

SOUTH CENTRAL ILLINOIS CONTINUUM OF CARE

BOARD MEETING

Agenda

C.E.F.S. Board Room

Effingham, IL 62401

January 15, 2020 at 10 am

- I.** Welcome-Call to Order
- II.** Roll Call
- III.** Organization Spotlight –
- IV.** Board Application Training (Questions 2B-6, 2B-7, 3A-1, 3A-1a)
- V.** Old Business
 - October 9, 2019 Board Minutes
- VI.** Committee Reporting
 - Executive Committee - Kevin Bushur
 - HMIS - Larry Sullivan
 - Membership and Marketing - Gerry Schlechte
 - Approving Nominations for Executive Committee
 - New Board Member – Dwayne Wheeler
 - Planning and Assessment – Barb Waymire
 - Monitoring and Ranking – Gerry Schlechte
 - Monitoring Results – 3rd Quarter 2019
 - CoC Project Rankings:
 - Request suggestions for tweaking 2020 ranking scales
 - Ranking infrastructure projects and new projects
 - Threshold criteria for new applications
 - Sub Committees and Task Forces:
 - Veterans – Dana Tell
 - SOAR - Stephanie Stahlhut
 - HIC and PIT – Larry Sullivan
 - Point in Time Training – January 13, 14, and 17, 2020
 - Point in Time Count – January 30, 2019
 - Coordinated Entry Task Force – Susie Beaumont
- VII.** New Business
 - FY2019 Competition Results
 - Reallocation Discussion and Review
 - 2020 Proxy Forms
 - Gaps Report
 - New CE Waiting List
 - Occupancy charges for PSH residents on sliding scale
 - CoC Spending Report – 9/30/19
 - Next Meeting – April 8, 2020 at Lake Land College
 - Updated Timeline
- VIII.** Other

Conference Call Information:

Dial-In Number: (605) 475-4883

Access Code: 630483

Pin: 4661

Applicants must select whether the CoC added or removed emergency shelter, transitional housing, or Safe-Haven inventory because of funding specific to a Presidentially-declared disaster, resulting in a change to the CoC's 2019 sheltered PIT count. No

2B-5. Unsheltered PIT Count–Changes in Implementation.

Applicants must describe:

- 1. any changes in the unsheltered count implementation, including methodology or data quality methodology changes from 2018 to 2019, if applicable; and**
 - 2. how the changes affected the CoC's unsheltered PIT count results; or**
 - 3. state "Not Applicable" if there were no changes.**
- (limit 2,000 characters)**

1) We made one change in methodology and one change in data quality.

The change in methodology was using a by-name wait list of all known unsheltered individuals and households in the CoC. The by-name list is created and maintained by our Coordinated Entry system, and our PIT team used it to identify, contact, and collect data from these persons.

The change in data quality was that we used a regional approach. Before the count, we conducted separate volunteer training sessions in each of our three regions. After the count, each regional lead agency checked all questionnaires for accuracy before submitting them to the CoC Collaborative Applicant, and the Collaborative Applicant then performed a final quality check before entering the data into HDX.

2) The methodological change resulted in a more accurate count, because we were aware of and in contact with many of the unsheltered homeless persons well before PIT day. The number of unsheltered persons rose from 22 in 2018 to 35 this year.

***2B-6. PIT Count–Identifying Youth Experiencing Homelessness.**

Applicants must:

Indicate whether the CoC implemented specific measures to identify youth experiencing homelessness in their 2019 PIT count. Yes

2B-6a. PIT Count–Involving Youth in Implementation.

Applicants must describe how the CoC engaged stakeholders serving youth experiencing homelessness to:

- 1. plan the 2019 PIT count;**
 - 2. select locations where youth experiencing homelessness are most likely to be identified; and**
 - 3. involve youth in counting during the 2019 PIT count.**
- (limit 2,000 characters)**

- 1) We engaged stakeholders during the planning process for the 2019 PIT count. In the months prior to the PIT we met with school McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons and counselors.
- 2) As a direct result of these conversations with stakeholders, we again included truck stops on interstate highways in our service-based count, and we visited after-school programs for high-risk youth in area high schools to interview participants. Both of these locations were suggested by stakeholders.
- 3) Even with these methods, we found no unaccompanied or parenting homeless youth under 18 in our geographic area. Because we had no homeless youth, we could not engage this group in the 2019 PIT process.

2B-7. PIT Count–Improvements to Implementation.

