



Instruction Manual  
2022 Local Evaluation Instrument  
Due on May 2, 2022

# **2022 CoC Competition Local Evaluation Instrument**

--

**Instrument & Instruction Manual**

For all HUD CoC-Funded projects in  
the Chicago Continuum of Care



# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

## Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Assistance</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Overview of the Evaluation Process</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Who Participates in the Evaluation Process?</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>How to Submit for Consolidated Projects</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Timeline</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Deadline and Submission Requirements</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Alchemer Tips</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Scoring</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>Ranking</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>Appeals</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>What's New</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>LEI</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>LEI Detailed Instructions</b> .....	<b>17</b>
CoC Participation Section .....	17
Grant Management Section .....	17
Persons of Lived Experience Input Section .....	18
Project Performance Section .....	23
<b>Appendix</b> .....	<b>36</b>



# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

## Introduction

The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provides annual funding for Continuum of Care (CoC) programs that provide housing and services for people experiencing homelessness. The CoC program is designed to quickly rehouse people experiencing homelessness, minimize trauma and dislocation caused by homelessness, and promote access to mainstream programs and services.

The Chicago CoC Board of Directors is the group of community stakeholders that sets local priorities for HUD CoC funding. The Chicago CoC Board has designated All Chicago to act as the Collaborative Applicant. In this role, All Chicago is responsible for developing a review process for prioritizing and ranking renewal projects for CoC funding. All Chicago develops the Local Evaluation Instrument (LEI) with community input, and the results may be incorporated into the project ranking list and used to make funding reallocation decisions at the local level. The LEI is designed to quantify the performance of each project and measure the degree to which the project improves Chicago's system performance.

In addition to submitting an LEI, all projects must submit a HUD renewal application after the annual Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) is released by HUD. HUD makes final funding determinations. Please note that renewal funding is not guaranteed upon submission of the LEI. For information on how renewal funding is assessed based on LEI scores, see the [Ranking Process](#) section.

Applications for new (not renewal) funding involve a different application process. Please contact All Chicago at [CoCPrograms@allchicago.org](mailto:CoCPrograms@allchicago.org) for information on the new project application and selection process.



# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

## Assistance

### *Resources*

Please visit the following online resources:

- LEI information: <https://allchicago.org/continuum-of-care/coc-programs/>
- Frequently Asked Questions: [Join the Chicago CoC Slack Channel](#) (This is where updated FAQs are posted; go to the provider questions channel.)
- HMIS Helpdesk: <https://hmis.allchicago.org>

### *LEI Training*

All Chicago provides a virtual training with an overview of the LEI. The training will cover the LEI questions, timeline, submission form, and appeals process. Please register for the training in advance. The session will be recorded and posted in All Chicago's [Online Learning Portal](#). If you have any questions regarding these trainings, please contact the CoC Program team at [CoCprograms@allchicago.org](mailto:CoCprograms@allchicago.org).

- What: LEI Training
- When: April 6, 2022, 9:30-11:00 am
- Where: GoToWebinar platform
- Register: <https://allchicago.talentlms.com/catalog/info/id:545>

### *HMIS Tickets & Webinar*

Submit questions about HMIS data to [helpdesk@allchicago.org](mailto:helpdesk@allchicago.org). All Chicago has scheduled a webinar mid-way through the LEI submission period to provide additional support after Agency Technical Administrators (ATAs) have had a chance to begin reviewing data and sending questions to the helpdesk. The webinar will: 1) Announce and explain any significant changes in the report logic due to any discovered errors, 2) Provide everyone with the opportunity to hear answers to frequently asked questions about the performance data reports. Register [here](#) for the webinar on April 18, 9:30-11:00.

### *Alchemer Technical Assistance*

All Chicago provides technical assistance regarding the use of Alchemer (formerly SurveyGizmo). Within the Alchemer Technical Assistance Course, you can find information about navigating through Alchemer, utilizing the "save and continue" feature, uploading files, and other tips and tricks.

- What: Alchemer Technical Assistance (slides you can view at your own pace, any time)
- Where: <https://allchicago.talentlms.com/learner/courseinfo/id:510>

### *All Chicago Program Staff Support*

All Chicago program staff are available to respond to questions and provide technical assistance. Agencies are encouraged to consult the Instruction Manual and FAQs prior to contacting All Chicago.



# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

- Email: [CoCprograms@allchicago.org](mailto:CoCprograms@allchicago.org)
- Phone: Jennifer Fabbrini (872-291-1263) or Ted Barzev (872-291-1274)
- Business hours: 9am to 5pm, Monday through Friday. Please allow 24-48 hours for a response.



# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

## Overview of the Evaluation Process

There are two required steps in the Chicago CoC's locally developed review process for renewal projects: 1) Intent to Renew (ITR), and 2) Local Evaluation Instrument (LEI). The ITR step is designed to minimize risk to the Chicago CoC by reviewing compliance with HUD requirements and verifying whether local priorities and thresholds are being met. The LEI step is designed to quantify the performance of each project and measure the degree to which the project improves Chicago's system performance.

## Who Participates in the Evaluation Process?

### *Required to participate in the Intent to Renew*

All projects with HUD CoC Funding that were in operation for any length of time between 1/1/21 and 12/31/21, including system level coordination projects such as Coordinated Entry, HMIS lead, or the planning grant.

### *Required to participate in Local Evaluation Instrument*

All projects with HUD CoC Funding that meet all the criteria listed below.

- HUD program model is PSH, RRH, TH, Joint TH-RRH, SH or SSO
- The project is not a system level coordination project such as Coordinated Entry, HMIS lead, or the planning grant
- If the project began operation in 2021, the project served clients for a minimum of six months during the period between 1/1/21 and 12/31/21
- The project declared an intention to renew the grant in the Intent to Renew submission
- The project is included in the final 2022 Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW)

## How to Submit for Consolidated Projects

If your agency consolidated two or more projects into one project with HUD approval and the grant that ended in 2021 was the consolidated grant, then complete the LEI for the consolidated project. Consolidated projects will be scored on all questions including the grant management question. If the consolidation is upcoming or has not yet completed one year as a combined project, then complete the LEI for the separate projects.



# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

## Timeline

Step	Date
LEI opens	April 4
Training webinar	April 6
LEI submission deadline	May 2
Preliminary reports released	June 1
Deadline to submit a Level 1 appeal to All Chicago for scoring remedy	June 8
All Chicago responds to scoring remedies	June 15
Deadline to Appeal to Level 2 LEI Appeals Panel	June 21
LEI Appeals Panel responds to appeals	June 28
Final reports released	July 1

## Deadline and Submission Requirements

**Where to submit:** Agencies submit the LEI online via Alchemer (formerly SurveyGizmo) -- to submit the LEI, please click [here](#). Each agency only needs to submit one LEI covering all project-level and agency-level information. There is not a separate link for agency and project components.

**Deadline:** **All submissions are due by 4:00pm (CST) on May 2, 2022.** It is highly recommended to submit as early as possible before the deadline to allow enough time to address any technical difficulties that may arise in submitting evaluations. Please check all responses and open all attachments to ensure accuracy prior to submission.

**Authorized Representative:** Only an authorized representative should submit the LEI for your agency. An authorized representative should be a senior-level staff member in the organization who is authorized to enter into contractual agreements. Typically, this is the CEO or Executive Director, though at large agencies it may be another senior-level staff member. This representative will check the box to certify the submission and “sign” electronically by typing their name and title to authorize the submission.

**Missing or Late Submissions:** Projects that submit a LEI after the deadline – May 2, 2022 - will automatically receive a deduction of 10% off the final score per project. Projects that do not submit a LEI at all may have their funding reallocated by the CoC Board. Agencies/projects may file an appeal with supporting documentation regarding their late submission or lack of submission. All Chicago will make a determination on the appeal. If necessary, further appeals may be submitted in accordance with the appeals process.



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

**Multiple Submissions:** If you already submitted the LEI and need to make corrections prior to the deadline, you may email [CoCprograms@allchicago.org](mailto:CoCprograms@allchicago.org) and request a link that you can use for the purpose. If this type of request is made within 48 hours of the deadline, All Chicago does not guarantee a response. If an agency submits two or more complete LEIs, the last submission will be considered final unless the agency notifies All Chicago in writing via email.

**Technical Assistance:** Preliminary and final reports will include feedback from the ITR and scores from the LEI. Technical assistance opportunities will be provided according to identified needs. Low scoring projects may receive a monitoring review and/or technical assistance. Low scores for multiple years may be considered for involuntary funding reallocation by the CoC Board.

**Technical Deficiencies Policy regarding blank or incomplete answers:** All Chicago will not reach out to agencies to correct technical deficiencies. A blank or incomplete answer on a question in the LEI will result in a loss of points for that question. Ensure that all parts of a question, including narrative and explanation fields, tables, etc. are completed. For a question that pertains to project-level information, submit information for every project at the agency.

## Alchemer Tips

The survey software used by All Chicago is Alchemer (formerly SurveyGizmo). We recommend using **Firefox** or **Google Chrome** as your browser when working with Alchemer.

**Save and Continue Feature:** You should see a black bar running across the top of the page. On the right-hand side, inside the black bar, there is text that reads "Save and Continue later." Click here and enter your email to receive a unique link to your LEI form. You can use this link to reopen and continue your LEI at any time before submission. You will only need to do this once and can use the same link each time you go back to work on the LEI in Alchemer.

Keep the email that you receive containing the link. If you do not see the email, check your junk mail folder. Sometimes there is a delay of a few hours in receiving the email. The email will be from 'noreply@alchemer.com.' Check your email to ensure you have received the link before navigating away from your LEI form.

Your responses will **save** whenever you navigate between pages by clicking 'Back' or 'Next.' **NOTE:** If you complete a page and close the LEI before clicking on 'Next,' the work you did on that page will not be saved.

