

CoC
Rank &
Review
Process
RENEWALS

2015 Rank and Review Committee

Process used to get to final ranking

Developed a scorecard to score each program based on HUD priority outcomes, HUD requirement, HEART ACT requirements and other data approved by COC. See attached Scorecards

Developed a renewal application for each program to fill out to describe their program and outcomes. See attached Renewal form

HMIS staff presented #s from present HMIS system to score outcomes. Numbers were based on the 2014 calendar year.

Allowed agencies to present their #s and reasons why if HMIS #s and their #s had discrepancies.

This year we scored on the numbers provided by the agencies for the calendar year. This was due to the transition from MISI ROSIE to COMPASS ROSE. Some of the data was not correctly entered into the present system.

To avoid conflict of interest we set up the scoring to be completed by individuals who had no association to the programs. Final review and ranking was conducted by two individuals who do not receive any COC funding.

Time line of the process included.

Saint Louis Continuum of Care

Rank & Review Committee

2015 Process for Ranking Renewal Projects

8/4/2015 Committee meeting with Department of Human Services and Continuum of Care consultant Tina Patterson to review process and proposed forms. Process authorized by Director Eddie Roth.

8/5/2015 Rank and Review Committee sends the Scorecard and Renewal Review document to each funded project. Projects have one week to complete the documents and submit them to Rank and Review Committee.

8/12/2015 Scorecard and Renewal Review due to Rank and Review by noon. Failure to submit documentation indicates that project does not intend to be funded.

8/13/2015 Rank and Review Meeting to review documents submitted by projects.

Review Process: To reduce potential conflict of interest, six team members will be involved in the ranking process.

- In the first round, a pair of service provider representatives from a Transitional Housing program will review documents from Permanent Supportive Housing providers. A second pair of service provider representatives from a Permanent Supportive Housing program will review documents from Transitional Housing programs.
- In the second round, a pair of provider representatives with no affiliation to either Transitional Housing or Permanent Supportive Housing will review and confirm final ranking.

8/17/2015 Rank and Review will submit recommendations and ranking to the City of Saint Louis Department of Human Services.

Ongoing Committee will be available to discuss rankings with Department of Human Services staff and Continuum of Care Executive Board as necessary.

City of St. Louis CoC 2015 Renewal Review

I. Agency and Grant Information

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Agency Name | |
| Project Name | |
| Grant Number | |
| Grant Start Date | |
| Contact Person | |
| Phone/Email | |

II. Project Summary

1. Provide a brief summary of your project, including purpose, design and target population. Include steps to prioritizing clients according to the CoC's priority list for PSH housing. Also describe how you will be coordinating placements in your housing programs utilizing the community's new coordinated assessment process. Describe your use of HMIS in data collection.

III. Program Changes

1. Describe any significant changes to your program during the past year or planned for the upcoming grant term, including changes in budget line items, population served, numbers served, program design.
2. Have you executed any grant amendments with the City of St. Louis for this project in the past year (or do you have any unexecuted grant amendment requests)? If yes, please submit as part of this renewal packet.

IV. HEARTH Compliance

| HEARTH Requirement | YES or NO |
|---|-----------|
| Do you have consumer representation on your Board? | |
| If you receive Leasing dollars, do you master lease units? | |
| If you receive Leasing or Rental Assistance dollars, do you comply with the rent reasonableness requirements? | |
| Are you conducting an Annual Service Needs Assessment for all participants who are enrolled for more than one year? | |
| Do you comply with Housing Quality Standards (HQS)? | |

V. Budget

1. Do you expect that all funds in your 2014 CoC grant will be expended? If not, what amount will not be spent and why.
2. Is there any money in this grant that would be available for reallocation to a new project?
3. Complete the following 2015 CoC budget tables for your CoC program. QUANTITY DESCRIPTIONS MUST BE ENTERED.

| SUPPORTIVE SERVICES BUDGET | | |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Eligible Costs | Quantity Description (400 characters max) | CoC Assistance Requested |
| Assessment of Services Needs | | |
| Assistance with Moving Costs | | |
| Case Management | | |
| Child Care | | |

