

Approved Ranking for NOFA Grants Posted 9/8/16

Program Evaluation Committee
 Ranking Procedures for 2016
 August 22, 2016
 Peggy Russell, Chairman

The Southern Illinois Continuum of Care Network Board of Directors met on July 28, 2016 and voted to review System Performance Measurements and other information available that could be generated from HMIS and the most recent APRs available. Agencies were contacted to ensure the amounts they requested *from* HUD agreed with the amounts provided *by* HUD in the Grant Inventory Worksheet. Based on the available information, the projects ranked in the same order as last year.

SICO CN
 2016 PROJECT RANKING FORM
ALL PROJECTS

This form is to be used to place projects in their ranked order. HMIS is required by HUD, and therefore SICO CN ranks it as first on the ranking form. HUD funding priorities indicate PSH, TH, and SSO projects will be approved in that order. SICO CN will also rank in that order, with PSH projects being ranked in first, then TH projects, and finally SSO projects will be ranked. There are no new projects.

RANK NUMBER	TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT NAME	AGENCY
1	HMIS	HMIS 54,813	SWAN
2	PSH	PSH 93,722	SICH
3	PSH	PSH 80,234	SWAN
4	PSH	PSH 187,174	Light the Way
5	PSH	PSH 125,003	SICH
6	TH	TH 2 51,852	SICH
7	TH	TH 1 61,665	SICH
8	TH	TH 19,970	BCM W
9	TH	TH 73,023	SWAN
10	TH	TH 21,436	The Women's Center
11	TH	TH 75,644	Good Samaritan House
12	SSO	TH 29,887	The Women's Center
	TOTAL	\$874,423	

Program Evaluation Committee
 Ranking Procedures for 2016
 August 22, 2016
 Peggy Russell, Chairman

The Southern Illinois Continuum of Care Network Board of Directors met on July 28, 2016 and voted to review System Performance Measurements and other information available that could be generated from HMIS and the most recent APRs available. Agencies were contacted to ensure the amounts they requested *from* HUD agreed with the amounts provided *by* HUD in the Grant Inventory Worksheet. Based on the available information, the projects ranked in the same order as last year.

SICO CN
 2016 PROJECT RANKING FORM
ALL PROJECTS

This form is to be used to place projects in their ranked order. HMIS is required by HUD, and therefore SICO CN ranks it as first on the ranking form. HUD funding priorities indicate PSH, TH, and SSO projects will be approved in that order. SICO CN will also rank in that order, with PSH projects being ranked in first, then TH projects, and finally SSO projects will be ranked. There are no new projects.

RANK NUMBER	TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT NAME	AGENCY
1	HMIS	HMIS 54,813	SWAN
2	PSH	PSH 93,722	SICH
3	PSH	PSH 80,234	SWAN
4	PSH	PSH 187,174	Light the Way
5	PSH	PSH 125,003	SICH
6	TH	TH 2 51,852	SICH
7	TH	TH 1 61,665	SICH
8	TH	TH 19,970	BCMWW
9	TH	TH 73,023	SWAN
10	TH	TH 21,436	The Women's Center
11	TH	TH 75,644	Good Samaritan House
12	SSO	TH 29,887	The Women's Center
	TOTAL	\$874,423	

Posted 8/12/16

SICO CN NOFA WRITER INFORMATION

SICO CN applicants,

Please send a copy of your most recent APR, electronically, to the Program Evaluation Committee Chair, Peggy Russell by 8/17/16: homeless@mchsi.com

Her committee has to have all applications ranked by 8/26/16. I realize that some of you have not been able to complete your new APR due to HUD updating the APR in e-snaps. If this is the case, please send her the most recent one you have submitted and they will use that one. She will let you know if she needs anything else, but that should be it.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Posted 8/2/16

Some things to really consider as you work on your applications....we got docked A LOT of points last year for several things:

- 1) demonstrating assistance to project participants to obtain mainstream benefits (there are specific questions that ask about assisting your participants in obtaining benefits. Please make sure you show that you do this because I'm sure in one way or another you truly are)
- 2) low barrier projects (few projects identified themselves as being low-barrier...please reconsider this as HUD did not like it. If at all possible, please try have a low-barrier project; there are specific questions about being low-barrier which HUD strongly encourages all projects to be....the bottom line is, HUD does not want it to be difficult for people to access your services/housing....their top priority is ending homelessness)
- 3) Housing First- This is a biggie and was a big topic on the debriefing as to why CoC's lost points for not using a Housing First approach (i.e. you house people first and then look at their barriers, addictions, etc.) HUD STRONGLY encourages projects to be Housing First so when you get to the question about this, even if you are in the least bit Housing First, please indicate so.

