**SOUTH CENTRAL ILLINOIS CONTINUUM OF CARE**

**BOARD MEETING**

# Agenda

Lake Land College, Mattoon, IL

April 10, 2019 at 12:30 pm

**I.** Welcome-Call to Order

**II.** Roll Call

**III.** Organization Spotlight – Michael Stopka – The Haven

**IV.** Board Application Training (Questions 1E-3, 1E-4, 1E-5)

**V.** Old Business

- January 9, 2019 Board Meeting Minutes
- Application Updates
  - 2019 Competition Timeline - Updated
- IL-516 PIT/HIC Report Breakfast

**VI.** Committee Reporting

- Executive Committee - Kevin Bushur
- HMIS - Larry Sullivan
- Membership and Marketing - Gerry Schlechte
- Planning and Assessment – Barb Waymire
- Monitoring and Ranking – Fred Spannaus
  - Recommendations for Changes to Ranking System
  - Monitoring Report
- Sub Committees and Task Forces:
  - Veterans – Dana Tell
  - SOAR - Stephanie Stahlhut
  - HIC and PIT – Larry Sullivan
    - 2019 PIT/HIC Update
  - Coordinated Entry Task Force – Susie Beaumont
    - Yearly CE Look

**VII.** New Business

- FY2018 CoC Competition Debrief
- HB3331 Update

**VIII.** Other

**Conference Call Information:**
**Dial-In Number: (605) 475-4883**
**Access Code: 630483**
**Pin: 4661**

to chronic homelessness, and the other pertains to health conditions, income status, and prior living conditions. This section uses HUD's Ranking Tool.

Additionally, our alternate review system for victim service providers awards priority consideration to projects serving victims of abuse.

As a tiebreaker, our Ranking Committee considers geographic balance by calculating the amount of HUD homeless assistance (CoC and ESG dollars) per homeless person in each of three geographic areas in the CoC.

**1E-3. Public Postings. Applicants must indicate how the CoC made public:**
**(1) objective ranking and selection process the CoC used for all projects (new and renewal);**
**(2) CoC Consolidated Application–including the CoC Application, Priority Listings, and all projects accepted and ranked or rejected, which HUD required CoCs to post to their websites, or partners websites, at least 2 days before the CoC Program Competition application submission deadline; and**
**(3) attach documentation demonstrating the objective ranking, rating, and selections process and the final version of the completed CoC Consolidated Application, including the CoC Application with attachments, Priority Listing with reallocation forms and all project applications that were accepted and ranked, or rejected (new and renewal) was made publicly available, that legibly displays the date the CoC publicly posted the documents.**

| Public Posting of Objective Ranking and Selection Process | | Public Posting of CoC Consolidated Application including: CoC Application, Priority Listings, Project Listings | |
|---|---|---|---|
| CoC or other Website | ☐ | CoC or other Website | ☐ |
| Email | ☐ | Email | ☐ |
| Mail | ☐ | Mail | ☐ |
| Advertising in Local Newspaper(s) | ☐ | Advertising in Local Newspaper(s) | ☐ |
| Advertising on Radio or Television | ☐ | Advertising on Radio or Television | ☐ |
| Social Media (Twitter, Facebook, etc.) | ☐ | Social Media (Twitter, Facebook, etc.) | ☐ |

**1E-4. Reallocation. Applicants must indicate whether the CoC has cumulatively reallocated at least 20 percent of the CoC's ARD between the FY 2014 and FY 2018 CoC Program Competitions.**

**Reallocation:** Yes

**1E-5. Local CoC Competition. Applicants must indicate whether the CoC:**
**(1) established a deadline for project applications that was no later than 30 days before the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition Application deadline–attachment required;**
**(2) rejected or reduced project application(s)–attachment required; and**

## (3) notify applicants that their project application(s) were being rejected or reduced, in writing, outside of e-snaps, at least 15 days before FY 2018 CoC Program Competition Application deadline–attachment required. :

| | |
|---|---|
| **(1) Did the CoC establish a deadline for project applications that was no later than 30 days before the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition Application deadline? Attachment required.** | Yes |
| **(2) If the CoC rejected or reduced project application(s), did the CoC notify applicants that their project application(s) were being rejected or reduced, in writing, outside of e-snaps, at least 15 days before FY 2018 CoC Program Competition Application deadline? Attachment required.** | Did not reject or reduce any project |
| **(3) Did the CoC notify applicants that their applications were accepted and ranked on the Priority Listing in writing outside of e-snaps, at least 15 before days of the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition Application deadline?** | Yes |

**South Central Illinois Continuum of Care**
**January 9, 2019**
**Board Meeting**

Attendees: Barb Waymire, Jessica Pauley, Cindy Mayer, Kelly Hardy, Larry Sullivan, Christi Dawson, Theresa Loy, Susie Beaumont, Fred Spannaus, Stephanie Stahlhut, Gerry Schlechte, Kevin Bushur, Brandy Sechrest & Rebecca Sudduth

Dana Tell from SSVF was the spotlight organization-Stand down is an event that all community agencies are invited to showcase what services are provided to Veterans. Functional Zero for Mattoon & Charleston waiting for the announcement that they have zero veterans that are homeless. 90, but usually 30 days they are housed.