**Required Questions:** All Chicago has not enacted the required question feature for any questions in this year's LEI. By doing this, it is easy for you to skip ahead and navigate backwards and forwards through the form. Even though the required question feature is not enacted, it is still necessary for you to provide an answer to every question that applies to your agency/project(s). Please ensure that you complete all blank fields. An 'N/A' option has been provided if there are cases in which that is an acceptable response.





# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

## Scoring

All questions in the LEI are indicated as one of the following:

- *Scored:* Points are allocated based on the scoring criteria noted for each question. See the detailed instructions in this manual that explain the scoring criteria for every question.
- *Informational:* These questions are used only for informational purposes and will not contribute to the project’s overall score. Informational questions may appear as scored questions in future LEIs.

### *Weighted Scoring*

The LEI uses a weighted scoring approach which means that each section is given a specific value or weight. These values will be provided to sections for all projects regardless of how many points are possible or earned in the section.

<b><u>Section:</u></b>	<b><u>Weight</u></b>
CoC Participation	2%
Grant Management	7%
Persons of Lived Experience Input	29%
Project Performance	62%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

### *Example of weighted scoring:*

Project X earns 0/1 point for CoC Participation, 4/4 points for Grant Management, 7/14 points for Persons of Lived Experience Input, and 80/100 points for Project Performance. The weighted score is calculated by multiplying the earned score for the section by the section weight, and then adding these together.

CoC Participation :  $0/1 = 0 \times .02 = 0$  (earned score is 0, weight is .02)

Grant Management :  $4/4 = 1 \times .07 = .07$  (earned score is 1, weight is .07)

Persons of Lived Experience Input:  $7/14 = .50 \times .29 = .145$  (earned score is .5, weight is .29)

Project Performance:  $80/100 = .80 \times .62 = .496$  (earned score is .80, weight is .62)

Total score =  $.145 + .07 + 0 + .496 = .711 \times 100 = 71.1\%$

## Ranking

The CoC Board (and relevant committees or work groups) will establish the 2022 Ranking Policies upon release of the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) from HUD. LEI scores are one of many factors considered when determining the Ranking Policies. A copy of these policies will be distributed when they are approved and projects will be notified of their ranking status.



# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

## Appeals

All Chicago will review and score the LEI submissions in accordance with the LEI Instruction Manual's policies and procedures. A preliminary report containing LEI scores will be sent to agencies. The Appeals Policy and instructions will be included in the email containing the preliminary report. After reviewing the scores, agencies may appeal their scores in accordance with the Appeals Process outlined in the [Local Evaluation Appeal Change Memo \(January 2022\)](#). This Appeals Process is a continuation of the pilot in 2021, and it differs from the process outlined in the CoC charter.

New attachments or supporting documentation will not be considered during the Appeals Process, unless specifically requested by All Chicago staff. Agencies may submit an appeal for the following reasons: data was not pulled correctly or All Chicago incorrectly followed the scoring instructions detailed in this Instruction Manual. As in past years, All Chicago collects community feedback when developing the LEI, and therefore philosophical disagreements and question wording will not be grounds for appeals. Agencies wishing to express their disagreement about questions based on philosophy or wording are encouraged to do so at a meeting or in writing to the Collaborative Applicant Committee (CAC).

The role of All Chicago in reviewing appeals is to ensure scoring or data errors are identified and corrected, so that agency scores are not negatively impacted. All Chicago calculates scores based on this Instruction Manual's policies and procedures.

The role of the LEI Appeals Panel in reviewing appeals is to ensure that appeal denials issued by All Chicago follow this LEI Instruction Manual policies and procedures. This is the final opportunity to appeal. All decisions by the LEI Appeals Panel are final.

To submit an appeal, follow each step below in consecutive order. Agencies may not skip any step in the process listed below. Failure to complete a step will result in an automatic denial of the appeal.

### **Appeals Steps**

**Step 1:** Agencies wishing to appeal must begin by remedying scoring issues with All Chicago (Collaborative Applicant). This must be done by sending an email to [CoCprograms@allchicago.org](mailto:CoCprograms@allchicago.org) by the deadline of **June 8**. In the email, explain the scoring issue (such as data that was not pulled correctly or incorrect scoring according to the Instruction Manual) you have identified. Please include which question and which project(s) it applies to. Submit a separate email for each question you are appealing.

**Step 2:** Following receipt of remediation decisions from All Chicago by June 15, agencies may appeal to the LEI Appeals Panel utilizing the [2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Appeal Form](#) by June 21. The appeal must be submitted via this form.



# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

**Step 3:** Agencies will receive a response to their appeals by July 1 with the final reports. Decisions made by the LEI Appeals Panel are final.

<b>Appeals Step</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Preliminary scorecards released	June 1
Deadline to submit a Level 1 appeal to All Chicago for scoring remedy	June 8
All Chicago responds to scoring remedies	June 15
Deadline to Appeal to Level 2: LEI Appeals Panel	June 21
LEI Appeals Panel responds to appeals	June 28
Final scorecards released	July 1



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

## What's New

### 1. **Project Performance:**

- Some of the data metrics will be pulled from the APR. The reasons for this include:
  - i. Align with how HUD measures a data element
  - ii. Mirror the approach of many other communities and the approach suggested in the [Sample HUD Rating and Ranking Tool](#) (an optional tool that can be used by CoCs to evaluate project performance)
  - iii. Providers must submit APRs to HUD anyway and this can aid in preparing data for the submission
- To bring the instrument into more alignment with System Performance Measures and previous NOFO priorities the following changes were made:
  - i. Eliminated the question about non-cash benefits
  - ii. Changed the income question from “maintain and increase” to “increase”
  - iii. Added new metrics related to cost effectiveness, racial equity and serving high need populations (these will be informational in the first year).
- To address challenges that are particular to our community/system, the following changes were made:
  - i. Added a new metric to measure the number/category of rematch requests (informational in first year)
  - ii. Added the need status timeliness metric which is in the EHI Accountability Plan (scored)
- To support transparency and understanding of the purpose behind decisions, there is a rationale for each metric. Rationales may include aligning with the System Performance Measures, the [Sample HUD Rating and Ranking Tool](#) (an optional tool that can be used by CoCs to evaluate project performance), the community standards or with a local community/system challenge.
- It is anticipated that the pandemic may have impacted performance outcomes. Therefore, All Chicago will analyze the data received through this process before finalizing the scoring scales used to determine the level of performance that earns full, partial or zero points. All Chicago will host a community presentation to provide transparency about the methods used to make these decisions.

2. **Persons of Lived Experience Input:** The Lived Experience Commission (LEC) shared with All Chicago their perspective about the aspects that should have priority focus within this section. All Chicago made changes to incorporate this feedback. All Chicago also responded to community feedback that the questions in this section were subjective and lacked clear scoring guidelines by adding objective questions (instead of narrative ones) where possible and by providing more detailed scoring criteria and instructions.

3. **Grant Management:** For projects that spent less than 95% of funds, the decision to voluntarily reallocate remains an option to offset the number of points deducted. However, voluntary reallocation amounts are no longer based on the 3-year history of underspending. The [involuntary reallocation process](#) is used to correct for 3-year chronic underspending patterns.



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

## LEI

Each question in the LEI is listed below. Important: see the [detailed instructions](#) (next section of this instruction manual) for guidance and scoring criteria.

### *CoC Participation (section weight: 2%)*

1. Determination of whether the agency is a member of the CoC in good standing. (1 point)

### *Grant Management (section weight: 7%)*

1. Measurement of the percentage of funds the project spent for the grant year that was completed in 2021. (4 points)

If the project did **not** spend 100% of funds for the grant year that was completed in 2021:

- a. Explain the reason the project did not expend 100% of the funds.
- b. Is the project willing to reallocate funds in 2022? If yes, please indicate the amount.

### *Persons of Lived Experience Input (section weight: 29%)*

1. Which of the following did the agency use to seek input from participants at least once in 2021? (Check all that apply. Upload a copy of the survey if selected.) (3 points)
  - a. Survey
  - b. Advisory council
  - c. Townhalls, community/resident meeting
  - d. Representative with lived experience on the Board of Directors
  - e. Suggestion box
  - f. Other method of actively seeking input (specify):
2. Describe the intentional steps the agency has taken to ensure there is at least one method for participants to provide feedback completely anonymously. (2 points)
3. Describe how the agency (in calendar year 2021) involved current or former program participants, or other people with lived experience of homelessness, in planning or performing program operations and/or providing services through employment or volunteer roles (beyond having a board member of lived experience)? (2 points)
4. Does the agency include one or more people of lived experience on its Board of Directors or other policy making entity? (Check all that apply.) (2 points)
  - a. Person/people of lived experience on the Board of Directors
  - b. Person/people of lived experience on other policy-making entity (specify):
  - c. None
5. Describe one example within the last year (Jan 1, 2021 – Dec 31, 2021) of a change made to a program, process or policy that resulted from direct input provided by a program participant(s) or Board member(s) of lived experience. Please describe the most impactful example of a change during the 2021 calendar year. Please address each of the sub-questions below. (5 points)
  - a. Describe what change was implemented as a direct result of input.
  - b. When did this example take place?
  - c. Detail the method used to actively collect the input that gave rise to this change.
  - d. Detail the steps taken to review and consider the input among agency staff, decision making entity or Board.



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

- e. List all ways the program or policy change was communicated to program participants.
6. If your agency has one or more board members of lived experience, how does it support them (or decrease any barriers they may experience) to fully participate in all board activities? (informational)
7. If your agency currently doesn't have any board members of lived experience on its board, please explain why? (Informational)

#### *Project Performance (section weight: 62%)*

Listed by program model type. There are 19 questions in total and each program model type has a different set of questions that are applicable. Therefore, if a number is skipped in the list below it is because the question is not applicable to the program model type. The questions are listed out in chart format and additional guidance provided in the [detailed instructions](#). The "Project Performance Metrics Chart" in the [detailed instructions](#) indicates situations in which projects are exempted from a scored question. The [detailed instructions](#) also includes the logic used to calculate these metrics.

