Chicago Continuum of Care Board of Directors Meeting  
City Hall, 121 N. LaSalle, Room 501A  
Chicago, IL  
April 17, 2019  
9:30am – 11:30am

AGENDA

I. Welcome, Introductions/Roll Call – Commissioner Lisa Morrison Butler 9:30 am

II. ☑️ Consent Agenda Items (including February meeting items)  
   – Commissioner Lisa Morrison Butler 9:35 am
   a. February & April Meeting Agenda
   b. December & February Board Meeting Minutes
   c. CoC Action Agenda Work Plans (workplans)
   d. CoC Board Committee Reports (February and April)

III. ☑️ New Voting Items 9:40 am
    a. Executive Committee – Betsy Benito
       i. ☑️ Recommendation:  
          The board authorizes the Pre-Application review panel to make decisions on  
          coordinated pre-applications and report back to the Board
    b. Board Affairs Committee – Fred Friedman 9:50 am
       i. ☑️ Recommendation:
          To approve the 2019 Board Terms
    c. System Operations & Performance Committee – Carmelo Barbaro 9:55 am
       i. ☑️ Recommendation:  
          To extend the 2018 Collaborative Applicant MOU to December 31, 2019
       ii. ☑️ Recommendation:  
           To approve the 2019 System Goals draft
    d. Finance Committee Report – Steve Gaydos 10:05 am
       i. ☑️ UFA Overview & Recommendation:  
          To approve the formation of the UFA committee

IV. CoC Action Agenda Spotlight 10:25 am
    - Employment/Income: Vision & Implementation Plan – Carrie Thomas/  
      Jennifer Rehfeldt

V. FY 2018 CoC NOFA Debrief – Dave Thomas 10:50 am

VI. Bring Chicago Home Campaign – Doug Schenkelberg 11:00 am

VII. Public Comment Period – Commissioner Morrison Butler 11:15 am

VIII. Adjournment – Commissioner Morrison Butler 11:30 am

☑️ = Voting item
☑️ = Document included in Board packet
Chicago CoC Board of Directors Meeting
Chicago Community Trust
225 N. Michigan Avenue, Suite 2200
Chicago, IL
February 20, 2019
9:39 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

Minutes
(Submitted by Julie McKelphin, All Chicago)

In Attendance:

Board Members: Fred Friedman, Richard Rowe, Larry Smith, Gwendolyn Turner, Peter Toepfer (Proxy for Evelyn Diaz), Jeri Linas, Audrey Thomas, Ken Burnett (Proxy for Mark Ishaug), Commissioner Lisa Morrison Butler, Mary Howard, Bennett Applegate, Anna Lee, Carmello Barbaro (Proxy for Ruth Coffman), Megan Spitz (Proxy for Audra Hamernik).

Alternates: Dorothy Yancy, Otha Gaston, Kenneth Burnett, Pete Toepfer

Action Agenda Co-Lead Project Managers: Maura McCauley, Dave Thomas

Guests: Nonie Brennan, Michael Banghart, A. Bendixen, A. Beato, Carrie Thomas, Joan Bundley (Parliamentarian), Melissa Anson, Sherese Alexander, Doug Nichols (All Chicago), Sterling J. Gusserseeis, Kim Davidson, Adam Rogers, Anna Lee, Debbie Culpepper, Jackie Edens, Tawanda Acosta, Steve Gaydos (All Chicago), Keri Lowder (All Chicago), Julie McKelphin (All Chicago)

Agenda Items

I. Welcome and introductions

Meeting was called to order by Commissioner Morrison-Butler at 9:42 a.m. Introductions of Board Members and audience members were made. The Commissioner announced that guest comments will be made at the end of the meeting. She also announced that two board members resigned.

II. Review of Consent Agenda Items

Since the meeting was one person short of quorum, consent agenda items will be voted on in the April meeting. The MOU will be extended for 6 months. There was one error in the December meeting minutes: Carmello Barbaro was in attendance for Ruth Coffman. The Commissioner requested a report on the attendance of Board members.