Board Application Training: 1D-1-CoC does have a policy but not in writing Maybe consultants could work on that
1E-1-Project Ranking System we have set up and working pretty good.
1E-2-We do a lot for severity of needs and vulnerabilities

Old Business: Gerry made the motion to approve the October Meeting Minutes and Kelly 2nd motion carried.

PIT: Info on how to calculate who is homeless. PIT count will be 24th of January. Please get all info to IVED. Time for this count is 12:00 am-12:00 pm. should a question be changed from where did you sleep late night to where are you sleeping tonight.

Application updates: Government shut down so don't know who is funded

Execute committee-no meeting
HMIS Committee-Jan 2 conference call discussed the HMIS assessment. HUD Recommendations went through he assessment tool and think they are meeting HUD requirements. 3 areas in improvement
Emergency shelter beds coverage did not have 85% in HMIS,
CoC notices deficiency don't have a policy to correct
Funding for HMIS –what are the actual cost to operate HMIS and where does the funding come from. Motion to amendment Jess made motion and Gerry 2nd, motion carried.
Membership & Marketing Committee-Jan 9th attendance report attendance is outstanding, need someone to replace Brandy for attendance report. Make sure annual membership is on brochure, website and maybe Facebook. Received 3 self-nominations that are the same as now. Kelly made the Motion to approve nominations Gerry 2nd motion carried. Board member term renewal that was Tracy and she is no longer on board. Amendment for the governance charter. 3 remaining meeting dates for the year.

Planning & Assessment-Jan 8- review plan for each quarter. Coordinated Entry task force meets about every 3 months and scheduled next meeting Coordinated Entry is a sub committee of Planning and Assessment. March is next meeting. No longer needed the employment task for.

Monitoring & ranking-in the process of monitoring for the 4th quarter. Meeting Jan 25th would like report the monitoring to the board. Tweaking the ranking process.

Sub Committee

Veterans Task Force-Meeting once a month, not a lot to talk about

SOAR-No updates

HIC & PIT- check accuracy for the HIC.

Coordinated Entry Task Force- doing well with progress, got 3 regions detailed.

New Business:

Proposed Governance Charter Changes-Kevin wanted to have more clarification on the Executive Committee in the governance charter. Need two more people on the executive committee. Jess made the motion to change the governance charter and Kelly 2nd, motion carried. Gerry and Dana on executive committee. Kevin made a motion and Brandy 2nd, motion carried.

Renew Agency Proxy Forms-New Proxies need to be turned into Jess by Feb 1st.

2019 CoC Competition Timeline-Some dates will change after HUD gives those dates. It is on the website. Should there be dates for appeals. Add 5 days for appeals

IL-516 PIT/HIC Report Breakfast-The board is invited on March 21st. How the PIT is reported to the community

Other: Brandy passed out the MKV numbers through Dec 15th

Jess discussed the April Semi-Annual meeting and Kelly is going to find a presenter.