#### **Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)**

1. Coordinated Entry participation – 12 points
2. Coordinated Entry rematches (informational)
3. Need status timeliness – 6 points
5. Time from match to housing – 6 points
7. Increase in earned or non-employment income (i.e., any income) for stayers - 3 points
8. Increase in earned or non-employment income (i.e., any income) for leavers - 3 points
9. Health insurance - 23 points
10. Exit to permanent housing - 12 points
11. Remain in or exit to permanent housing - 23 points
13. Racial equity (informational)
14. Serve high need populations – chronic homelessness (informational)
15. Serve high need populations – zero income (informational)
16. Serve high need populations – more than one disability (informational)
17. Serve high need populations – place not meant for habitation (informational)
18. Unit utilization - 12 points
19. Cost effectiveness (informational)

#### **Rapid Rehousing (RRH)**

1. Coordinated Entry participation - 13 points
2. Coordinated Entry rematches (informational)
3. Need status timeliness - 6 points
5. Time from match to housing - 6 points
7. Increase in earned or non-employment income (i.e., any income) for stayers - 11 points
8. Increase in earned or non-employment income (i.e., any income) for leavers - 11 points
9. Health insurance - 13 points
10. Exit to permanent housing - 22 points
11. Remain in or exit to permanent housing (informational)
12. Returns to homelessness - 6 points
13. Racial equity (informational)
14. Serve high need populations – chronic homelessness (informational)



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

15. Serve high need populations – zero income (informational)
16. Serve high need populations – more than one disability (informational)
17. Serve high need populations – place not meant for habitation (informational)
18. Unit utilization - *12 points*
19. Cost effectiveness (informational)

#### **Transitional Housing (TH)**

In 2021, there were two types of TH projects – those that take matches from Coordinated Entry (CE) and those formerly categorized as interim that do not take matches from CE. The projects that take matches from CE are evaluated on questions 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19. The projects that do not take matches from CE are evaluated on questions 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19. For both groups, the set of scored questions adds up to 100 points.

1. Coordinated Entry participation - *24 points*
2. Coordinated Entry rematches (informational)
3. Need status timeliness - *7 points*
4. Assessments - *31 points*
6. Time from entry to exit to permanent housing (informational)
7. Increase in earned or non-employment income (i.e., any income) for stayers - *12 points*
8. Increase in earned or non-employment income (i.e., any income) for leavers - *12 points*
9. Health insurance - *14 points*
10. Exit to permanent housing - *24 points*
11. Remain in or exit to permanent housing (informational)
13. Racial equity (informational)
14. Serve high need populations – chronic homelessness (informational)
15. Serve high need populations – zero income (informational)
16. Serve high need populations – more than one disability (informational)
17. Serve high need populations – place not meant for habitation (informational)
18. Unit utilization - *7 points*
19. Cost effectiveness (informational)

#### **Joint Transitional Housing – Rapid Rehousing (Joint TH-RRH)**

This model type is set up in HMIS as two separate projects. The TH project will be evaluated on the set of TH questions listed above that apply to projects that take matches from Coordinated Entry. The RRH project will be evaluated on the set of RRH questions listed above. To combine the two scores into one joint score, All Chicago will review the number of TH units and RRH units listed on the project's 2021 NOFO renewal application and use the formula below to calculate the score:

Combined score = (#TH units / # Total units) x TH project score + (#RRH units / # Total units) x RRH project score.

#### **Supportive Services Only (SSO)**

1. Assessments - *70 points*
7. Increase in earned or non-employment income (i.e., any income) for stayers - *5 points*
8. Increase in earned or non-employment income (i.e., any income) for leavers - *5 points*
9. Health insurance - *10 points*
10. Exit to permanent housing - *10 points*
13. Racial equity (informational)
14. Serve high need populations – chronic homelessness (informational)
15. Serve high need populations – zero income (informational)





## Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

16. Serve high need populations – more than one disability (informational)
17. Serve high need populations – place not meant for habitation (informational)
19. Cost effectiveness (informational)

### **Safe Haven (SH)**

1. Coordinated Entry participation - *14 points*
2. Coordinated Entry rematches (informational)
3. Need status timeliness - *8 points*
7. Increase in earned or non-employment income (i.e., any income) for stayers - *4 points*
8. Increase in earned or non-employment income (i.e., any income) for leavers - *4 points*
9. Health insurance - *24 points*
10. Exit to permanent housing - *8 points*
11. Remain in or exit to permanent housing - *24 points*
13. Racial equity (informational)
14. Serve high need populations – chronic homelessness (informational)
15. Serve high need populations – zero income (informational)
16. Serve high need populations – more than one disability (informational)
17. Serve high need populations – place not meant for habitation (informational)
18. Unit utilization - *14 points*
19. Cost effectiveness (informational)





# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

## LEI Detailed Instructions

This section provides details related to each section and question in the LEI. It is recommended for agencies to carefully review everything in this section.

### CoC Participation Section

**Question #1.** Determination of whether the agency is a member of the CoC in good standing.

**Question Type/Method:** All Chicago Verification. Agencies do not need to submit anything because All Chicago will access this information from the CoC membership database.

**Agency or Project Question:** This is an agency-level question.

**Guidance:** Agencies that paid 2022 dues by April 4, 2022 are considered members of the CoC in good standing. All Chicago maintains this information in the CoC membership database. Therefore, agencies do not need to submit an answer to this question. All Chicago will pull the list of member agencies that have paid 2022 dues to verify and score this question.

**Scoring:** This question is worth 1 point. Agencies that are members of the CoC in good standing will receive 1 point and agencies that are not members will receive 0 points. The points for this question will be applied to all projects at the agency.

### Grant Management Section

**Question #1:** Measurement of the percentage of funds the project spent for the grant year completed in 2021. Please answer the following set of questions for each project at your agency that did **not** spend 100% of funds for the grant year that was completed in 2021:

- a. Explain the reason the project did not expend 100% of the funds.
- b. Is the project willing to reallocate funds in 2022? If yes, please indicate the amount.

**Question Type/Method:** All Chicago Verification **and** Project Narrative. Projects do not need to submit the percentage of funds spent because this will be calculated by All Chicago based on data provided by HUD. Projects need to submit a narrative to explain unspent funds (if applicable).

**Agency or Project Question:** This is a project-level question.

**Projects exempt from this question:** Projects that were new or transferred in 2021.

**Guidance:** All projects should make efforts to spend down 100% of grant funds and should, if needed, adjust their budget and contact local HUD throughout the year, to avoid recapture of funds. All Chicago will receive data from HUD about each project's expenditures and will calculate the percentage of funds spent. Therefore, agencies do not need to submit the expenditure percentage to All Chicago. However, if a project did not spend 100% of its funds, Questions #1a-1b need to be



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

completed. If agencies have multiple projects that did not spend 100% of funds, they need to answer Questions #1a-1b multiple times. Skip this question for any project that has spent 100% of funds or for any project that is exempt from this question.

*Involuntary reallocation:* Chicago's Involuntary Reallocation Policy evaluates the 3-year spending pattern of every project. Projects subject to involuntary reallocation are **not** eligible to receive points in the Local Evaluation Instrument for voluntary reallocation.

*Voluntary reallocation:*

All Chicago will use the following process to give agencies the opportunity to voluntarily reallocate funds to the CoC: While completing the LEI, agencies will be asked whether they are willing to reallocate funds. In the preliminary report, this decision will not have been verified yet so points will not reflect this. All Chicago will reach out to projects and those that commit to voluntarily reallocate funds by signing a commitment form will receive points for this question in the final report, according to the formula described below.

**Scoring:** Projects spending >98% of funds will be eligible for four (4) points. Projects will be eligible for three (3) points if 95-97.9% of funds were expended. Projects that spent less than 95% of funds must analyze whether the funds are still needed to operate the project. If the project can maintain operations with fewer funds, voluntary reallocation is encouraged, and this will increase the score received.

- Projects that expended 90-94.9% of funds will receive zero (0) points if no voluntary reallocation takes place and two (2) points if a voluntary reallocation commitment is made according to this formula: Amount spent in this grant year + Amount voluntarily reallocated  $\geq$  95% of grant total.
- Projects that expended less than 90% of funds will receive -2 points if no voluntary reallocation takes place and zero (0) points if a voluntary reallocation commitment is made according to this formula: Amount spent in this grant year + Amount voluntarily reallocated  $\geq$  95% of grant total.

## Persons of Lived Experience Input Section

All Persons of Lived Experience input questions are agency-level questions. The score an agency receives on this section will be applied to each of the agency's project scores.

**Question #1:** Which of the following did the agency use to seek input from participants **at least once in 2021?** (Check all that apply.)

- Survey
- Advisory council
- Townhalls, community/resident meeting
- Representative with lived experience on the Board of Directors
- Suggestion box
- Other method of actively seeking input (specify):



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

If a survey is selected, you must also upload a blank copy of the survey used. If your agency is selected for CoC Monitoring in 2022, you may be asked to provide evidence of your response to this question. For example, if the agency indicates a survey was administered, All Chicago may ask to see the results. If the agency indicates a townhall occurred, All Chicago may ask for attendance sheets, meeting notes, or other documentation.

**Question Type/Method:** Checkbox and attachment upload.

**Agency or Project Question:** This is an agency-level question.

**Guidance:** It is the priority of the Chicago CoC Board to ensure that all services reflect the expressed needs of persons who are experiencing homelessness. The CoC Board believes that when participants are provided opportunities to contribute experiences and expertise related to the assistance and services that they need, projects and the Continuum are strengthened.

**Scoring:** There are a total of three (3) points possible for this question. One (1) point will be awarded if the agency uses a survey to seek input and uploads a copy. Up to two (2) additional points will be awarded if the agency uses any of the remaining five options to seek input (1 point for each additional selection up to 2 additional selections).

**Question #2:** Describe the intentional steps the agency has taken to ensure there is at least one method for participants to provide feedback completely anonymously.

