

Overview of Impact ICT CoC FY2022 Ranking & Review Process:

The mission of Impact ICT (KS-502, Wichita/Sedgwick County) is to make homelessness rare, brief, and nonrecurring. The CoC can further that mission through a competitive grant application process for funding to provide housing services and supportive services to persons defined as homeless. This grant is competitive both locally and nationally. This document outlines the local CoC Competition.

Deadlines

The local competition for new and renewal projects to apply for FY2022 CoC funds opened September 15th. The deadline for local projects to submit to eSNAPS is August 31st, 5pm.

Ranking & Review Committee

The Ranking & Review Committee is a group of persons who believe in the mission of the CoC. To that end, they are tasked with reviewing projects and project outcomes and ranking projects so that the best projects to serve our local community are funded.

The members of the Ranking & Review Committee cannot be persons who sit on the boards of applying agencies, are staff of applying agencies, or those who would gain financially from the funding of certain projects over other projects. Each member must complete training detailing what the CoC is, how this funding works as part of the whole homeless service system, and what decisions they will need to make.

The Ranking & Review Committee has the ability to approve applications, reject applications that fall below the total funding amount the CoC can request, and reallocate funding.

Where do FY2022 Scoring Factors come from?

In the FY 2022 NOFO, HUD outlines several standards for how CoCs are to conduct the Review and Ranking process in section 1E. During the review process, for full points, HUD expects that each project's total score is divided into:

At least 33% of points based on objective criteria

- Cost effectiveness, timely draws, utilization rate, match, leverage, etc.
- Performance Data
- Type of population served (DV, youth, veteran, CH)
- Type of housing proposed (PSH, RRH)

At least 20% of total points based on system performance data

- Exits to PH destinations
- Retention of PH
- LoT homeless
- Returns to homelessness

HUD also expects, as outlined in the FY2022 NOFO, that the ranking & review process:

Provides points for projects that address severe barriers to housing/services, which considers those projects that may be providing necessary services to those that are harder

to serve but not perform at the same level as other projects of the same type. Some examples of those severe barriers are:

- High utilization of crisis/emergency services to meet basic needs
 - Including (not limited to): jails, ER, psychiatric facilities
- History of victimization/abuse including domestic abuse, sexual assault, & childhood abuse
- Length of time Homeless
- Low income
- No income
- Only project of its kind serving a special homeless population/subpopulation
- Risk of continued homelessness
- Significant challenges or functional impairments:
 - Physical, mental, developmental, or behavioral health which require a significant level of support to maintain permanent housing
- Substance abuse – current or past
- Unsheltered homelessness (especially youth and children)
- Vulnerability to illness or death
- Vulnerability to victimization, including physical assault, trafficking, or sex work

And:

Promotes Racial Equity, especially to overrepresented populations in the Impact ICT homeless services system.

[Where do the data for each project in the objective scoring come from?](#)

Data will be used for each renewal project that has data from the previously completed grant year (funded FY19). Data will be used from the HIC, PIT, LSA, SPM, and as entered in HMIS.

The Ranking & Review Committee will only look at information as provided in the application, the data as provided in HMIS, and any additional information that may be asked of an applicant during the Ranking & Review Process (i.e., a Diversity – Equity – Inclusion priority that isn't asked in the application).

[How does scoring work?](#)

Each project type (PSH, RRH, TH+RRH) has different scoring criteria based on the objectives of the project. Unless the rating factor is a yes/no (ex: Project is operating in conformance with CoC Standards), projects can score a portion of points for each rating factor.

For example, a RRH project may be rated on percentage of clients that exit to permanent housing. The standard for this year's competition is 80% of RRH clients exit to permanent housing for 25 points. If only 76% of clients exited to permanent housing, the project's score would be calculated:

$76\% / 80\% = .95$; $.95 * 25 \text{ points} = 23.75 \text{ points awarded}$.

However, if a project did better than the standard, they would not receive bonus points:

$100\% / 80\% = 1.25$; $1.25 * 25 \text{ points} = 31.25 \text{ points}$; only 25 points awarded.

Some rating factors may not have an objective data point and will require the Ranking & Review to score the item subjectively by what is presented by the applicant, especially for new project applications that can't be supported by project outcome data. In the event of these questions, a composite score will be generated by the member's score.

For example, a question may be worth 10 points. The reviewers individual score the question out of 10. The average of all the reviewers score, 7 points, will be used for the actual awarded points, 7 points.

How does ranking work?

