

South Central Illinois Continuum of Care
 Evaluation Process Tracking Tool
 2016

	First Yr.	Preliminary	CoC Priority	HUD NOFA	<i>FINAL</i>
PERMANENT HOUSING New		0	0	0	no applicants
PERMANENT HOUSING Renewal					
Clay, Effingham, Fayette, Shelby		115			2
Embarras River Basin Agency, Inc.		125			1
PSH-RAPID RE-HOUSING RENEWAL					
Clay, Effingham, Fayette, Shelby	v-no APR	130			5
Embarras River Basin Agency, Inc.		115			3
PSH-RAPID RE-HOUSING NEW					
Clay, Effingham, Fayette, Shelby	v	115			4
Illinois Valley Economic Development	v	115			6
SCI CoC Planning (will be evaluated with a pass or fail)	v	does not apply			Approved

Agency ERBA

Project Name Erba PH 12 Unit

Total Score 125.00

South Central CoC

Projects achieving the goal will receive full points for the priority area. Projects coming within 5% of the goal will receive 75% of the available points for the priority area.

Project Evaluation Items and goals

PSH Projects Reporting Period 1/1/15-12/31/15

Project Evaluation Item	Data source	Goal	Actual Percentage	Possible Points	Total points
Project Participant Impact- Housing Stability					
% of participants who remained in project as of end of reporting period or exited to PH during the reporting period	HMIS Project evaluation Report	90%	100.00%	10	10.00
% of exits to own housing unit (permanent tenure)	HMIS Project evaluation Report	80%	100.00%	10	10.00
% of participants who exited to PH and returned to homelessness within 6 months.	HMIS Project evaluation Report	2%	0.00%	10	10.00
% of participants who exited to ph and returned to homelessness within 6-24 months	HMIS Project evaluation Report	5%	0.00%	10	10.00
Accessing mainstream resources and income					
% participants with 1 source of non-cash benefits or health insurance at exit	HMIS Project evaluation Report	85%	100.00%	10	10.00
% of adult participants who gained or increased the r total income (from all sources) as of the end of the reporting period or at program exit	HMIS Project evaluation Report	30%	73.39%	10	10.00
Meeting Community Need-Project Demand					
% of average bed/unit utilization	HMIS Project evaluation Report	90%	91.60%	10	10.00
Targeting Hardest to Serve					
% participant entries from street/shelter (Adults only)	HMIS Project evaluation Report	85%	100.00%	10	10.00
% if participant entries with zero income (adults only)	HMIS Project evaluation Report	40%	34.00%	10	0.00
%Of participant entries with previous episodes of homelessness	Not evaluated this year				
Project Capacity					
Cost Effectiveness					
Annual Cost per exit to or retention of PH					
Cost per PH exit or retention ≤ 8000	Projected Budget and HMIS info	8000	5	5	5.00
Cost per PH exit or retention = 8001-12000	Projected Budget and HMIS info	8001-1200		2	
Cost per PH exit or retention >12000	Projected Budget and HMIS info	>12000		0	
If 24 month return to homelessness is greater than 5% 0 points					
Unspent Funds					
% of 2013-2014 total CoC expenditures	Had LOCCS	95%	100.00%	5	5.00
% of 2014-2015 total CoC expenditures	Had LOCCS	95%	100.00%	5	5.00
On track to spend 2015-2016 funds	Had LOCCS		yes	5	5
HMIS Data Quality					
No clients with duplicate, incorrect or missing Data (1/1/15-12/31/15)		0	0	1	1.00
Acceptable Missing Data Rates (1/1/15-12/31/2015)					
0% missing Data		0	0	4	4.00
0.1%-2% missing data	HMIS Data Report	.1%-2%		3	
2.1%-5% missing data		2.1%-5%		2	
5.1%-8% missing data	HMIS Data Report	5.1%-8%		1	
>8% missing data		>8%		0	
Best Practice Points					
Project uses housing first practices			yes	10	10
project prioritizes or dedicates beds for chronically homeless.			yes	10	10
Total Project Score				135	125.00

Agency CEFS

Project Name CEFS PH

Total Score 115.00

South Central CoC

Projects achieving the goal will receive full points for the priority area. Projects coming within 5% of the goal will receive 75% of the available points for the priority area.