Gerry made a motion to adjourn and Jess 2nd, motion carried.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | South Central Illinois Continuum of Care | | | |
| | 2019 Program Competition Timeline | | | Black is CoC competition related |
| | | | | Red is Continuum Operations |
| Sequence | Timeframe and Due Date | | | Task |
| 1 | 01/01/19 | | | BOD Application Competition Training |
| 2 | 01/09/19 | | | Board of Directors Annual Mtg. recommend board selection |
| 3 | 01/11/19 | | | Point in Time Training |
| 4 | 01/24/19 | | | Point in Time Count |
| 5 | 01/25/19 | | | Quarterly Project Monitoring |
| 6 | 01/31/19 | | | FY2019 CoC Program Registration Opens |
| 7 | 02/01/19 | | | Ranking and monitoring committee process started |
| 8 | 03/14/19 | | | Registration Closed |
| 9 | 04/10/19 | | | BOD Mtg and Semi Annual Training hosted by IVEDC |
| 10 | 04/10/19 | | | Ranking System approval by Board (new apps last) |
| 11 | 04/15/19 | | projected | GIW available on HUD exchange |
| 12 | 04/20/19 | | projected | Field Offices review GIW from CoC |
| 13 | 04/25/19 | | | Quarterly Project Monitoring |
| 14 | 04/30/19 | | projected | Field Offices post GIW to HUD Exchange |
| 15 | 04/30/19 | | | Deadline for HIC and PIT Submission on HDX |
| 16 | 05/03/19 | | | FY2019 NOFA Released |
| 17 | 05/07/19 | | 1 wk after NOFA | Solicitation announcement for new projects to all agencies and public |
| 18 | 05/10/19 | | 2 wks after NOFA | Intent for Reapply due for all Renewal Projects, including request for voluntary reallocation |
| 19 | 05/20/19 | | projected | CoC Program Competition Opens |
| 20 | 05/22/19 | | | Confirm Profiles (IVEDC, ERBA, CEFS and CoC) |
| 21 | 05/28/19 | | projected | Project Applications available in esnaps |
| 22 | 06/03/19 | | 4 wks after NOFA | Notice of intent for new projects, with project type and estimated dollar amounts |
| 23 | 06/03/19 | | 4 wks after NOFA | PDF version of renewal project application to Lead for approval before submit button |
| 24 | 06/05/19 | | projected | Commitment of projects sent to Board |
| 25 | 06/10/19 | | 5 wks after NOFA | All Renewal Applications submitted |
| 26 | 06/17/19 | | 6 wks after NOFA | MRR Committee notifies applicants of all projects selected for ranking (based on HUD threshold requirements) |
| 27 | 06/24/19 | | 7 wks after NOFA | PDF version of new project application to Lead for approval before submit button |
| 28 | 06/30/19 | | 8 wks after NOFA | All new projects submitted |
| 29 | 07/10/19 | | | BOD Meeting |
| 30 | 07/14/19 | | 10 wks after NOFA | MRR Releases ranking results to Board and to public |
| 31 | 07/19/19 | | 5 days after rank rel. | Deadline for Appeal of Ranking to Board |
| 32 | 07/25/19 | | | Quarterly Project Monitoring |
| 33 | 07/27/19 | | projected | Post CoC app, attachments, Priority Listing |
| 34 | 07/27/19 | | | Notify Community and key stakeholders app is available |
| 35 | 08/02/19 | | HUD date Aug 18? | Final CoC, Priority List & Project Apps submitted to HUD |
| 36 | 10/01/19 | | projected | HDX opens for LSA data entry |
| 37 | 10/02/19 | | projected | Monitor of existing projects to include ESG |
| 38 | 10/09/19 | | | BOD Meeting and Semi Annual hosted by CEFS |
| 39 | 10/25/19 | | | Quarterly Project Monitoring |
| 40 | 11/09/19 | | projected | Deadline for LSA Test Upload for both All Persons and Veterans |
| 41 | 11/30/19 | | projected | Deadline for LSA Final Upload for both All Persons and Veterans |
| 42 | 12/05/19 | | projected | LSA deadline confirmation of data for All Persons and Veterans |

# Ranking Scales for CoC Projects – FY 2019
# South Central Illinois CoC (IL-515)

**PROPOSED CHANGES ARE IN RED**

**NOTES:**

1. Data is taken from SAGE APRs unless otherwise noted. SAGE APR reports are generated for all projects for a 12-month period ending in the most recently completed calendar quarter.
2. All numbers and percentages are rounded to nearest whole number/percentage.

| RANKING FACTORS FOR RENEWAL PROJECTS | Maximum Points |
|---|---|
| **1. Needs and Vulnerabilities**<br><br>HOW MEASURED: Percentage of participants who entered the project with high barriers.<br><br>CALCULATION:<br>For RRH Projects, there are three factors:<br>• At or above average of all RRH projects in percentage of adult participants had with income at entry (from item Q16)<br>• At or above average of all RRH projects in percentage of adult participants with more than one condition at entry (Q13a2)<br>• At or above average of all RRH projects in percentage of adult participants who entered project from place not meant for human habitation (Q15)<br><br>For PSH projects, there are three factors:<br>• At or above average of all PSH projects in percentage of adult participants with zero income at entry (from item Q16)<br>• At or above average of all PSH projects in percentage of adult participants with more than one condition at entry (Q13a2)<br>• At or above average of all PSH projects in percentage of adult participants who entered project from place not meant for human habitation (Q15)<br><br>SCALE:<br>Projects meeting all three factors = 5 points<br>Projects meeting two factors = 3 points<br>Projects meeting one factor = 1 point<br>Projects meeting zero factors = 0 points | 5 |
| **2. Chronic Homelessness**<br><br>HOW MEASURED: Percentage of participants who were chronically homeless at entry.<br><br>CALCULATION: Number of chronically homeless adults divided by total number of adults (from item Q05a).<br><br>SCALE:<br>Highest percentage among all projects = 3 points<br>Second highest percentage = 2 points<br>All other projects serving any chronically homeless = 1 point<br>Projects serving no chronically homeless = 0 points<br><br>Tied projects receive full score, and the next highest project receives the score for the next level. For example, if two projects tie for highest percentage, they both get 3 points, and the project(s) with the next highest percentage gets 2 points. | 3 |