Each project type may have a different number of total points awarded. For example, a renewal TH-RRH project may be worth 200 points, but a new TH-RRH project may only be worth 100 points. All projects will be adjusted to a 100-point score. For example:

Renewal TH-RRH scores 167 out of 200; new TH-RRH scores 55 out of 100. The renewal TH-RRH will be adjusted to be out of 100 points: $167/200 * 100 = 83.5$ points on the 100-point scale.

Projects will be ranked based on highest score to lowest score, from 100 to 0 points. The ranking and review committee can adjust the final ranking through consensus; for example, the group may decide that project A, while scoring higher, is not as important to the needs of the CoC as Project B, that scored lower.

The Ranking and Review Committee will also consider that the total amount of grant funding can't exceed \$2,719,842, or \$2,981,508 if a project applies for DV bonus funds (this excludes the CoC Planning project, which is unranked). If a project at the bottom of the ranks needs to be reduced for the CoC request to be within its limits, the Ranking & Review Committee can reduce or reallocate a project as needed while considering that some projects can't function without their full funding request.

The Ranking & Review Committee cannot reallocate funding from Project A to Project B if the reallocated funding would exceed Project B's request for funding.

Any decision to change project ranking, adjust funding, or deny an application must have the reason why written by the Ranking & Review Committee.

HUD & CoC Thresholds:

To be considered for funding, all projects must pass Standard HUD thresholds for approval. HUD reserves the rights to reject applications or conditionally accept them, even if approved by the CoC, if they don't pass the HUD thresholds. Additionally, all projects must pass the threshold standards the CoC sets as recommended by HUD.

New projects have additional thresholds, outlined in page 49-52 of the FY2022 NOFO.

HUD Thresholds:

- 1) Applicant has an Active SAM registration with current information and maintains an active SAM registration annually.
- 2) Applicant has Valid UEI (Unique Entity Identifier) Number.

- 3) CoC Program Eligibility – Project applicants and potential subrecipients meet the eligibility requirements of the CoC Program as described in the Act and the Rule and provide evidence of eligibility required in the application (e.g., nonprofit documentation)
- 4) Financial and Management Capacity: Project applicants and subrecipients demonstrate the financial and management capacity and experience to carry out the project as detailed in the project application and the capacity to administer federal funds.
- 5) Certifications: Project applicants submit the required certifications specified in the NOFO.
- 6) Population Served: The population to be served meets program eligibility requirements as described in the Act, the Rule, and the NOFO.
- 7) HMIS Participation – Project applicants, except Collaborative Applicants that only receive awards for CoC planning costs and agree to participate in the local HMIS system. However, Victim Service providers do not need to share data with the local HMIS system, but instead a comparable database.
- 8) Applicant has no Outstanding Delinquent Federal Debts, unless:
 - a. A negotiated repayment schedule is established, and the repayment schedule is not delinquent, or
 - b. Other arrangements satisfactory to HUD are made before the award of funds by HUD
- 9) Applicant has no Debarments or Suspensions to do business with the Federal Government
- 10) Pre-Selection Review of Performance: If your organization has delinquent federal debt or is excluded from doing business with the Federal government, the organization may be ineligible for an award. In addition, before making a Federal award, HUD reviews information available through any OMB-designated repositories of government-wide eligibility qualification or financial integrity information, such as Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), and the “Do Not Pay” website. HUD reserves the right to:
 - a. Deny funding, or with a renewal or continuing award, consider suspension or termination of an award immediately for cause;
 - b. Require the removal of any key individual from association with management or implementation of the award; and
 - c. Make provisions or revisions regarding the method of payment or financial reporting requirements
- 11) Sufficiency of Financial Management System: HUD will not award or disburse funds to applicants that do not have a financial management system that meets Federal standards as described at 2 CFR 200.302. HUD may arrange for a survey of financial management systems for applicants selected for award who have not previously received Federal financial assistance, where HUD Program officials have reason to question whether a financial management system meets Federal standards, or for applicants considered high risk based on past performance or financial management findings.
- 12) False Statements - A false statement in an application is grounds for denial or termination of an award and may result in criminal, civil, and/or administrative sanctions, including fines, penalties, and imprisonment. Recipient or applicant confirms all statements are truthful.
- 13) Mandatory Disclosure Requirement - Recipients or applicants disclose in writing to the awarding program office at HUD, all violations of Federal criminal law involving fraud, bribery, or gratuity violations potentially affecting the Federal award within ten days after learning of the violation. Recipients that have received a Federal award including the term and condition outlined in Appendix XII to 2 CFR part 200—Award Term and

Condition for Recipient Integrity and Performance Matters are required to report certain civil, criminal, or administrative proceedings to SAM. Failure to make required disclosures can result in any of the remedies described in § 200.338 Remedies for noncompliance, including suspension or debarment. (See also 2 CFR part 180, 31 U.S.C. 3321, and S.C. 2313.)