III. Executive Committee Report – Commissioner Morrison Butler
UFA Survey results were presented by Carmelo Barbaro. The Finance Committee was tasked with taking the lead on analyzing next steps and present recommendations at the April meeting.

IV. **Collaborative Applicant Report** - Nonie Brennan presented the Collaborative applicant report which focused on the NOFA announcement of over $73,000,000 being awarded to the Chicago CoC in last year's competition.

V. **CoC Action Agenda Reports/Discussions**
   a. Maura presented on the System Goals.
   b. Stephanie Sideman and Karen Kowal presented on the updated Coordinated Entry Prioritization.
   c. Betsy Benito and Steve Gaydos presented on Pipeline Expansion/System Funding. Betsy and Steve intend to meet with public funders to truly understand what exists and increase resources where possible and to begin to create new resources.

VI. **Public Comment Period**: Comments included having the CoC Board and All Chicago’s Board increased communication.

VII. **Meeting adjourned at 11:32 a.m.**
CoC Financial Summary
For the Period Ended 01/01/19 thru 03/31/19
Preliminary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual To Date</th>
<th>Additional Projected Amount</th>
<th>Projected Total For The Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Projected Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$32,298</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$32,298</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$2,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses to Date (See note below)</td>
<td>$9,067</td>
<td>$29,235</td>
<td>$38,302</td>
<td>$38,932</td>
<td>$(630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Surplus (Deficit)</td>
<td>$23,231</td>
<td>$(29,235)</td>
<td>$(6,004)</td>
<td>$(8,932)</td>
<td>$2,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Fund Balance at End of Year

$41,804

Note:
The 2019 expense budget includes $8,932 in expenses carried over from the 2018 budget.
CoC Board of Directors  
Board Affairs Committee Report  
March 27, 2019

In attendance: Fred Friedman (chair), Larry Smith, Christy Prahl, Jennifer Rehfeldt  
Support: Dave Thomas and Maura McCauley

I. Welcome & introductions were made
   a. There were two new committee members in attendance (Larry and Jennifer)

II. Review Scope of Work:
   a. The committee reviewed its scope of work and is on-track
   b. A document was created to standardize recruitment for non-board members to
      the Board committees and Dave will share it with other committees for feedback
   c. On-going Board Recruitment: Committee members will think about At-Large
      members moving forward. Once at-large terms are finalized, the 2020 Board at-
      large member recruitment process will begin
   d. All Chicago will reach out to other CoCs about their Board recruitment processes
      to help this committee come up with a thoughtful plan
   e. Developing Board recruitment and mentorship plans will be primary discussion
      items for the May Board Affairs Committee meeting
   f. Fred will ask the Board to have an informal get together to build cohesion among
      the Board per the committee’s suggestion

III. Open Board Seats:
   a. The committee reviewed the currently open seats on the CoC Board and
      developed a plan of action:
      i. Mayor’s seat will remain open until new mayor is in place
      ii. Faith-based – Fred will reach out to Saeed Richardson (Community
          Renewal Society)
      iii. At-Large open seats:
          1. Workforce Development - Jennifer will reach out to Amanda Cage
             from the Workforce Development sector
          2. IDHS –Fred will reach out to Sol Flores for a recommendation
             from IDHS
          3. Justice System - Christy will reach out to Judge Colleen Sheehan
             (Restorative Justice Court)
          4. Cook Co. Health & Hospital System - Dave will reach out for a
             replacement rep
      iv. SPC alt seats are being filled through their election process

IV. Board Terms Process
a. Each constituency “draws straws”: SPC, LEC, Funders, At-large
b. LEC, SPC and Funders will determine their own three-year terms prior to the April Board meeting
c. At-large seats will be randomized by Fred, Maura, and Dave