Applicants must describe the CoC’s actions implemented in its 2019 PIT count to better count:

- 1. individuals and families experiencing chronic homelessness;**
 - 2. families with children experiencing homelessness; and**
 - 3. Veterans experiencing homelessness.**
- (limit 2,000 characters)**

- 1) In 2019 we took two steps to improve our count of persons and families experiencing chronic homelessness. (i) First, we intensified our training of PIT volunteers by stressing HUD’s definition of chronic homelessness and by giving specific examples of circumstances that qualified (and did not qualify) as chronically homeless. (ii) Second, we conducted two checks of all completed questionnaires, one at the regional level and another by the Collaborative Applicant, to verify that the information qualified as chronically homeless.
- 2) In the prior year, 2018, we took three actions to improve our count of families with children experiencing homelessness, and these changes proved to be very effective again this year: (i) We improved our questionnaire to give more accurate identification of households with children. (ii) We provided enhanced training for volunteers. (iii) We asked respondents if they were “responsible” for children – rather than asking if they were parents or legal guardians. This lessened suspicion that our volunteers were from child protective services.
- 3) In 2019 we made two improvements in a count of veterans. (i) First, we used a by-name list of all known homeless veterans. This list was compiled and maintained jointly by our Coordinated Entry system and the area’s SSVF Coordinator. (ii) Second, the SSVF Coordinator oversaw the veterans count. With these changes we counted only 4 veterans experiencing homelessness, and all were assisted; we now have zero veterans on our by-name list.

3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) System Performance

Instructions

Guidance for completing the application can be found in the FY 2019 CoC Program Competition Notice of Funding Availability and in the FY 2019 CoC Application Detailed Instructions.

Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask-A-Question at <https://www.hudexchange.info/program-support/my-question/>

Resources:

The FY 2019 CoC Application Detailed Instruction can be found at:

<https://www.hudexchange.info/e-snaps/guides/coc-program-competition-resources>

The FY 2019 CoC Program Competition Notice of Funding Availability at:

<https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/e-snaps/fy-2019-coc-program-nofa-coc-program-competition/#nofa-and-notices>

Warning! The CoC Application score could be affected if information is incomplete on this formlet.

*3A-1. First Time Homeless as Reported in HDX.

Applicants must:

Report the Number of First Time Homeless as Reported in HDX.
--

511

3A-1a. First Time Homeless Risk Factors.

Applicants must:

1. describe the process the CoC developed to identify 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. (limit 2,000 characters)

1) We identified risk factors for first-time homelessness by surveying front-line staff members at all 18 Coordinated Entry access points. The surveys identified the following as major risk factors: lack of income (75%), substance abuse (63%), mental health (32%), and lack of affordable housing (32%).

2) Our strategy to address households at risk of becoming homeless has two elements:

First, we partnered with a statewide coalition to increase the amount of state prevention funding, and to allow providers more flexibility in using these funds.

Our CoC's coordinator testified before the Illinois General Assembly to support legislation that will increase prevention funding to \$11 million and broaden the allowable uses.

Second, the Coordinated Entry staff in each of our three regions maintains a by-name list of individuals and families who are at imminent risk of becoming homeless. These persons are prioritized for prevention funds and for assistance from local charities and faith congregations.

3) The CoC Coordinated Entry Task Force is responsible for this strategy.

***3A-2. Length of Time Homeless as Reported in HDX.**

Applicants must:

Report Average Length of Time Individuals and Persons in Families Remained Homeless as Reported in HDX.

21

3A-2a. Strategy to Reduce Length of Time Homeless.

Applicants must:

- 1. describe the CoC's strategy to reduce the length of time individuals and persons in families remain homeless;**
 - 2. describe how the CoC identifies and houses individuals and persons in families with the longest lengths of time homeless; and**
 - 3. 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.**
- (limit 2,000 characters)**

1) Our strategy for reducing the length of homelessness is straightforward: we get persons into housing as fast as we can. To implement this in our rural CoC, we pursue three tracks; (i) First, we coordinate with private landlords to increase the availability of affordable housing for clients. (ii) Second, we involve family members when possible, to help them assume some measure of responsibility for housing their homeless relatives. (iii) When appropriate, we advocate for admission to assisted living and skilled care facilities.