- 14) Prohibition Against Lobbying Activities - Applicants are subject to the provisions of Section 319 of Public Law 101-121, 31 U.S.C. 1352, (the Byrd Amendment), and 24 CFR part 87, which prohibit recipients of federal awards from using appropriated funds for lobbying the executive or legislative branches of the Federal government in connection with a Federal award. All applicants submit with their application the signed Certification Regarding Lobbying included in the Application download from Grants.gov. In addition, applicants disclose, using Standard Form LLL (SFLLL), "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," any funds, other than federally appropriated funds, that will be or have been used to influence federal employees, members of Congress, or congressional staff regarding specific awards. Federally-recognized Indian tribes and tribally designated housing entities (TDHEs) established by federally-recognized Indian tribes as a result of the exercise of the tribe's sovereign power are excluded from coverage of the Byrd Amendment, but state-recognized Indian tribes and TDHEs established only under state law shall comply with this requirement. Applicants submit the SFLLL if they have used or intend to use non-federal funds for lobbying activities.
- 15) Equal Participation of Faith-Based Organizations in HUD Programs and Activities – Projects ensure that all projects meet the requirements under 24 CFR 5.109. On April 4, 2016, HUD amended 24 CFR 5.109 consistent with E.O. 13559, entitled Fundamental Principles and Policymaking Criteria for Partnerships with Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Organizations (75 Fed. Reg. 71319 (Nov. 22, 2010)). (See 81 FR 19355). These regulations apply to all HUD programs and activities, including all of HUD's Native American Programs, except as may be otherwise provided in the respective program regulations, or unless inconsistent with the respective program authorizing statute.
- 16) Resolution of Civil Rights Matters - Outstanding civil rights matters be resolved before the application submission deadline. Project applicants, who after review are confirmed to have civil rights matters unresolved at the application submission deadline, will be deemed ineligible. Their applications will receive no further review, will not be rated and ranked, and will not receive funding

CoC Thresholds:

- Agency actively participates in Coordinated Entry, including Case Conferencing
- Documented, secured minimum match
- Project has reasonable costs per PH exit, as defined locally
- Project is financially feasible
- Applicant is active CoC participant (PIT Count, CoC Meetings, CoC Workgroups, Consolidated Grant Application)

Project Rating Factors & Specific Thresholds:

Renewals

Project Type: Rapid ReHousing

Thresholds:

- Coordinated Entry Participation
- Documented, secured minimum match
- Project has reasonable costs per PH exit, (\$2,172 - \$3,080)
- Project is financially feasible (grant experience)
- Applicant is an active CoC Participant (PIT Count, CoC Meetings, CoC Workgroups, Consolidated Grant Application)

Scoring:

| Performance Measures | | |
|---|---------|-----------|
| Length of Stay before move in | 15 days | 20 points |
| Minimum percent to move into PH | 90% | 25 points |
| Maximum percent of participants return to homelessness w/n 12 months of exit | 20% | 15 |
| Minimum percent of participants with new/increased income for project stayers | 8% | 2.5 |
| Min. percent of participants with new/increased non-employment income for stayers | 10% | 2.5 |
| Min. percent of participants with new/increased earned income for project leavers | 15% | 2.5 |
| Min. percent of participants with new or increased non-employment income for project leavers | 15% | 2.5 |
| Bed/Unit Utilization at or above 90% | 90% | 10 |
| Serve High Need Populations | | |
| % of clients that are CH | 5% | 5 points |
| % of Clients that enter with no income or low income (FY 2021 Income Limits Documentation System -- Summary for Wichita, KS HUD Metro FMR Area (huduser.gov)) | 90% | 5 points |
| Agency serves an undeserved population (substance abuse, mental health, youth) through dedicated beds | Yes | 5 points |
| % of clients that enter were unsheltered at time of enrollment | 40% | 5 points |
| Project Effectiveness | | |
| Costs are within local average cost per positive housing exit for RRH (\$2,172 - \$3,080) | Yes/No | 20 |
| CE Participation – Minimum % of entries to project from CE | 90% | 10 |
| Does this project follow Housing First policies? | Yes/No | 10 |

| Equity Factors | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Recipient has under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc.) in managerial and leadership positions | Yes | 5 |
| Recipient has a relational process for receiving and incorporating feedback from persons with lived experience of homelessness | Yes | 5 |
| Agency commits to reviewing internal policies and procedures with an equity lens, including persons with lived experience of homelessness in the process, and commits to developing and implanting equitable policies that do not impose undue barriers | Yes | 10 |
| Agency Commits to working with HMIS lead to develop a schedule for reviewing HMIS data with disaggregation by race, ethnicity, gender identity, age, and/or other underserved populations | Yes | 10 |
| Other & Local Criteria | | |
| Project is operating in conformance with CoC Standards (Score >=90%) | Yes | 10 |
| Data Quality at or above 90% | 90% | 5 |