| RANKING FACTORS FOR RENEWAL PROJECTS | Maximum Points |
|---|---|
| **3. Housing Stability**<br><br>HOW MEASURED: The percentage of participants remaining in or exiting to permanent housing.<br><br>CALCULATION: The number of stayers in permanent housing, including RRH, at the end of the year (from item Q05a), plus the number who exited to permanent housing destinations during the year (from items Q23a and Q23b); divided by the total number of persons (Q05a)<br><br>SCALE:<br>100% = 5 points<br>90-99% = 4 points<br>80-89% = 3 points<br>70-79% = 2 points<br>60-69% = 1 point<br>Less than 60% = 0 points | 5 |
| **4. Housing First**<br><br>HOW MEASURED: Housing First Self-Assessment score **(WE WILL POST QUESTIONNAIRES ON THE CoC WEBSITE)**<br><br>SCALE:<br>170-180 = 5 points<br>160-169 = 4 points<br>150-159 = 3 points<br>140-149 = 2 points<br>130-139 = 1 point<br>Under 130 = 0 points | 5 |
| **5. Income Increases**<br><br>HOW MEASURED: Percentage of adults who increased any income.<br><br>CALCULATION: From item Q19a3, line 6 (any income). Number of adults in column 8, divided by total adults (column 7).<br><br>SCALE:<br>60% or more = 5 points<br>45-59% = 4 points<br>30-44% = 3 points<br>15-29% = 2 points<br>1-14% = 1 points | 5 |
| **6. APR Submission**<br><br>HOW MEASURED: If APR submitted within 90 days of project end date, as reported by grantees.<br><br>SCALE:<br>APR submitted within 90 days of project end date = 3 points<br>91 or more days = 0 points<br>Projects in their first year of operation for whom APR is not due by time of ranking will receive 3 points. | 3 |

| RANKING FACTORS FOR RENEWAL PROJECTS | Maximum Points |
|---|---|
| **7. Spending**<br><br>HOW MEASURED: Percentage of funds expended at end of project term, as reported by grantees.<br><br>SCALE:<br>Project spent 100% of grant funds in most recent completed year = 5 points<br>90-99% = 3 points<br>80-89% = 2 points<br>70-79% = 1 points<br>Less than 70% = 0 points | 5 |
| **8. Data Quality and Security**<br><br>HOW MEASURED: Accuracy and completeness of HMIS client data, and security measures to protect client data<br><br>CALCULATION:<br>(1) Percentage of errors in 12 HMIS data fields (6 from Q06a, 5 from Q06b, and 1 from Q06c/Exits on line 4):<br>a. Universe for Q06a and Q06b is Q05a, line 1 (total # served)<br>b. Universe for Q06c/Exits is Q05a, line 6 (# adult leavers)<br>(2) Completion of HMIS security checklist.<br><br>SCALE:<br>Up to 2 points for percentage errors in HMIS client data fields:<br>0.00% error rate = 2 points<br>0.01% to 0.99% error rate = 1 point<br>1.00% and above error rate = 0 points<br><br>Up to 2 points for HMIS questionnaire:<br>Follow all Core Elements plus at least 1 Advanced Element = 2 points<br>Follow all Core Elements = 1 point<br>Does not follow all Core Elements = 0 points | 4 |
| **9. Type of Project**<br><br>HOW MEASURED: Incentives for projects that provide permanent housing or meet critical local needs.<br><br>SOURCE: Most recent project application.<br>PSH = 5 points<br>RRH = 3 points<br>HMIS and SSO/Coordinated Entry = 2 points<br>All other projects = 0 points | 5 |
| **10. SOAR Training**<br><br>HOW MEASURED: As reported by grantees.<br><br>SCALE:<br>Staff of grantee or designated referral agency completed SOAR training in past 24 months = 1 point<br>Staff of grantee or designated referral agency did not complete SOAR training in past 24 months = 0 points | 1 |
| **MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS** | **41** |

**Tie Breakers**

If two or more projects receive the exact same score, the tie(s) will be broken as follows:

- Tiebreaker #1 – **Funds available per person by region**. We will compute this as follows: Take the total CoC and ESG funds currently available in each region, and divide it by the PIT count for the region. Projects in the region with the smaller amount of funds available per person win the tie. If projects are still tied because they are in the same region, we will move to Tiebreaker #2.
- Tiebreaker #2 - **Number of beds**. The project with the greater number of beds (from Project Application section 4B) wins the tie. If projects are still tied because they have the same number of beds, we will move to Tiebreaker #3.
- Tiebreaker #3 – **Budget**. The project with the higher total budget (from Project Application section 6I) wins the tie.