PSH Programs

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Education Services | | |
| Employment Assistance | | |
| Food | | |
| Housing/Counseling Services | | |
| Legal Services | | |
| Life Skills | | |
| Mental Health Services | | |
| Outpatient Health Services | | |
| Outreach Services | | |
| Substance Abuse Treatment Services | | |
| Transportation | | |
| Utility Deposits | | |
| Total Services Assistance Requested | | |

| OPERATING BUDGET | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|
| Eligible Costs | Quantity Description (400 characters max) | CoC Assistance Requested |
| Maintenance/Repair | | |
| Property Taxes & Insurance | | |
| Replacement Reserve | | |
| Building Security | | |
| Electricity, Gas & Water | | |
| Furniture | | |
| Equipment (lease, buy) | | |
| Total Operating Assistance Requested | | |

| LEASING/LONG-TERM RENTAL ASSISTANCE BUDGET | | | | | | |
|---|------------|-----|-------------|--------------|--|--|
| Size of Units | # of Units | FMR | # of Months | Total Budget | | |
| SRO | | X | X | 12 | | |
| 0 Bedroom | | X | X | 12 | | |
| 1 Bedroom | | X | X | 12 | | |
| 2 Bedrooms | | X | X | 12 | | |
| 3 Bedrooms | | X | X | 12 | | |
| 4 Bedrooms | | X | X | 12 | | |
| 5 Bedrooms | | X | X | 12 | | |
| 6+ Bedrooms | | X | X | 12 | | |
| Total | | | | | | |

| SUMMARY BUDGET | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------------|
| Eligible Costs | CoC Assistance Requested | Match specify cash, in-kind, amount & source | Total |
| Leased Units | | | |
| Leased Structures | | | |
| Housing Relocation and Stabilization | | | |
| Short-term/Medium Term Assistance | | | |
| Long-term Rental Assistance | | | |
| Supportive Services | | | |
| Operating | | | |
| HMIS | | | |
| Sub-Total Requested | | | |
| Admin (up to 7%) | | | |
| Total plus Admin Requested | | | |
| Sub-Total Cash Match | | | |
| Sub-total In-Kind Match | | | |
| TOTAL MATCH | | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET | | | |

Match requirements – 25% overall match of total grant minus Leasing costs. Matching funds must be used on eligible CoC program costs. NOTE: Program income, including client rent or occupancy charges, CANNOT be used as match.

VI. Performance

The tables below should be completed using both HMIS data and agency reported.

1. Complete the column for households expected to be served and number who will exit during the 2015 CoC grant term

| Households | 2014 Calendar Year HMIS Generated | 2014 Calendar Year Agency Reported | CoC 2015 Grant Year (Projected) |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Total Number of households | | | |
| Total Number of households who exited/will exit | | | |

| Data Element | 2014 Calendar Year HMIS Generated | 2014 Calendar Year Agency Reported | 2015 System Target |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Destination Permanent Housing | | | 47% |
| Housing Stability | | | 98% |
| Cash Income – Stayers | | | 70% |
| Non-Cash Benefits – Stayers | | | 73% |
| Return to Shelter | | | 17* |

2. Provide an explanation as well as specific steps that will be taken to improve your program's outcomes if your program has/is:
- a variance between the HMIS generated reports and the agency provided reports and what steps are being taken to assure HMIS data completeness and accuracy for 2016.
 - below the system target for our CoC

Complete and return electronically to Rich LaPlume
 Chair of the Rank and Review Committee
 rich.laplume@depaulusa.org by (August 12, 2015 by 12:00pm)

| | | HMIS # | Agency# | Comments |
|-----|---|--------|---------|----------|
| 1 | Leavers destination was Permanent Housing- Individuals who exited the program and moved into permanent housing 10 points for 56% or higher 5 points for 55% -47% zero for below 47% . | | | |
| 2 | Leavers income- Individuals who exited program have increased or maintained their income. 10 points for 76% or higher 5 points for 70% or less zero for below 69% | | | |
| 2A | Stays Income | | | |
| 3 | Leavers have increased Non-cash- Benefits- Individuals who exited the programs have obtained all possible benefits eligible for themselves. 83% or higher 10 pts. 82-80% 5pts. Below 80% zero. | | | |
| 3A | Stayers have increased Non-cash | | | |
| 4 | Stable housing 6+ months being housed 10 points for 95% or higher 5 points 94% or lower | | | |
| 5 | Has returned to shelter- Individuals who exit the programs have returned to shelter 10 points for 0-5% 5 points for 6-13% zero 13% and above. | | | |
| 6 | HMIS Data Performance- | | | |
| 7 | Active in COC- 10 points for 80% or greater in attendance at general meetings is a participant on the board or a committee. 5 points for less than 80% participation. Zero points if organization is not active on a committee. | | | |
| 8 | Utilization Rate/Occupancy- 10 points for 95% utilization 5 points for 90% Zero below 90% | | | |
| 9 | Organizational Strength- 10 points for 6 or more years of experience of key staff who administer the grant, 5 points for 5-2yrs, zero points for 1 or less. Key staff= Program director, case managers, intake workers | | | |
| 10 | Budget- 10 points for spending down 100%-95% HUD allotted dollars and meets match . 5 points 95%-90%-5pts. Below 90%-zero | | | |
| 10A | Budget leasing dollars percentage of leasing dollars left on the books | | | |
| 11 | Serves priority population 5pts | | | |
| 12 | Meets HEARTH requirements 5pts | | | |