Sorry for all the info....just doing some reading tonight and trying to figure out ways to increase your score so that no funding is lost this year. Let me know if you have any questions!

SICO CN NOFA WRITER INFORMATION

Well I guess you have all heard, I decided to take on the task of writing the NOFA again. I'm hoping this will give you guys a little more transition time as you look for someone new to take it on. As you probably know, the NOFA was recently released for continuum of care. However, to date, the application is not yet available in e-snaps. I wanted to wait until it was to send an e-mail but I feel we need to get some timelines set. I anticipate it to be available very soon.

- The entire NOFA with all project applications is due 9/14/16 (my deadline)
- Project applications (you guys) will be due August 12th because HUD sets a deadline of when they all have to be ranked.
- The deadline to have projects ranked is August 26th. (Monitoring & Review Committee)

Things to keep in mind:

- Any attachments you use must be dated between 5/1/19-8/12/16
- You will need to export your application from e-snaps and save it to your computer/flash drive, etc so that you can e-mail a copy to Peggy Russell or whoever is currently in charge of your ranking and review
- You will have to do the certification of consistency with the consolidated plan again this year, I think it will like in previous years but I will let you know when I have more information
- All the information (completed application, ranking list, etc.) will have to be put on the website as a HUD requirement
- The ranking committee will really want to look at who they put in tier 2 this year. MANY CoC's lost entire programs that they had placed in tier 2 last year. We were very lucky and somehow slid by. I have a feeling this year might be different. I hope I am wrong and I will do my best on the grant to try and prevent this.

I wish I had more information for you guys. I'm excited to see the application and what all it entails. Sounds like performance measures are going to be a biggie this year. I will update you as soon as I hear anything. Hope everyone is doing well! I miss seeing you guys!!!

Thanks,

LeAnn Speiser

From: [HUD Exchange Mailing List](#)
To: =?utf-8?Q??=
Subject: The FY 2016 CoC Program Competition is Now Open
Date: Wednesday, June 29, 2016 11:47:04 AM

Is this email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

HUD Exchange Mailing List



The FY 2016 CoC Program Competition is Now Open

The Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 Continuum of Care (CoC) Program Competition has been posted to the [FY 2016 CoC Program Competition: Funding Availability page](#) on the HUD Exchange.

Submission Deadline: Wednesday, September 14, 2016 at 7:59:59 PM EDT

- The FY 2016 CoC Program Competition is administered under the CoC Program interim rule (24 CFR part 578) and covers the application and award process for the FY 2016 CoC Program funds.
- The electronic application, *e-snaps*, is **not yet available**. HUD strongly encourages CoCs, Collaborative Applicants, project applicants, and stakeholders to use the time before *e-snaps* opens to:
 - Carefully and thoroughly read the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA to clearly understand what has changed from last year; and
 - Begin to plan local competitions based on the information, new and changed, from the previous competition, provided in the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA.
- An announcement will be made on the [FY 2016 CoC Program Competition: Funding Availability page](#) on the HUD Exchange and via listserv message when the *e-snaps* is available. For your planning purposes, we anticipate this will occur sometime after July 6, 2016.
- HUD will issue a Preliminary Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) Report that includes each CoC's Preliminary Pro Rata Need (PPRN) and ARD amounts no earlier than July 8, 2016, followed by a final ARD Report no earlier than August 5, 2016 that will include each CoC's PPRN, ARD, CoC Planning, and Permanent Housing Bonus amounts available.

What's New and Special Considerations for the FY 2016 CoC Program

Competition

The list below highlights some important information about what has changed, what is new, and special considerations that CoCs should make while planning for the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition. This list is not exhaustive, so please plan to watch the upcoming 2016 NOFA Broadcast and read the Competition Focus Messages for additional information.