2) To ensure that we first serve those with longest durations of homelessness, we identify and prioritize all persons on the by-name wait lists, based on length of time homeless. Our Coordinated Entry policy manual requires that we organize our priority list based on length of homelessness along with other risk factors gleaned from the VI-SPDAT. As an additional measure, the CE policy outlines how supervisors may advance persons who have experienced long periods of homelessness.

3) The CoC Planning & Assessment Committee is responsible for overseeing this strategy. It meets quarterly and reviews real-time data for System Performance Measure #1 (Length of Homelessness).

October 9, 2019
SCICoC Board Meeting

Present: Cathy Feltner (via phone), Kelly Hardy, Dana Tell, Emy Nelson, Gerry Schlechte, Chris Davis, Roselene Quick, Barb Waymire, Larry Sullivan, Fred Spannaus, Susie Beaumont, Cindy Mayer, Jess Pauley, Rebecca Sudduth (via phone).

Board Members were welcomed and Vice President, Cathy Feltner, called the meeting to order at 12:54pm. Roll Call occurred.

Organizational Spotlight:

- Barb discussed CEFS and the programs they offer.

Board Application Training:

- Fred and Susie covered questions 2-B, which relate to the PIT count.

Old Business:

- Barb motioned to approve the minutes from the July 10, 2019 Board Meeting, Gerry seconded, motion carried.
- Jess discussed the HUD application. It is finished and turned in. We expect to hear about funding in December or January. Overall, the feeling was that it was a strong application. The strength comes from the members, the process, and the timetable. The CoC has a lot to be proud of concerning the work on the application.

Committee Reporting:

- Executive Committee – Cathy reported that the Executive Committee did not meet during the quarter.
- HMIS Committee - Larry reported that the HMIS Committee did not meet during the quarter.
- Membership & Marketing Committee - Gerry reported that the Membership & Marketing Committee did have a conference call the previous week. The Attendance Report was provided. A question was proposed regarding continuum members and what the definition of a continuum member is as it relates to meeting attendance. Discussion was held about committee minutes and the need to track attendance. A motion was made by Gerry to keep sign-in sheets from semi-annual meetings for the purposes of meeting threshold requirements if the need to track attendance would ever arise Emy seconded, motion carried. New members Chris Davis from The Haven and Roselene Quick with ROE 12 were introduced. The Membership and Marketing Committee recommended the approval of Chris and Roselene to board. Barb motioned to approve Chris and Roselene's board membership, Dana seconded, motion carried. The committee discussed adding a representative from law enforcement to the board. Jess reminded the Board that the Bylaws require an odd number of members. Jess also reminded the Board that officer nominations are to be sent to Kevin by the end of the year. Emy submitted her letter of resignation due to increasing job responsibilities. She will be staying on until the end of January. Finally, the committee suggested changing the next board meeting date to January 15th.
- Planning and Assessment – Fred reported that the committee did meet and are still looking at planning for the next few years. The work that has already been done was reviewed. Suzie is looking at performance measures throughout the year to monitor the CoC's progress as a whole. The committee is

meeting again in January.

- **Monitoring and Ranking** – Gerry reported that the committee met to rank bonus projects. They reviewed the CoC policy with regards to ranking and followed the policy. Discussion was held into those policy rules with regards to how projects are ranked. It is problematic that DV service provider projects cannot be ranked with the same criteria as other CoC projects. After some discussion it was determined that DV service providers will be ranked on their own scale using the information that they can provide. Overall rankings will then be percentage based. Discussion was held into infrastructure projects and if they should be considered as a CoC wide benefit. To which the group consensus was yes. Discussion was also held in regards to the policy stating that new projects are to be ranked at the bottom.
- **Veterans** – Dana reported that a Stand Down event will be held at the LifeSpan Center in Charleston on 11/5/2019. All board members are encouraged to attend. Call Laura at the LifeSpan center for more information and scheduling. The committee is looking for more members. They meet monthly and have a call in number. Dana also reported that one of the Mayor's Offices in Coles County announced they were at functional zero.
- **SOAR** – No updates were provided.
- **HIC/PIT** – Larry announced a tentative PIT count date for 01/30/2020. Larry and Jess will provide more information on volunteer training for the PIT by region. Jess made note of the tentative timeline in the board packet.
- **Coordinated Entry** – Susie reported that the group met and discussed the data that was available. New rules with HUD were also discussed as well as discussion into how the CoC will adapt it's process. A meeting was proposed where DV providers could meet with coordinated entry folks and talk about what they do and how the CoC can fortify partnerships with DV survivors. The coordinated entry evaluation lead to the discussion about building a better partnership so that survivors can have warm handoff among all service providers. It was suggested that a Kelly should join the coordinated entry committee as a DV provider to assist in planning the event. The proposed amendment that was on the agenda was tabled.