**Question Type/Method:** Narrative (maximum of 300 words).

**Agency or Project Question:** This is an agency-level question.

**Guidance:** Anticipation of consequences can prevent program participants from providing input. Therefore, it is important for agencies to offer participants the ability to remain anonymous. Not every method of collecting input may be well suited to offer anonymity. The method described here can be one that was selected in Question 1.

**Scoring:** This question is worth two (2) points. Maximum points will be awarded for a complete description of a method of seeking input that shows reasonable effort is taken to fully prevent staff from linking feedback to participants. The rubric below identifies the methodology for determining the difference between full, partial, or zero points.

- **Maximum points (2)** – There is (to the maximum extent possible) no way to link feedback to a participant.  
Example: Survey is submitted anonymously without staff seeing who submitted the survey; survey doesn't include any way to identify who submitted it (i.e., name, address), such as providing a self-addressed and postage paid envelope; suggestion box is out of staff's sight.
- **Some points (1)** – Some steps are taken to ensure anonymity, but the process isn't completely anonymous.



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

Example: Intern administering the survey; exit survey is used to seek input.

- **No points** – No evidence of effort to ensure anonymity.

**Question #3:** Describe how the agency (in calendar year 2021) involved current or former program participants, or other people with lived experience of homelessness, in planning or performing program operations and/or providing services through employment or volunteer roles (beyond having a board member of lived experience)?

- Check this box if the example you are describing took place in 2021.

**Question Type/Method:** Checkbox and narrative (maximum of 300 words).

**Agency or Project Question:** This is an agency-level question.

**Guidance:** Ensure the response addresses activities that support program operations or services. Provide detail to help the reviewer understand specifically what this work looks like at your agency. Providing an example of a person participating on the Board of Directors will not earn any points. A person may have been hired or begun their involvement prior to 2021, but the narrative needs to describe involvement that took place during 2021. Use the check box to verify if the example took place in 2021.

**Scoring:** This question is worth two (2) points. The rubric below identifies the methodology for determining the difference between full, partial, or zero points.

- **Maximum points (2)** – Current or former participants or persons of lived experience contribute to planning core agency operations or providing core services through employment or structured, continuous volunteer service.  
Examples: Former participant has a role providing services to current participants; former participant is hired as a case manager or program coordinator delivering services to current participants; a person of lived experience is hired or currently employed by the agency on a continuous (not one time) basis; current participant contributes to program planning on an ongoing basis in a structured role, such as being a peer mentor.
- **Some points (1)** – Agency provides one-time or unstructured opportunities for participants to contribute to agency operations or in providing services. The activities performed may not allow staff/participant to influence the planning or delivery of core services. The opportunities although structured and on-going may not involve core programs and services.  
Example: Agency involves participants in communal gardening; agency involves participants in planning and hosting a holiday party.
- **No points** – Agency doesn't provide any opportunities for current or former participants and other people of lived experience to participate in agency planning or operations.

**Question #4:** Does the agency include one or more people of lived experience on its Board of Directors or other policy making entity?

Check all that apply:

- Person/people of lived experience on the **Board of Directors**



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

- Person/people of lived experience on **other policy-making entity (specify):**
- None

**Question Type/Method:** Checkbox

**Agency or Project Question:** This is an agency-level question.

**Guidance:** Both options (Board of Directors and other policy-making entity) fulfill the minimum HUD requirement. However, Board participation is prioritized locally and is therefore awarded maximum points. There is no requirement for how recently a board member(s) have experience of homelessness.

**Scoring:** There are a total of two (2) points possible for this question. Two (2) points will be awarded if the agency has a person of lived experience on the Board of Directors. One (1) point will be awarded if the agency has a person of lived experience on a policy-making entity and not on the Board of Directors. Zero (0) points will be earned if the agency has neither. To be clear, extra points are not awarded for selecting Board of Directors *and* other policymaking entity, but both answers may be selected if this is the case at your agency.

**Question #5:** Describe **one example within the last year** (Jan 1, 2021 – Dec 31, 2021) of a change made to a program, process or policy that resulted from direct input provided by a program participant(s) or Board member(s) of lived experience. *Please describe the most impactful example of a change during the 2021 calendar year. Please address each of the sub-questions below.*

- a) Describe what change was implemented as a direct result of input.
- b) When did this example take place?
- c) Detail the method used to actively collect the input that gave rise to this change.
- d) Detail the steps taken to review and consider the input among agency staff, decision making entity or Board.
- e) List all ways the program or policy change was communicated to program participants.

**Question Type/Method:** Narrative (maximum 300 words for each sub-question)

**Agency or Project Question:** This is an agency-level question.

**Guidance:** The response should enable the reviewer to get a clear and detailed sense of the steps and processes by which your agency seeks input and uses it to improve programs and policies.

**Scoring:** There are a total of five (5) points possible for this question.

- a) Maximum of two (2) points for this sub-question. The rubric below identifies the methodology for determining the difference between full, partial, or zero points.
  - **Maximum points (2)** – The change is related to project design, program improvement, or use of new funding.



## Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

Example: Input informs renovations of the entire building; change to the types of services being offered; changes to the intake process and form.

- **Some points (1)** – The change is related to everyday logistics and small quality of life adjustments.

Example: Change in computer room hours; purchase of additional items for common kitchen; organizing a movie night.

- **No points** – Agency did not provide a narrative.
- b) Half ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) point for answering when this occurred and demonstrating that it occurred in calendar year 2021
  - c) Half ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) point for a full narrative
  - d) One (1) point for a full narrative
  - e) One (1) point for a full narrative

**Question #6 (Informational):** If your agency has one or more board members of lived experience, how does it support them (or decrease any barriers they may experience) to fully participate in all board activities?

**Question Type/Method:** Narrative (maximum 300 words).

**Agency or Project Question:** This is an agency-level question.

**Scoring:** None.

**Question #7 (Informational):** If your agency currently doesn't have any people of lived experience on its board, please explain why.

**Question Type/Method:** Narrative (maximum 300 words).

**Agency or Project Question:** This is an agency-level question.

**Scoring:** None.





# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

## Project Performance Section

Quantitative data from HMIS is used to measure the performance outcomes of projects. The list of metrics has been updated from previous years for the purpose of bringing the metrics into better alignment with System Performance Measures and [Sample HUD Rating and Ranking Tool](#) (an optional tool that can be used by CoCs to evaluate project performance).

For each metric, the data is pulled either from the Annual Performance Report (APR) or from a custom HMIS report. The APR report is available within HMIS to run and download any time. The report must be run on the time period of January 1, 2021 – December 31, 2021. Visit this [Helpdesk article for a refresher on running the CoC APR](#).

For the performance metrics that will be pulled from custom reports, each project will receive a copy of these custom reports two times. The first time will be within two business days of the date the LEI is released. ATAs can review and correct data based on this report up until the deadline of May 2. The second time the project will receive a copy is when All Chicago exports the data once the deadline has passed. For any project that has two or more provider IDs in HMIS, the first copy of the custom data reports will show separate data for each provider ID. The second copy of the data reports (pulled once the deadline has passed) will combine the data together.

### Data Update and Correction

As the HMIS data used for each Question is reviewed by the agency, there may be updates and/or corrections indicated. Any updates or corrections should be made to make the data accurate and correct. These will likely fall into the following categories:

- Data that your agency is responsible for entering. As usual, please enter the correct data into the HMIS system.
- Data that another agency or group is responsible for entering. Please contact the HMIS Help Desk ([helpdesk@allchicago.org](mailto:helpdesk@allchicago.org)).
- Data is correct in the HMIS but not reported correctly in the data extract for each question. Please contact the HMIS Help Desk ([helpdesk@allchicago.org](mailto:helpdesk@allchicago.org)).

### Discovering and Announcing Report Errors

All Chicago and several volunteer ATAs tested the custom reports prior to releasing them. However, as agencies review data and submit questions to the HMIS Help Desk, it is possible that an error in report logic may be discovered. If this occurs, the report will be fixed and the correction will be announced. Minor corrections will be announced in the LEI FAQ document posted to the Chicago CoC Slack site (provider questions channel). Significant corrects will be announced in an email blast.

### April 18 Webinar

All Chicago has scheduled a webinar mid-way through the LEI submission period to address the following: 1) Announce and explain any significant changes in the report logic due to any discovered errors, 2) Provide everyone with the opportunity to hear answers to frequently asked questions about the data reports. Register [here](#) for the webinar on April 18, 9:30-11:00.



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

#### **Submitting the Data**

Agencies may review, update and correct data until the LEI deadline of May 2. Agencies do not need to submit the data to All Chicago. All Chicago will export all the data directly out of HMIS. A copy of the data that All Chicago exports will be shared with each project.

#### **Agencies Not Using HMIS**

Some projects serving survivors of domestic violence are exempt from the requirement to participate in HMIS. These projects are required to self-report their performance on each applicable metric by uploading an excel file (in the LEI Alchemer form) by the May 2 deadline. All Chicago will provide the excel file template.

#### **Scoring scales**

The scoring scale provides the performance thresholds used to award full, partial or zero points for each metric. The scoring scales have not been determined prior to releasing this instrument and will be made available when preliminary reports are released. It is anticipated that the pandemic may have impacted performance outcomes. Therefore, All Chicago will analyze the data received through this process before finalizing the scoring scales used to determine the level of performance that earns full, partial or zero points. All Chicago will host a community presentation by August 2022 to provide transparency about the methods used to make these decisions.

The following pages contain important details regarding the report logic used to calculate performance and how the project performance questions are scored.





# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022



## Project Performance Metrics Chart

This chart contains a list of all performance metrics. The yellow columns on the right side indicate how the metrics are applied to each program model. A number in the cell indicates the number of scored points for the model. “Info” indicates it is an informational question for the model (i.e., not scored). N/A indicates the metric does not apply to this model.

If there is a situation in which a project is exempt from a scored question that applies to its program model type, this will be indicated in the “Exceptions” column below. For such cases, the points associated with the question will be removed from the numerator and denominator of the project’s score.