| | HMIS # | Agency # | Comments |
|----|--------|----------|---|
| 1 | | | Leavers destination was Permanent Housing- Individuals who exited the program and moved into permanent housing 10 points for 66% or higher 5 points for 65% -60% zero for below 60% . |
| 2 | | | Leavers have income- Individuals who exited program have increased or maintained their income. 10 points for 66% or higher 5 points for 65% or less zero for below 60% |
| 3 | | | Leavers have Employment Income- Individuals who exit the programs have gained/maintained employment and earned income due to employment 10 points 44% or higher 5 points 43-40% zero below 40% |
| 4 | | | Leavers have Non-cash-HoH Benefits-Individuals who exit the programs have obtained all possible benefits eligible for themselves. 83% or higher 10 pts. 82-80% 5pts. Below 80% zero. |
| 5 | | | Has returned to shelter- Individuals who exit the programs have returned to shelter 10 points for 0-5% 5 points for 6-13% zero 13% and above. |
| 6 | | | Average Length of Stay in TH- for leavers 10 points for less than 290 days or less 5 points for greater than 291 days. |
| 7 | | | HMIS Data Performance- HMIS scoresheet method |
| 8 | | | Active in COC- 10 points for 80% or greater in attendance at general meetings is a participant on the board or a committee. 5 points for less than 80% participation. Zero points if organization is not active on a committee. |
| 9 | | | Utilization Rate/Occupancy- contracted beds 10 points for 95% utilization 5 points for 90% Zero below 90% |
| 10 | | | Organizational Strength- 10 points for 6 or more years of experience of key staff who administer the grant, 5 points for 5-2yrs, zero points for 1 or less. |
| 11 | | | Budget- 10 points for spending down 100%-95% HUD allotted dollars and meets match . 5 points 95%-85%-5pts. Below 85%-zero |
| 12 | | | Serves priority population 5pts |
| 13 | | | Meets HEARTH requirements 5pts |

Review and Ranking Proposal for the CoC application

| | | | Current | Proposed |
|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|------------------|
| DePaul - MORE | PH | 100 | 304,904 | 289,659 |
| Doorways - Maryland | PH | 92.6 | 678,586 | 644,657 |
| Doorways - Jumpstart | PH | 88.9 | 253,672 | 240,988 |
| DePaul - PLUS | PH | 85.2 | 425,599 | 404,319 |
| Doorways - Delmar | PH | 81.5 | 107,221 | 101,860 |
| St. Patrick Ctr- Project Protect | PH | 77.8 | 460,603 | 437,573 |
| DMH SZB Chronic | PH | 77.8 | 348,136 | 330,729 |
| Employment Connection | PH | 76 | 187,511 | 178,135 |
| Places for People | PH | 74.1 | 223,309 | 212,144 |
| DMH QoP SCL TRA | PH | 74.1 | 1,614,883 | 1,534,139 |
| DMH SPC SCQ | PH | 70.4 | 559,840 | 531,848 |
| DMH Chronic SYC TRA | PH | 70.4 | 412,364 | 391,746 |
| St. Patrick - Rosati | PH | 66.7 | 555,383 | 527,614 |
| DMH QoP SZC TRA | PH | 66.7 | 195,071 | 185,317 |
| DMH Chron. QoP Families SCS SRA | PH | 55.6 | 735,990 | 699,191 |
| Hope House | TH | 78.3 | 781,272 | 626,272 |
| Humanitri-Transitional | TH | 87 | 204,407 | 163,526 |
| YWCA | TH | 86 | 78,092 | 62,474 |
| Covenant House | TH | 69.7 | 266,430 | 213,144 |
| Queen of Peace | TH | 56.5 | 610,984 | 488,787 |
| St. Patrick's Employment | SSO | 73.3 | 310,526 | 248,413 |
| HMiS | HMiS | NEW | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| The Bridge | SSO | NEW | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| | | | | 8,762,535 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|-----|---------|------------------|
| Rapid ReHousing-St Patrick Ctr | PH | NEW | 857,781 | 857,781 |
| Rapid ReHousing-Gateway180 | PSH | NEW | 200,900 | 200,900 |
| New PSH Project-St. Patrick Ctr. | PSH | NEW | 488,400 | 488,400 |
| | | | | 1,547,081 |