Project Evaluation Items and goals

PSH Projects Reporting Period 1/1/15-12/31/15

Project Evaluation Item	Data source	Goal	Actual Percentage	Possible Points	Total points
Project Participant Impact- Housing Stability					
% of participants who remained in project as of end of reporting period or exited to PH during the reporting period	HMIS Project evaluation Report	90%	100.00%	10	10.00
% of exits to own housing unit (permanent tenure)	HMIS Project evaluation Report	80%	100.00%	10	10.00
% of participants who exited to PH and returned to homelessness within 6 months.	HMIS Project evaluation Report	2%	0.00%	10	10.00
% of participants who exited to ph and returned to homelessness within 6-24 months	HMIS Project evaluation Report	5%	0.00%	10	10.00
Accessing mainstream resources and income					
% participants with 1 source of non-cash benefits or health insurance at exit	HMIS Project evaluation Report	85%	100.00%	10	10.00
% of adult participants who gained or increased their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the reporting period or at program exit	HMIS Project evaluation Report	30%	22.22%	10	0.00
Meeting Community Need-Project Demand					
% of average bed/unit utilization	HMIS Project evaluation Report	90%	93.75%	10	10.00
Targeting Hardest to Serve					
% participant entries from street/shelter (Adults only)	HMIS Project evaluation Report	85%	60.00%	10	0.00
% if participant entries with zero income (adults only)	HMIS Project evaluation Report	40%	45.00%	10	10.00
%Of participant entries with previous episodes of homelessness	Not evaluated this year				
Project Capacity					
Cost Effectiveness					
Annual Cost per exit to or retention of PH					
Cost per PH exit or retention < 8000	Projected Budget and HMIS Info	8000	5	5	5.00
Cost per PH exit or retention = 8001-12000	Projected Budget and HMIS Info	8001-1200		2	
Cost per PH exit or retention >12000	Projected Budget and HMIS info	>12000		0	
If 24 month return to homelessness is greater than 5% 0 points					
Unspent Funds					
% of 2013-2014 total CoC expenditures	Had LOCCS	95%	100.00%	5	5.00
% of 2014-2015 total CoC expenditures	Had LOCCS	95%	100.00%	5	5.00
On track to spend 2015-2016 funds	Had LOCCS		yes	5	5
HMIS Data Quality					
No clients with duplicate, incorrect or missing Data (1/1/15-12/31/15)		0	0	1	1.00
Acceptable Missing Data Rates (1/1/15-12/31/2015)					
0% missing data		0	0	4	4.00
0.1% -2% missing data	HMIS Data Report	.1%-2%		3	
2.1%-5% missing data		2.1%-5%		2	
5.1%-8% missing data	HMIS Data Report	5.1%-8%		1	
>8% missing data		>8%		0	
Best Practice Points					
Project uses housing first practices			yes	10	10
project prioritizes or dedicates beds for chronically homeless.			yes	10	10
Total Project Score				135	115.00

Agency ERBA

Project Name Rapid Rehousing

Total Score 115.00

South Central CoC

Projects achieving the goal will receive full points for the priority area. Projects coming within 5% of the goal will receive 75% of the available points for the priority area.

Project Evaluation items and goals

Rapid Rehousing Projects

Reporting Period 1/1/15-12/31/15

Project Evaluation Item	Data source	Goal	Actual Percentage	Possible Points	Total points
Project Participant Impact-Housing Stability					
% RRH participants moving to PH at exit	HMIS Project evaluation Report	83%	94.00%	10	10.00
% Exits to participants own housing units	HMIS Project evaluation Report	80%	94.00%	10	10.00
% of participants who exited to PH and returned to homelessness with in 6 months.	HMIS Project evaluation Report	7%	0.00%	10	10.00
% of participants who exited to ph and returned to homelessness within 6-24 months	HMIS Project evaluation Report	12%	0.00%	10	10.00
Accessing mainstream resources and income					
% participants with 1 source of non-cash benefits or health insurance at exit	HMIS Project evaluation Report	85%	92.00%	10	10.00
% of adult participants who gained or increased their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the reporting period or at program exit	HMIS Project evaluation Report	18%	0.00%	10	0.00
Meeting Community Need-Project Demand					
% of average bed/unit utilization	HMIS Project evaluation Report	90%	82.00%	10	0.00
Targeting Hardest to Serve					
% participant entries from street/shelter (Adults only)	HMIS Project evaluation Report	85%	100.00%	10	10.00
% if participant entries with zero income (adults only)	HMIS Project evaluation Report	40%	47.60%	10	10.00
%Of participant entries with previous episodes of homelessness	Not evaluated this year				
Project Capacity					
Cost Effectiveness					
Annual Cost per exit to or retention of PH					
Cost per PH exit or retention < 8000	Projected Budget and HMIS info	8000		5	
Cost per PH exit or retention = 8001-12000	Projected Budget and HMIS info	8000-1200	5	2	5.00
Cost per PH exit or retention >12000	Projected Budget and HMIS info	>12000		0	
If 24 month return to homelessness is greater than 5% 0 points					
Unspent Funds					
% of 2013-2014 total CoC expenditures	Had LOCCS	95%	yes	5	5.00
% of 2014-2015 total CoC expenditures	Had LOCCS	95%	yes	5	5.00
On track to spend 2015-2016 funds	Had LOCCS		yes	5	5
HMIS Data Quality					
No clients with duplicate, incorrect or missing Data (1/1/15-12/31/15)		0	0	1	1.00
Acceptable Missing Data Rates (1/1/15-12/31/2015)					
0% missing data		0		4	
0.1%-2% missing data	HMIS Data Report	.1%-2%		3	
2.1%-5% missing data		2.1%-5%		2	
5.1%-8% missing data	HMIS Data Report	5.1%-8%		1	
>8% missing data		>8%	0	0	4.00
Best Standard					
Project uses housing first practices			yes	20	20
Total Project Score				135	115.00