Question #	Metric	Data Source	Rationale	Exceptions made for model types scored on the metric						
					PSH	RRH	TH	Joint TH-RRH	SSO	SH
1	<b>Coordinated Entry participation.</b> Percent of participants housed in the project with a coordinated entry referral.	Custom Report	Projects funded through HUD CoC are required to participate in Chicago's coordinated entry system. Chicago's System Goal 3 is "Projects committed to the Coordinated Entry System will use only that system to fill their units."	1) TH projects formerly categorized as interim that do not take matches from CE, 2) Projects that use the CHA vacancy matching process, 3) Projects using the DV CE	12	13	24	24 (TH); 13 (RRH)	N/A	14
2	<b>Coordinated Entry rematches.</b> Percentage of matches that are rematched by category (i.e., the categories in the need status glossary).	Custom Report	Our local CE system has identified a challenge related to declined matches. The purpose is to look at whether rematches are happening in alignment with housing first.	1) TH projects formerly categorized as interim that do not take matches from CE, 2) Projects that use the CHA vacancy matching process, 3) Projects using the DV CE	info	info	info	info	N/A	info



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022



Question #	Metric	Data Source	Rationale	Exceptions made for model types scored on the metric	PSH	RRH	TH	Joint TH-RRH	SSO	SH
3	<b>Need status timeliness.</b> Percentage of referrals that lapsed or missed the 15 day timeframe.	Custom Report	Timely updates to need statuses support our CE system's efforts to avoid a slow-moving system. Housing people as quickly as possible is a local priority as evidenced by the Expedited Housing Initiative, and this metric is part of the EHI Accountability Plan.	1) TH projects formerly categorized as interim that do not take matches from CE, 2) Projects that use the CHA vacancy matching process, 3) Projects using the DV CE	6	6	7	7 (TH); 6 (RRH)	N/A	8
4	<b>Assessments.</b> Percent of participants who were assessed for Coordinated Entry.	Custom Report	In the Program Model Chart, Coordinated Entry assessments is a standard for this model type.	TH projects that take matches from CE	N/A	N/A	31	N/A	70	N/A
5	<b>Time from match to housing.</b> "On average, participants spend XX days from match to housing move-in."	Custom Report	Housing people as quickly as possible is a local priority as evidenced by the Expedited Housing Initiative, and this metric is part of the EHI Accountability Plan. This metric is a system performance measure (i.e., measure 1 length of time homeless) and the previous HUD NOFO awarded points for a CoC's use of local rating criteria that includes outcome measures related to CoC system performance measures.	1) TH projects formerly categorized as interim that do not take matches from CE, 2) Projects that use the CHA vacancy matching process, 3) Projects using the DV CE	6	6	N/A	N/A (TH); 6 (RRH)	N/A	N/A



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022



Question #	Metric	Data Source	Rationale	Exceptions made for model types scored on the metric	PSH	RRH	TH	Joint TH-RRH	SSO	SH
6	<b>Time from entry to exit to permanent housing.</b> Percent of households that went into permanent housing within XX days.	Custom Report	A successful outcome for TH projects is for participants to move into permanent housing.		N/A	N/A	info	info (TH); N/A (RRH)	N/A	N/A
7	<b>Increase in earned or non-employment income (i.e., any income) for stayers.</b> Percent of participants with new or increased earned income for project stayers.	HUD APR, Q19a1	This is a HUD System Performance Measure (SPM), a Chicago CoC System Goal, and included in the Chicago Community Standards. The previous HUD NOFO awarded points for a CoC's use of local rating criteria that include outcome measures related to CoC system performance measures (i.e., measure 4 employment and income growth).		3	11	12	12 (TH); 11 (RRH)	5	4
8	<b>Increase in earned or non-employment income for leavers.</b> Percent of participants with new or increased earned income for project leavers.	HUD APR, Q19a2	This is a HUD System Performance Measure (SPM), a Chicago CoC System Goal, and included in the Chicago Community Standards. The previous HUD NOFO awarded points for a CoC's use of local rating criteria that include outcome measures related to CoC system performance measures (i.e., measure 4 employment and income growth).		3	11	12	12 (TH); 11 (RRH)	5	4



# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022



Question #	Metric	Data Source	Rationale	Exceptions made for model types scored on the metric	PSH	RRH	TH	Joint TH-RRH	SSO	SH
9	<b>Health insurance.</b> Percent of participants with health insurance.	APR Q21, Q5a	Health care access is consistently referenced in the Chicago Community Standards as an essential element to programs.		23	13	14	14 (TH); 13 (RRH)	10	24
10	<b>Exit to permanent housing.</b> "Of those who exit, percent who move to permanent housing."	HUD APR Q23c	The Chicago Community Standards include a local standard for exits to permanent housing for PSH and RRH. HUD includes this metric in the sample HUD Rating and Ranking Tool, and it is used by other communities.		12	22	24	24 (TH); 22 (RRH)	10	8
11	<b>Remain in or exit to housing.</b> Percent remain in or move to housing. For PSH and SH, "remain in" includes households that have remained 12 months or longer. For other models, "remain in" is any person enrolled in the project.	HUD APR, Q5a, Q22a1, Q23c	The Chicago Community Standards include a local standard for retention for PSH and SH. HUD includes this metric in the sample HUD Rating and Ranking Tool, and it is used by other communities.		23	info	info	info	N/A	24



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022



Question #	Metric	Data Source	Rationale	Exceptions made for model types scored on the metric	PSH	RRH	TH	Joint TH-RRH	SSO	SH
12	<b>Returns to homelessness.</b> Percent of participants who return to homelessness (as indicated in 6 month follow up) within 6 months of exit to permanent housing.	Custom Report	Returns to homelessness is a HUD System Performance Measure. The 2021 HUD NOFO awards points for a CoC's use of local rating criteria that include outcome measures related to CoC system performance measures (i.e., measure 2 returns to homelessness). The Chicago Community Standards include a local standard for returns to homelessness for RRH. HUD includes this metric in the sample HUD Rating and Ranking Tool, and it is used by other communities.		N/A	6	N/A	N/A (TH); 6 (RRH)	N/A	N/A
13	<b>Racial Equity.</b> The percent of participants served by race and ethnicity compared to the CoC's demographics.	HUD APR Q12a, Q12b	Addressing racial equity is a local priority area and Line of Action. HUD includes this metric in the sample rating/ranking tool. The 2021 HUD NOFO included points for rating and ranking projects based on the degree to which program participants mirror homeless population demographics.		info	info	info	info	info	info
14	<b>Serve high need populations - chronic homelessness.</b> Percent of households experiencing chronic homelessness.	HUD APR Q26a	HUD's sample rating and ranking tool includes space for evaluating whether projects are serving a high needs population, of which chronic homelessness is one of the sample areas.		info	info	info	info	info	info



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022



Question #	Metric	Data Source	Rationale	Exceptions made for model types scored on the metric	PSH	RRH	TH	Joint TH-RRH	SSO	SH
15	<b>Serve high need populations - zero income.</b> Percent of households entering with zero income.	HUD APR Q16	HUD's sample rating and ranking tool includes space for evaluating whether projects are serving a high needs population, of which zero income is one of the sample areas.		info	info	info	info	info	info
16	<b>Serve high need populations - more than one disability].</b> Percent of persons with more than one disability type.	HUD APR Q13a2	HUD's sample rating and ranking tool includes space for evaluating whether projects are serving a high needs population, of which more than one disability is one of the sample areas.		info	info	info	info	info	info
17	<b>Serving high need populations - place not meant for habitation.</b> Percent of adults entering the project from a place not meant for habitation.	HUD APR Q15	Reducing unsheltered homelessness is a policy priority outlined in the 2021 HUD NOFO. HUD's sample rating and ranking tool includes space for evaluating whether projects are serving a high needs population, of which unsheltered is one of the sample areas.		info	info	info	info	info	info
18	<b>Unit utilization.</b> Number of occupied units out of the number of total units each month.	Custom Report	This metric is part of the EHI Accountability Plan and therefore ties into our system's ability to house people quickly.	Congregate projects measured on bed utilization instead of unit utilization	12	12	7	7 (TH); 12 (RRH)	N/A	14



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022



Question #	Metric	Data Source	Rationale	Exceptions made for model types scored on the metric						
					PSH	RRH	TH	Joint TH-RRH	SSO	SH
19	<b>Cost effectiveness.</b> Project cost per person compared to selected outcome.	Self report of project costs in the ITR; HUD APR Q5a	The HUD 2021 NOFO stated that CoCs should review all projects effectiveness in serving people experiencing homelessness, including cost-effectiveness. The HUD Rating & Ranking sample tool includes a similar project effectiveness metric encompassing cost-effectiveness.		info	info	info	info	info	info



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

#### **Logic Used for Custom Reports**

This section contains the report logic for questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12 and 18. Each question below will be delivered in its own spreadsheet with two sheets (tabs): Results and Detail.