ARD= 10,309,830

85% = 8,763,355

15%= 1,546,474

**Rank and Review Special Committee Meeting
October 5, 2015**

Attendees:

Bonnie Reece
Irene Agustin
Eddie Roth
Trudy Elder
Tina Patterson
Greg Vogleweid
Kim Anderson
Daniel Gray
Rich LaPlume
Char Pfeiffer
Melody Parkins
Steve Campbell
Kim Beck

Meeting called to order by Rich LaPlume: 10:38 am

Goal: Review new CoC project proposals

Greg Vogleweid and Steve Campbell are abstaining from scoring.

Coordinated Entry

Char Pfeiffer with The Bridge Outreach was asked to step out of the room because The Bridge has an application in this section.

Scores:

The Bridge Outreach – 71.4
Arch City Defenders – 63.2

Discussion:

Arch City Defender – experience in direct client work is only focused on individuals and families with legal issues, budget is staff heavy and high level staff is needed, they do not use the Vi-SPDAT as their assessment tool

The Bridge Outreach – consumers use The Bridge as a “front door,” experience with the Vi-SPDAT, concern that staffing and budget is too low

Rich LaPlume makes a motion: Rank & Review have selected The Bridge Outreach based on their overall score, knowledge and experience with the Vi-SPDAT. Rank & Review requests that The Bridge re-examine their staffing and budget.

Greg Vogleweid seconds.

Motion passes unanimously.

Permanent Supportive Housing

Steve Campbell with Peter & Paul Community Services (PPCS) was asked to step out of the room because PPCS has an application in this section.

Scores:

St. Patrick Center – 51.0

Peter & Paul Community Services – 50.3

Discussion:

PPCS – Status is in good standing with HUD after some issues were identified, request ask for staffing only and not adding any beds (this may hurt the competitiveness of the St. Louis City CoC application)

St. Patrick Center – this application will be able to absorb women from Shalom House

Rich LaPlume make a motion: Rank & Review have selected St. Patrick Center based on their overall score, add new permanent supportive housing beds to the continuum of care and fill the gap left by the Shalom House closure.

Motion passes unanimously.

Rapid Rehousing

Scores:

St. Patrick Center – 56.28

Gateway 180 – 55.29

Employment Connections – 54.85

Arch City Defenders – 46.00

Discussion:

| Organization | # HH served | \$ per HH | % to direct svcs |
|------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| St. Patrick Center | 75 | \$5791.89 | 63% |
| Gateway 180 | 40 | \$5022.50 | 55% |
| Employment Connections | 20 | \$5599.90 | 61% |
| Arch City Defenders | 660 served w/ legal services | | |

Arch City Defenders – their legal services are valuable; however, they do not have experience in housing, rank & review recommends they partner with St. Patrick Center

Rich LaPlume make a motion: Rank & Review have selected St. Patrick Center based on their overall score, long-standing reputation and amount of people they will serve with this funding.

Melody Perkins seconds.

Motion passes unanimously.

Proposed Ranking Scenario (see attached proposal)

All renewal projects will receive a cut. Permanent Supportive Housing will receive a 5% and Transitional Housing Program will receive a 20% across the board. With these cuts, the projects cannot change the amount of people served.

Tier 2 recommendations

1. St. Patrick Center Rapid Rehousing (partnership with Arch City Defenders - \$100,000): \$857,781
2. Gateway 180 Rapid Rehousing: \$200,900
3. St. Patrick Center Permanent Supportive Housing: \$488,400

Rich LaPlume make a motion: Rank & Review recommend proposed ranking scenario to the St. Louis City CoC Board of Directors.

Greg Vogleweid seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. Rich LaPlume proxy for Kim Beck and Melody Perkins.