

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
<b>Project Participant Impact- Housing Stability</b>					
% 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
<b>Accessing mainstream resources and income</b>					
% 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%	73.39%	10	10.00
<b>Meeting Community Need-Project Demand</b>					
% of average bed/unit utilization	HMIS Project evaluation Report	90%	91.60%	10	10.00
<b>Targeting Hardest to Serve</b>					
% 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				
<b>Project Capacity</b>					
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>					
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					
<b>Unspent Funds</b>					
% 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
<b>HMIS Data Quality</b>					
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	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	0	
<b>Best Practice Points</b>					
Project uses housing first practices			yes	10	10
project prioritizes or dedicates beds for chronically homeless.			yes	10	10
<b>Total Project Score</b>				<b>135</b>	<b>125.00</b>

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
<b>Project Participant Impact- Housing Stability</b>					
% 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
<b>Accessing mainstream resources and income</b>					
% 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
<b>Meeting Community Need-Project Demand</b>					
% of average bed/unit utilization	HMIS Project evaluation Report	90%	93.75%	10	10.00
<b>Targeting Hardest to Serve</b>					
% 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				
<b>Project Capacity</b>					
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>					
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					
<b>Unspent Funds</b>					
% 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
<b>HMIS Data Quality</b>					
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	
<b>Best Practice Points</b>					
Project uses housing first practices			yes	10	10
project prioritizes or dedicates beds for chronically homeless.			yes	10	10
<b>Total Project Score</b>				<b>135</b>	<b>115.00</b>

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
<b>Project Participant Impact-Housing Stability</b>					
% 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 within 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
<b>Accessing mainstream resources and income</b>					
% 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
<b>Meeting Community Need-Project Demand</b>					
% of average bed/unit utilization	HMIS Project evaluation Report	90%	82.00%	10	0.00
<b>Targeting Hardest to Serve</b>					
% 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				
<b>Project Capacity</b>					
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>					
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	8000-1200		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					
<b>Unspent Funds</b>					
% 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
<b>HMIS Data Quality</b>					
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
<b>Best Standard</b>					
Project uses housing first practices			yes	20	20
<b>Total Project Score</b>				<b>135</b>	<b>115.00</b>

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.
<b>South Central CoC</b>			
<b>Project Evaluation items and goals</b>			
<b>2016 New Project Review and Scoring Tool</b>			
Project Evaluation Item	Possible Points	Actual Points	Data source
<b>Best Practices</b>			
Applicant proposes to use Housing First practices and how they will be implemented	15	15	Project Application 3A & 3b
<b>Supportive Services for Participants</b>			
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
<b>Experience of Applicant and Partners</b>			
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
<b>Performance Measures</b>			
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
<b>Meeting Community Need</b>			
<b>Community Planning</b>			
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	H1c Matrix
<b>Project Demand</b>			
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	H1c 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	H1c Matrix
Applicant identified a multi-county service area	10	10	2 B2Project application
<b>Targeting Hard to Serve</b>			
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 rom ES or unsheltered locations.	10	10	Project Application 5c & 4b
<b>Project Capacity</b>			
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>			
Cost <\$5000	10	10	Project Application 5a-6i
Cost=\$5001-\$9000	5	0	Project Application 6i & 6E
Cost > \$9001	0	0	Project Application
<b>Supportive Services VS Housing Request</b>			
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
<b>Total Project Score</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>135</b>	

Agency	CEFS		
Project Name	Rapid Rehousing (formerly TH)	Total Score	130.00
<b>South Central CoC</b>		Where project application narrative is the data source reviewers may opt to give partial points as they see fit.	
<b>Project Evaluation items and goals</b>			
<b>2016 New Project Review and Scoring Tool</b>			
Project Evaluation Item	Possible Points	Actual Points	Data source
<b>Best Practices</b>			
Applicant proposes to use Housing First practices and how they will be implemented	15	15	Project Application 3A & 3b
<b>Supportive Services for Participants</b>			
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
<b>Experience of Applicant and Partners</b>			
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
<b>Performance Measures</b>			
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
<b>Meeting Community Need</b>			
<b>Community Planning</b>			
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
<b>Project Demand</b>			
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
<b>Targeting Hard to Serve</b>			
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
<b>Project Capacity</b>			
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>			
Cost <=\$5000	10	10	Project Application 5a-6i
Cost=\$5001-\$9000	5	0	Project Application 6i & 6E
Cost > \$9001	0	0	Project Application
<b>Supportive Services VS Housing Request</b>			
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
<b>Total Project Score</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>130</b>	

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
<b>Best Practices</b>			
Applicant proposes to use Housing First practices and how they will be implemented	15	15	Project Application 3A & 3b
<b>Supportive Services for Participants</b>			
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
<b>Experience of Applicant and Partners</b>			
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
<b>Performance Measures</b>			
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
<b>Meeting Community Need</b>			
<b>Community Planning</b>			
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
<b>Project Demand</b>			
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
<b>Targeting Hard to Serve</b>			
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
<b>Project Capacity</b>			
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>			
Cost <\$5000	10	10	Project Application 5a-6f
Cost=\$5001-\$9000	5	0	Project Application 6f & 6E
Cost > \$9001	0	0	Project Application
<b>Supportive Services VS Housing Request</b>			
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	6f
<b>Total Project Score</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>115</b>	

South Central Illinois Continuum of Care  
 Evaluation Process Tracking Tool  
 2016

	First Yr.	Preliminary	CoC Priority	HUD NOFA	<i>FINAL</i>
<b>PERMANENT HOUSING New</b>		0	0	0	no applicants

**PERMANENT HOUSING Renewal**

Clay, Effingham, Fayette, Shelby		115			2
Embaras River Basin Agency, Inc.		125			1

**PSH-RAPID RE-HOUSING RENEWAL**

Clay, Effingham, Fayette, Shelby	v-no APR	130			5
Embaras River Basin Agency, Inc.		115			3

**PSH-RAPID RE-HOUSING NEW**

Clay, Effingham, Fayette, Shelby	v	115			6
Illinois Valley Economic Development	v	130	x		4

**SCI CoC Planning**

(will be evaluated with a pass or fail)

v	does not apply			Approved
---	----------------	--	--	----------