- Tier 1 is now 93 percent of the CoC's ARD amount, up from the 85 percent in the FY 2015 CoC Program Competition, which means CoCs will have an opportunity to protect more of the higher priority projects.
- The amount available for the FY 2016 Permanent Housing Bonus is 5 percent of the CoC's Final Pro Rata Need (FPRN), which allows HUD to provide permanent housing bonus funding to more CoCs.
- Tier 2 project-level scoring has been revised to include:
 - Up to 50 points based on CoC Application score;
 - Up to 35 points based on where the CoC ranks a project in Tier 2 in the local ranking process;
 - Up to 5 points based on the type of project in Tier 2; and
 - Up to 10 points based on each Tier 2 project's commitment to a Housing First approach. It is important to note that any project that identifies through the project application as Housing First will be required to operate as such.
- After several years of preparing for and providing information on performance measures, this is the first Competition where CoCs will be rated for submitting system performance measures, which will be worth 10 points. You can find more information about the [System Performance Measures](#) on the HUD Exchange.
- The local ranking process continues to be crucial to making the CoC program as effective as possible. CoCs should use objective, performance-based criteria to rate projects and should consider both the need to serve particular populations (for example, survivors of domestic violence, youth, and persons with substance use disorders) of people experiencing homelessness and the effectiveness of their projects in reducing homelessness.

HUD strongly encourages CoCs to consider the needs of special populations when making local ranking decisions. In particular, HUD has received many questions about transitional housing (TH) projects that serve people fleeing domestic violence. HUD recognizes that in many communities CoC-funded domestic violence programs are vital, particularly in those places where there are no other projects serving people fleeing domestic violence within a reasonable distance. We encourage CoCs to ensure that these programs are reviewed and

ranked with special attention to the needs of the population in mind and that these programs are not unfairly disadvantaged in the local decision-making process. However, we also want to ensure that like all CoC-funded projects, projects serving people fleeing domestic violence are as effective as possible, and we encourage CoCs, when they have TH projects serving households fleeing domestic violence that are lower performing, to reallocate to other types of projects serving people fleeing domestic violence. HUD will release an additional message on this issue shortly.

Listserv Communications

All information related to the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition is communicated via the HUD Exchange Mailing List. Join the mailing list to receive important updates and reminders.

If you are aware or suspect that the Collaborative Applicant, CoC members, or interested stakeholders are not currently receiving these listserv messages, please forward the following link, <https://www.hudexchange.info/maillinglist/>, to them to register for the listserv messages as this is the only form of communication used by HUD to the public.

If you have questions related to subscribing to the HUD Exchange mailing list or have issues receiving listserv messages in your inbox please contact info@hudexchange.info. Please be sure to add news@hudexchange.info and info@hudexchange.info to your contact list or safe senders list. This ensures that messages from the HUD Exchange go to your inbox and are not filtered to your spam or junk folder.

Questions

If you have questions pertaining to *e-snaps* technical issues, please submit your questions to the *e-snaps* [Ask A Question \(AAQ\) portal](#) on the HUD Exchange website. To submit a question to the *e-snaps* AAQ portal, select “*e-snaps*” from the “My question is related to” drop down list on Step 2 of the question submission process.

If you have questions related to the CoC Program interim rule or a policy related question, please submit your questions to the [CoC Program AAQ portal](#). To submit a question to the CoC Program AAQ portal, select “CoC Program” from the “My question is related to” drop down list on Step 2 of the question submission process.

The AAQ portal accepts question submissions 24/7. However, responses are usually provided between 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, except for weekends and federal holidays. Additionally, per the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA, starting 2 days prior to the application deadline for FY 2016 funds, the AAQ will respond only to emergency technical support questions up to the deadline of Wednesday, September 14, 2016 at 7:59:59 PM EDT.



Visit the HUD Exchange at <https://www.hudexchange.info>

[Forward to a Friend](#)



[Update Subscription](#)



This email was sent to housing@WEEOC.ORG by news@hudexchange.info. Do not reply this message. Contact the HUD Exchange at info@hudexchange.info.