Project Type: Permanent Supportive Housing

Thresholds:

- Coordinated Entry Participation
- Housing First and/or Low Barrier Implementation
- Documented, secured minimum match
- Project has reasonable costs per PH exit, (\$4,187- 8,187)
- Project is financially feasible (grant experience)
- Applicant is an active CoC Participant (PIT Count, CoC Meetings, CoC Workgroups, Consolidated Grant Application)

Scoring:

| Performance Measures | | |
|---|---------|-----------|
| Length of Stay before move in | 25 days | 20 points |
| Minimum percent remain in or move into PH | 90% | 25 points |
| Maximum percent of participants return to homelessness w/n 12 months of exit | 10% | 15 |
| Minimum percent of participants with new/increased income for project stayers | 8% | 2.5 |
| Min. percent of participants with new/increased non-employment income for stayers | 15% | 2.5 |
| Min. percent of participants with new/increased earned income for project leavers | 15% | 2.5 |
| Min. percent of participants with new or increased non-employment income for project leavers | 25% | 2.5 |
| Bed/Unit Utilization at or above 90% | 90% | 10 |
| Serve High Need Populations | | |
| % of clients that are CH | 20% | 5 points |
| % of Clients that enter with no income or low income (FY 2021 Income Limits Documentation System -- Summary for Wichita, KS HUD Metro FMR Area (huduser.gov)) | 90% | 5 points |
| % of clients that enter were unsheltered at time of enrollment | 30% | 5 points |
| % of clients with significant barriers to retain permanent housing without support (Physical/mental/developmental/behavioral health) | 80% | 5 |
| Project Effectiveness | | |
| Costs are within local average cost per positive housing exit for PSH (\$4,187-\$8,187) | Yes/No | 20 |
| CE Participation – Minimum % of entries to project from CE | 90% | 10 |

| | | |
|---|--------|----|
| Does this project follow Housing First policies? | Yes/No | 10 |
| Equity Factors | | |
| Recipient has under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc.) in managerial and leadership positions | Yes | 5 |
| Recipient has a relational process for receiving and incorporating feedback from persons with lived experience of homelessness | Yes | 5 |
| Agency commits to reviewing internal policies and procedures with an equity lens, including persons with lived experience of homelessness in the process, and commits to developing and implanting equitable policies that do not impose undue barriers | Yes | 10 |
| Agency Commits to working with HMIS lead to develop a schedule for reviewing HMIS data with disaggregation by race, ethnicity, gender identity, age, and/or other underserved populations | Yes | 10 |
| Other & Local Criteria | | |
| Project is operating in conformance with CoC Standards (Score >=90%) | Yes/No | 10 |
| Data Quality at or above 90% | 90% | 5 |

Project Type: Joint TH-RRH

Thresholds:

- Coordinated Entry Participation
- Documented, secured minimum match
- Project has reasonable costs per PH exit, (\$2,172 - \$3,080)
- Project is financially feasible (grant experience)
- Applicant is an active CoC Participant (PIT Count, CoC Meetings, CoC Workgroups, Consolidated Grant Application)

Scoring:

| Performance Measures | | |
|---|----------|-----------|
| RRH – Length of time homeless between project enrollment and move-in | 15 days | 20 points |
| TH – Average Length of stay | 180 days | 10 points |
| RRH - Minimum percent to move into PH | 90% | 25 points |
| Maximum percent of participants return to homelessness w/n 12 months of exit | 20% | 15 |
| Minimum percent of participants with new/increased income for project stayers | 8% | 2.5 |
| Min. percent of participants with new/increased non-employment income for stayers | 10% | 2.5 |
| Min. percent of participants with new/increased earned income for project leavers | 15% | 2.5 |
| Min. percent of participants with new or increased non-employment income for project leavers | 15% | 2.5 |
| Bed/Unit Utilization at or above 90% | 90% | 10 |
| Serve High Need Populations | | |
| % of clients that are CH | 5% | 5 points |
| % of Clients that enter with no income or low income (FY 2021 Income Limits Documentation System -- Summary for Wichita, KS HUD Metro FMR Area (huduser.gov)) | 90% | 5 points |
| Agency serves an undeserved population (substance abuse, mental health, youth) through dedicated beds | Yes | 5 points |
| % of clients that enter were unsheltered at time of enrollment | 40% | 5 points |
| Project Effectiveness | | |
| Costs are within local average cost per positive housing exit for RRH (\$2,172 - \$3,080) | Yes/No | 20 |
| CE Participation – Minimum % of entries to project from CE | 90% | 10 |
| Does this project follow Housing First policies? | Yes/No | 10 |