V. Ad Hoc Charter Committee
a. Due to lack of wide representation from the Board for this committee, recruitment was discussed
b. Audrey Thomas is willing to chair the committee.
c. The Board Affairs Committee set the following guidelines for ad hoc Charter Committee participation:
   i. No more than 2 people from any constituency on the board.
   ii. For non-board members, strive for other diverse representation.
   iii. No more than two reps from any subgroup constitutes the ad hoc charter committee with the idea of diverse representation serves as a guiding principle for non-board member recruitment.
d. Bring in a lawyer after the community gives input/feedback. Develop the content first and then ask for a lawyer to weigh in.

VI. Next meeting: Wednesday May 22 from 9:30-11:30am at DFSS
System Operation and Performance Committee (SOPC)
Report to Chicago Continuum of Care (CoC) Board of Directors
April 2019

Membership
The SOPC has worked to recruit additional members. Andrea Dakin has joined as a representative of the System Performance and Evaluation Committee (SPEC). Additional members will be recruited from the HMIS Committee and Collaborative Applicant Committee (CAVC).

Evelyn Diaz has resigned from the CoC Board and will no longer serve on SOPC.

System Goals
During its March 2019 meeting, the SOPC aligned on an approach for reporting on System Goals to the Board of Directors.

- Recommended System Performance Goals will be presented to the Board of Directors for review and approval at the first meeting of each calendar year.
- During subsequent meetings of the Board of Directors, the SOPC will present a “deep dive” on one System Performance Goal.
- Overall performance on system goals will be summarized annually and reported to the Board of Directors during the final Board meeting of the calendar year.

The SOPC will work collaboratively with SPEC to prepare the above updates. SOPC aims to implement this full cycle in calendar year 2020, and will implement a modified schedule in calendar year 2019.

Lead Agency Monitoring
The SOPC is working to establish an approach to monitoring the performance of lead agencies that is comprehensive, leverages best practices, and strikes an appropriate balance of oversight and autonomy. To accomplish this, the SOPC will contract with Mandy Chapman Semple (Clutch Consulting) and Lori Pampilo Harris to better understand how other CoCs perform this function. This national scan will explore:

- Board and committee structures
- MOU and contract terms
- Metrics used to monitor performance
- Feedback mechanisms

The SOPC solicited feedback from CAC leadership on this approach and will share the results of this scan with the Board of Directors at the June or August meetings.

Collaborative Applicant MOU
The MOU between the CoC and Collaborative Applicant is currently expired. After aligning with the CAC on the need for the above scan, the SOPC and CAC recommend that the Board of Directors renew this MOU through December 31, 2019.
Preamble
The Chicago Continuum of Care (CoC) is a membership-based organization comprised of a variety of stakeholders committed to preventing and ending homelessness through the design and implementation of plans, which are consistent with local, state, and federal policies. Towards that end, the Chicago CoC enters into a collegial relationship with its designated Collaborative Applicant (CA) to ensure that the goals of developing and sustaining a culture of trust, respect and support among all of its members is mutually realized. The attainment of these goals will support the development and implementation of essential initiatives so that those served through the many programs and services available within the Chicago CoC derive the maximum benefit possible on their journey to independence and economic self-sufficiency.

It is expected that the Chicago CoC and the CA will work together to ensure that the Chicago CoC achieves, and maintains, a HUD high-performance status, thus affording the opportunity to acquire enhanced funding to further support the accomplishment of the overall established goals of the Chicago CoC. Further, in the accomplishment of their defined responsibilities the CA will provide informed technical information, associated research and support required by the various committees, workgroups and like bodies as defined in the Charter and outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

The Chicago CoC Membership, and the CA commit to timely responses, open communication and collaborative working strategies, from each other, in the accomplishment of tasks necessary to ensure efficient and effective operations of the Chicago CoC.