Agency IVEDC
 Project Name Rapid Rehousing Total Score 135.00

Where project application narrative is the data source reviewers may opt to give partial points as they see fit.

South Central CoC

Project Evaluation items and goals

2016 New Project Review and Scoring Tool

Project Evaluation Item	Possible Points	Actual Points	Data source
Best Practices			
Applicant proposes to use Housing First practices and how they will be implemented	15	15	Project Application 3A & 3b
Supportive Services for Participants			
Applicant sufficiently described how they will address case management needs of clients including, if necessary, development MOUs with partners. This should clearly describe who is responsible for what - e.g.. Is the applicant responsible for service coordination or is a partner agency? Who will provide mental health services, if needed.	10	10	Project Application 4A
Applicant described how they will assist clients to obtain/maintain permanent housing	5	5	Project Application 4A
Applicant described how they will assist clients to increase employment/income	5	5	Project Application 4A
Applicant described how they will assist clients to access benefits	5	5	Project Application 4A
Experience of Applicant and Partners			
Applicant sufficient described their experience and the experience of partners with the proposed activities, and that experience suggest applicant/partner can manage the proposed project.	Not ranked this year 5 points awarded	5	2B1 Project application
Applicant sufficiently and appropriately described how they will work with partner to implement and administer proposed project. Applicant should be as specific as possible.	5	5	2B2+3B1Project application
Performance Measures			
Applicant projects that 70% of the participants will be those that are most vulnerable (special Needs, alcohol, drug, mental health, physical disability, developmental issues)	5	5	3B4 Project application
Meeting Community Need			
Community Planning			
Applicant sufficiently described how project will fit within the Homeless Planning Region and applicant participates in the homeless planning region	Not ranked this year 5 points awarded	5	Hic Matrix
Project Demand			
Current homeless programs in the service area are generally operating at capacity (If only some projects are at capacity five partial points: If applicant only partially accurately described current utilization, give partial points)	5	5	Hic Matrix
Applicant sufficiently described how project meets community needs.	Not ranked this year 5 points awarded	5	Project application
Applicant identified a service area currently unserved by PSH or RRH	15	15	Hic Matrix
Applicant identified a multi-county service area	10	10	2 B2Project application
Targeting Hard to Serve			
PSH: project will be dedicated to or will prioritize chronically homeless and applicant sufficiently described how this will be done. RRH: Applicant demonstrated that project will prioritize those with greatest needs and will service only clients coming from ES or unsheltered locations.	10	10	Project Application 3c & 4b
Project Capacity			
Cost Effectiveness			
Cost <\$5000	10	10	Project Application 5a-6i
Cost=\$5001-\$9000	5	0	Project Application 6i & 6E
Cost > \$9001	0	0	Project Application
Supportive Services VS Housing Request			
Supportive services < 30% of total CoC Funds Requested	10	10	Project Application
Documented 100% cash and in-kind match (match as % of CoC funds Requested)	10	10	6i
Total Project Score	135	135	