#### **Question 1, CE Participation Percentage:**

- File: "LEI Question 1 CE Participation Results - <Parent Agency HMIS Name>.xlsx"
- The base data is enrollments with a 2021 Housing Move-in Date. The count of these enrollments is the "Housed" for the project.
- Of the enrollments above, the number with a CE Referral with a Referral Date that precedes the Entry Date into the project is counted as the "CE Referred"
- Of the enrollments above, the number with a Transfer with a Referral Date that precedes the Entry Date into the project is counted as the "Transferred"
- The "Percent" is calculated as  $(\text{CE Referred} + \text{Transferred}) / (\text{Housed}) * 100$ .
- The detail data has the following columns:
  - Provider\_id (Project)
  - Name (Project Name)
  - Program\_type\_code (HUD Program Type)
  - Parent\_provider\_id (Agency ID)
  - Agency (Agency Name)
  - Client\_id (HMIS ID)
  - Entry\_exit\_id (HMIS enrollment ID)
  - Entry\_date (Project Entry Date)
  - Exit\_date (Project Exit Date)
  - Hmid (Housing Move-in Date)
  - CE\_refer\_date (Referral date from Coordinated entry; NULL = not present)
  - Transfer\_refer\_date
- Potential data issues:
  - Missing enrollments
  - Missing or incorrect Housing Move-in Dates
  - Missing or incorrect CE Referral Dates
  - Missing or incorrect Transfer Referral Dates

#### **Question 2, Percent of CE Rematches:**

- File: "LEI Question 2 CE Rematches - <Parent Agency HMIS Name>.xlsx"
- The base data is all CE referrals with a Referral Date in 2001. A count is made of the number of referrals for each project as "#Referrals".
- Of the Referral items above, a count of the number that have a Status that begins with "CES: Rematch Needed" is performed as "#Rematches".
- The "Percentage" is calculated as  $\# \text{Rematches} / \# \text{Referrals} * 100$ .
- The detail data has the following columns:
  - Client\_ID (HMIS ID)
  - Need\_ID (Referral ID)
  - Referto\_Provider\_id (HMIS Project ID)
  - Name (Project Name)
  - Program\_type\_code (HUD Program Type)
  - Parent\_provider\_id (Agency HMIS Project ID)
  - Agency (Agency Name)
  - Refer\_date (Referral date of client)





# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

- Status (Referral Status)
- Note (Referral Notes)
- Potential data Issues:
  - Missing or incorrect CE Referrals
  - Missing or incorrect Need Status

#### Question 3, Need Status Timeliness:

- File: "LEI Question 3 Need Status Timeliness - <Parent Agency HMIS Name>.xlsx"
- Base data is CE Referrals with a Referral Date in 2021. These are counted as "Total Referrals".
- The number of the referrals above that have a Status of "CES: Matched: Awaiting response by Housing Provider" and are older than 15 days are counted as "#Matched\_awaiting\_GT\_15".
- The number of the referrals above that have a Status of "CES: Attempted/Attempting Contact" and are older than 15 days are counted as "#Attempted\_GT\_15".
- The number of the referrals above that have a Status of "CES: Rematch Needed: CES Team Only: Housing Provider Did Not Respond" are counted as "#Provider\_did\_not\_respond".
- The Percent is calculated as (Sum of the three values above) / (Total Referrals) \* 100
- The detail data has the following columns:
  - Client\_id (HMIS ID of referred client)
  - Refer\_date (Date referred from CE)
  - Status (Need Status)
  - Refer\_to\_provider\_id (Project ID receiving referral)
  - Name (Project Name)
  - Program\_type\_code (HUD Program Type)
  - Parent\_provider\_id (Agency ID)
  - Agency (Agency Name)
- Potential data issues:
  - Missing or incorrect CE Referrals
  - Missing or incorrect Needs Status

#### Question 4, Percent of CE Participants Assessed:

- File: "LEI Question 4 Percent of CE Participants Assessed - <Parent Agency HMIS name>.xlsx"
- Base data is clients with enrollments in TH projects with an entry date in 2021. The count is "#Clients".
- For the clients above, count the number with an enrollment in the CE project. This count is "#Assessed".
- "Percent" is calculated as #Assessed / #Clients \* 100.
- The detail data has the following columns:
  - Client\_ID (HMIS ID)
  - Provider\_id (HMIS Project ID)
  - Name (Project Name)
  - Program\_type\_code (HUD Program Type)
  - Parent\_provider\_id (Agency HMIS Project ID)
  - Agency (Agency Name)
  - CE\_Entry\_date (Enrollment date of client in CE project)
- Potential data issues:
  - Missing or incorrect project enrollment



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

- Missing or incorrect CE enrollment

#### **Question 5, Average Time from Match to Housing:**

- File: "LEI Question 5 Average Time Refer to Housed - <Parent Agency HMIS name>.xlsx"
- Base data is enrollments with a Housing Move-in Date in 2021 and a CE Referral Date. This count is "#Enrollments" (not shown).
- For each enrollment, calculate the difference between Housing Move-in Date ("hmid") and CE Referral Date ("CE\_refer\_date") as "#Days" in Detail. Do the same for Transfers.
- Calculate average number of days for the project as (sum of the detail #Days) / #Enrollments as "#Days" in the Results.
- The detail data has the following columns:
  - Client\_id (HMIS ID)
  - Entry\_date (project entry date)
  - HMID (PH Housing move-in date)
  - CE\_refer\_date (Date of CE referral)
  - Transfer\_refer\_date (Date of Transfer referral)
  - #Days (number of days between CE referral and HMID)
  - Provider\_id (HMIS Project ID)
  - Name (Project Name)
  - Program\_type\_code (HUD Program Type)
  - Parent\_provider\_id (Agency HMIS Project ID)
  - Agency (Agency Name)
- Potential data issues:
  - Missing or incorrect enrollments
  - Missing or incorrect CE referral
  - Missing or incorrect Transfer Referral
  - Missing or incorrect Housing Move-in Date

#### **Question 6, Average Time from Entry to Permanent Exit Destination:**

- File: "LEI Question 6 Average Time Entry to Exit TH - <Parent Agency HMIS name>.xlsx"
- Base data is TH enrollments with an exit date in 2021 and an exit destination to one of the following:
  - Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWA PH (HUD)
  - Owned by client, no ongoing housing subsidy (HUD)
  - Owned by client, with ongoing housing subsidy (HUD)
  - Permanent housing (other than RRH) for formerly homeless persons (HUD)
  - Rental by client, no ongoing housing subsidy (HUD)
  - Rental by client, with GPD TIP housing subsidy (HUD)
  - Rental by client, with other ongoing housing subsidy (HUD)
  - Rental by client, with VASH housing subsidy (HUD)
  - Staying or living with family, permanent tenure (HUD)
  - Staying or living with friends, permanent tenure (HUD)
- For each such enrollment, calculate the number of days between Entry Date and Exit Date as "#Days" in Detail.
- Calculate Average Number of Days as (Sum of #Days) / # Enrollments as "Average #Days".
- The detail data has the following columns:
  - Client\_id (HMIS ID)
  - Entry\_date (Project entry date)



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

- Exit\_date (Project exit date)
- #Days (Number of days between Entry date and Exit Date)
- Destination (Exit Destination)
- Provider\_id (HMIS Project ID)
- Name (Project Name)
- Program\_type\_code (HUD Program Type)
- Parent\_provider\_id (Agency HMIS Project ID)
- Agency (Agency Name)
- Potential data issues:
  - Missing or incorrect enrollment
  - Missing or incorrect Destination

#### **Question 12, Returns to Homelessness**

- Report still under development at time of LEI release. All Chicago will separately email RRH projects (this question only applies to RRH) with the report logic once complete.

#### **Question 18, Unit Utilization**

- File: "LEI Question 18 Unit Util Results - <Parent Agency HMIS name>.xlsx"
- Base data is Unit Inventory for 2021 ("Units") and households enrolled ("Units Enrolled") at a point in time each month
- Calculate  $(\text{Average Units Enrolled}) / (\text{Average Units}) * 100$  as "Avg Unit Util"
- The detail data has the following columns:
  - Name (Project Name)
  - Provider\_id (Project HMIS ID)
  - Program\_type\_code (HUD Program Type)
  - Units (Unit Inventory for the project)
  - Units Enrolled (# Households Enrolled)
  - Unit Rate (Util Rate for that Month)
  - Month
  - Year
  - Agency (Agency Name)
- Potential Data Issues:
  - Incorrect or missing Unit Inventory
  - Incorrect or missing enrollments



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

#### APR Logic

This section contains the report logic for questions 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 19. These questions use data from the APR report in ServicePoint. All Chicago is implementing a way to load the APR data into database tables to make the tabulation of the data efficient for the final reporting and scoring. We do not have an efficient way to distribute that data on an iterative basis to each agency.

Since agencies have access to the APR report in ServicePoint, you have independent access to that data and the ability to see the impact of any changes you might make. To check what your values will be, please run the APR report for your projects. The instructions for running an APR for a project can be found in the following Help Desk article: <https://hmis.allchicago.org/hc/en-us/articles/360000404183-Running-the-CoC-APR->

The date range for all projects for the LEI is 01/01/2021 – 12/31/2021.

The file names specified below are the file names to extract from the compressed (zip) file that is downloaded as a result of running the APR. For any questions concerning the APR, please contact the Help Desk.

#### Question 7, Increase in earned or non-employment income, stayers:

- File: Q19a1.csv
- Highlighted value below is used

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
"Income Change by Income Category (Universe: Adult Stayers with Income Information at Start and Annual Assessment)"	"Had Income Category at Start and Did Not Have It at Annual Assessment"	"Retained Income Category But Had Less \$ at Annual Assessment Than at Start"	"Retained Income Category and Same \$ at Annual Assessment as at Start"	"Retained Income Category and Increased \$ at Annual Assessment"	"Did Not Have the Income Category at Start and Gained the Income Category at Annual Assessment"	"Did Not Have the Income Category at Start or at Annual Assessment"	"Total Adults (including those with No Income)"	"Performance Measure: Adults who Gained or Increased Income from Start to Annual Assessment Average Gain"	"Performance measure: Percent of persons who accomplished this measure"
"Number of Adults with Earned Income (i.e., Employment Income)"	0	0	0	0	0	51	51	0	0
"Average Change in Earned Income"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
"Number of Adults with Other Income"	2	0	0	36	5	8	51	41	0.8
"Average Change in Other Income"	-728.5	0	0	832.69	779	0	0	826.15	0
"Number of Adults with Any Income (i.e., Total Income)"	2	0	0	36	5	8	51	41	0.8
"Average Change in Overall Income"	-728.5	0	0	853.92	779	0	650	844.78	0

- Potential data issues:
  - Missing or incorrect Income assessment/sub-assessment