1. Parties

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is made and entered into by and between the Chicago Continuum of Care ("CoC") and All Chicago, the Collaborative Applicant (CA) for the Chicago CoC, defining the services to be provided by the Collaborative Applicant, establishing performance expectations and reporting requirements of the Collaborative Applicant and establishing a process for reviewing the performance of the Collaborative Applicant annually.

2. Purpose

This MOU governs the duties, assignments and responsibilities of the Chicago CoC and its governing body, its Collaborative Applicant Committee, and the Collaborative Applicant.

3. Background Role of the Collaborative Applicant

2018 Collaborative Applicant Memorandum of Understanding
The Chicago Alliance to End Homelessness a program of All Chicago ("CAEH") has been designated as the Collaborative Applicant for the Chicago CoC and will serve in that role until the next annual review of performance and Chicago CoC confirmation that will occur no later than December 31, 2018.

For the purposes of the annual HUD CoC application and the management of Chicago CoC Program planning grants, the CoC must designate a grant recipient to be the Collaborative Applicant. The Collaborative Applicant is the only entity that may:

- Submit the Chicago CoC Consolidated Application to HUD
- Apply for Chicago CoC Program grants from HUD on behalf of the Continuum
- Apply for and receive Chicago CoC Program planning funds on behalf of the Chicago CoC

4. Duties and Responsibilities of the Collaborative Applicant

The CA will also assume responsibility for the following deliverables and subsequent activities outlined in Exhibit A: Scope of Services.

5. Role of the Collaborative Applicant Committee

Annually, the Chicago CoC’s Collaborative Applicant Committee will review the Collaborative Applicant’s performance on metrics agreed upon in this MOU. The Committee’s recommendation(s) will be reviewed by the Chicago CoC Board of Directors annually and renewed by a 2/3 vote of then-seated Board members. The renewal of this MOU must be approved by the full Chicago CoC.

Every three years, the Collaborative Applicant Committee will be charged by the Board to lead a process of recommending reselection of the Collaborative Applicant or initiating a competitive process to select a Collaborative Applicant.

6. Term of MOU

This MOU shall commence date of execution, as designated by the signatures of both parties and continue through December 31, 2018, unless this MOU is terminated sooner by written agreement of both parties. The parties may extend the term of this MOU for no more than twelve months from the date of execution, by written amendment from the Chicago CoC Board of Directors, at any time prior to the expiration of this MOU.

The CA acknowledges that if at any time their duties and responsibilities as CA pursuant to this Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") are terminated or end in accordance with the expiration of a contract, the CA is obligated to participate in an expedient and professional transition of knowledge, documents, grants and all other relevant information (even if not identified by name in this document) to the successor entity. This transition will also include a formal training period, term of which will be negotiated by the CAC and the parties involved, to facilitate the successful transfer of information with minimal disruption to the COC."
7. **Scope of Services**

The services that the CA shall provide under this MOU are those described in Exhibit A incorporated herein to this MOU.

Scope of Services are subject to change, as agreed to by both parties, depending on the amount of funding that is allocated to the CA to complete the work of the Chicago CoC.

8. **Grants/Contracts**

All government grants/contracts awarded to the CA that exclusively support the activities conducted by the CA on behalf of the Chicago CoC are subject to reassignment should there be a change in the CA designation. Reassignment of private individual or foundation grants awarded to the CA that exclusively support the activities conducted by the CA on behalf of the Chicago CoC will be discussed with each funder should there be a change in the CA designation and carried out according to donor intent.

New opportunities for funding and template language for funding applications made by the CA that exclusively support the activities performed by the CA on behalf of the Chicago CoC will be shared for review and input by the Collaborative Applicant Committee and Chicago CoC Governing Board. The template language will remain confidential information between the CA, the Collaborative Applicant Committee, and the Chicago CoC Governing Board.

9. **Performance Reporting Template**

The CA will report on its performance to the Collaborative Applicant Committee utilizing a report that follows the template set forth in *Exhibit B: Quarterly Performance Reporting Template*.