New Business:

- The Racial Disparities Report was reviewed and the annual evaluation was discussed.
- The dates for 2020 and timeline were referenced in the packet.

Other:

- Nothing to report.

The meeting adjourned at 2:37pm on a motion from Gerry, which was seconded by Roselene. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted by:
Kelly Hardy, Secretary

Housing Stability (Placement/Retention)

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u># Persons</u>	<u>PH Stayers</u>	<u># Leavers</u>	<u># Pos 90d+</u>	<u># Pos 90d-</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Haven "No Data Collected"</u>	
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	8	7	1			87.5%		
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	8	8	0	0	0	100.0%	2017 2nd Q	53%
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing1 (formerly TH)	12	5	7			41.7%	2017 3rd Q	43%
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing2 (reallocation)	30	17	13			56.7%	2017 4th Q	31%
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH	15	11	4	0	4	100.0%	2018 1st Q	36%
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	21	15	6			71.4%	2018 2nd Q	76%
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	35	32	3	0	3	100.0%	2018 3rd Q	57%
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	32	23	9			71.9%	2018 4th Q	29%
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)						NA	2019 1st Q	13%
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	11	5	6			45.5%	2019 2nd Q	2%
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	14	4	10			28.6%	2019 3rd Q	3%
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter			79	0	22	27.8%		

Q 5a, 23a, 23b

Length of Homelessness (ES only)

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Leavers</u> <u>Avg</u>	<u>Leavers</u> <u>Median</u>	<u>Stayers</u> <u>Avg</u>	<u>Stayers</u> <u>Median</u>	<u>Overall Avg</u>		
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	NA					2017 2nd Q	10.75
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	NA					2017 3rd Q	11.25
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing1 (formerly TH)	NA					2017 4th Q	15.50
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing2 (reallocation)	NA					2018 1st Q	31.75
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH	NA						
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	NA					2018 2nd Q	22.00
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	NA					2018 3rd Q	25.25
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	NA					2018 4th Q	14.25
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)	NA					2019 1st Q	13.67
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	NA					2019 2nd Q	23.50
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	NA					2019 3rd Q	22.75
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter	17	8	47	19	22.75		

Q 22b

Data Quality

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>06a errors</u>	<u>06b errors</u>	<u>06c Exit errors</u>	<u>Total Errors</u>	<u>Total # served</u>	<u># Adult Leavers</u>	<u># All Leavers</u>	<u>Total Universe</u>	<u>Error Rate</u>
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	0	0	0	0	8	1	1	90	0.00%
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	88	0.00%
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing1 (formerly TH)	0	0	0	0	12	5	7	144	0.00%
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing2 (reallocation)	0	0	0	0	30	11	13	354	0.00%
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH	0	0	0	0	15	1	4	170	0.00%
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	0	0	0	0	21	4	6	241	0.00%
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	0	0	0	0	35	3	3	391	0.00%
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	3	0	0	3	32	7	9	368	0.82%
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)									
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	0	1	1	2	11	3	6	130	1.54%
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	1	0	0	1	14	7	10	171	0.58%
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter	7	7	4	18	107	67	79	1323	1.36%

Q 6a (all except 1st column), 6b (all), 6c (lines 1&4)

Q 05a (lines 1 & 6)

Data Timeliness (RRH and ES only)

HOLDING FOR NEW MEASURES

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing1 (formerly TH)
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing2 (reallocation)
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter

Q 6e (project start)

Length to Move-in (RRH only)

HOLDING FOR NEW MEASURES

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing1 (formerly TH)
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing2 (reallocation)
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter

TOTAL

Q 22c

Total Income

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u># Adults</u> <u>Column 4</u>	<u># Adults</u> <u>Column 5</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Adults</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	0	1	1	100.0%	
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	3	1	7	57.1%	
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing1 (formerly TH)	1	2	5	60.0%	
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing2 (reallocation)	3	2	11	45.5%	
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH	0	0	1	0.0%	New Project
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	0	0	4	0.0%	
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	10	2	20	60.0%	
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	0	0	7	0.0%	
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)				NA	
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	0	0	3	0.0%	
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	0	3	7	42.9%	
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter				NA	

Q 19a3 (line 5)