[Update Profile/Email Address](#) | [Instant removal with SafeUnsubscribe™](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development | 451 7th Street S.W. | Washington | D.C. | 20410

System Performance Measurement Report - Return to Homelessness

Run on: 23-JUN-16 Reporting Period: 01-OCT-14 to 30-SEP-15

Group Name: IL-520 - Southern Illinois

Measure 2a and 2b: The Extent to which Persons who Exit Homelessness to Permanent Housing Destinations Return to Homelessness within 6 to 12 months (and 24 months in a s

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1		Total Number of Persons who Exited to a Permanent Housing Destination (2 Years Prior)	Number Returning to Homelessness in Less than 6 Months (0 - 180 days)	Percentage of Returns in Less than 6 Months (0 - 180 days)	Number Returning to Homelessness from 6 to 12 Months (181 - 365 days)	Percentage of Returns from 6 to 12 Months (181 - 365 days)	Number Returning to Homelessness from 13 to 24 Months (366 - 730 days)	Percentage of Returns from 13 to 24 Months (366 - 730 days)	Number of Returns in 2 Years	Percentage of Returns in 2 Years
2	Exit Was from SO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Exit was from ES	313	4	1.27	2	.63	3	.95	9	2.87
4	Exit was from TH	21	1	4.76	1	4.76	2	9.52	4	19.04
5	Exit was from SH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	Exit was from PH	92	0	0	2	2.17	0	0	2	2.17
7	TOTAL Returns to Homelessness	426	5	1.17	5	1.17	5	1.17	15	3.52

System Performance Measurement Report - Homeless Persons

Run on: 23-JUN-16 Reporting Period: 01-OCT-14 to 30-SEP-15

Group Name: IL-520 - Southern Illinois

Metric 3.1 - Change in PIT counts of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons

NOTE - The table below is left blank on purpose, because data in it doesn't come from the HMIS. Instead, the data should be manually entered using the appropriate point-in-time counts previously submitted.

	A	B	C	D
1		Previous FY PIT Count	Current FY PIT Count	Difference
2	Universe: Total PIT count of sheltered and unsheltered persons			
3	Emergency Shelter Total			
4	Safe Haven Total			
5	Transitional Housing Total			
6	Total Sheltered Count			
7	Unsheltered Count			

Metric 3.2 - Change in annual counts of sheltered homeless persons in HMIS

	A	B	C	D
1		Previous FY Count	Current FY Count	Difference
2	Universe: Unduplicated Total sheltered homeless persons		932	
3	Emergency Shelter Total		875	
4	Safe Haven Total		0	
5	Transitional Housing Total		79	

System Performance Measurement Report - First Time Homeless

Run on: 06/23/2016 07:05 AM Reporting Period: 10/01/2014 to 09/30/2015

Group Name: IL-520 - Southern Illinois

Metric 5.1 - Change in the number of persons entering ES, SH, and TH projects with no prior enrollments in HMIS

	A	B	C	D
1		Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
2	Universe: Person with entries into ES, SH or TH during the reporting period.		842	
3	Of persons above, count those who were in ES, SH, TH or any PH within 24 months prior to their entry during the reporting year.		171	
4	Of persons above, count those who did not have entries in ES, SH, TH or PH in the previous 24 months. (i.e., Number of persons experiencing homelessness for the first time.)		671	

Metric 5.2 - Change in the number of persons entering ES, SH, TH, and PH projects with no prior enrollments in HMIS

	A	B	C	D
1		Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
2	Universe: Person with entries into ES, SH, TH or PH during the reporting period.		920	
3	Of persons above, count those who were in ES, SH, TH or any PH within 24 months prior to their entry during the reporting year.		175	
4	Of persons above, count those who did not have entries in ES, SH, TH or PH in the previous 24 months. (i.e., Number of persons experiencing homelessness for the first time.)		745	

System Performance Measurement Report - Successful Placement/Retention of Permanent Housing

Run on: 23-JUN-16

Reporting Period: 01-OCT-14 to 30-SEP-15

Group Name: IL-520 - Southern Illinois

Metric 7a.1 - Change in exits to permanent housing destinations

	A	B	C	D
1		Previous FY	Current FY	% Difference
2	Universe: Persons who exit Street Outreach		0	
3	Of persons above, those who exited to temporary & some institutional destinations		0	
4	Of the persons above, those who exited to permanent housing destinations		0	
5	% Successful exits		0	

