

## 2015 HUD CoC Competition Evaluation Process Report

**167** Projects have been awarded HUD funding

**155** Were scored through the 2015 Evaluation Process


**12** Projects were not scored through the 2015 Evaluation Process

The Chicago CoC was Awarded

**\$59,601,053**

By HUD for FY14

### Total Submissions by Project Model



In February 2015, the Chicago Continuum of Care (CoC) completed the 2015 HUD CoC Competition Evaluation Process. All HUD-funded projects were required to complete the Evaluation Instrument, unless otherwise specified, in order to be eligible to apply for renewal funding. Of the 167 projects currently receiving HUD funding, 155 completed the evaluation. 12 projects were not evaluated for the following reasons:

- 8 Projects were not yet operational
- 4 Projects were exempt (CRS, HMIS (2), Planning)

All former Shelter Plus Care (SPC) projects participated in the evaluation process, regardless of renewal status, with 44 SPC projects scored.

### Instrument Format and Content

A subcommittee of the HUD McKinney-Vento Committee (HMC) is responsible for creating and regularly updating the Evaluation Instrument. The subcommittee met to review the Instrument in 2014 and made changes based on recommendations from the previous year. The 2015 Evaluation Instrument format maintained many of the elements of the previous year's Instrument, with a few minor changes:

- The HMIS section of the Agency Component was removed, with previous items now placed in the Checklist.
- Points were reduced for the HMIS section of the Project Component, with those points being moved to the Consumer Focus and Representation Section.
- Project performance was scored using HMIS data for CY2014, allowing all projects to be scored on the same timeframe and allowing for better alignment with HUD funding cycle timelines.
- A previously unscored question regarding Central Referral System (CRS) participation was scored this year, due to further emphasis on System Priorities.
- Project Performance and Consumer Outcomes questions for Permanent Housing with Short Term Supports (PHwSS) and Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects were adjusted slightly, in response to feedback from the previous year.

## Overall Agency and Project Scores

Final scores ranged from 94.38% as the highest score to 53.23% as the lowest. Based on the comparison to the right, the overall scores were distributed similarly to the previous year. The average overall score for 2015 is slightly higher than the previous year's average (<2% change).

Additionally, the median score and the standard deviation are similar to 2014. These factors indicate that the 2015 scores are broadly distributed across the scoring spectrum, and comparable to the previous year. This may be attributed to the fact that only minor changes were made to the Evaluation Instrument for 2015. However, there were four scores that fell below two standard deviations from the mean, compared to just two the previous year. This may be attributed to a slightly lower standard deviation and slightly higher average.

## Technical Assistance

In accordance with the policies set by the HMV Committee, projects falling below two standard deviations from the mean receive technical assistance from the Alliance. Two agencies received individualized technical

assistance, due to their scores falling more than two standard deviations from the mean in 2014. Both agencies worked with the Alliance to formulate a work plan and set goals for improvement. One project increased their score by 18.5%, while the other increased their score by 24.19%. Areas addressed through TA included match/leverage, performance outcomes, HMIS data quality, as well as consumer focus and representation.

## Scores by Project Model Type


The average evaluation scores varied amongst project model types. As the chart below illustrates, Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) and Permanent Housing for Youth (PH-Y) had the highest averages, both at 74.5%. PHwSS and SSO projects had the lowest averages with 68.16% and 64.21%, respectively. Former Shelter Plus Care (SPC) projects saw an average score increase of 4.32%, resulting in a higher average in 2015 overall. SSO Projects saw an average decrease of 16.65%, resulting in a significantly lower average in 2015, a decrease which is most likely attributed to the changes made to scoring criteria in this section. PSH and former SPC projects had the highest standard deviations, indicating a broader range of scores within these project types. Important to note is the number of projects represented by each project type. Some project models have significantly less projects on which the statistics are based. See chart below for more detail.

2015 Overall Agency and Project Scores		2014 Scores
Average	73.71%	72.67%
Median	74.50%	71.75%
Standard Deviation	9.33%	9.57%
Score < 2 Standard Deviations	55.04%	53.53%
Low Scores (scores below 2 standard deviations from the overall mean)	53.23%	52.69%
	53.50%	46.50%
	53.80%	
	54.00%	

Scores by Project Model	IH	PHwSS	PH Youth	PSH	SPC	SSO
Total Projects	9	12	6	82	44	2
2015 Average	71.38%	68.16%	74.58%	74.51%	72.98%	64.21%
Median	67.17%	66.50%	77.27%	75.25%	74.87%	64.21%
Standard Deviation	7.59%	7.87%	6.24%	9.42%	9.39%	0.53%
2 Standard Deviations Below the Average	56.20%	52.41%	62.09%	56.49%	54.20%	63.16%
Number of Projects Below Two Standard Deviations	0	0	0	2	2	0
Low Scores (below 2 standard deviations)	n/a	n/a	n/a	55.50% 54.00%	53.23% 53.80%	n/a

## Project Scores by Section

There was variation in the overall scores for each of the Project Component sections. The Leading Practices and HMIS sections, as in 2014, had the highest average scores of 93.58% and 96.37%, respectively. The Project Performance and Consumer Outcomes (PPCO) section had the lowest at 45.97%. See chart to the right for average section scores by Project Type, as well as the overall average for each section for all projects combined.