Draws & Spending

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u># months</u>	<u>% Year</u>	<u>Total HUD \$</u>	<u>Draw</u>	<u>Draw %</u>	<u>Spend</u>	<u>Spend %</u>	<u>Difference</u>	
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	3	25.0%	\$75,231	\$0	0.0%	\$20,416	27.1%	2.1%	
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	1	8.3%	\$49,818	\$2,472	5.0%	\$5,248	10.5%	2.2%	
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing1 (formerly TH)									Project Ended
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing2 (reallocation)									Project Ended
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH	3	25.0%	\$110,657	\$21,699	19.6%	\$21,699	19.6%		
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	3	25.0%	\$85,241	\$24,725	29.0%	\$24,725	29.0%	4.0%	
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	3	25.0%	\$265,273	\$90,916	34.3%	\$90,916	34.3%	9.3%	
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	8	66.7%	\$156,186	\$111,608	71.5%	\$111,608	71.5%	4.8%	
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)	3	25.0%	\$35,424	\$0	0.0%	\$9,186	25.9%	0.9%	
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	3	25.0%	\$25,676	\$0	0.0%	\$8,164	31.8%	6.8%	
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	3	25.0%	\$78,455	\$12,040	15.3%	\$13,843	17.6%	-7.4%	
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter	3	25.0%	\$37,601	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	-25.0%	
C.E.F.S.	CoC	RRH Consolidated	5	41.7%	\$342,060	\$56,296	16.5%	\$71,904	21.0%	-20.6%	

Housing First Practices (from most recent)

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Pct.</u>
C.E.F.S.	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	157	180	87.2%
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	179	180	99.4% As of 4/19
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing1 (formerly TH)	178	180	98.9% As of 4/19
C.E.F.S.	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing2 (reallocation)	178	180	98.9% As of 4/19
ERBA	CoC	DV Joint TH/RRH	202	216	93.5% As of 4/19
ERBA	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing			Data missing
ERBA	CoC	Permanent Supportive Housing	175	180	97.2% As of 4/19
ERBA	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	173	180	96.1% As of 4/19
HOPE	ESG	Emergency Shelter (DV)			Data missing
IVEDC	ESG	Rapid Re-Housing	173	204	84.8% As of 4/19
IVEDC	CoC	Rapid Re-Housing	173	204	84.8% As of 4/19
The Haven	ESG	Emergency Shelter			Data missing

Ranking Scales for CoC Projects – FY 2019

South Central Illinois CoC (IL-515)

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. Numbers and percentages are not rounded.

