Impact ICT Continuum of Care
Rank and Review Procedure

Selection of Ranking & Review Committee Members

Ranking and Review Committee Members are selected by the Collaborative Applicant, with approval from the CoC Advisory Board, who are knowledgeable about homelessness and housing in Wichita-Sedgwick County and who are broadly representative of the relevant subpopulations, CoC membership, and the geographic area. The Ranking and Review Committee will be composed of representatives from a cross-section of groups which might include Faith-based and non-profit providers of homeless services and housing; housing developers; local government representatives; mental health; substance abuse; veteran’s services; and persons with lived expertise of homelessness. The members of the committee must be unbiased and not be employed by or sit on the Board of any current recipient of CoC funds or an applicant for CoC funds.

The Ranking Committee will consist of seven to eleven members. The Committee members will be trained on topics including:
- An overview of the Federal and Local Strategic Plans to end homelessness
- An overview of the current system to end homelessness
- Best Practices to reach Functional Zero, including strong data management, Coordinated Entry and a Quality By Name List, and a housing-focused approach
- Information regarding homelessness activities, needs, services, definitions, and other issues that are pertinent to the CoC
- The role of the Ranking & Review Committee
- An overview of the scoring tools, eligible applications, resources, and APR data

Ranking and Review Process for New and Renewal Applications

The selected and unbiased Ranking and Review Committee will meet annually to review new and renewal projects, recommend reallocations, and rank projects for inclusion in the Impact ICT CoC Application. The proposal scores and rankings will be based on the current year’s Notice Of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) and the objective scoring rubric, both of which will be widely distributed and available on the collaborative applicant’s website.

Projects will be expected to meet certain thresholds for consideration, which can include participation in CoC activities, participation in HMIS, compliance with the CoC Data Quality Plan, commitment to Housing First in policies and procedures, compliance with evidence-based practices, and participation in Coordinated Entry.

Renewal project outcomes for the previous full program year, as indicated by the Annual Progress Report generated from HMIS data, will be the primary way renewal projects are scored. A new project’s proposed outcomes and evidence that the outcomes are achievable through experience will be the primary way new projects are scored. Projects may also be scored by, but not limited to, cost effectiveness, efficiency, outcomes including household income increases and permanent housing exits, number of persons served, and percentage of the grant spent.
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Reviewing and Prioritizing Projects for Funding:
The Ranking and Review Committee will review all new and renewal applications for CoC funds to determine eligibility, score, and rank based on the terms of the needs of the Impact ICT CoC as well as the current year’s NOFO.

General Procedure:
HUD CoC Funds are granted based on a national competition following a local competition. The local competition, including the Ranking and Review Process, is designed to present the best possible projects to HUD for funding based on community need and quality of the projects. Prior to HUD releasing the IMPACT ICT NOFO, the CoC coordinates the following process:

- The Collaborative Applicant considers community priorities based on Coordinated Entry Prioritization, the Local strategic plan, the gaps-and-needs analysis, and the previous competition’s Preliminary Pro Rata Need (PPRN), then designs and presents scoring materials to the Impact ICT Advisory Board for approval.
- The Impact ICT Advisory Board considers and approves the scoring tools and materials.
- The CoC will advertise in the local newspaper, post on its website, and/or distribute to its membership a public notice requesting applications for both new and renewal projects. The public notice will include the CoC’s priorities and details of eligibility applications, as defined by the current year’s NOFO, will be posted.
- The Collaborative Applicant selects members for the Ranking & Review Committee; the CoC Advisory Board approves the slate of selected members.
- Applicants submit project applications to the Collaborative Applicant for threshold review; eligible applications are turned over to the Ranking and Review Committee. Ineligible applications can revise and resubmit until the final submission deadline, as outlined in the local CoC competition announcement.
- Ranking and Review Committee Members independently review and score each application prior to meeting, per the scoring rubric published on the CoC website.
- Together, the Ranking and Review Committee reviews, scores, and ranks the projects using the approved scoring rubric that is posted on the Collaborative Applicant’s website.
  - The Collaborative Application Staff takes notes and documents group feedback, but do not participate in the decision-making process.
- The Ranking & Review Committee allocates funding to projects based on the published NOFO’s PPRN, project ranking and score, and the gaps-and-needs analysis, considering the number of needed units of each of housing resource.
- The Ranking and Review Committee presents their total score sheet and ranking, as well as feedback to the Collaborative Applicant staff to send announcements and post on the Collaborative Applicant’s website.