## Unscored Questions

Only one question, regarding Environmental Reviews, remained unscored in the Project Component, in addition to 30 questions included in the Certification Checklist. Out of the projects that submitted an Evaluation, 29% indicated that Environmental Reviews had not been completed for all of their projects, compared with 46% in 2014. One question that was previously unscored, but scored in 2015, related to project participation in the Central Referral System (CRS). Of those that are required to pull from the CRS for unit vacancies, 14% were not doing so, as confirmed by the CRS Managing Entity. There were no unscored questions included in the Agency Component of the evaluation, aside from the 23 questions included in the Certification Checklist. One question that was previously unscored related to consumer participation on the Agency's Board, was scored in 2015. Out of 48 agencies, 27% do not currently have a Board member who is currently housed in their project, who is experiencing homelessness, or previously experienced homelessness within the last ten years, compared with 31% the previous year.

**27%** of projects do not currently have a Board member who is currently housed in their project, experiencing homelessness, or who previously experienced homelessness within the last ten years.

## Preliminary Scores and Appeals Process

On March 11th, preliminary scores were sent to agencies, with instructions on how to appeal any of the agency's scores. Appeals were due to the Alliance on March 18th, with 135 appeals received. The Appeals Committee of the Interim Board of Directors reviewed the appeals and threshold waiver requests and were the final decision-making entity for all 2015 appeals. 26 Project Threshold Waiver Requests were submitted and the committee approved all. Of the 109 non-Threshold appeals submitted, 22 appeals (20%) were approved and 87 appeals (80%) were denied. There was a significant (47%) decrease in the number of appeals submitted in 2015. This can largely be attributed to the re-introduction of the Technical Deficiencies Policy, as well as intentional efforts to improve training around Evaluation submission through SurveyGizmo and scoring criteria, such as percentiles. For more information, please see the full [2015 Appeals Report](#).


## Impact of the Technical Deficiencies Policy

In 2015, the HMV Committee re-introduced the Technical Deficiencies Policy, utilized in previous Evaluation cycles, in response to the number of missing or incomplete attachments in the previous year and the subsequent impact on appeals. Through this policy, agencies were able to re-submit attachments found to be missing or incomplete with original submission, with 0.5 point deducted from their overall score per attachment. Ten projects were sent a Technical Deficiencies Notice for one or more attachments, with all but one being resolved.

**73%** Of agencies attended either the In-Person Beginner or Webinar Advanced Training prior to completing the Evaluation Instrument.

**29%** Reported that this was their first time completing the Evaluation.

### Completion Time



■ 8 hours (1 day)  
■ 16-24 hours (2-3 days)  
■ 32-40 hours (4-5 days)  
■ 41-56 hours (6-7 days)  
■ More than 7 Days

**100%** Of providers rated the expertise of Alliance staff as either Good or Excellent.

**95%** Of providers indicated that they received timely responses from Alliance staff either by phone or by email.

## 2015 Evaluation Process Feedback Survey

Following the release of final scores, agencies were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the Evaluation Process through an online survey. 24 agencies (49%), representing all project types, provided feedback; Their responses and recommendations are summarized below.

### Time Commitment and Workload

Half of all providers indicated spending 16-24 hours (2-3 days) per project completing the Evaluation Instrument. An additional 20% indicated spending 32-40 hours (4-5 days) per project. However, the percentage of providers who reported spending more than 7 days per project decreased by 5%. Overall, the amount of time spent completing the Evaluation Instrument was comparable to the previous year. Providers reported that the Project Performance and Consumer Outcomes section took the longest to complete (average of 5 hours), followed by the HMIS (3.8 hours) and Project Operations (3.6 hours) sections of the Project Component. Within the Agency Component, providers reported that the Additional Financial Review section took the longest to complete (average of 3 hours).

### Training and Technical Assistance

The Chicago Alliance held two trainings, one webinar (Advanced) and one in-person (Beginner). 50 providers attended the webinar session and 12 providers attended the in-person session, with 73% of agencies represented. Overall, there were positive responses to the TA provided. 100% of survey respondents utilized the All Chicago website to access additional resources, such as the Instruction Manual and Frequently Asked Questions document, both of which were rated highly, at over 85% Good or Excellent. In response to the concerns noted in the previous year, the Alliance provided additional clarity around scoring criteria, including percentiles and performance measurement, as well as offered monthly TA sessions through the Learning Center throughout 2015. Still, responses indicate that additional training may be needed around calculating performance and understanding or interpreting scores.