| Grantee | Project | | Needs and Vulnerabilities | Chronic Homelessness | Housing Stability | Housing First | Income | APR Submission | Spending | Data Quality and Security | Type of Project | SOAR Training | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Max Points→** | **5** | **3** | **5** | **5** | **5** | **3** | **5** | **4** | **5** | **1** | **41** |
| C.E.F.S. | PSH | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C.E.F.S. | RRH (from SSO Reallocation) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C.E.F.S. | RRH (formerly TH) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ERBA | Permanent Housing | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ERBA | Rapid Rehousing | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IVEDC | Rapid Rehousing | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| SPECIAL RANKING FACTORS FOR FIRST-TIME RENEWAL PROJECTS<br>WITH LESS THAN 12 MONTHS HISTORY | Maximum Points |
|---|---|
| **1. Chronic homelessness**<br><br>WHAT: Housing for persons who are chronically homeless.<br><br>HOW MEASURED: Percentage of all beds that are designated or prioritized for chronically homeless.<br><br>SOURCE: First-year project application (item 4B).<br><br>SCALE:<br>100% of beds dedicated or prioritized = 5 points<br>90-99% = 4 points<br>80-89% = 3 points<br>70-79% = 2 points<br>60-69% = 1 point<br>Less than 60% = 0 points | 5 |
| **2. Housing First**<br><br>HOW MEASURED: Housing First Self-Assessment score<br><br>SCALE:<br>170-180 = 5 points<br>160-169 = 4 points<br>150-159 = 3 points<br>140-149 = 2 points<br>130-139 = 1 point<br>Under 130 = 0 points | 5 |
| **3. Vulnerabilities**<br><br>HOW MEASURED: Types of vulnerabilities that are prioritized<br><br>SOURCE: First year project application, Item 3B(4)<br><br>SCALE: Up to 4 points maximum.<br>• Chronically homeless – 2 points<br>• Veterans – 1 points<br>• Youth (under 25) – 1 point<br>• Families with children – 1 point<br>• Domestic violence – 1 point<br>• Substance use disorders – 2 points<br>• Mental illness – 2 points<br>• HIV-AIDS – 1 point | 4 |

| SPECIAL RANKING FACTORS FOR FIRST-TIME RENEWAL PROJECTS WITH LESS THAN 12 MONTHS HISTORY | Maximum Points |
|---|---|
| **4. Data quality and security**<br><br>HOW MEASURED: Completion of HMIS security checklist.<br><br>SOURCE: Questionnaire.<br><br>SCALE:<br>Follow all Core Elements plus at least 1 Advanced Element = 2 points<br>Follow all Core Elements = 1 point<br>Does not follow all Core Elements = 0 points | 2 |
| **5. Type of project**<br><br>WHAT: Type of project (e.g., SSO, TH, RRH, PSH, HMIS).<br><br>HOW MEASURED: Incentives for projects that provide permanent housing or meet critical local needs, based on scale to be created.<br><br>SOURCE: First year project application Items 3a(5) and 3b(4).<br>PSH = 5 points<br>RRH = 3 points<br>HMIS and SSO/Coordinated Entry = 2 points<br>All other projects = 0 points | 5 |
| **6. SOAR training**<br><br>WHAT: Participation in SOAR training.<br><br>HOW MEASURED: Did grantee staff, or staff of designated referral agency, attend SOAR training in past 24 months?<br><br>SOURCE: Grantee.<br><br>SCALE:<br>Staff of grantee or designated referral agency completed SOAR training in past 24 months = 1 point<br>Staff of grantee or designated referral agency did not complete SOAR training in past 24 months = 0 points | 1 |
| **MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS** | **20** |

**Adjustment Factor:**

The initial scores for first-time renewal projects are multiplied by the maximum total points of the Renewal Project scales divided by the maximum total points of the First-time Renewal project scale. (Adjusted Score = Initial Score X 41/20). The effect of this is that the highest-scoring first-time renewal projects will land in the middle of the final rankings, and lower-scoring first-time renewals will be in the bottom half.

## NEW PROJECTS:

All new projects that are eligible for HUD funding and pass threshold reviews are ranked at the bottom, listed in order of bed capacity.

## Selection & Ranking for Projects Submitted by Victim Services Providers

Restrictions are in place that protect privacy and foster safety for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, dating violence, and human trafficking. These restrictions prohibit the sharing of data that is used to select and rank projects that are submitted by organizations that do not serve victims of these crimes.

Therefore, the CoC Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee has developed this alternate system of selecting and ranking projects submitted by victim service providers.