RANKING FACTORS FOR RENEWAL PROJECTS	Maximum Points
1. Needs and Vulnerabilities HOW MEASURED: Percentage of participants who entered the project with high barriers. CALCULATION: For RRH Projects, there are three factors: • At or above average of all RRH projects in percentage of adult participants with zero income at entry (from item Q16) • At or above average of all RRH projects in percentage of adult participants with more than one condition at entry (Q13a2) • At or above average of all RRH projects in percentage of adult participants who entered project from place not meant for human habitation (Q15) For PSH projects, there are three factors: • At or above average of all PSH projects in percentage of adult participants with zero income at entry (from item Q16) • At or above average of all PSH projects in percentage of adult participants with more than one condition at entry (Q13a2) • At or above average of all PSH projects in percentage of adult participants who entered project from place not meant for human habitation (Q15) SCALE: Projects meeting all three factors = 5 points Projects meeting two factors = 3 points Projects meeting one factor = 1 point Projects meeting zero factors = 0 points	5
2. Chronic Homelessness HOW MEASURED: Percentage of participants who were chronically homeless at entry. CALCULATION: Number of chronically homeless adults divided by total number of adults (from item Q05a). SCALE: Highest percentage among all projects = 3 points Second highest percentage = 2 points All other projects serving any chronically homeless = 1 point Projects serving no chronically homeless = 0 points 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 HOW MEASURED: The percentage of participants remaining in or exiting to permanent housing. 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) SCALE: 100% = 5 points 90-99% = 4 points 80-89% = 3 points 70-79% = 2 points 60-69% = 1 point - Less than 60% = 0 points	5
4. Housing First HOW MEASURED: Housing First Self-Assessment score (WE WILL POST QUESTIONNAIRES ON THE CoC WEBSITE) SCALE: 170-180 = 5 points 160-169 = 4 points 150-159 = 3 points 140-149 = 2 points 130-139 = 1 point - Under 130 = 0 points	5
5. Income Increases HOW MEASURED: Percentage of adults who increased any income. CALCULATION: From item Q19a3, line 6 (any income). Number of adults in column 8, divided by total adults (column 7). SCALE: 60% or more = 5 points 45-59% = 4 points 30-44% = 3 points 15-29% = 2 points 1-14% = 1 points	5
6. APR Submission HOW MEASURED: If APR submitted within 90 days of project end date, as reported by grantees. SCALE: - APR submitted within 90 days of project end date = 3 points 91 or more days = 0 points - 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 HOW MEASURED: Percentage of funds expended at end of project term, as reported by grantees. SCALE: Project spent 100% of grant funds in most recent completed year = 5 points 90-99% = 3 points 80-89% = 2 points 70-79% = 1 points Less than 70% = 0 points	5
8. Data Quality and Security HOW MEASURED: Accuracy and completeness of HMIS client data, and security measures to protect client data CALCULATION: (1) Percentage of errors in 12 HMIS data fields (6 from Q06a, 5 from Q06b, and 1 from Q06c/Exits on line 4): a. Universe for Q06a and Q06b is Q05a, line 1 (total # served) b. Universe for Q06c/Exits is Q05a, line 6 (# adult leavers) (2) Completion of HMIS security checklist. SCALE: Up to 2 points for percentage errors in HMIS client data fields: 0.00% error rate = 2 points 0.01% to 0.99% error rate = 1 point 1.00% and above error rate = 0 points Up to 2 points for HMIS questionnaire: Follow all Core Elements plus at least 1 Advanced Element = 2 points Follow all Core Elements = 1 point Does not follow all Core Elements = 0 points	4
9. Type of Project HOW MEASURED: Incentives for projects that provide permanent housing or meet critical local needs. SOURCE: Most recent project application. PSH = 5 points RRH = 3 points HMIS and SSO/Coordinated Entry = 2 points All other projects = 0 points	5
10. SOAR Training HOW MEASURED: As reported by grantees. SCALE: Staff of grantee or designated referral agency completed SOAR training in past 24 months = 1 point 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.

			Needs and Vulnerabilities	Chronic Homelessness	Housing Stability	Housing First	Income	APR Submission	Spending	Data Quality and Security	Type of Project	SOAR Training	Total
<u>Grantee</u>	<u>Project</u>	Max Points→	5	3	5	5	5	3	5	4	5	1	41
C.E.F.S.	PSH												
C.E.F.S.	RRH												
ERBA	Permanent Housing												
ERBA	Rapid Rehousing												
IVEDC	Rapid Rehousing												

SPECIAL RANKING FACTORS FOR FIRST-TIME RENEWAL PROJECTS WITH LESS THAN 12 MONTHS HISTORY	Maximum Points
1. Chronic homelessness WHAT: Housing for persons who are chronically homeless. HOW MEASURED: Percentage of all beds that are designated or prioritized for chronically homeless. SOURCE: First-year project application (item 4B). SCALE: 100% of beds dedicated or prioritized = 5 points 90-99% = 4 points 80-89% = 3 points 70-79% = 2 points 60-69% = 1 point - Less than 60% = 0 points	5
2. Housing First HOW MEASURED: Housing First Self-Assessment score SCALE: 170-180 = 5 points 160-169 = 4 points 150-159 = 3 points 140-149 = 2 points 130-139 = 1 point - Under 130 = 0 points	5
3. Vulnerabilities HOW MEASURED: Types of vulnerabilities that are prioritized SOURCE: First year project application, Item 3B(4) SCALE: Up to 4 points maximum. • Chronically homeless – 2 points • Veterans – 1 points • Youth (under 25) – 1 point • Families with children – 1 point • Domestic violence – 1 point • Substance use disorders – 2 points • Mental illness – 2 points • 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 HOW MEASURED: Completion of HMIS security checklist. SOURCE: Questionnaire. SCALE: Follow all Core Elements plus at least 1 Advanced Element = 2 points Follow all Core Elements = 1 point Does not follow all Core Elements = 0 points	2
5. Type of project WHAT: Type of project (e.g., SSO, TH, RRH, PSH, HMIS). HOW MEASURED: Incentives for projects that provide permanent housing or meet critical local needs, based on scale to be created. SOURCE: First year project application Items 3a(5) and 3b(4). PSH = 5 points RRH and Joint TH-RRH = 3 points HMIS and SSO/Coordinated Entry = 2 points All other projects = 0 points	5
6. SOAR training WHAT: Participation in SOAR training. HOW MEASURED: Did grantee staff, or staff of designated referral agency, attend SOAR training in past 24 months? SOURCE: Grantee. SCALE: Staff of grantee or designated referral agency completed SOAR training in past 24 months = 1 point 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. The Committee shall inform all Applicants and the Board of the final decision as soon as possible.



