

<p><i>Corporation for Supportive Housing</i></p> <p><i>50 Broadway, 17th floor</i></p> <p><i>New York, New York</i></p>	<p>Application ID: 11SI128306</p>
<p>Please find below comments from five Program Reviewers and two Evaluation Reviewers of your application. Reviewers were not required to reach consensus regarding their comments for this review; therefore, there may be disparate views between Reviewers on the quality of your proposal.</p>	
<p>PROGRAM REVIEW</p>	
<p>I. Program Reviewer 1</p>	
<p>COMMENTS: The applicant has a history of grantmaking in this field, having given \$17 million to 333 nonprofits in the last 5 years. They make a strong case for their ability to successfully execute a “healthy futures” issue-area SIF grant. They have made a compelling case for both the existing need and for the efficacy of their chosen intervention of supportive housing. Supportive housing is a best practice that has not yet taken root nationally, and, with its large, experienced local and national staff, the applicant is well positioned to identify and support partners in new geographies. The applicant states that homeless people have higher mortality rates, higher rates of drug use and other risky behaviors, and a decreased likelihood of regular medical treatment for mental and physical illness. Using data pulled from national and state-specific studies, the applicant makes a very persuasive case for the need for supportive housing (SH) assistance, particularly as related to better health outcomes. They chose Los Angeles and 9 other priority geographies from which 4 subgrantees will be selected, and provide strong arguments as to the selection of these areas. Ten selection criteria are referenced, including size of chronically homeless population, existing SH pilots, and opportunities for collaboration. The proposal outlines a clear and comprehensive plan for executing a competitive subgrant selection process, including broadly disseminated RFPs in target geographies and a requirement that supportive housing providers partner with community health centers at the subgrantee proposal stage. The theory of change documentation will be required from subgrantees, and they will need to clearly outline how they will execute on a commitment to replication/expansion targeting frequent users of crisis services. Subgrantees will be required to submit evidence of effectiveness and demonstrate their capacity to manage and report on performance data. These requirements are evidence of a rigorous selection process. The applicant currently has 88 full-time staff, 1 part-time staff, and 3 volunteers, with extensive experience in housing and community development, nonprofits, government, supportive services, grants management, leadership, and administration indicating that there is a robust infrastructure in place to support their multi-city approach. The applicant offers several specific examples from the past 9 years of ways they have used evidence-based approaches for strengthen organizations and build successful outcomes. They have effectively managed multi-site, multi-million dollar grants for RHL, THCH, and FUHSI through shared responsibility between the national office and local offices. This track record indicates that they are capable of managing a SIF investment.</p>	
<p>II. Program Reviewer 2</p>	
<p>COMMENTS: Overall, this applicant presents a comprehensive proposal and detailed approach for addressing significant social issues for many urban communities. The scaling up of the Supportive Housing (SH) model for addressing the social issue of “frequent users” of shelters, ERs and other institutions is exactly what the SIF was created to fund. The applicant has made a persuasive case for the importance of this issue and potential cost savings to local, state and federal social service programs. It is clear from this proposal that innovation is being encouraged and invested in at two levels. First, at the level of the applicant who has granted \$17 M in grants in the last five years to 333 nonprofits who are using the Supportive Housing (SH) method of addressing chronic homelessness and health challenges of “frequent users.” By funding and supporting organizations that are making change</p>	

<p><i>Corporation for Supportive Housing</i></p> <p><i>50 Broadway, 17th floor</i></p> <p><i>New York, New York</i></p>	<p>Application ID: 11SI128306</p>
<p>on these social issues, the applicant is seeking ways to scale up the impact of their approach. Second, through a competitive process, the applicant will encourage social innovation by investing in the expansion of effective SH models in the Los Angeles area. The measurable outcomes are clearly identified in the proposal as evidenced by the list of measurable outcomes that have been used to evaluate previous grantees. The proposed plan for a competitive subgranting process clearly and effectively describes how the applicant will identify organizations that are capable of fulfilling the objectives of this program. The plan will identify capable and innovative organizations that can scale up the SH model which is a key aspect of the SIF NOFO. However, it is unclear what the exact process will be to select the subgrantees. The applicant is experienced in subgranting but does not provide enough detail for the process of subgranting of this SIF. The applicant provides an impressive theory of change and approach to the social issues they are addressing in a cost-effective manner. They have demonstrated a diverse set of funding resources as evidenced by their own funds, and funds raised from various foundations. Their costs are reasonable and leverage the economies of scale evident in their organization. However, it is unclear how the \$1.275M proposed for subgrantees will be used by subgrantees and at what levels. There is ample evidence of prudent funding of subgrantees throughout the proposal but the specifics of the plan are not presented.</p>	
<p>III. Program Reviewer 3</p> <p>COMMENTS: The proposed key measurable outcomes – partnerships, housing stability, healthcare coverage, increased use of preventative and primary care, rise in following of regular drug regimens, fewer mental illness symptoms, improved physical and mental health and reduced use of public crisis care – are relevant to the proposed project. However, it is an ambitious list of measurable outcomes and there are no specific targets beyond increase, improve, rise or reduced. The proposal would benefit from more specific targeting that give a sense of the scale of improvement the program is seeking to achieve. The description of the proposed subgranting process is adequate but lacks sufficient details. Each section includes an overview of the criteria the applicant will use to evaluate proposals but it is not specific enough. The proposed criteria are consistent with the requirements of the SIF but the application does not offer sufficient details as to how they will be adapted within the field in which they work. The proposed technical assistance and capacity building support activities are relevant but not specific enough to be able to assess their likelihood of improving the work of the subgrantees. The proposal does not provide sufficient detail on how it will assist grantees with identifying and securing matching funds. The proposal includes less than a paragraph on the proposed monitoring of subgrantees. It indicates it will work with CNCS semi-annually and “work intensively to detect any operational or programmatic issues.” This is not a sufficient level of detail to evaluate whether or not they have a sound plan for monitoring subgrantees. The budget is thorough and details an allocation of organizational resources and staff time that is not explained in the application narrative. The application provides some additional detail regarding the staffing of the program, the qualifications of the staff administering the subgrant process, the technical assistance and the monitoring and evaluation in the key staff positions and qualifications section of the application. The activities described in the staff descriptions were not elaborated on in either the program design or the organizational capacity section of the proposal.</p>	
<p>IV. Program Reviewer 4</p> <p>COMMENTS: The Corporation for Supportive Housing brings its impressive national reach, extensive experience, entrepreneurial approach and strong organization infrastructure to the cause of persuasively identifying and describing the</p>	