### Online Submission Format

There were overall positive responses to the online format through SurveyGizmo.com being utilized again for the 2015 process. Many noted that it was easy to use and presented no issues. However, providers also expressed that the ability to move across sections or more easily navigate between pages within the survey would be desirable. While there are minor limitations to utilizing SurveyGizmo.com, most providers felt the online survey was easier to use and allowed for more convenient submission than formats previously utilized.

## Ability of Evaluation to Assess Agency and Project—By Section



### Instrument Effectiveness and Structure

The Evaluation Instrument was seen as overall effective in accurately assessing an agency or project, with almost all sections receiving a majority rating of Good or Excellent. However, the Project Performance and the System Priorities sections were seen as needing improvement, with only 41% and 54% rating these sections as Good or Excellent, respectively. Providers indicated that further considerations should be made for projects that serve families and special populations, as well as small projects. Providers also felt that the use of percentiles did not allow for an accurate assessment of a project's performance and that alternate scoring criteria should be explored for future Evaluation processes.

### 2015 Site Visit Process

The Site Visit process was first introduced in the 2014 HUD CoC Competition Evaluation Process, in an effort to reduce the amount of documentation required to be submitted with the Evaluation Instrument in the past. Following the 2014 Evaluation process, a subcommittee of the HMV Committee worked to create a Site Visit process that aims to gain a more in-depth view of the day to day operations of the projects, but also to provide any needed technical assistance and support. The site visits are designed to look at all aspects of a project and will incorporate three components: a review of the Site Visit and Certification Checklists conducted by All Chicago staff, a peer interview with staff conducted by members of HMV, and a Consumer Engagement session conducted by members of the Lived Experience Commission.

Due to the brief timeline, the HMV Committee has selected six projects to participate in the "pilot" site visit process in 2015; three of the six are randomly selected, while the other three represent the lowest scoring projects from the 2015 Evaluation process. Site Visits are being conducted between May and October of this year.

While the Site Visit process does not currently have any bearing on Evaluation scores, aside from a follow-up question to the CES, the Evaluation subcommittee may be reviewing how this will be incorporated in the future. The subcommittee will also be soliciting feedback on the site visit process and will utilize this feedback to improve and fully implement a site visit process for 2016, with the anticipation of at least 10 visits being conducted throughout the year going forward.

# **Recommendations for the 2016 HUD CoC Competition Evaluation Process**

## **Overall Agency and Project Scores**

- Due to minimal changes being made in the Evaluation Instrument, resulting in comparable scores from 2014 to 2015, the HEARTH Funding Opportunities Task Group should consider utilizing two years of scores in the 2015 ranking process.
- Scoring criteria that allow for ranking among project types for performance should continue to be utilized in future Evaluation cycles to allow for the appropriate variance in scores. However, the Evaluation Subcommittee should explore options outside of percentiles to determine if these are the most appropriate criteria, particularly for program models that have fewer total projects.

## **Preliminary Scores and Appeals Process (Based on Appeals Committee Recommendations)**

- The Appeals process should better align with the structure and scopes outlined in the CoC Governance Charter. Additionally, the CoC Board of Directors should provide guidance to the Appeals Committee when reviewing Evaluation appeals in order to maintain continuity, consistency, and objectivity.
- The HCV Committee should provide recommendations for the Collaborative Applicant review stage of the Appeals process, in order to ensure the spirit and intention of the Instrument, as well as the scoring criteria, are maintained.

## **Time Commitment and Workload**

- The Instrument should be reviewed thoroughly for 2016 to minimize the number of redundant or unnecessary questions.

## **Training and Technical Assistance**

- Webinar and In-Person trainings should continue to be utilized, in order to respond to varying experience levels and learning styles.
- Additional trainings should be offered through the Learning Center that specifically address areas of deficiency in the Evaluation scores, such as Match and Leverage, Performance or Program Models, and System Priorities.
- Trainings should further emphasize scoring criteria and outline the specific expectations for each question and response.

## **Instrument Effectiveness and Structure**

- Review the Project Performance and Consumer Outcomes section to incorporate the newly revised Program Models Chart outcomes and benchmarks. Additionally, newly designated project types should be incorporated, such as Rapid Re-housing.
- The full Evaluation Instrument should be reviewed to ensure it reflects current HUD and CoC priorities, such as ending Veteran and Chronic Homelessness.
- All scoring criteria should be reviewed to ensure fairness and consistency are maintained throughout the Instrument.