SOUTH CENTRAL ILLINOIS CONTINUUM OF CARE

EMBARRAS RIVER BASIN AGENCY, LEAD AGENCY

SUSAN BEAUMONT
LEAD CONTACT

400 W. PLEASANT
GREENUP, IL 62428

217.923.3113
susieb@erbainc.org

SERVING THE COUNTIES OF CALHOUN, CHRISTIAN, CLARK, CLAY, COLES, CRAWFORD, CUMBERLAND, DOUGLAS, EDGAR, EFFINGHAM, FAYETTE, GREENE, JASPER, JERSEY, MACOUPIN, MONTGOMERY, MOULTRIE AND SHELBY

South Central Illinois Rural Continuum of Care Threshold Requirements Form

Applicant: _____

Project Title: _____

Project Type: ☐ Permanent Supportive Housing
 ☐ Rapid Rehousing ☐ Other:

APPLICANT: PLEASE ATTACH THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTATION

- _____ 501 c 3 documentation
- _____ latest Annual Progress Report, other funding source equivalent
- _____ board or governing body approval of submission
- _____ Accounting practices audit
- _____ Applicant has attended Continuum meetings within the last year
- _____ Applicant has served on a committee of the Continuum within the last year
- _____ Homeless Management Information System Information (software name)

The above mentioned criteria has been reviewed and meets South Central Illinois Rural Continuum specifications to submit application. The applicant will be notified of approval for submission with the Continuum application.

Governing Board Signature

Date

Governing Board Signature

Date

Governing Board Signature

Date

Governing Board Signature

Date

Attachment 1E-4

CoC's Reallocation Process

**South Central Illinois CoC
IL-515**

SOUTH CENTRAL ILLINOIS CONTINUUM OF CARE
Reallocation Process
CoC IL-515

For the last several years, HUD has placed importance on the reallocating of funding from underperforming projects, projects that are underspending, or projects that no longer serve the needs of the populations within the CoC. These criteria are monitored by the Monitoring and Ranking Committee. The South Central Illinois Continuum of Care reallocates funding as needed to improve CoC performance, reduce homelessness and create and promote housing stability. Funds are reallocated on a voluntary or involuntary basis in accordance with the criteria below.

1. Voluntary Reallocation

Any current CoC grantee can voluntarily reallocate its existing project by reducing a project's annual renewal demand either in whole or in part. Any grantee wishing to reallocate funds must notify the South Central Illinois Continuum of Care within the timeline outlined in that year's competition process.

2. Involuntary Reallocation

Throughout the year, the Monitoring and Ranking Committee meets to monitor the ongoing results of the grants. The following tools and benchmarks are used to measure project performance in this process: Monitoring tool utilization rates, housing stability, eligibility, length of time homelessness, destination at exit, income growth, and utilization of main stream benefits. Additionally, review of applicable APR submissions and documentation of draws from eLOCCS are monitored for timeliness and accuracy.

If a project is deemed to be in need of reallocation due to low performance in these areas, the CoC begins a review using the Coordinated Assessment tracking tool to verify the next greatest need. A final reallocation process summary is submitted to the Continuum Board of Directors within the timeline outlined in that year's competition process.

All funding made available through either voluntary or involuntary reallocation is awarded via a competitive application process. Providers wishing to apply for funds made available through reallocation must submit a new project application in accordance with the CoC Competition instructions. New funding requests are considered by the Monitoring and Ranking Committee during the annual competition and are ranked as part of the CoC prioritization process.

This year, the South Central Illinois CoC Governing Board found that no reallocation was needed because all CoC projects were high-performing and meeting the critical needs of their jurisdictions.

In past years, the Board has faced difficult decisions, such as (1) reallocating a large portion of transitional housing to rapid rehousing in order to redirect the funding to serve an increased population need, and (2) reallocating supportive service grants to increase rapid rehousing units, again to serve an increased population need.

The Reallocation process and availability to apply are discussed yearly at the Board of Directors meeting in July.