Metric 7b.1 - Change in exits to permanent housing destinations

	A	B	C	D
1		Previous FY	Current FY	% Difference
2	Universe: Persons in ES, SH, TH and PH-RRH who exited		753	
3	Of the persons above, those who exited to permanent housing destinations		213	
4	% Successful exits		28.28	

Metric 7b.2 - Change in exit to retention of permanent housing

	A	B	C	D
1		Previous FY	Current FY	% Difference
2	Universe: Persons in all PH projects except PH-RRH		140	
3	Of the persons above, those who remained in applicable PH projects and those who exited to permanent housing destinations		140	
4	% Successful exits/retention		100	

NOFA Letters of Intent must be submitted by May 5. You can bring them to the meeting in West Frankfort or send them to Linda Bookwalter at SWAN so that she receives them by May 5.

Sharon Atchison
SICO CN President

Sharon Atchison
Executive Director
The Lighthouse Shelter
1101 N. Madison St.
PO Box 732
Marion, IL 62959
Phone (618)993-8180
Fax (618)997-3625
Email - admin@thelighthouseshelter.com

Priority #

**SICO CN
PROJECT PRIORITY RANKING
RENEWAL PROJECTS**

Maximum Points HMIS-12 PSH- 52 TH- 50 SSO- 36 DV Projects: (DV/PSH)- NA (DV/TH)- 48 (DV/SS)- 36
--

_____ Agency _____ Date _____


_____ Component Type _____

DV Project- Yes No

Max. Points Available

Actual Points

% of Points

Total Points from Monitoring/Evaluation Worksheet  →→→→→			
RANKING ACTIVITY	MEASUREMENT & DATA SOURCE	SCORING RANGE	TOTAL POINTS
1. Program Type	Component type. <i>Source: APR</i> Q3	<input type="checkbox"/> Permanent- PSH(3 points) <input type="checkbox"/> Transitional- TH (2 points) <input type="checkbox"/> SSO- SSO (1 point)	
2. % of Housing Activities	Percentage of HUD funds used for Housing Activities. <i>Source: APR Q 31a4</i> Q30a4: SHP and Cash Match Expenditures During the Operating Year: SHP Funds (Leasing + Operating Expenses): SHP Funds Total Expenses Q3: Amount of Contract or Award	<input type="checkbox"/> 80%+ (3 points) <input type="checkbox"/> 50%-79% (2 points) <input type="checkbox"/> 0%-49% (1 point)	
3. An Agency Representative is on a SICO CN Committee	SICO CN Officers/Committee List 2015-2016	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 point) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 points)	
4. Meeting Attendance	Meeting Minutes (1 year prior to grant due date)	<input type="checkbox"/> Attended 50%-100% (2 points) <input type="checkbox"/> Attended 0%-49% (0 point)	
5. Annual Retreat	Retreat Sign-In Sheets 2015	<input type="checkbox"/> Attended both days (2 points) <input type="checkbox"/> Attended 1 day (1 point)	NA
6. An Agency Representative is a Committee Chair, Officer or Region Representative	SICO CN Officers/Committee List 2015-2016	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 points) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 points)	
		TOTAL POINTS	
		(Add the total points including the total points from the monitoring/evaluation worksheet)	

SICO CN Monitoring/Evaluation Worksheet



Agency _____

Date _____

Program _____

Monitor(s) _____

	MEASUREMENT & DATA SOURCE	SCORING RANGE	TOTAL POINTS
Client Files			
1. HUD Definition of Homeless in client files	Sampling of client files	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation Missing- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation in File (2 Points) (80% or more of the files have documentation)	
2. Documentation of Homelessness in client files	Sampling of client files	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation Missing- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation in File (2 Points) (80% or more of the files have documentation)	
3. HUD Rent Calculation worksheet in client files	Sampling of client files	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation Missing- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation in File (2 Points) (80% or more of the files have documentation)	
4. Intake plan in client files	Sampling of client files	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation Missing- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation in File (2 Points)	
5. Service plan in client files	Sampling of client files	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation Missing- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation in File (2 Points) (80% or more of the files have documentation)	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Accounting			
6. Staff time sheets show HUD hours	Fiscal Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation Missing- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation Provided- (2 Points)	
7. Account Code- Separate Ledger from other records	Fiscal Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation Missing- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation Provided- (2 Points)	
Efficient Use of Resources			
8. Bed Utilization Rate (PSH, TH only)	Average Daily utilization rate during the operating year. <i>Source: APR</i> Q10/Q11	<i>HUD Benchmark 85%</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 0-25%- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> 25-50%- (1 Point) <input type="checkbox"/> 51-79%- (2 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> ≥80%- (3 Points) Bonus Points (In addition to points above) <input type="checkbox"/> ≥90%- (2 Points)	