#### Question 8, Increase in earned or non-employment income, leavers:

- File Q19a2.csv
- Highlighted value below is used

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
"Income Change by Income Category (Universe: Adult Leavers with Income Information at Start and Exit)"	"Had Income Category at Start and Did Not Have It at Exit"	"Retained Income Category But Had Less \$ at Exit Than at Start"	"Retained Income Category and Same \$ at Exit as at Start"	"Retained Income Category and Increased \$ at Exit"	"Did Not Have the Income Category at Start and Gained the Income Category at Exit"	"Did Not Have the Income Category at Start or at Exit"	"Total Adults (including those with No Income)"	"Performance Measure: Adults who Gained or Increased Income from Start to Exit Average Gain"	"Performance measure: Percent of persons who accomplished this measure"
"Number of Adults with Earned Income (i.e., Employment Income)"	0	0	1	0	0	8	9	0	0
"Average Change in Earned Income"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
"Number of Adults with Other Income"	0	0	1	6	0	2	9	6	0.67
"Average Change in Other Income"	0	0	0	444.5	0	0	0	444.5	0
"Number of Adults with Any Income (i.e., Total Income)"	0	0	1	6	0	2	9	6	0.67
"Average Change in Overall Income"	0	0	0	444.5	0	0	296	444.5	0

- Potential data issues:
  - Missing or incorrect Income assessment/sub-assessment



# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

## Question 9, Percentage with Health Insurance

- Files Q21.csv, Q5a.csv
- Values highlighted in yellow below from Q21.csv are added together as "Total with insurance"

A	B	C	D
	"At Start"	"At Annual Assessment for Stayers"	"At Exit for Leavers"
'MEDICAID"	41	28	5
'MEDICARE"	19	14	1
'State Children's Health Insurance Program"	1	0	0
'Veteran's Administration (VA) Medical Services"	19	12	3
'Employer - Provided Health Insurance"	1	0	0
'Health Insurance obtained through COBRA"	1	0	0
'Private Pay Health Insurance"	3	1	1
'State Health Insurance for Adults"	1	0	0
'Indian Health Services Program"	0	0	0
'Other"	1	0	0
'No Health Insurance"	11	7	0
'Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused"	0	0	0
'Data Not Collected"	0	12	0
'Number of Stayers not yet Required To Have an Annual Assessment"	0	5	0
'1 Source of Health Insurance"	52	33	8
'More than 1 Source of Health Insurance"	14	11	1

- Values in blue above is subtracted from the value in green below from Q5a.csv to get "Total Population"

A	B
"Total Number of Persons Served"	77
"Number of Adults (age 18 or over)"	77
"Number of Children (under age 18)"	0
"Number of Persons with Unknown Age"	0
"Number of Leavers"	9
"Number of Adult Leavers"	9
"Number of Adult and Head of Household Leavers"	9
"Number of Stayers"	68
"Number of Adult Stayers"	68
"Number of Veterans"	19
"Number of Chronically Homeless Persons"	39
"Number of Youth Under Age 25"	0
"Number of Parenting Youth Under Age 25 with Children"	0
"Number of Adult Heads of Household"	75
"Number of Child and Unknown-Age Heads of Household"	0
"Heads of Households and Adult Stayers in the Project 365 Days or More"	63

- Percentage = (Total with Insurance) / (Total Population)
- Potential data issues:
  - Missing or incorrect data in Assessment for Insurance coverage



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

**Question 10, Percent Exited to PH:**

- File: Q23c.csv
- Value highlighted below is used

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
		"Total"	"Without Children"	"With Children and Adults"	"With Only Children"	"Unknown Household Type"	
1							
2	"Permanent Destinations"						
3	"Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWA PH"	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	"Owned by client, no ongoing subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	"Owned by client, with ongoing subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	"Rental by client, no ongoing subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	"Rental by client, with VASH subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	"Rental by client, with GPD TIP subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	"Rental by client, other ongoing subsidy"	4	4	0	0	0	0
10	"Permanent housing (other than RRH) for formerly homeless persons"	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	"Staying or living with family, permanent tenure"	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	"Staying or living with friends, permanent tenure"	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	"Rental by client, with RRH or equivalent subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	"Rental by client, with HCV voucher (tenant or project based)"	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	"Rental by client in a public housing unit"	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	"Subtotal"	4	4	0	0	0	0
17	"Temporary Destinations"						
18	"Emergency shelter, including hotel or motel paid for with emergency shelter voucher"	1	1	0	0	0	0
19	"Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWATH"	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	"Transitional housing for homeless persons (including homeless youth)"	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	"Staying or living with family, temporary tenure"	0	0	0	0	0	0
22	"Staying or living with friends, temporary tenure"	0	0	0	0	0	0
23	"Place not meant for human habitation"	0	0	0	0	0	0
24	"Safe Haven"	0	0	0	0	0	0
25	"Hotel or motel, paid by client"	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	"Host Home (non-crisis) "	0	0	0	0	0	0
27	"Subtotal"	1	1	0	0	0	0
28	"Institutional Settings"						
29	"Foster care home or group foster care home"	0	0	0	0	0	0
30	"Psychiatric hospital or other psychiatric facility"	0	0	0	0	0	0
31	"Substance abuse treatment facility or detox center"	1	1	0	0	0	0
32	"Hospital or other residential non-psychiatric medical facility"	0	0	0	0	0	0
33	"Jail, prison, or juvenile detention facility"	1	1	0	0	0	0
34	"Long-term care facility or nursing home"	1	1	0	0	0	0
35	"Subtotal"	3	3	0	0	0	0
36	"Other Destinations"						
37	"Residential project or halfway house with no homeless criteria"	0	0	0	0	0	0
38	"Deceased"	1	1	0	0	0	0
39	"Other"	0	0	0	0	0	0
40	"Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused"	0	0	0	0	0	0
41	"Data Not Collected (no exit interview completed)"	0	0	0	0	0	0
42	"Subtotal"	1	1	0	0	0	0
43	"Total"	9	9	0	0	0	0
44	"Total persons exiting to positive housing destinations"	4	4	0	0	0	0
45	"Total persons whose destinations excluded them from the calculation"	2	2	0	0	0	0
46	"Percentage"	0.57	0.57	0	0	0	0
47							

- Potential data issues:
  - Missing or incorrect Destinations



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

**Question 11, Remain in or exit to housing:**

- Files: Q5a.csv, Q22a1.csv, Q23c.csv
- Sum the highlighted values below in Q23c.csv as “Leavers\_PH”

	A	B	C	D	E	F
		"Total"	"Without Children"	"With Children and Adults"	"With Only Children"	"Unknown Household Type"
1						
2	"Permanent Destinations"					
3	"Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWA PH"	0	0	0	0	0
4	"Owned by client, no ongoing subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0
5	"Owned by client, with ongoing subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0
6	"Rental by client, no ongoing subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0
7	"Rental by client, with VASH subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0
8	"Rental by client, with GPD TIP subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0
9	"Rental by client, other ongoing subsidy"	4	4	0	0	0
10	"Permanent housing (other than RRH) for formerly homeless persons"	0	0	0	0	0
11	"Staying or living with family, permanent tenure"	0	0	0	0	0
12	"Staying or living with friends, permanent tenure"	0	0	0	0	0
13	"Rental by client, with RRH or equivalent subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0
14	"Rental by client, with HCV voucher (tenant or project based)"	0	0	0	0	0
15	"Rental by client in a public housing unit"	0	0	0	0	0
16	"Subtotal"	4	4	0	0	0
17	"Temporary Destinations"					
18	"Emergency shelter, including hotel or motel paid for with emergency shelter voucher"	1	1	0	0	0
19	"Moved from one HOPWA funded project to HOPWA TH"	0	0	0	0	0
20	"Transitional housing for homeless persons (including homeless youth)"	0	0	0	0	0
21	"Staying or living with family, temporary tenure"	0	0	0	0	0
22	"Staying or living with friends, temporary tenure"	0	0	0	0	0
23	"Place not meant for human habitation"	0	0	0	0	0
24	"Safe Haven"	0	0	0	0	0
25	"Hotel or motel, paid by client"	0	0	0	0	0
26	"Host Home (non-crisis)"	0	0	0	0	0
27	"Subtotal"	1	1	0	0	0
28	"Institutional Settings"					
29	"Foster care home or group foster care home"	0	0	0	0	0
30	"Psychiatric hospital or other psychiatric facility"	0	0	0	0	0
31	"Substance abuse treatment facility or detox center"	1	1	0	0	0
32	"Hospital or other residential non-psychiatric medical facility"	0	0	0	0	0
33	"Jail, prison, or juvenile detention facility"	1	1	0	0	0
34	"Long-term care facility or nursing home"	1	1	0	0	0
35	"Subtotal"	3	3	0	0	0
36	"Other Destinations"					
37	"Residential project or halfway house with no homeless criteria"	0	0	0	0	0
38	"Deceased"	1	1	0	0	0
39	"Other"	0	0	0	0	0
40	"Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused"	0	0	0	0	0
41	"Data Not Collected (no exit interview completed)"	0	0	0	0	0
42	"Subtotal"	1	1	0	0	0
43	"Total"	9	9	0	0	0
44	"Total persons exiting to positive housing destinations"	4	4	0	0	0
45	"Total persons whose destinations excluded them from the calculation"	2	2	0	0	0
46	"Percentage"	0.57	0.57	0	0	0
47						

- Sum the highlighted values in Q22a1.csv below as “#Stayers\_PH”





# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

	A	B	C	D
1	"Length"	"Total"	"Leavers"	"Stayers"
2	"30 days or less"	0	0	0
3	"31 to 60 days"	0	0	0
4	"61 to 90 days"	0	0	0
5	"91 to 180 days"	0	0	0
5	"181 to 365 days"	6	1	5
7	"366 to 730 Days (1-2 Yrs)"	10	2	8
8	"731 to 1,095 Days (2-3 Yrs)"	15	0	15
9	"1,096 to 1,460 Days (3-4 Yrs)"	7	3	4
0	"1,461 to 1,825 Days (5-5 Yrs)"	6	1	5
1	"More than 1,825 Days (>5 Yrs)"	33	2	31
2	"Data Not Collected"	0	0	0
3	"Total"	77	9	68
4				

