cost Per Client	\$17,654	\$15,660															
Project exceeds the Kane County average cost of PSH by less than 15%.																	

2. Project Performance (See APR)	Max: 35	 Excellent 35 points	 Good 29-34 points	 Fair 20-28 points	 Poor 0-19 points
<p>Projects' effectiveness will be demonstrated through the following metrics:</p> <p><i>Financial Drawdowns</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Completed quarterly drawdowns Good – Missed 1 quarterly drawdown Fair – Missed 2 quarterly drawdowns Poor – Missed 3 quarterly drawdowns <p><i>Percentage of Funds Expended</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% or more of grant expended Good – 90-94% of grant expended Fair – 85-89% of grant expended Poor – less than 85% of the grant expended <p><i>Annual Performance Report Submitted</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Submitted on time and accepted with 0-1 returns for corrections Good – Submitted on time and accepted with 2 returns for corrections Fair – Submitted on time and accepted with 3 returns for corrections Poor – Submitted late, or accepted with 4 or more returns for corrections <p><i>Exits to Permanent Housing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% (PH), 90% (others) Good – 90% (PH), 85% (others) Fair – 80% (PH), 75% (others) Poor – less than 80% (PH), less than 75% (others) <p><i>Unit Utilization Rate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 100% Good – 95% Fair – 90% Poor – less than 90% <p><i>Income Growth (all leavers, and stayers who have been in the project for more than 365 days) (+)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 50% Good – 45% Fair – 40% Poor – less than 40% <p><i>Returns to Homelessness within 6 months</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 5% Good – 10% Fair – 15% Poor – greater than 15% 	<p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p style="text-align: center;">33/35</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p>	<p>Excellent 6 points</p> <p>Excellent 6 points</p> <p>Excellent 4 points</p> <p>Excellent 5 points</p> <p>Excellent 5 points</p> <p>Excellent 5 points</p> <p>Excellent 4 points</p>	<p>Good 2 points</p> <p>Good 2 points</p> <p>Good 2 points</p> <p>Good 4 points</p> <p>Good 3 points</p> <p>Good 3 points</p> <p>Good 3 points</p> <p>Good 3 points</p>	<p>Fair 1 point</p> <p>Fair 1 point</p> <p>Fair 1 point</p> <p>Fair 1 point</p> <p>Fair 1 point</p> <p>Fair 2 points</p> <p>Fair 1 point</p> <p>Fair 1 point</p>	<p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p> <p>Poor 0 points</p>
		<p>*Projects in their first year who have not submitted an APR (because it is not yet due) will be awarded 2 points</p>			
		<p>Unit utilization rate was 97%</p>			

3. Data (APR)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10-14 points	 Fair 7-10 points	 Poor 0-6 points
<p>Applicants will be expected to meet or exceed the following data quality standards, as detailed in the CoC's HMIS Policies and Procedures:</p> <p><i>Completeness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – no more than 5% missing PII (personally identifying information) • Good – no more than 7% missing PII • Fair - no more than 10% missing PII • Poor – more than 10% missing PII <p><i>Timeliness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – majority of records entered on the same day that client received services • Good – majority of records entered within 3 days of the day client received services • Fair - majority of records entered within 10 days of the day client received services • Poor – majority of records entered more than 10 days after the day client received services 					
	15/15				
	9	Excellent 9 points	Good 7 points	Fair 5 points	Poor 0 points
6	Excellent 6 points	Good 4 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	

Evaluation Outcome

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Proposer Score	Total Score: <u>86/100</u>
Design Criteria	40	35	
Performance Criteria	60	51	

COC PROGRAM NOFA APPLICATION EVALUATION SHEET – Renewal






Project Name	Abbott	
Agency	Ecker Center	
Proposed Service	Permanent Supportive Housing	
Total Participants to be Served	6	
Budget Summary	Grant Request:	\$180,584.00
	Documented Match:	\$29,900.00
	Total Cost:	\$210,484.00






THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS	RATING	COMMENTS
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">● Pass</div> <div style="text-align: center;">○ Fail</div> </div>
<p><i>Outstanding audit findings: Successful applicants will not have any outstanding HUD, state and local government monitoring and/or audit findings.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Participation: Successful applicants will be members in good standing of the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Interim Rule Compliance: Successful applicants will be in full compliance with all applicable requirements of the CoC Interim Rule (24 CFR part 578), including participation in (or willingness to participate in) the Coordinated Entry System.</i></p> <p><i>The project has a housing first model.</i></p> <p>1. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a program screens out program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Having too little or no income</i> • <i>Active or history of substance abuse</i> • <i>Having a criminal record¹</i> • <i>Having an eviction record</i> • <i>Having a history of domestic violence</i> <p>2. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a project terminates program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Failure to participate in program services</i> • <i>Failure to make progress on a service plan</i> • <i>Loss of, or failure to improve income</i> • <i>Being a victim of domestic violence</i> • <i>Activities not covered in a lease agreement</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pass/Fail</i> 	●	Project meets all requirements.






¹ With exceptions for state mandated restrictions

Project Design

The Continuum of Care will give preference to projects that are based on Housing First principles and focus on populations and needs that have been prioritized by the Continuum of Care. Applicants will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well the application addresses each Design criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on information included in the project application and the Applicant Questionnaire.






DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
1. Severity of Needs (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points  Good 10 points  Fair 5 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project serves people who have experienced:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Low or no income</i> • <i>Current or past substance abuse</i> • <i>History of victimization</i> • <i>Criminal histories</i> • <i>Chronic homelessness</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – all these groups</i> • <i>Good – three or four of these groups</i> • <i>Fair – two of these groups</i> • <i>Poor – none or one of these groups</i> 	<p> 15/15</p>	Project serves all of the groups listed.






DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
2. Local Priorities / Special Populations (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points  Good 10 points  Fair 5 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>Preference will be given to projects that serve one or more of the following local priority populations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Chronically homeless</i> • <i>Members of households with children</i> • <i>Veterans</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – serves 3 listed populations</i> • <i>Good – serves 2 listed populations</i> • <i>Fair – serves 1 listed population</i> • <i>Poor – serves none of the listed populations</i> 	<p> 10/15</p>	Project does not serve families.