9. Spend-down of HUD funding	Percentage of HUD funds expended during the last completed HUD contract. <i>Source: APR</i> <u>Q30a.4: Total SHP Expenses (Total Expenses, SHP column)</u> <u>Q3: Amount of Contract or Award</u>	<i>HUD Benchmark 100%</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 0-75%- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> 76-94%- (1 Point) <input type="checkbox"/> ≥95%- (2 Points)	
HMIS			
10. HMIS Bed Coverage (Does not apply to DV, HMIS or SSO)	Total HMIS bed coverage rate for all year round beds. <i>Source: APR</i> Q6	<i>HUD Benchmark 100%</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 0-94% (1 Point) <input type="checkbox"/> ≥95% (2 Points)	
Performance Measures			
11. Cash Income (PSH, TH, SSO)	Percentage of adult leavers who maintained or increased their cash income (except maintenance of \$0 income). <i>Source: APR</i> <u>Q24b.2: #ofAdults Retained same \$ at exit + # of Adults retained & increased \$ at exit + did not have income & gained income</u> <u>Q23: Total Adult Leavers (column 3)</u>	<i>HUD Benchmark- 90%</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 0-25%- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> 26-50%- (1 Point) <input type="checkbox"/> 51- 84%- (2 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> ≥85%- (3 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> No Leavers (3 Points) Bonus Points (In addition to points above) <input type="checkbox"/> ≥95% (2 Bonus Points)	
12. Non-Cash Benefits (PSH, TH, SSO)	Percentage of adult leavers who were in receipt of non-cash benefits. <i>Source APR</i> <u>Q26a2: adultleavers with 1 + source</u> <u>Q23: Total adult leavers (column 3)</u>	<i>HUD Benchmark- 20%</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 0-14%- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> ≥15%- (2 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> No Leavers (2 Points) Bonus Points (In addition to points above) <input type="checkbox"/> ≥25% (2 Bonus Points)	
13. Employment (PSH, TH, SSO)	Percentage of adults with earned income. <i>Source APR</i> <u>Q25a1: Adultleaverswithearnedincome+25b1 adultstayerswithearned income</u> <u>Q23:Totaladultleavers(column 3 total)+stayers(column 2 total)</u>	<i>HUD Benchmark- 20%</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 0-14%- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> 15-20% (2 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> No Leavers (2 Points) Bonus Points (In addition to points above) <input type="checkbox"/> ≥25% (2 Bonus Points)	
14. Exits to PH (TH)	Percentage of leavers exiting to permanent housing. <i>Source: APR</i> <u>Q29a1: Perm_Destination subtotal (column1)+ Q29a2 Perm_Destination Subtotal (column1)</u> <u>Q29a1 Total (Column 1) + Q29a2 (Column 1)</u>	<i>HUD Benchmark- 65%</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 0-25%- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> 26-59%- (1Points) <input type="checkbox"/> ≥60%- (2 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> No Leavers (2 Points) Bonus Points (In addition to points above) <input type="checkbox"/> ≥70% (2 Bonus Points)	
15. Length of Participation (PSH)	Percentage of PSH participants staying longer than 6 months. <i>Source: APR</i> <u>Q27: stayerandleavers ≥ 181 days</u> <u>Q27: Totalallleaversandstayers</u>	<i>HUD Benchmark- 80%</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 0-25%- (0 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> 26-50%- (1 Point) <input type="checkbox"/> 51-74%- (2 Points) <input type="checkbox"/> ≥75%- (3 Points) Bonus Points (In addition to points above) <input type="checkbox"/> ≥85%- (2 Bonus Points)	
		TOTAL POINTS	

Comments: _____

Agency Representative Signature

Date

Monitor Signature

Date

Monitor Signature

Date