10. **Budget**

The budget is set forth in *Exhibit C: Budget*.

11. **General Provisions.**

a) **Amendments**. Either party may request changes to this MOU. Any changes, modifications, revisions or amendments to this MOU which are mutually agreed upon by and between the parties to this MOU shall be incorporated by written instrument, and effective when executed and signed by all parties to this MOU.

b) **Entirety of Agreement**. This Agreement, including any referenced documents or exhibits, constitutes the entire agreement of the parties with respect to the matters contained herein. No modification of or amendment to this Agreement shall be effective unless such modification or amendment is in writing and signed by both parties hereto.
c) **Severability.** Should any portion of this MOU be judicially determined to be illegal or unenforceable, the remainder of this MOU shall continue in full force and effect, and either party may renegotiate the terms affected by the severance.

d) **Compliance with Laws:** The parties shall at all times comply with all applicable laws, federal, and state, county, municipal statutes, ordinances and regulations relating to this MOU or which may affect the performance of this MOU.

e) **Indemnification:** Each party shall be responsible for the negligent acts or omissions of its officers, agents, directors and employees to the extent allowable by law.

f) **No Personal Liability:** No officer, member, official, employee or agent of the Chicago Continuum of Care or the CA shall be personally liable in connection with this MOU.

g) **Governing Law:** This MOU and all subsequent amendments shall be governed and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Illinois. The exclusive venue for any dispute shall be Cook County, Illinois.

h) **Signatures.** In Witness Whereof, the parties to this MOU through their duly authorized representatives have executed this MOU on the days and dates set out below, and certify that they have read, understood, and agreed to the terms and conditions of this MOU as set forth herein. The effective date of this MOU is the date of the signature last affixed to this page.

Nonie Brennan  
Executive Director/CEO  
All Chicago

[Signature]  
2.12.18  
Date

[Insert Name]  
Date

Chairperson  
Board of the Chicago Continuum of Care

2.12.18  
Date
Chicago CoC System Goals 2019

(All goals for January – December unless otherwise indicated)

1. Reduce the number of persons who are homeless, overall and for identified subpopulations.¹
   Metric 1: 15% decrease in the total number of households on the One List.
   Metric 2: 10% increase in number of households placed in permanent housing (through the homeless system and self-resolved).
   Metric 3: 5% decrease in the system-wide inflow.

2. Reduce the time persons remain homeless.
   Metric 1: Average 90 days between entry into the homeless system and move into housing.
   Metric 2: Average 30 days between referral to project and move into housing.

3. Homeless dedicated units should all be filled utilizing the coordinated entry system (CES).
   Metric: 100% of homeless dedicated units will have been filled utilizing CES.

4. Increase the earned income and/or other income of adults served in the homeless services system.
   Metric: 8% of adults engaged in Chicago’s homeless services system increase their earned income during the year.
   Metric: 15% of adults engaged in Chicago’s homeless services system increase their non-employment cash income during the year.

5. Increase persons who exit street homelessness to enter sheltered destination (ES, SH, TH, PH)
   Metric: 10% increase in the number of households moving from street homelessness to a sheltered destination, either Emergency Shelter, Save Haven, Transitional Housing, or Permanent Housing.

Notes:

i. A racial equity lens will be included in the 2019 system goals data incorporated into the dashboard.

ii. The 2019 system goals and metrics have been reviewed and approved by the SOP committee of the CoC Board. The targets for each metric may be further refined. Still underdevelopment is the “data plan” to define what, how, and when data will be compiled and presented, including in the dashboard.