| Equity Factors | | |
|---|--------|----|
| Recipient has under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc.) in managerial and leadership positions | Yes | 5 |
| Recipient has a relational process for receiving and incorporating feedback from persons with lived experience of homelessness | Yes | 5 |
| Agency commits to reviewing internal policies and procedures with an equity lens, including persons with lived experience of homelessness in the process, and commits to developing and implanting equitable policies that do not impose undue barriers | Yes | 10 |
| Agency Commits to working with HMIS lead to develop a schedule for reviewing HMIS data with disaggregation by race, ethnicity, gender identity, age, and/or other underserved populations | Yes | 10 |
| Other & Local Criteria | | |
| Project is operating in conformance with CoC Standards (Score >=90%) | Yes/No | 10 |
| Data Quality at or above 90% | 90% | 5 |

New Projects

All Projects (HMIS, CE, RRH, TH+RRH, PSH)

In addition to the CoC and HUD thresholds, each project type has additional thresholds to clear. These thresholds can be found on page 49-52 of the FY2022 NOFO.

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Experience | |
| Describe the experience of the applicant and sub-recipients (if any) in working with the proposed population and in providing housing similar to that proposed in the application. | 15 points |
| Describe experience with utilizing a Housing First approach. Include 1) eligibility criteria; 2) process for accepting new clients; 3) process and criteria for exiting clients. Must demonstrate there are no preconditions to entry, allowing entry regardless of current or past substance abuse, income, criminal records (with exceptions of restrictions imposed by federal, state, or local law or ordinance), marital status, familial status, self-disclosed or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression. Must demonstrate the project has a process to address situations that may jeopardize housing or project assistance to ensure that project participation is terminated in only the most severe cases | 10 |
| Describe experience in effectively utilizing federal funds including HUD grants and other public funding, including satisfactory drawdowns and performance for existing grants as evidenced by timely reimbursement of subrecipients (if applicable), regular drawdowns, timely resolution of monitoring findings, and timely submission of required reporting on existing grants. | 5 |
| Design of Housing & Supportive Services | |
| Extent to which the applicant 1) Demonstrates understanding of the needs of the clients to be served. 2) Demonstrates that type, scale, and location of the housing fit the needs of the clients to be served. 3) Demonstrates that type and scale of the all supportive services, regardless of funding source, meets the needs of clients to be served. 4) Demonstrates how clients will be assisted in obtaining mainstream benefits. 5) Establishes performances measures for housing and income that are objective, measurable, trackable and meet or exceed any established HUD or CoC benchmarks. | 15 |
| Describe the plan to assist clients to rapidly secure and maintain permanent housing that is safe, affordable, accessible, and acceptable to their needs. | 5 |
| Describe how clients will be assisted to increase employment and/or income and to maximize their ability to live independently. | 5 |
| (if a housing project) Project leverages housing resources with housing subsidies or units not funded through the CoC or ESG programs. | 10 |
| (If a housing project) Project leverages health resources, including a partnership commitment with a healthcare organization. | 10 |
| Timeliness | |
| Describe plan for rapid implementation of the program, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing the first program participant. Provide a detailed schedule of proposed activities for 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days after grant award. | 10 |
| Project is cost-effective when projected cost per person served is compared to CoC average within project type. | 5 |
| Organization's most recent audit: | |
| Found no exceptions to standard practices | 5 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Identified agency as 'low risk' | 5 |
| Indicates no findings | 5 |
| Project will only accept referrals from CE | |
| Minimum percent of entries to come from CE is 95% | 5 |
| Equity Factors | |
| New project has under-representated individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc) in managerial and leadership positions | 10 |
| New project has relational process for receiving and incorporating feedback from persons with lived experience or a plan to create one | 10 |
| New project commits to reviewing internal policies and procedures with an equity lens and has a plan for developing and implementing equitable policies that do not impose undue barriers that exacerbate disparities and outcomes | 10 |
| New project describes plan to work with HMIS lead to develop a schedule for reviewing HMIS data with disaggregation by race, ethnicity, gender identity, and or/age. If already implementing plan, describe findings from review | 10 |