<p><i>Corporation for Supportive Housing</i></p> <p><i>50 Broadway, 17th floor</i></p> <p><i>New York, New York</i></p>	<p>Application ID: 11SI128306</p>
<p>challenges of a homeless population badly in need of attention from social innovators. Overall, CSH makes a strong case that it has the capacity to serve as a sharp-eyed innovation-seeker with the staffing and systems in place to support subgrantees. Specifically: The applicant has scaled its SIF intelligently and appropriately by electing to focus resources raised through and dedicated to the SIF on only four high-need communities and provides a thoughtful set of criteria for narrowing prospective locales for the SIF. The applicant provides examples emphasizing that the supportive housing field lends itself to innovations, citing several cases where groups in various cities coast to coast have developed and independently evaluated successful working innovations, including in Denver, New York, San Francisco and Chicago. In each of these cases, the resulting projects reduced pressure on the public purse, eased service demands on “crisis systems” used by homeless people and produced salutary results for previously homeless individuals. The applicant budgets realistically for staff monitoring, oversight and site-based staff that support the scale, scope and quality of the program design. In particular, the applicant shows realistic staff costs and intends to cover 90 percent of them, exceeding its required contribution.</p>	
<p>V. Program Reviewer 5</p> <p>COMMENTS: The applicant's sole mission is to build the capacity of the supportive housing industry to end homelessness and they have nearly a 20 year history of being the only national nonprofit intermediary dedicated to this effort. The applicant has significant experience in managing federal grants that includes managing over \$12 million in U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development grants. The strength of the organization is supported by a coherent description of a staffing pattern that supports both their national and local work that includes staff in 20 U.S. locations that are overseen by three regional managing directors. The applicant makes a compelling case for the need for innovation but did not provide a clear picture of how their proposed program would result in innovative outcomes. The program design was focused on a process to create infrastructure but the timeline for when that infrastructure would produce outcomes wasn't clear making it difficult to identify the specific measurable outcomes that would be achieved in terms of individuals that would have improved outcomes as a result of the program. The applicant describes a process of providing technical assistance that supports rigorous use of data to drive continuous improvement in program implementation including a customized implementation plan that includes protocols for service delivery, tenant engagement and housing provision. While the description of the required workplan provides confidence that measurable targets will be identified and problem solving will occur throughout the program delivery, what's not clear is whether applicants will be expected to achieve infrastructure outcomes vs. outcomes for individuals.</p>	
<p>EVALUATION REVIEW</p>	
<p>VI. Evaluation Reviewer 1</p> <p>COMMENTS: Overall, this proposal is acceptable. Generally, the proposal is lacking specific research design parameters around experimental/quasi-experimental design appropriateness, as well as metrics, for the proposed project. Additionally, most statements in the proposal regarding the use of data are very broad and lack specificity by way of examples of detailed program</p>	

<p><i>Corporation for Supportive Housing</i></p> <p><i>50 Broadway, 17th floor</i></p> <p><i>New York, New York</i></p>	<p>Application ID: 11SI128306</p>
<p>model changes that resulted. The applicant also does not propose explicitly shared metric systems or technologies to support subgrantee and cross-subgrantee performance measurement and program design improvement processes. Lastly, the applicant does not explicitly state how, for this effort, they will engage their subgrantees in analytically determining the cause-and-effect relationships between specific program design elements and outcomes nor does the applicant detail how it will engage subgrantees in analyzing outcome data to glean insights into how different program design elements work for sub-populations within the “frequent user” population to which they are targeting programs.</p>	
<p>VII. Evaluation Reviewer 2</p> <p>COMMENTS: This applicant provides a clear presentation on the impact and effectiveness of a supportive housing model citing that evaluations have included a variety of methodologies, based on initiative goals research questions, and available funding. This applicant presents a good amount of research and a myriad of successes. The applicant exhibits a nice presentation on supportive housing and its societal benefits. Many studies were listed/described which related to supportive housing. The applicant made a clear case for the value that this would add to individuals and to the community. Although, research that has been gamered is a plus, the applicant does not seem to use the metrics directly to make a difference. The evaluation standards for the subgrantees do not require them to stay in line with designs that research shows have worked. The applicant does not provide enough structure/expectations with how subgrantees roll out their effort—focusing in on how to measure performance. This is an acceptable application but it is unclear that all answers will be there when determining if this effort will really make a difference to the hard to reach populations.</p>	