3 . Mainstream Benefits (Section 7)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 4 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides transportation assistance to enable clients to attend mainstream benefit appointments and/or employment training, or to travel to work • Follows up with participants at least annually to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed • Provides program participants with access to SSI/SSDI technical assistance, either by the applicant, a subrecipient, or partner agency <p><i>Criterion Scoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – provides all three of the services above • Good – provides only two of the above services • Fair – provides only one of the above services • Poor – provides none of the services listed above 	 10/10	Project provides all of the mentioned services.

Project Performance

The Continuum of Care will give preference to high performing projects. New Applications and Renewals will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well they address each performance criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on projections included in the project application and information in the Applicant Questionnaire.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS									
1. Cost Effectiveness (Section 10)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 3 points  Poor 0 points									
<p><i>Cost effectiveness will be determined based on costs per successful outcome (clients retained in project or exited to permanent housing) compared with similar costs of similar projects within the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>Scoring criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – above costs are lower than similar projects • Good – above costs are no more than 5% higher than similar projects • Fair – above costs are no more than 15% higher than similar projects • Poor - above costs are more than 15% higher than similar projects 	 0/10	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="815 1417 1161 1444"><u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u></td> <td data-bbox="1205 1417 1323 1444"><u>This Project</u></td> <td data-bbox="1334 1417 1481 1444"><u>Similar Projects</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="815 1459 998 1486">Total Cost Per Client</td> <td data-bbox="1237 1459 1323 1486">\$30,097</td> <td data-bbox="1399 1459 1481 1486">\$15,660</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="815 1591 1177 1663">Project exceeds the Kane County CoC average cost of PSH by more than 15%.</td> </tr> </table>	<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>	Total Cost Per Client	\$30,097	\$15,660	Project exceeds the Kane County CoC average cost of PSH by more than 15%.		
<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>									
Total Cost Per Client	\$30,097	\$15,660									
Project exceeds the Kane County CoC average cost of PSH by more than 15%.											

2. Project Performance (See APR)	Max: 35	 Excellent 35 points	 Good 29-34 points	 Fair 20-28 points	 Poor 0-19 points				
<p><i>Projects' effectiveness will be demonstrated through the following metrics:</i></p> <p><i>Financial Drawdowns</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Completed quarterly drawdowns Good – Missed 1 quarterly drawdown Fair – Missed 2 quarterly drawdowns Poor – Missed 3 quarterly drawdowns <p><i>Percentage of Funds Expended</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% or more of grant expended Good – 90-94% of grant expended Fair – 85-89% of grant expended Poor – less than 85% of the grant expended <p><i>Annual Performance Report Submitted</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Submitted on time and accepted with 0-1 returns for corrections Good – Submitted on time and accepted with 2 returns for corrections Fair – Submitted on time and accepted with 3 returns for corrections Poor – Submitted late, or accepted with 4 or more returns for corrections <p><i>Exits to Permanent Housing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% (PH), 90% (others) Good – 90% (PH), 85% (others) Fair – 80% (PH), 75% (others) Poor – less than 80% (PH), less than 75% (others) <p><i>Unit Utilization Rate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 100% Good – 95% Fair – 90% Poor – less than 90% <p><i>Income Growth (all leavers, and stayers who have been in the project for more than 365 days) (+)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 50% Good – 45% Fair – 40% Poor – less than 40% <p><i>Returns to Homelessness within 6 months</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 5% Good – 10% Fair – 15% Poor – greater than 15% 		<p>35/35</p>							
	6					Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points
	6					Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points
	4					Excellent 4 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points
	<p>*Projects in their first year who have not submitted an APR (because it is not yet due) will be awarded 2 points</p>								
	5					Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points
	5					Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points
	5					Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points
4	Excellent 4 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points					

3. Data (APR)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10-14 points	 Fair 7-10 points	 Poor 0-6 points
<p>Applicants will be expected to meet or exceed the following data quality standards, as detailed in the CoC's HMIS Policies and Procedures:</p> <p><i>Completeness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – no more than 5% missing PII (personally identifying information) • Good – no more than 7% missing PII • Fair - no more than 10% missing PII • Poor – more than 10% missing PII <p><i>Timeliness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – majority of records entered on the same day that client received services • Good – majority of records entered within 3 days of the day client received services • Fair - majority of records entered within 10 days of the day client received services • Poor – majority of records entered more than 10 days after the day client received services 					
	15/15				
	9	Excellent 9 points	Good 7 points	Fair 5 points	Poor 0 points
6	Excellent 6 points	Good 4 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	

Evaluation Outcome

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Project Score	Total Score: <u>85/100</u>
Design Criteria	40	35	
Performance Criteria	60	50	

COC PROGRAM NOFA APPLICATION EVALUATION SHEET – Renewal






Project Name	Leasing	
Agency	Ecker Center	
Proposed Service	Permanent Supportive Housing	
Total Participants to be Served	16	
Budget Summary	Grant Request:	\$200,458.00
	Documented Match:	\$10,300.00
	Total Cost:	\$210,758.00






THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS	RATING	COMMENTS
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">● Pass</div> <div style="text-align: center;">○ Fail</div> </div>
<p><i>Outstanding audit findings: Successful applicants will not have any outstanding HUD, state and local government monitoring and/or audit findings.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Participation: Successful applicants will be members in good standing of the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Interim Rule Compliance: Successful applicants will be in full compliance with all applicable requirements of the CoC Interim Rule (24 CFR part 578), including participation in (or willingness to participate in) the Coordinated Entry System.</i></p> <p><i>The project has a housing first model.</i></p> <p>1. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a program screens out program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Having too little or no income</i> • <i>Active or history of substance abuse</i> • <i>Having a criminal record¹</i> • <i>Having an eviction record</i> • <i>Having a history of domestic violence</i> <p>2. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a project terminates program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Failure to participate in program services</i> • <i>Failure to make progress on a service plan</i> • <i>Loss of, or failure to improve income</i> • <i>Being a victim of domestic violence</i> • <i>Activities not covered in a lease agreement</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pass/Fail</i> 	●	Project satisfies all requirements.