Agency	CEFS		
Project Name	Rapid Rehousing (formerly TH)	Total Score	130.00
South Central CoC		Where project application narrative is the data source reviewers may opt to give partial points as they see fit.	
Project Evaluation items and goals			
2016 New Project Review and Scoring Tool			
Project Evaluation Item	Possible Points	Actual Points	Data source
Best Practices			
Applicant proposes to use Housing First practices and how they will be implemented	15	15	Project Application 3A & 3b
Supportive Services for Participants			
Applicant sufficiently described how they will address case management needs of clients including, if necessary, development MOUs with partners. This should clearly describe who is responsible for what - e.g., Is the applicant responsible for service coordination or is a partner agency? Who will provide mental health services, if needed.	10	10	Project Application 4A
Applicant described how they will assist clients to obtain/maintain permanent housing	5	5	Project Application 4A
Applicant described how they will assist clients to increase employment/income	5	5	Project Application 4A
Applicant described how they will assist clients to access benefits	5	5	Project Application 4A
Experience of Applicant and Partners			
Applicant sufficient described their experience and the experience of partners with the proposed activities, and that experience suggest applicant/partner can manage the proposed project.	Not ranked this year 5 points awarded	5	2B1 Project application
Applicant sufficiently and appropriately described how they will work with partner to implement and administer proposed project. Applicant should be as specific as possible.	5	5	2B2+3B1Project application
Performance Measures			
Applicant projects that 70% of the participants will be those that are most vulnerable (special Needs, alcohol, drug, mental health, physical disability, developmental issues)	5	0	3B4 Project application
Meeting Community Need			
Community Planning			
Applicant sufficiently described how project will fit within the Homeless Planning Region and applicant participates in the homeless planning region	Not ranked this year 5 points awarded	5	HIC Matrix
Project Demand			
Current homeless programs in the service area are generally operating at capacity (if only some projects are at capacity five partial points: if applicant only partially accurately described current utilization, give partial points)	5	5	Hic Matrix
Applicant sufficiently described how project meets community needs.	Not ranked this year 5 points awarded	5	Project application
Applicant identified a service area currently unserved by PSH or RRH	15	15	Hic Matrix
Applicant identified a multi-county service area	10	10	2 B2Project application
Targeting Hard to Serve			
PSH: project will be dedicated to or will prioritize chronically homeless and applicant sufficiently described how this will be done. RRH: Applicant demonstrated that project will prioritize those with greatest needs and will service only clients coming from ES or unsheltered locations.	10	10	Project Application 5c & 4b
Project Capacity			
Cost Effectiveness			
Cost <=\$5000	10	10	Project Application 5a-6i
Cost=\$5001-\$9000	5	0	Project Application 6i & 6E
Cost > \$9001	0	0	Project Application
Supportive Services VS Housing Request			
Supportive services < 30% of total CoC Funds Requested	10	10	Project Application
Documented 100% cash and in-kind match (match as % of CoC funds Requested)	10	10	6i
Total Project Score	135	130	

Agency CEFS
 Project Name Rapid Rehousing (reallocation) Total Score 115.00

Where project application narrative is the data source reviewers may opt to give partial points as they see fit.

South Central CoC

Project Evaluation items and goals

2016 New Project Review and Scoring Tool

Project Evaluation Item	Possible Points	Actual Points	Data source
Best Practices			
Applicant proposes to use Housing First practices and how they will be implemented	15	15	Project Application 3A & 3b
Supportive Services for Participants			
Applicant sufficiently described how they will address case management needs of clients including, if necessary, development MOUs with partners. This should clearly describe who is responsible for what - e.g.. Is the applicant responsible for service coordination or is a partner agency? Who will provide mental health services, if needed.	10	10	Project Application 4A
Applicant described how they will assist clients to obtain/maintain permanent housing	5	5	Project Application 4A
Applicant described how they will assist clients to increase employment/income	5	5	Project Application 4A
Applicant described how they will assist clients to access benefits	5	5	Project Application 4A
Experience of Applicant and Partners			
Applicant sufficient described their experience and the experience of partners with the proposed activities, and that experience suggest applicant/partner can manage the proposed project.	Not ranked this year 5 points awarded	5	2B1 Project application
Applicant sufficiently and appropriately described how they will work with partner to implement and administer proposed project. Applicant should be as specific as possible.	5	5	2B2+3B1Project application
Performance Measures			
Applicant projects that 70% of the participants will be those that are most vulnerable (special Needs, alcohol, drug, mental health, physical disability, developmental issues)	5	0	3B4 Project application
Meeting Community Need			
Community Planning			
Applicant sufficiently described how project will fit within the Homeless Planning Region and applicant participates in the homeless planning region	Not ranked this year 5 points awarded	5	Hlc Matrix
Project Demand			
Current homeless programs in the service area are generally operating at capacity (if only some projects are at capacity five partial points: if applicant only partially accurately described current utilization, give partial points)	5	5	Hlc Matrix
Applicant sufficiently described how project meets community needs.	Not ranked this year 5 points awarded	5	Project application
Applicant identified a service area currently unserved by PSH or RRH	15	0	Hlc Matrix
Applicant identified a multi-county service area	10	10	2 B2Project application
Targeting Hard to Serve			
PSH: project will be dedicated to or will prioritize chronically homeless and applicant sufficiently described how this will be done. RRH: Applicant demonstrated that project will prioritize those with greatest needs and will service only clients coming from ES or unsheltered locations.	10	10	Project Application 5c & 4b
Project Capacity			
Cost Effectiveness			
Cost <\$5000	10	10	Project Application 5a-6i
Cost=\$5001-\$9000	5	0	Project Application 6i & 6E
Cost > \$9001	0	0	Project Application
Supportive Services VS Housing Request			
Supportive services < 30% of total CoC Funds Requested	10	10	Project Application
Documented 100% cash and in-kind match (match as % of CoC funds Requested)	10	10	6i
Total Project Score	135	115	