YOUR AGENCY LETTERHEAD

To: _____

From: _____

RE: Designation of Board Member and Voting Representative to South Central Illinois Continuum of Care Board of Directors.

Please be advised that the following individual(s) are hereby designated as our representative and alternative representative, to the South Central Illinois Continuum of Care (SCICOC) Board of Directors. These individuals are authorized to cast our agency's/department's voice on matters which come before the SCICOC membership regarding serving the homeless population.

This board member and voting representative designation is for the year, running through January 31, 2021.

Individual Authorized by Governing
Official

_____, _____
Signature Title

Authorized Proxy Designation

_____, _____
Signature Title

PLEASE SIGN AND RETURN THIS FORM AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO:

Embarras River Basin Agency, Inc.
Attn: Jessica Pauley
Email: jessicap@erbainc.org

	South Central Illinois Continuum of Care						
	2020 Program Competition Timeline				Black is CoC competition related		
					Red is Continuum Operations		
Sequence	Timeframe and Due Date			Task			
1	01/01/20			BOD Application Competition Training			
2	01/15/20			Board of Directors Annual Mtg. recommend board selection			
3	01/17/20			Point in Time Training			
4	01/25/20			Quarterly Project Monitoring			
5	01/30/20			Point in Time Count			
6	01/31/20		projected	FY2019 CoC Program Registration Opens			
7	02/01/20			Ranking and monitoring committee process started			
8	02/28/20			System Performance Measures Submission due in HDX 1.0			
9	03/15/20		projected	Registration Closed			
10	04/08/20			BOD Mtg and Semi Annual Training hosted by ERBA			
11	04/08/20			Ranking System approval by Board (new apps last)			
12	04/15/20		projected	GIW available on HUD exchange			
13	04/20/20		projected	Field Offices review GIW from CoC			
14	04/25/20			Quarterly Project Monitoring			
15	04/30/20		projected	Field Offices post GIW to HUD Exchange			
16	04/30/20			Deadline for HIC and PIT Submission on HDX 1.0			
17	mid May '20		projected	Deadline for FY 2019 LSA Submission in HDX 2.0			
18	07/03/20			FY2019 NOFA Released			
19	07/08/20			CoC Program Competition Opens			
20	07/08/20			Confirm Profiles (IVEDC, ERBA, CEFS and CoC)			
21	07/08/20			Project Applications available in esnaps			
22	07/08/20			BOD Meeting			
23	07/10/20		1 wk after NOFA	Solicitation announcement for new projects to all agencies and public			
24	07/17/20		2 wks after NOFA	Intent for Reapply due for all Renewal Projects, including request for voluntary reallocation			
25	mid July '20		projected	FY 2019 LSA Data Cleaning and Confirmation in HDX 2.0			
26	07/25/20			Quarterly Project Monitoring			
27	07/31/20		4 wks after NOFA	Notice of intent for new projects, with project type and estimated dollar amounts			
28	07/31/20		4 wks after NOFA	PDF version of renewal project application to Lead for approval before submit button			
29	08/02/20		projected	Commitment of projects sent to Board			
30	08/07/20		5 wks after NOFA	All Renewal Applications submitted			
31	08/14/20		6 wks after NOFA	MRR Committee notifies applicants of all projects selected for ranking (based on HUD threshold requirements)			
32	08/21/20		7 wks after NOFA	PDF version of new project application to Lead for approval before submit button			
33	08/28/20		8 wks after NOFA	All new projects submitted			
34	09/11/20		10 wks after NOFA	MRR Releases ranking results to Board and to public			
35	09/18/20		5 days after rank rel.	Deadline for Appeal of Ranking to Board			
36	09/20/20		projected	Post CoC app, attachments, Priority Listing			
37	09/20/20			Notify Community and key stakeholders app is available			
38	09/25/20		HUD Date 9/30/20 - proj	Final CoC, Priority List & Project Apps submitted to HUD			
39	10/01/20		projected	HDX opens for LSA data entry			
40	10/02/20		projected	Monitor of existing projects to include ESG			
41	10/14/20			BOD Meeting and Semi Annual hosted by IVEDC			
42	10/25/20			Quarterly Project Monitoring			
43	11/09/20		projected	Deadline for LSA Test Upload for both All Persons and Veterans			
44	11/30/20		projected	Deadline for LSA Final Upload for both All Persons and Veterans			
45	12/05/20		projected	LSA deadline confirmation of data for All Persons and Veterans			