### Project Selection

The Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee selects projects submitted by victim services providers based on the following criteria:

1. Projects and applicants must meet threshold requirements as required by HUD and the CoC.
2. Projects must serve eligible populations.
3. Projects must be eligible for funding as new or renewal projects, as defined by HUD for the specific CoC competition year.
4. Project expenditures must consist of eligible costs.
5. Projects must adhere to principles of victim safety in all policies and practices, including at a minimum (a) victim-centered services, (b) client choice, and (3) protection of individual data.

Projects meeting the above criteria are selected and ranked.

### Ranking Process

The Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee reviews projects submitted by victim services providers and assigns them to rankings in the CoC Project Priority Listing. It takes the following factors into consideration:

- Demonstration of need
- Demonstration of ability to address the need effectively
- Number of persons served
- Use of research-based practices
- Realistic and achievable goals
- Cost per client
- Internal evaluations conducted by or for the grantee
- Positive feedback on client satisfaction surveys
- Positive relationships with local networks, including (a) health care; (b) law enforcement and criminal justice; (c) CoC; (d) human services; (e) advocacy groups; and (f) education
- Standing with state and national associations
- Other factors relevant to the type of project proposed

After considering the above factors, the Monitoring, Review, and Ranking Committee places each project in appropriate order in the CoC rankings.

**APPEAL PROCESS:**

Applicants wishing to appeal a project's ranking must file a written appeal with the Chair of the Monitoring, Review & Ranking Committee within 5 calendar days of the Board approval of the rankings. The appeal shall state the reason for the appeal and the action desired by the Applicant to resolve the problem. The Monitoring, Review & Ranking Committee shall make a ruling on the appeal, and the Committee's ruling shall be final.

## Monitoring Report to Board

| Grantee | 2nd Q 2018 | 3rd Q 2018 | 4th Q 2018 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **C.E.F.S.** | | | Draw & Spending: $0 draw on one project (issue resolved) |
| **ERBA** | Length to Move-in (issue resolved)<br><br>Draw & Spending (issue resolved) | | |
| **Haven** | Housing Stability: missing data<br><br>Data Quality: high error rate | No/late response to 2nd Q questions<br><br>Data Quality: high error rate (issue being resolved)<br><br>Draw & Spending (issue resolved) | Did not submit Draw & Spending report<br><br>Did not respond to 3rd Q questions |
| **HOPE*** | | | Did not submit Draw & Spending report |
| **IVEDC** | Data Quality: high error rate<br><br>Length to Move-in: missing data<br><br>Draw & Spending: submitted late | Data Quality: high error rate<br><br>Draw & Spending: submitted late | Did not submit Draw & Spending report |

*HOPE cannot submit any monitoring data because its data system does not track the items that we monitor. This is a long-standing problem. HOPE is working towards a solution and hopes to have it in place by the end of October 2019. Currently, we require HOPE to submit only a Draw & Spending report.

# Coordinated Entry Tracking Tool

**Reporting Agency:** South Central Illinois Continuum of Care

**Reporting Period:** 1/1/2018 - 12/31/2018 *incomplete data due to date tracking began*

| Agency Totals: | HL inquiries | # diverted | Housed by CoC program | Housed by In-house Non-CoC Program | Housed by other program | Pending outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CEFS | 257 | 176 | 29 | 20 | 22 | 10 |
| ERBA | 278 | 172 | 38 | 16 | 5 | 47 |
| IVEDC | 141 | 47 | 51 | 15 | 15 | 13 |
| **Continuum Totals:** | 676 | 395 | 118 | 51 | 42 | 70 |
| **Percentage avoiding Homeless System:** | | **58.43%** | **Percentage entering homeless system:** | 31.21% | **Percent pending** | 10.36% |

CoC Name: South Central Illinois CoC

CoC Number: IL-515

This document summarizes the scores your Continuum of Care (CoC) received during the Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 CoC Program Competition and includes:

1. **High Priority CoC Application Questions**;
2. **CoC Scoring Summary–**on the four sections of the application; and
3. **Overall Scores for all CoCs–**including highest and lowest scores.

The scores are organized in the same manner as the CoC application. HUD included a FY 2018 CoC Application NOFA Cross Reference in the Detailed Instructions of the FY 2018 CoC Application which indicated how the CoC application questions relate to the NOFA for the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition.