¹ With exceptions for state mandated restrictions

Project Design

The Continuum of Care will give preference to projects that are based on Housing First principles and focus on populations and needs that have been prioritized by the Continuum of Care. Applicants will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well the application addresses each Design criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on information included in the project application and the Applicant Questionnaire.






DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
1. Severity of Needs (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	    Excellent Good Fair Poor 15 points 10 points 5 points 0 points
<p><i>The project serves people who have experienced:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Low or no income</i> • <i>Current or past substance abuse</i> • <i>History of victimization</i> • <i>Criminal histories</i> • <i>Chronic homelessness</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – all these groups</i> • <i>Good – three or four of these groups</i> • <i>Fair – two of these groups</i> • <i>Poor – none or one of these groups</i> 	 15/15	Project serves all of the groups.






DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
2. Local Priorities / Special Populations (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	    Excellent Good Fair Poor 15 points 10 points 5 points 0 points
<p><i>Preference will be given to projects that serve one or more of the following local priority populations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Chronically homeless</i> • <i>Households with children</i> • <i>Veterans</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – serves 3 listed populations</i> • <i>Good – serves 2 listed populations</i> • <i>Fair – serves 1 listed population</i> • <i>Poor – serves none of the listed populations</i> 	 10/15	Project does not serve households with children.






3 . Mainstream Benefits (Section 7)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 4 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides transportation assistance to enable clients to attend mainstream benefit appointments and/or employment training, or to travel to work Follows up with participants at least annually to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed Provides program participants with access to SSI/SSDI technical assistance, either by the applicant, a subrecipient, or partner agency <p><i>Criterion Scoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – provides all three of the services above Good – provides only two of the above services Fair – provides only one of the above services Poor – provides none of the services listed above 	 10/10	Project provides all of the mentioned services.

Project Performance

The Continuum of Care will give preference to high performing projects. New Applications and Renewals will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well they address each performance criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on projections included in the project application and information in the Applicant Questionnaire.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS						
1. Cost Effectiveness (Section 10)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 3 points  Poor 0 points						
<p><i>Cost effectiveness will be determined based on costs per successful outcome (clients retained in project or exited to permanent housing) compared with similar costs of similar projects within the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>Scoring criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – above costs are lower than similar projects Good – above costs are no more than 5% higher than similar projects Fair – above costs are no more than 15% higher than similar projects Poor - above costs are more than 15% higher than similar projects 	 10/10	<table border="0"> <tr> <td><u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u></td> <td><u>This Project</u></td> <td><u>Similar Projects</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Cost Per Client</td> <td>\$12,528</td> <td>\$15,660</td> </tr> </table>	<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>	Total Cost Per Client	\$12,528	\$15,660
<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>						
Total Cost Per Client	\$12,528	\$15,660						

2. Project Performance (See APR)	Max: 35	 Excellent 35 points	 Good 29-34 points	 Fair 20-28 points	 Poor 0-19 points
<p>Projects' effectiveness will be demonstrated through the following metrics:</p> <p><i>Financial Drawdowns</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Completed quarterly drawdowns Good – Missed 1 quarterly drawdown Fair – Missed 2 quarterly drawdowns Poor – Missed 3 quarterly drawdowns <p><i>Percentage of Funds Expended</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% or more of grant expended Good – 90-94% of grant expended Fair – 85-89% of grant expended Poor – less than 85% of the grant expended <p><i>Annual Performance Report Submitted</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Submitted on time and accepted with 0-1 returns for corrections Good – Submitted on time and accepted with 2 returns for corrections Fair – Submitted on time and accepted with 3 returns for corrections Poor – Submitted late, or accepted with 4 or more returns for corrections <p><i>Exits to Permanent Housing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% (PH), 90% (others) Good – 90% (PH), 85% (others) Fair – 80% (PH), 75% (others) Poor – less than 80% (PH), less than 75% (others) <p><i>Unit Utilization Rate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 100% Good – 95% Fair – 90% Poor – less than 90% <p><i>Income Growth (all leavers, and stayers who have been in the project for more than 365 days) (+)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 50% Good – 45% Fair – 40% Poor – less than 40% <p><i>Returns to Homelessness within 6 months</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 5% Good – 10% Fair – 15% Poor – greater than 15% 	<p style="text-align: center;">  25/35 6 6 4 0 0 5 4 </p>	<p style="text-align: center;"> Excellent 6 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Good 2 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Fair 1 point </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Poor 0 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Excellent 6 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Good 2 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Fair 1 point </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Poor 0 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Excellent 4 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Good 2 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Fair 1 point </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Poor 0 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;">*Projects in their first year who have not submitted an APR (because it is not yet due) will be awarded 2 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Excellent 5 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Good 4 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Fair 1 point </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Poor 0 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;">Exits to permanent housing was 50%.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Excellent 5 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Good 3 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Fair 2 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Poor 0 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;">Unit utilization rate was 87%</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Excellent 5 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Good 3 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Fair 1 point </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Poor 0 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Excellent 4 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Good 3 points </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Fair 1 point </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Poor 0 points </p>			

3. Data (APR)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10-14 points	 Fair 7-10 points	 Poor 0-6 points
<p>Applicants will be expected to meet or exceed the following data quality standards, as detailed in the CoC's HMIS Policies and Procedures:</p> <p>Completeness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – no more than 5% missing PII (personally identifying information) • Good – no more than 7% missing PII • Fair - no more than 10% missing PII • Poor – more than 10% missing PII <p>Timeliness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – majority of records entered on the same day that client received services • Good – majority of records entered within 3 days of the day client received services • Fair - majority of records entered within 10 days of the day client received services • Poor – majority of records entered more than 10 days after the day client received services 					
	<p>7/15</p> <p>7</p> <p>0</p>				

Evaluation Outcome

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Project Score	Total Score: <u>77/100</u>
Design Criteria	40	35	
Performance Criteria	60	42	

COC PROGRAM NOFA APPLICATION EVALUATION SHEET – Renewal






Project Name	The Harbor	
Agency	PADs Inc (Hesed)	
Proposed Service	Permanent Supportive Housing	
Total Participants to be Served	12	
Budget Summary	Grant Request:	\$219,610.00
	Documented Match:	\$60,329.00
	Total Cost:	\$301,644.00






THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS	RATING	COMMENTS
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <input checked="" type="radio"/> Pass </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <input type="radio"/> Fail </div> </div>
<p><i>Outstanding audit findings: Successful applicants will not have any outstanding HUD, state and local government monitoring and/or audit findings.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Participation: Successful applicants will be members in good standing of the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Interim Rule Compliance: Successful applicants will be in full compliance with all applicable requirements of the CoC Interim Rule (24 CFR part 578), including participation in (or willingness to participate in) the Coordinated Entry System.</i></p> <p><i>The project has a housing first model.</i></p> <p>1. An applicant will be penalized if a program screens out program participants for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Having too little or no income</i> • <i>Active or history of substance abuse</i> • <i>Having a criminal record¹</i> • <i>Having an eviction record</i> • <i>Having a history of domestic violence</i> <p>2. An applicant will be penalized if a project terminates program participants for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Failure to participate in program services</i> • <i>Failure to make progress on a service plan</i> • <i>Loss of, or failure to improve income</i> • <i>Being a victim of domestic violence</i> • <i>Activities not covered in a lease agreement</i> <p>Criterion scoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pass/Fail</i> 	<div style="text-align: center; font-size: 2em;">●</div>	<p>Project satisfies all requirements.</p>






¹ With exceptions for state mandated restrictions

Project Design

The Continuum of Care will give preference to projects that are based on Housing First principles and focus on populations and needs that have been prioritized by the Continuum of Care. Applicants will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well the application addresses each Design criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on information included in the project application and the Applicant Questionnaire.






DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS			
1. Severity of Needs (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10 points	 Fair 5 points	 Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project serves people who have experienced:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low or no income • Current or past substance abuse • History of victimization • Criminal histories • Chronic homelessness <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – all these groups • Good – three or four of these groups • Fair – two of these groups • Poor – none or one of these groups 	 15/15	Project serves all groups.			






2. Local Priorities / Special Populations (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10 points	 Fair 5 points	 Poor 0 points
<p><i>Preference will be given to projects that serve one or more of the following local priority populations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chronically homeless • Members of households with children • Veterans <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – serves 3 listed populations • Good – serves 2 listed populations • Fair – serves 1 listed population • Poor – serves none of the listed populations 	 10/15	Project does not serve families.			






3 . Mainstream Benefits (Section 7)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 4 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides transportation assistance to enable clients to attend mainstream benefit appointments and/or employment training, or to travel to work • Follows up with participants at least annually to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed • Provides program participants with access to SSI/SSDI technical assistance, either by the applicant, a subrecipient, or partner agency <p><i>Criterion Scoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – provides all three of the services above • Good – provides only two of the above services • Fair – provides only one of the above services • Poor – provides none of the services listed above 	 10/10	Project provides all of the mentioned services.

Project Performance

The Continuum of Care will give preference to high performing projects. New Applications and Renewals will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well they address each performance criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on projections included in the project application and information in the Applicant Questionnaire.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS									
1. Cost Effectiveness (Section 10)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 3 points  Poor 0 points									
<p><i>Cost effectiveness will be determined based on costs per successful outcome (clients retained in project or exited to permanent housing) compared with similar costs of similar projects within the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>Scoring criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – above costs are lower than similar projects • Good – above costs are no more than 5% higher than similar projects • Fair – above costs are no more than 15% higher than similar projects • Poor - above costs are more than 15% higher than similar projects 	 0/10	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="813 1417 1161 1444"><u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u></td> <td data-bbox="1203 1417 1317 1444"><u>This Project</u></td> <td data-bbox="1328 1417 1477 1444"><u>Similar Projects</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="813 1459 1003 1486">Total Cost Per Client</td> <td data-bbox="1230 1459 1317 1486">\$18,300</td> <td data-bbox="1393 1459 1477 1486">\$15,660</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="813 1549 1161 1661"> Project cost per successful outcome exceeds the Kane County average for permanent supportive housing. </td> </tr> </table>	<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>	Total Cost Per Client	\$18,300	\$15,660	Project cost per successful outcome exceeds the Kane County average for permanent supportive housing.		
<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>									
Total Cost Per Client	\$18,300	\$15,660									
Project cost per successful outcome exceeds the Kane County average for permanent supportive housing.											

2. Project Performance (See APR)	Max: 35	 Excellent 35 points	 Good 29-34 points	 Fair 20-28 points	 Poor 0-19 points																																	
<p><i>Projects' effectiveness will be demonstrated through the following metrics:</i></p> <p><i>Financial Drawdowns</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Completed quarterly drawdowns Good – Missed 1 quarterly drawdown Fair – Missed 2 quarterly drawdowns Poor – Missed 3 quarterly drawdowns <p><i>Percentage of Funds Expended</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% or more of grant expended Good – 90-94% of grant expended Fair – 85-89% of grant expended Poor – less than 85% of the grant expended <p><i>Annual Performance Report Submitted</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Submitted on time and accepted with 0-1 returns for corrections Good – Submitted on time and accepted with 2 returns for corrections Fair – Submitted on time and accepted with 3 returns for corrections Poor – Submitted late, or accepted with 4 or more returns for corrections <p><i>Exits to Permanent Housing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% (PH), 90% (others) Good – 90% (PH), 85% (others) Fair – 80% (PH), 75% (others) Poor – less than 80% (PH), less than 75% (others) <p><i>Unit Utilization Rate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 100% Good – 95% Fair – 90% Poor – less than 90% <p><i>Income Growth (all leavers, and stayers who have been in the project for more than 365 days) (+)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 50% Good – 45% Fair – 40% Poor – less than 40% <p><i>Returns to Homelessness within 6 months</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 5% Good – 10% Fair – 15% Poor – greater than 15% 	<p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p style="text-align: center;">28/35</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p>	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">Excellent 6 points</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">Good 2 points</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 6 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 2 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 4 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 2 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center;"> <p>*Projects in their first year who have not submitted an APR (because it is not yet due) will be awarded 2 points</p> <p>Project is in first year and has not yet submitted an APR.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 5 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 4 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 5 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 3 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 2 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 5 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 3 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center;"> <p>All leavers and stayers showed no income growth.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 4 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 3 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 1 point</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> </table>	Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Excellent 4 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	<p>*Projects in their first year who have not submitted an APR (because it is not yet due) will be awarded 2 points</p> <p>Project is in first year and has not yet submitted an APR.</p>				Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	<p>All leavers and stayers showed no income growth.</p>				Excellent 4 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points
Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																																			
Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																																			
Excellent 4 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																																			
<p>*Projects in their first year who have not submitted an APR (because it is not yet due) will be awarded 2 points</p> <p>Project is in first year and has not yet submitted an APR.</p>																																						
Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																																			
Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points																																			
Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																																			
<p>All leavers and stayers showed no income growth.</p>																																						
Excellent 4 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																																			