Funding Priorities and Local Need
All our neighbors experiencing homelessness deserve housing and services, however, there are specific areas that present the highest level of need and will be a funding priority for the CoC. Creating funding priorities is driven by the community’s gaps-and-needs analysis, which is created based on HMIS and PIT/HIC data, and community input. The gaps-and-needs analysis is presented to and approved by the CoC Advisory Board.

Procedures for Application Submissions
Applications must be submitted to the Collaborative Applicant for threshold review per the instructions on the posted and widely distributed notice.

- Applications must also be submitted via e-snaps by the identified due date, usually 30 days prior to the submission date of the CoC Collaborative Application.
**Late and Incomplete Applications Policy**
To promote fairness to those applications that were submitted before the final deadline, late applications will not be accepted. Incomplete applications cannot be cured for Ranking and Review Committee scoring, but must be corrected prior to final HUD submission.

**Using All Available Funds and Bonus Opportunities**
The CoC will do everything possible to ensure that all funds available to the community are applied for. If the CoC has not received enough applications prior to the application deadline and either 1) the community is not requesting as much money as is available from HUD or 2) no eligible bonus projects have been submitted, then:

- The Collaborative Applicant will make an additional announcement of how much money is available and for what type of programs, if there are qualifications.

Any additional applications for these funds will be due one week after the announcement is made or no later than 30 days before the CoC Collaborative Application submission deadline.

**Application Eligibility Threshold Review**
Projects must pass a threshold review before being submitted to the Ranking and Review Committee. The Collaborative Applicant will complete the threshold review to verify the eligibility of:

- Applicant
- Project
- Activity
- Completeness of Application

This review will take place prior to the application’s submission to the Ranking and Review Committee. Proposals not completely meeting threshold review criteria will not be forwarded to the Ranking and Review Committee; instead, they will be returned to the applicant with the noted deficiencies.

**Scoring Tools**
Scoring tools are created by the Collaborative Applicant and approved by the Impact ICT Advisory Board. The scoring tools may review projects based on, but not limited to, the below rating factors:

- Independent audits
- Surveys of program clients
- Cost Effectiveness
- Provider Organization Experience
- Provider Organization Capacity
- CoC Involvement
- HMIS Participation
- Match funds committed to the project
- APR data
- Program Outcomes or Expected Program Outcomes
- Increases in Client Income
- Length of Time Homeless (Project Entry to Move-in date)
- Exits to Permanent Housing
- Coordinated Entry
- Other priorities as determined by the CoC based on NOFO priorities
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Ranking of Projects for the Collaborative Application Project Listing

HUD requires all projects to be ranked in two tiers. Tier 1 is defined by HUD in the NOFO as a percent of the CoC’s Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) approved by HUD on the final HUD-approved Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW).

Tier 2 projects are conditionally awarded based on Impact ICT’s Collaborative Application score, the scores of other CoCs, and on available funding. Tier 2 is the difference between Tier 1 and the CoC’s ARD, plus any amount available for bonus, as described in the HUD NOFO.

The Ranking and Review Committee will rank both renewal and new projects selected to be included in the CoC Collaborative Application using their total score. All points available will be part of the notice (RFP) and posted on a scoring rubric available on the collaborative applicant’s website. Projects that fall below the Tier 2 funding line will not be included in the CoC Collaborative Application.

Reallocation Policy
Any funds reallocated due to recapturing unspent funds, voluntary or involuntary reallocation will be made available during the allocation portion of the Ranking and Review Committee’s process.

Voluntary Reallocation
As part of the local solicitation for inclusion in the HUD CoC Collaborative Application, providers are strongly encouraged to reallocate projects that are not spending their full award, are underutilized, underperforming, and/or not in alignment with the needs-and-gaps analysis. Such reallocated funds are pooled for reallocation to New or Expansion Projects.

Involuntary Reallocation
Projects with poor performance, not spending their full award, underutilizing beds, misalignment with CE, Housing First, and Housing-Focused principles and practices, not serving the intended population, significant, unresolved findings, or not clearing thresholds are subject to involuntary reallocation.

Unspent Funds – For Grants Awarded during the FY23 NOFO Competition
The CoC is responsible for ending homelessness, which includes fully utilizing resources. Underspending funds directly goes against this mission. Projects that are not fully expending their grant awards are subject to the reallocation process.

Projects that have underspent their award by 10% may be reduced by 80% of the unspent amount. A one-year grace period may be extended by the Impact ICT Advisory Board to providers who appeal proposed reallocation with a plan that demonstrates that the grant’s expenditure will be improved in the current program year.
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