| 1. High Priority CoC Application Questions | | |
|---|---|---|
| **CoC Application Questions** | **Maximum Score Available** | **CoC Score Received** |
| **1E. Continuum of Care (CoC) Project Review, Ranking, and Selection** | | |
| *This question assessed whether a CoC used objective criteria and past performance to review and rank projects. To receive full points, CoCs would have had to use performance-based criteria to at least partially evaluate and rank projects. Examples of performance criteria include reducing the length of time people experienced homelessness and the degree to which people exited programs for permanent housing destinations.*<br>**1E-1.** Project Ranking and Selection. Applicants must indicate whether the CoC used the following to rank and select project applications for the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition: (1) objective criteria; (2) at least one factor related to achieving positive housing outcomes; (3) a specific method for evaluating projects submitted by victim services providers; and (4) attach evidence that supports the process selected. | 18 | 15 |
| **1E-2.** Severity of Needs and Vulnerabilities. Applicants must describe: (1) the specific severity of needs and vulnerabilities the CoC considered when reviewing, ranking, and rating projects; and (2) how the CoC takes severity of needs and vulnerabilities into account during the review, rating, and ranking process. | 4 | 4 |
| **2A. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Bed Coverage** | | |
| **2A-5.** Bed Coverage Rate. Using 2018 HIC and HMIS data, applicants must report by project type: (1) total number of beds in 2018 HIC; (2) total beds dedicated for DV in the 2018 HIC; and (3) total number of beds in HMIS. | 6 | 6 |

| 1. High Priority CoC Application Questions | | |
|---|---|---|
| **CoC Application Questions** | **Maximum Score Available** | **CoC Score Received** |
| **3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) System Performance** | | |
| **3A-1.** First Time Homeless as Reported in HDX. Applicants must: (1) describe how the CoC determined which risk factors the CoC uses to identify persons becoming homeless for the first time; (2) describe the CoC's strategy to address individuals and families at risk of becoming homeless; and (3) provide the name of the organization or position title that is responsible for overseeing the CoC's strategy to reduce the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness for the first time. | 3 | 2 |
| **3A-2.** Length-of-Time Homeless as Reported in HDX. Applicants must: (1) provide the average length of time individuals and persons in families remained homeless (i.e., the number); (2) describe the CoC's strategy to reduce the length-of-time individuals and persons in families remain homeless; (3) describe how the CoC identifies and houses individuals and persons in families with the longest lengths of time homeless; and (4) provide the name of the organization or position title that is responsible for overseeing the CoC's strategy to reduce the length of time individuals and families remain homeless. | 14 | 14 |
| **3A-3.** Successful Permanent Housing Placement and Retention as Reported in HDX. Applicants must: (1) provide the percentage of individuals and persons in families in emergency shelter, safe havens, transitional housing, and rapid rehousing that exit to permanent housing destinations; and (2) provide the percentage of individuals and persons in families in permanent housing projects, other than rapid rehousing, that retain their permanent housing or exit to permanent housing destinations.<br><br>Applicants must: (1) describe the CoC's strategy to increase the rate at which individuals and persons in families in emergency shelter, safe havens, transitional housing and rapid rehousing exit to permanent housing destinations; and (2) describe the CoC's strategy to increase the rate at which individuals and persons in families in permanent housing projects, other than rapid rehousing, retain their permanent housing or exit to permanent housing destinations. | 11 | 9.5 |
| **3A-4.** Returns to Homelessness as Reported in HDX. Applicants must report the percentage of individuals and persons in families returning to homelessness over a 6- and 12-month period as reported in HDX. Applicants must: 1) describe how the CoC identifies common factors of individuals and persons in families who return to homelessness; (2) describe the CoC's strategy to reduce the rate of additional returns to | 8 | 7.5 |

| 1. High Priority CoC Application Questions | | |
|---|---|---|
| **CoC Application Questions** | **Maximum Score Available** | **CoC Score Received** |
| homelessness; and (3) provide the name of the organization or position title that is responsible for overseeing the CoC's strategy to reduce the rate individuals and persons in families returns to homelessness. | | |
| **3A-5.** Job and Income Growth. Applicants must: (1) describe the CoC's strategy to increase access to employment and non-employment cash sources; (2) describe how the CoC works with mainstream employment organizations to help individuals and families increase their cash income; and (3) provide the organization name or position title that is responsible for overseeing the CoC's strategy to increase job and income growth from employment. | 4 | 3 |
| **3A-6.** System Performance Measures Data Submission in HDX. Applicants must enter the date the CoC submitted the System Performance Measures data in HDX, which included the data quality section for FY 2017. (mm/dd/yyyy) | 6 | 6 |
| **3B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Performance and Strategic Planning Objectives** | | |
| | | |
| **3B-2.2.** Applicants must: (1) describe the CoC's current strategy to rapidly rehouse every household of families with children within 30 days of becoming homeless; (2) describe how the CoC addresses both housing and service needs to ensure families successfully maintain their housing once assistance ends; and (3) provide the organization name or position title responsible for overseeing the CoCs strategy to rapidly rehouse families with children within 30 days of becoming homeless. | 3 | 3 |
| **4A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Accessing Mainstream Benefits and Additional Policies** | | |
| **4A-2.** Housing First: Applicants must report: (1) total number of new and renewal CoC Program Funded PSH, RRH, SSO non-coordinated entry, Safe-Haven, and Transitional Housing projects the CoC is applying for in FY 2018 CoC Program Competition; and (2) total number of new and renewal CoC Program Funded PSH, RRH, SSO non-coordinated entry, Safe-Haven, and Transitional Housing projects the CoC is applying for in FY 2018 CoC Program Competition that have adopted the Housing First approach–meaning that the project quickly houses clients without preconditions or service participation requirements. | 7 | 7 |
| **4A-3.** Street Outreach. Applicants must: (1) describe the CoC's outreach; (2) state whether the CoC's Street Outreach covers 100 | 3 | 3 |