3. Data (APR)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10-14 points	 Fair 7-10 points	 Poor 0-6 points
<p>Applicants will be expected to meet or exceed the following data quality standards, as detailed in the CoC's HMIS Policies and Procedures:</p> <p><i>Completeness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – no more than 5% missing PII (personally identifying information) • Good – no more than 7% missing PII • Fair - no more than 10% missing PII • Poor – more than 10% missing PII <p><i>Timeliness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – majority of records entered on the same day that client received services • Good – majority of records entered within 3 days of the day client received services • Fair - majority of records entered within 10 days of the day client received services • Poor – majority of records entered more than 10 days after the day client received services 					
	13/15				
	7	Excellent 9 points	Good 7 points	Fair 5 points	Poor 0 points
	6	Project is missing more than 7% of PII.			
		Excellent 6 points	Good 4 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points

Evaluation Outcome

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Proposer Score	Total Score: <u>76/100</u>
Design Criteria	40	35	
Performance Criteria	60	41	

CoC PROGRAM NOFA APPLICATION EVALUATION SHEET – Renewal






Project Name	LIGHT-House 7	
Agency	PADs Inc.	
Proposed Services and Participant Figures	Total Participants Served:	Appx 8 Clients
Budget Summary	Grant Request:	\$51,552.00
	Documented Match:	\$3,474.00
	Total Cost:	\$55,026.00






THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS	RATING	COMMENTS
	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pass <input type="radio"/> Fail	
<p><i>Outstanding audit findings: Successful applicants will not have any outstanding HUD, state and local government monitoring and/or audit findings.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Participation: Successful applicants will be members in good standing of the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Interim Rule Compliance: Successful applicants will be in full compliance with all applicable requirements of the CoC Interim Rule (24 CFR part 578), including participation in (or willingness to participate in) the Coordinated Entry System.</i></p> <p><i>The project has a housing first model.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a program screens out program participants for:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Having too little or no income</i> • <i>Active or history of substance abuse</i> • <i>Having a criminal record¹</i> • <i>Having an eviction record</i> • <i>Having a history of domestic violence</i> 2. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a project terminates program participants for:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Failure to participate in program services</i> • <i>Failure to make progress on a service plan</i> • <i>Loss of, or failure to improve income</i> • <i>Being a victim of domestic violence</i> • <i>Activities not covered in a lease agreement</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pass/Fail</i> 	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<p>Project meets all of the threshold requirements.</p>






¹ With exceptions for state mandated restrictions

Project Design

The Continuum of Care will give preference to projects that are based on Housing First principles and focus on populations and needs that have been prioritized by the Continuum of Care. Applicants will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well the application addresses each Design criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on information included in the project application and the Applicant Questionnaire.






DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
1. Severity of Needs (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points  Good 10 points  Fair 5 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project serves people who have experienced:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Low or no income</i> • <i>Current or past substance abuse</i> • <i>History of victimization</i> • <i>Criminal histories</i> • <i>Chronic homelessness</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – all these groups</i> • <i>Good – three or four of these groups</i> • <i>Fair – two of these groups</i> • <i>Poor – none or one of these groups</i> 	 15/15	Project serves all of these groups.


DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
2. Local Priorities / Special Populations (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points  Good 10 points  Fair 5 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>Preference will be given to projects that serve one or more of the following local priority populations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Chronically homeless</i> • <i>Members of households with children</i> • <i>Veterans</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – serves 3 listed populations</i> • <i>Good – serves 2 listed populations</i> • <i>Fair – serves 1 listed population</i> • <i>Poor – serves none of the listed populations</i> 	 15/15	Project serves all of these populations.






3 . Mainstream Benefits (Section 7)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 4 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides transportation assistance to enable clients to attend mainstream benefit appointments and/or employment training, or to travel to work Follows up with participants at least annually to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed Provides program participants with access to SSI/SSDI technical assistance, either by the applicant, a subrecipient, or partner agency <p><i>Criterion Scoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – provides all three of the services above Good – provides only two of the above services Fair – provides only one of the above services Poor – provides none of the services listed above 	 10/10	Project provides all of these services.

Project Performance

The Continuum of Care will give preference to high performing projects. New Applications and Renewals will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well they address each performance criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; projects in their first year will receive half the points for performance and data, new projects will be rated based on projections included in the project application and information in the Applicant Questionnaire.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS									
1. Cost Effectiveness (Section 10)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 3 points  Poor 0 points									
<p><i>Cost effectiveness will be determined based on costs per successful outcome (clients retained in project or exited to permanent housing) compared with similar costs of similar projects within the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>Scoring criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – above costs are lower than similar projects Good – above costs are no more than 5% higher than similar projects Fair – above costs are no more than 15% higher than similar projects Poor - above costs are more than 15% higher than similar projects 	 10/10	<table border="0"> <tr> <td><u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u></td> <td><u>This Project</u></td> <td><u>CoC Average</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Housing Costs</td> <td>\$6,444</td> <td>\$15,660</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Project is below CoC average cost of <u>PSH.</u></td> </tr> </table>	<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>CoC Average</u>	Housing Costs	\$6,444	\$15,660	Project is below CoC average cost of <u>PSH.</u>		
<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>CoC Average</u>									
Housing Costs	\$6,444	\$15,660									
Project is below CoC average cost of <u>PSH.</u>											