- Use the value highlighted below in yellow from q5a.csv as "#Stayers\_RRH", and the value in green below as "#Participants"

	A	B
1	"Total Number of Persons Served"	77
2	"Number of Adults (age 18 or over)"	77
3	"Number of Children (under age 18)"	0
4	"Number of Persons with Unknown Age"	0
5	"Number of Leavers"	9
5	"Number of Adult Leavers"	9
7	"Number of Adult and Head of Household Leavers"	9
8	"Number of Stayers"	68
9	"Number of Adult Stayers"	68
0	"Number of Veterans"	19
1	"Number of Chronically Homeless Persons"	39
2	"Number of Youth Under Age 25"	0
3	"Number of Parenting Youth Under Age 25 with Children"	0
4	"Number of Adult Heads of Household"	75
5	"Number of Child and Unknown-Age Heads of Household"	0
6	"Heads of Households and Adult Stayers in the Project 365 Days or More"	63
7		

- RRH/TH Percentage = (#Stayers\_RRH + #Leavers\_PH) / #Participants
- PH/SH Percentage = (#Stayers\_PH + #Leavers\_PH) / #Participants





# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

**Question 13, Racial Equity:**

- We will be providing system-wide race and ethnicity percentages at a later date for comparison purposes.
- Files: Q12a.csv, Q12b.csv
- For percentages of each racial category, divide the values highlighted in yellow below by the value highlighted in green below from file Q12a.csv

A	B	C	D	E	F
	"Total"	"Without Children"	"With Children and Adults"	"With Only Children"	"Unknown Household Type"
"White"	15	15	0	0	0
"Black, African American, or African"	62	62	0	0	0
"Asian or Asian American"	0	0	0	0	0
"American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous"	0	0	0	0	0
"Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander"	0	0	0	0	0
"Multiple Races"	0	0	0	0	0
"Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused"	0	0	0	0	0
"Data Not Collected"	0	0	0	0	0
"Total"	77	77	0	0	0

- For percentages of each ethnicity category, divide the values highlighted in yellow below by the value highlighted in green below from file Q12b.csv

A	B	C	D	E	F
	"Total"	"Without Children"	"With Children and Adults"	"With Only Children"	"Unknown Household Type"
"Non-Hispanic/Non-Latin(a)(o)(x)"	75	75	0	0	0
"Hispanic/Latin(a)(o)(x)"	2	2	0	0	0
"Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused"	0	0	0	0	0
"Data Not Collected"	0	0	0	0	0
"Total"	77	77	0	0	0

- Potential data issues:
  - Missing or incorrect assessment data for Primary Race and/or Ethnicity

**Question 14, Serve High Need Populations - Chronic Homelessness:**

- File: Q26a.csv
- Percentage = value highlighted in yellow divided by the value highlighted in green below in Q26a.csv

A	B	C	D	E	F
	"Total"	"Without Children"	"With Children and Adults"	"With Only Children"	"Unknown Household Type"
"Chronically Homeless "	37	37	0	0	0
"Not Chronically Homeless"	38	38	0	0	0
"Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused"	0	0	0	0	0
"Data Not Collected"	0	0	0	0	0
"Total"	75	75	0	0	0



# Instruction Manual

## 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument

### Due on May 2, 2022

**Question 15, Serve high need populations – zero income:**

- File: Q16.csv
- Percentage = value highlighted in yellow divided by the value in highlighted in green below in Q16.csv

	A	B	C	D	E
		"Income at Start"	"Income at Latest Annual Assessment for Stayers"	"Income at Exit for Leavers"	
2	"No Income"	19	8	2	
3	"\$1 - \$150"	0	0	0	
4	"\$151 - \$250"	0	0	0	
5	"\$251 - \$500"	2	0	0	
6	"\$501 - \$1000"	44	15	1	
7	"\$1001 - \$1500"	9	5	1	
8	"\$1501 - \$2000"	0	10	2	
9	"\$2001+"	3	11	3	
0	"Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused"	0	0	0	
1	"Data Not Collected"	0	2	0	
2	"Number of Adult Stayers not yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment"	0	5	0	
3	"Number of Adult Stayers without Required Annual Assessment"	0	12	0	
4	"Total Adults"	77	68	9	
5					
6					

**Question 16, Serve high need populations - >=1 Disability**

- File: Q13a2.csv
- Percentage = sum of the values highlighted in yellow divided by the value highlighted in green below in Q13a2.csv

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	"Total"	"Without Children"	"Adults in HH with Children and Adults"	"Children in HH with Children and Adults"	"With Only Children"	"Unknown Household Type"
"None"	0	0	0	0	0	0
"1 Condition"	20	20	0	0	0	0
"2 Conditions"	25	25	0	0	0	0
"3+ Conditions"	32	32	0	0	0	0
"Condition Unknown"	0	0	0	0	0	0
"Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused"	0	0	0	0	0	0
"Data Not Collected"	0	0	0	0	0	0
"Total"	77	77	0	0	0	0



# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

## Question 17, Serve high need populations – Place Not Meant for Habitation:

- File: Q15.csv
- Percentage = value highlighted in yellow divided by value highlighted in green below in Q15.csv

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
		"Total"	"Without Children"	"With Children and Adults"	"With Only Children"	"Unknown Household Type"	
1	"Homeless Situations"						
1	"Emergency shelter, including hotel or motel paid for with emergency shelter voucher"	26	26	0	0	0	
1	"Transitional housing for homeless persons (including homeless youth)"	17	17	0	0	0	
1	"Place not meant for human habitation"	24	24	0	0	0	
1	"Safe Haven"	0	0	0	0	0	
1	"Host Home"	0	0	0	0	0	
1	"Subtotal"	67	67	0	0	0	
1	"Institutional Settings"						
0	"Psychiatric hospital or other psychiatric facility"	1	1	0	0	0	
1	"Substance abuse treatment facility or detox center"	3	3	0	0	0	
2	"Hospital or other residential non-psychiatric medical facility"	0	0	0	0	0	
3	"Jail, prison or juvenile detention facility"	0	0	0	0	0	
4	"Foster care home or foster care group home"	0	0	0	0	0	
5	"Long-term care facility or nursing home"	0	0	0	0	0	
6	"Residential project or halfway house with no homeless criteria"	0	0	0	0	0	
7	"Subtotal"	4	4	0	0	0	
8	"Other Locations"						
9	"Permanent housing (other than RRH) for formerly homeless persons"	0	0	0	0	0	
0	"Owned by client, no ongoing housing subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0	
1	"Owned by client, with ongoing housing subsidy"	1	1	0	0	0	
2	"Rental by client, with RRH or equivalent subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0	
3	"Rental by client, with HCV voucher (tenant or project based)"	0	0	0	0	0	
4	"Rental by client in a public housing unit"	0	0	0	0	0	
5	"Rental by client, no ongoing housing subsidy"	3	3	0	0	0	
6	"Rental by client, with VASH housing subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0	
7	"Rental by client, with GPD TIP housing subsidy"	0	0	0	0	0	
8	"Rental by client, with other housing subsidy (including RRH)"	1	1	0	0	0	
9	"Hotel or motel paid for without emergency shelter voucher"	0	0	0	0	0	
0	"Staying or living in a friend's room, apartment or house"	0	0	0	0	0	
1	"Staying or living in a family member's room, apartment or house"	0	0	0	0	0	
2	"Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused"	0	0	0	0	0	
3	"Data not collected"	1	1	0	0	0	
4	"Subtotal"	6	6	0	0	0	
5	"Total"	77	77	0	0	0	

## Question 19, Cost Effectiveness

- Project cost per person: Cost / Number of persons served
- Files: Q5a.csv
- Cost is taken from the Intent to Renew project information question 11j, total project funding
- Divide the total project funding by the value in green below from APR Q5a (number of persons served) to obtain project cost per person.

	A	B
1	"Total Number of Persons Served"	77
2	"Number of Adults (age 18 or over)"	77
3	"Number of Children (under age 18)"	0
4	"Number of Persons with Unknown Age"	0
5	"Number of Leavers"	9
6	"Number of Adult Leavers"	9
7	"Number of Adult and Head of Household Leavers"	9
8	"Number of Stayers"	68
9	"Number of Adult Stayers"	68
10	"Number of Veterans"	19
11	"Number of Chronically Homeless Persons"	39
12	"Number of Youth Under Age 25"	0
13	"Number of Parenting Youth Under Age 25 with Children"	0
14	"Number of Adult Heads of Household"	75
15	"Number of Child and Unknown-Age Heads of Household"	0
16	"Heads of Households and Adult Stayers in the Project 365 Days or More"	63
17		
18		

- All Chicago will create a graph plotting cost per person on one axis and a selected performance outcome on the other axis.
  - Exits to permanent housing (Question 10) will be used as the performance outcome for PSH, RRH, TH and SH.
  - Assessments (Question 4) will be used as the performance outcome for SSO.



# Instruction Manual 2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Due on May 2, 2022

## Appendix

The following items are referenced within this Instruction Manual and are listed again here for quick reference.

LEI Submission Form in Alchemer: <https://survey.alchemer.com/s3/6793469/2022-Local-Evaluation-Instrument>

LEI training registration: <https://allchicago.talentlms.com/catalog/info/id:545>

LEI Performance Data Webinar registration: <https://register.gotowebinar.com/register/6146218744326081035>

Webpage with LEI information: <https://allchicago.org/continuum-of-care/coc-programs/>

Alchemer Technical Assistance slides: <https://allchicago.talentlms.com/learner/courseinfo/id:510>

Frequently Asked Questions Document: [Join the Chicago CoC Slack Channel](#) (This is where updated FAQs are posted; go to the provider questions channel)

Appeal form: [2022 Local Evaluation Instrument Appeal Form](#)

HMIS Helpdesk articles: <https://hmis.allchicago.org>

HMIS Helpdesk ticket: [helpdesk@allchicago.org](mailto:helpdesk@allchicago.org)

Program team ticket: [cocprograms@allchicago.org](mailto:cocprograms@allchicago.org)