| 1. High Priority CoC Application Questions | | |
|---|---|---|
| **CoC Application Questions** | **Maximum Score Available** | **CoC Score Received** |
| percent of the CoC's geographic area; (3) describe how often the CoC conducts street outreach; and (4) describe how the CoC tailored its street outreach to persons experiencing homelessness who are least likely to request assistance. | | |
| **4A-5.** RRH Beds as Reported in the HIC. Applicants must report the total number of rapid rehousing beds available to serve all household types as reported in the Housing Inventory Count (HIC) for 2017 and 2018. | 10 | 10 |

## 2. CoC Scoring Summary

| Scoring Category | Maximum Score (Points) | Your CoC Score (Points) |
|---|---|---|
| Part 1: CoC Structure and Governance | 52 | 44.75 |
| Part 2: Data Collection and Quality | 49 | 38 |
| Part 3: CoC Performance and Strategic Planning | 77 | 68 |
| Part 4: Cross-Cutting Policies | 22 | 22 |
| **Total CoC Application Score** | **200** | **172.75** |

## 3. Overall Scores for all CoCs

| | |
|---|---|
| Highest Score for any CoC | 190 |
| Lowest Score for any CoC | 47.75 |
| Median Score for all CoCs | 160 |
| Weighted Mean Score* for all CoCs | 166.75 |

*The weighted mean score is the mean CoC score weighted by Annual Renewal Demand. CoCs that scored higher than the weighted mean score were more likely to gain funding relative to their Annual Renewal Demand, while CoCs that scored lower than the weighted mean were more likely to lose money relative to their Annual Renewal Demand.

# STRENGTHEN THE HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION PROGRAM
## HB3331

**REPRESENTATIVE DELIA RAMIREZ**
HERNANDEZ • ROBINSON • MUSSMAN • HARPER • GUZZARDI

Each year, Illinois successfully assists thousands of families in avoiding homelessness. The Homelessness Prevention Program is a twenty-year-old program in Illinois. It provides a one-time grant for individuals and families and is estimated to save $7,548 annually in state costs per household by keeping individuals and families housed and stable.*

Funds are used for rental and mortgage assistance, security deposits, arrearages, as well as utility assistance. Service providers also offer supportive services directly related to the prevention of homelessness.

Examples of individuals and families who may use the program include:

- furloughed federal workers
- people who've experienced an unexpected medical crisis,
- a grandparent who unexpectedly takes in their grandchildren.

Though the program has proven successful in keeping families stably housed providers would like to make the program stronger and ensure they are preventing homelessness and not just delaying it.

## IMPEDIMENTS

**Current policies restrict providers ability to ensure that families remain housed after receiving prevention assistance.**

- **Clarify ability to assist people who may need support with arrearages and short-term housing assistance going forward.** Current policy is unclear on how many months of arrearages and/or future assistance a household can receive and whether the two can be combined. There are instances where providers were given consent to provide six months of assistance while others are under the presumption that they can only assist on arrearages or future payments.
- **Providers are not able to provide comprehensive case management.** Seventy-one percent of provider state that the current funding levels do not meet their case management needs. Providers are currently limited to using 10% of their funding for case management. Along with the housing assistance families may need further help. Without adequate case management funding providers struggle to meet, assess, and assist them with their overall needs. Applicants often need mental health assessments, job training, or child care assistance that would ensure their continued success in staying housed.

## SOLUTION

**To better assist individuals and families in need of housing assistance permit providers to use:**

- Discretion to provide up to 6 months of rental and/or mortgage assistance to individuals and families for arrearages and/or future rents.
- Fifteen percent of their annual funding for case management and administrative costs

Under our current systems, for most families we are able to prevent homelessness, for others we are just delaying it, we'd like to better serve those families so that they remain housed.”

*– Rachel Contos, Homelessness Prevention Service Provider*

*The impact of homelessness prevention programs on homelessness William N. Evans, James X. Sullivan, Melanie Wallskog Science 12 Aug 2016: Vol. 353, Issue 6300, pp. 694-699 DOI: 10.1126/science.aag0833