2. Project Performance (See APR)	Max: 35	 Excellent Good Fair Poor 35 points 29-34 points 20-28 points 0-19 points																											
Projects' effectiveness will be demonstrated through the following metrics: Financial Drawdowns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Completed quarterly drawdowns Good – Missed 1 quarterly drawdown Fair – Missed 2 quarterly drawdowns Poor – Missed 3 quarterly drawdowns Percentage of Funds Expended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% or more of grant expended Good – 90-94% of grant expended Fair – 85-89% of grant expended Poor – less than 85% of the grant expended Annual Performance Report Submitted <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Submitted on time and accepted with 0-1 returns for corrections Good – Submitted on time and accepted with 2 returns for corrections Fair – Submitted on time and accepted with 3 returns for corrections Poor – Submitted late, or accepted with 4 or more returns for corrections Exits to Permanent Housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% (PH), 90% (others) Good – 90% (PH), 85% (others) Fair – 80% (PH), 75% (others) Poor – less than 80% (PH), less than 75% (others) Unit Utilization Rate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 100% Good – 95% Fair – 90% Poor – less than 90% Income Growth (all leavers, and stayers who have been in the project for more than 365 days) (+) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 50% Good – 45% Fair – 40% Poor – less than 40% Returns to Homelessness within 6 months <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 5% Good – 10% Fair – 15% Poor – greater than 15% 	○	<u>Project is in its first year and will receive half the points for performance.</u>																											
	17.5/ 35					<table border="0" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td>Excellent 6 points</td> <td>Good 2 points</td> <td>Fair 1 point</td> <td>Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Excellent 6 points</td> <td>Good 2 points</td> <td>Fair 1 point</td> <td>Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Excellent 4 points</td> <td>Good 2 points</td> <td>Fair 1 point</td> <td>Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Excellent 5 points</td> <td>Good 4 points</td> <td>Fair 1 point</td> <td>Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Excellent 5 points</td> <td>Good 3 points</td> <td>Fair 2 points</td> <td>Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Excellent 5 points</td> <td>Good 3 points</td> <td>Fair 1 point</td> <td>Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Excellent 4 points</td> <td>Good 3 points</td> <td>Fair 1 point</td> <td>Poor 0 points</td> </tr> </table>	Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Excellent 4 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point
Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																										
Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																										
Excellent 4 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																										
Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																										
Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points																										
Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																										
Excellent 4 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points																										

3. Data	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10-14 points	 Fair 7-10 points	 Poor 0-6 points								
<p>Applicants will be expected to meet or exceed the following data quality standards, as detailed in the CoC's HMIS Policies and Procedures:</p> <p>Completeness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – no more than 5% missing PII (personally identifying information)</i> • <i>Good – no more than 7% missing PII</i> • <i>Fair - no more than 10% missing PII</i> • <i>Poor – more than 10% missing PII</i> <p>Timeliness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – majority of records entered on the same day that client received services</i> • <i>Good – majority of records entered within 3 days of the day client received services</i> • <i>Fair - majority of records entered within 10 days of the day client received services</i> • <i>Poor – majority of records entered more than 10 days after the day client received services</i> 	<p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p style="text-align: center;">7.5 /15</p>	<p><u>Project is in its first year and will receive half the points for data.</u></p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 9 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 7 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 5 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent 6 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Good 4 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair 2 points</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor 0 points</td> </tr> </table>				Excellent 9 points	Good 7 points	Fair 5 points	Poor 0 points	Excellent 6 points	Good 4 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points
Excellent 9 points	Good 7 points	Fair 5 points	Poor 0 points										
Excellent 6 points	Good 4 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points										

Evaluation Outcome

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Proposer Score	Total Score: <u>75/100</u>
Design Criteria	40	40	
Performance Criteria	60	35	

COC PROGRAM NOFA APPLICATION EVALUATION SHEET – New Project






Project Name	LIGHT-House 8	
Agency	PADs Inc.	
Proposed Services	Permanent Supportive Housing	
Total Participants Served:	5	
Budget Summary:	Grant Request:	\$90,234.00
	Documented Match:	\$8,309.00
	Total Cost:	\$98,543.00






THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS	RATING	COMMENTS
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">● Pass</div> <div style="text-align: center;">○ Fail</div> </div>
<p><i>Outstanding audit findings: Successful applicants will not have any outstanding HUD, state and local government monitoring and/or audit findings.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Participation: Successful applicants will be members in good standing of the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Interim Rule Compliance: Successful applicants will be in full compliance with all applicable requirements of the CoC Interim Rule (24 CFR part 578), including participation in (or willingness to participate in) the Coordinated Entry System.</i></p> <p><i>The project has a housing first model.</i></p> <p>1. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a program screens out program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Having too little or no income</i> • <i>Active or history of substance abuse</i> • <i>Having a criminal record¹</i> • <i>Having an eviction record</i> • <i>Having a history of domestic violence</i> <p>2. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a project terminates program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Failure to participate in program services</i> • <i>Failure to make progress on a service plan</i> • <i>Loss of, or failure to improve income</i> • <i>Being a victim of domestic violence</i> • <i>Activities not covered in a lease agreement</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pass/Fail</i> 	●	Project meets all of the threshold requirements.






¹ With exceptions for state mandated restrictions






Project Design






The Continuum of Care will give preference to projects that are based on Housing First principles and focus on populations and needs that have been prioritized by the Continuum of Care. Applicants will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well the application addresses each Design criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on information included in the project application and the Applicant Questionnaire.

DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
1. Soundness of Program Design <i>(Project Information: questions 4, 7-9; Section 3; and Section 10 A – E)</i>	Max: 25	    Excellent Good Fair Poor 25 points 20 points 15 points 10 points
<i>The applicant’s proposal will be evaluated for overall feasibility and anticipated impact.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project a logical extension of the agency’s mission and work? Does the agency have a landlord identification plan? Does the agency have staffing plan for the new project? Will the potential impact of this program assist the CoC in addressing the specific needs of the Continuum? Does the budget make sense? Is it cost-effective? <i>Criterion Scoring</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – all yes Good – four “yes” responses Fair – three “yes” responses Poor – two or less “yes” responses 	 20/25	Project has a good program design and is a logical extension of the agency’s mission and work. The agency has a landlord identification and will use existing relationships to secure additional units as needed for this project. The agency currently has 3 FT, 2 PT staff dedicated to this program; the only missing staff member is 1 PT worker for LIGHT-House 8. The project address the needs of multiple homeless populations, however it will not serve households with children which is a priority of the CoC. The cost per client comes out to \$18,046.80, which is about 15% higher than the average client cost of \$15,660 in the CoC.

DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
2. Agency Capacity and Expertise <i>(Section 1: questions 2, 3, 5, 7, 8)</i>	Max: 25	    Excellent Good Fair Poor 25 points 20 points 15 points 10 points
<i>The applicant’s past performance managing CoC awards (or other similar funding sources) will be considered. The applicant’s likely ability to administer CoC funding (in addition to its existing programming) will be considered.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are key staff already in place and ready to begin work? Are staff well qualified and experienced in the type of services proposed? The organization has no recent history (last 5 years) of grant funds being recaptured. Is the agency experienced in effectively managing federal (or similarly sourced) funds? Is the agency ready to begin within 90 of their award? <i>Criterion Scoring</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – all “yes” responses Good – four “yes” responses Fair – three “yes” responses Poor – two or less “yes” responses 	 20/25	The agency currently has 3 FT, 2 PT staff dedicated to this program; the only missing staff member is 1 PT worker for LIGHT-House 8. The existing staff are experienced and well –qualified for this type of services. The organization has no recent history of grant funds being recaptured and is experienced in managing federal awards. The agency states they will be able to begin the project immediately after the grant becomes available.






3. Severity of Needs (Section 9 A-B)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10 points	 Fair 5 points	 Poor 0 points
<p>The project serves people who have experienced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low or no income • Current or past substance abuse • History of victimization • Criminal histories • Chronic homelessness <p>Criterion scoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – all of these groups • Good – three or four of these groups • Fair – two of these groups • Poor – none or one of these groups 	 15/15	The project will serve people in all categories.			

4. Local Priorities / Special Populations (Section 9 A- B)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10 points	 Fair 5 points	 Poor 0 points
<p>Preference will be given to projects that serve one or more of the following local priority populations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chronically homeless • Members of households with children • Veterans <p>Criterion scoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – serves 3 listed populations • Good – serves 2 listed populations • Fair – serves 1 listed population • Poor – serves none of the listed populations 	 10/15	The project will serve chronically homeless, and veteran populations but will not serve households with children.			

5. Mainstream Benefits (Section 7)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points	 Good 7 points	 Fair 3 points	 Poor 0 points
<p>The project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides transportation assistance to enable clients to attend mainstream benefit appointments and/or employment training, or to travel to work • Follows up with participants at least annually to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed • Provides program participants with access to SSI/SSDI technical assistance, either by the applicant, a subrecipient, or partner agency <p>Criterion Scoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – provides all three of the services above • Good – provides only two of the above services • Fair – provides only one of the above services • Poor – provides none of the services listed above 	 10/10	The project will provide all of the mentioned services.			

Project Performance

The Continuum of Care will give preference to high performing projects. New Applications and Renewals will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well they address each performance criterion below. New projects will be rated based on projections included in the project application.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS			
1. Cost Effectiveness (Section 10 A-E)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points	 Good 7 points	 Fair 3 points	 Poor 0 points
<i>Cost effectiveness will be determined based on costs per successful outcome (clients retained in project or exited to permanent housing) compared with similar costs of similar projects within the Continuum of Care.</i> <i>Scoring criteria:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – above costs are lower than similar projects</i> • <i>Good – above costs are no more than 10% higher than similar projects</i> • <i>Fair – above costs are no more than 15% higher than similar projects</i> • <i>Poor - above costs are more than 15% higher than similar projects</i> 	 0/10	<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u> Project Costs Per Client	<u>This Project</u> \$18,046	<u>Similar Projects</u> 15,660	Cost per successful outcome exceeds the Kane County average cost of Permanent Supportive Housing.

Evaluation Outcome

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Project Score	Total Score: <u>75/100</u>
Design Criteria	90	75	
Performance Criteria	10	0	

COC PROGRAM NOFA APPLICATION EVALUATION SHEET – Renewal






Project Name	Enduring Hope	
Agency	Midwest Shelter for Homeless Veterans	
Proposed Service	Permanent Supportive Housing	
Total Participants to be Served	6	
Budget Summary	Grant Request:	\$98,138.00
	Documented Match:	\$5,616.00
	Total Cost:	\$103,754.00






THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS	RATING	COMMENTS
		<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">● Pass</div> <div style="text-align: center;">○ Fail</div> </div>
<p><i>Outstanding audit findings: Successful applicants will not have any outstanding HUD, state and local government monitoring and/or audit findings.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Participation: Successful applicants will be members in good standing of the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>CoC Interim Rule Compliance: Successful applicants will be in full compliance with all applicable requirements of the CoC Interim Rule (24 CFR part 578), including participation in (or willingness to participate in) the Coordinated Entry System.</i></p> <p><i>The project has a housing first model.</i></p> <p>1. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a program screens out program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Having too little or no income</i> • <i>Active or history of substance abuse</i> • <i>Having a criminal record¹</i> • <i>Having an eviction record</i> • <i>Having a history of domestic violence</i> <p>2. <i>An applicant will be penalized if a project terminates program participants for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Failure to participate in program services</i> • <i>Failure to make progress on a service plan</i> • <i>Loss of, or failure to improve income</i> • <i>Being a victim of domestic violence</i> • <i>Activities not covered in a lease agreement</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pass/Fail</i> 	●	Project meets all of the threshold requirements.






¹ With exceptions for state mandated restrictions

Project Design

The Continuum of Care will give preference to projects that are based on Housing First principles and focus on populations and needs that have been prioritized by the Continuum of Care. Applicants will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well the application addresses each Design criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on information included in the project application and the Applicant Questionnaire.






DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
1. Severity of Needs (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points  Good 10 points  Fair 5 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>The project serves people who have experienced:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Low or no income</i> • <i>Current or past substance abuse</i> • <i>History of victimization</i> • <i>Criminal histories</i> • <i>Chronic homelessness</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – all these groups</i> • <i>Good – three or four of these groups</i> • <i>Fair – two of these groups</i> • <i>Poor – none or one of these groups</i> 	 15/15	Project serves all of the mentioned groups.





DESIGN CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS
2. Local Priorities / Special Populations (Sections 4 & 5)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points  Good 10 points  Fair 5 points  Poor 0 points
<p><i>Preference will be given to projects that serve one or more of the following local priority populations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Chronically homeless</i> • <i>Members of households with children</i> • <i>Veterans</i> <p><i>Criterion scoring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excellent – serves 3 listed populations</i> • <i>Good – serves 2 listed populations</i> • <i>Fair – serves 1 listed population</i> • <i>Poor – serves none of the listed populations</i> 	 10/15	Project does not serve households with children.






3 . Mainstream Benefits (Section 7)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 4 points  Poor 0 points			
<p><i>The project:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides transportation assistance to enable clients to attend mainstream benefit appointments and/or employment training, or to travel to work Follows up with participants at least annually to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed Provides program participants with access to SSI/SSDI technical assistance, either by the applicant, a subrecipient, or partner agency <p><i>Criterion Scoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – provides all three of the services above Good – provides only two of the above services Fair – provides only one of the above services Poor – provides none of the services listed above 	 10/10	Project provides all of the mentioned services.			

Project Performance

The Continuum of Care will give preference to high performing projects. New Applications and Renewals will be evaluated on a four-point scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) based on how well they address each performance criterion below. Renewal applications will be rated based on performance during the past year; new projects will be rated based on projections included in the project application and information in the Applicant Questionnaire.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	RATING	COMMENTS													
1. Cost Effectiveness (Section 10)	Max: 10	 Excellent 10 points  Good 7 points  Fair 3 points  Poor 0 points													
<p><i>Cost effectiveness will be determined based on costs per successful outcome (clients retained in project or exited to permanent housing) compared with similar costs of similar projects within the Continuum of Care.</i></p> <p><i>Scoring criteria:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – above costs are lower than similar projects Good – above costs are no more than 5% higher than similar projects Fair – above costs are no more than 15% higher than similar projects Poor - above costs are more than 15% higher than similar projects 	 7/10	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="813 1415 1159 1440"><u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u></td> <td data-bbox="1203 1415 1317 1440"><u>This Project</u></td> <td data-bbox="1328 1415 1481 1440"><u>Similar Projects</u></td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="813 1457 1003 1482">Total Cost Per Client</td> <td data-bbox="1230 1457 1312 1482">\$16,356</td> <td data-bbox="1393 1457 1481 1482">\$15,660</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> </table>				<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>			Total Cost Per Client	\$16,356	\$15,660		
<u>Annual Cost per Successful Outcome</u>	<u>This Project</u>	<u>Similar Projects</u>													
Total Cost Per Client	\$16,356	\$15,660													

2. Project Performance (See APR)	Max: 35	 Excellent 35 points	 Good 29-34 points	 Fair 20-28 points	 Poor 0-19 points	
<p><i>Projects' effectiveness will be demonstrated through the following metrics:</i></p> <p><i>Financial Drawdowns</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Completed quarterly drawdowns Good – Missed 1 quarterly drawdown Fair – Missed 2 quarterly drawdowns Poor – Missed 3 quarterly drawdowns <p><i>Percentage of Funds Expended</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% or more of grant expended Good – 90-94% of grant expended Fair – 85-89% of grant expended Poor – less than 85% of the grant expended <p><i>Annual Performance Report Submitted</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – Submitted on time and accepted with 0-1 returns for corrections Good – Submitted on time and accepted with 2 returns for corrections Fair – Submitted on time and accepted with 3 returns for corrections Poor – Submitted late, or accepted with 4 or more returns for corrections <p><i>Exits to Permanent Housing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 95% (PH), 90% (others) Good – 90% (PH), 85% (others) Fair – 80% (PH), 75% (others) Poor – less than 80% (PH), less than 75% (others) <p><i>Unit Utilization Rate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 100% Good – 95% Fair – 90% Poor – less than 90% <p><i>Income Growth (all leavers, and stayers who have been in the project for more than 365 days) (+)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 50% Good – 45% Fair – 40% Poor – less than 40% <p><i>Returns to Homelessness within 6 months</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent – 5% Good – 10% Fair – 15% Poor – greater than 15% 	○					
	11/35	0	Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points
	Project missed 4 quarterly drawdowns.					
	0	Excellent 6 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Poor 0 points
	Project expended 54% of their grant.					
	2	Excellent 4 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Poor 0 points
	*Projects in their first year who have not submitted an APR (because it is not yet due) will be awarded 2 points					
5	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Poor 0 points	
Projects average occupancy rate was 50%						
0	Excellent 5 points	Good 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	Poor 0 points	
No stayers or leavers reported any income growth.						
4	Excellent 4 points	Good 3 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points	Poor 0 points	

3. Data (APR)	Max: 15	 Excellent 15 points	 Good 10-14 points	 Fair 7-10 points	 Poor 0-6 points
<p>Applicants will be expected to meet or exceed the following data quality standards, as detailed in the CoC's HMIS Policies and Procedures:</p> <p><i>Completeness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – no more than 5% missing PII (personally identifying information) • Good – no more than 7% missing PII • Fair - no more than 10% missing PII • Poor – more than 10% missing PII <p><i>Timeliness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent – majority of records entered on the same day that client received services • Good – majority of records entered within 3 days of the day client received services • Fair - majority of records entered within 10 days of the day client received services • Poor – majority of records entered more than 10 days after the day client received services 	 13/15				
	9	Excellent 9 points	Good 7 points	Fair 5 points	Poor 0 points
	4	Excellent 6 points	Good 4 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points
Applicant met the data quality standards.					

Evaluation Outcome

Evaluation Criteria	Max. Score	Proposer Score	Total Score: <u>66/100</u>
Design Criteria	40	35	
Performance Criteria	60	36	