¹ Subpopulations: chronic homeless, street homeless, families, youth, veterans.
April 17, 2019

CoC Finance Committee Recommendation
Regarding the Unified Funding Agency Decision Process

• Background.
  o In response to the CoC Board’s request that the Finance Committee take the lead in advancing the discussion regarding the Unified Funding Agency, Finance Committee met to review the HUD Discussion Guide: Key Questions for Continuums of Care (CoCs) Considering Unified Funding Agency (UFA) Status (“Guide”).
  o The Guide addresses the following questions:
    ▪ What is a UFA?
    ▪ What are the specific responsibilities of a UFA?
    ▪ What are the benefits to obtaining the UFA designation?
    ▪ What things must a CoC consider before it applies to become a UFA?
    ▪ What process should a CoC use to decide to become a UFA?
  o Based on these meetings, the Committee would like to make the following recommendations to the Board.

• Recommendations:
  o Based on HUD’s guidance, the current Finance Committee membership does not adequately represent the entire community for an issue of this magnitude. The Finance Committee recommends that an ad hoc UFA Committee be formed as soon as possible to include all current members of the Finance Committee and at least three more members. These additional members should include:
    ▪ The CEO (or CFO) of at least one large service provider.
    ▪ One service provider who currently does not support the UFA.
  Other members could include:
    • A member of the Collaborative Applicant committee
    • CEOs and CFOs of service providers of all types
    • Any community stakeholder with an interest in this issue.
  o The UFA Committee will be charged to:
    ▪ Review the capacity of the Collaborative Applicant.
    ▪ Review the benefits and implications of UFA status.
    ▪ Discuss the challenges and rewards with current UFAs and with HUD.
    ▪ Develop recommendations for an operating agreement between the UFA and CoC.
    ▪ Make a recommendation to the Board as to whether to proceed with the UFA for the next registration period in 2020.
  o These tasks can be divided within the UFA Committee to maximize the efficiency of the committee.
  o The UFA Committee will be facilitated and supported by All Chicago.
Continuum of Care Program
Competition Debriefing
FY 2018

CoC Name: Chicago CoC
CoC Number: IL-510

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Application Questions</th>
<th>Maximum Score Available</th>
<th>CoC Score Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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.
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 | 13 |
| **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 | 3.5 |
## 1. High Priority CoC Application Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Application Questions</th>
<th>Maximum Score Available</th>
<th>CoC Score Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) System Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3A-1. First Time Homeless as Reported in HDX.</strong> 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.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3A-2. Length-of-Time Homeless as Reported in HDX.</strong> 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.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3A-3. Successful Permanent Housing Placement and Retention as Reported in HDX.</strong> 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.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3A-4. Returns to Homelessness as Reported in HDX.</strong> 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</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. High Priority CoC Application Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Application Questions</th>
<th>Maximum Score Available</th>
<th>CoC Score Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3A-5.</strong> 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.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3A-6.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Performance and Strategic Planning Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3B-2.2.</strong> 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 CoC’s strategy to rapidly rehouse families with children within 30 days of becoming homeless.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Accessing Mainstream Benefits and Additional Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4A-2.</strong> 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.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4A-3.</strong> Street Outreach. Applicants must: (1) describe the CoC’s outreach; (2) state whether the CoC’s Street Outreach covers 100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. High Priority CoC Application Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Application Questions</th>
<th>Maximum Score Available</th>
<th>CoC Score Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CoC Scoring Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Category</th>
<th>Maximum Score (Points)</th>
<th>Your CoC Score (Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1: CoC Structure and Governance</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2: Data Collection and Quality</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3: CoC Performance and Strategic Planning</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4: Cross-Cutting Policies</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CoC Application Score</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>171.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
FY 2018 Continuum of Care Program Competition Debrief Analysis

This document summarizes Chicago’s scores for the FY 2018 Continuum of Care (CoC) program competition based on a debrief from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The competition focused on the same four main categories as the previous year’s competition: CoC structure and governance; data collection and quality; CoC performance and strategic planning; and cross-cutting policies. The maximum number of points that CoCs may receive also remains unchanged at 200 points.

The CoC earned a total of 171.5 points for a score of 85.75%, which was a slight decrease from the previous year. The total score was higher than both the median score and the weighted mean score for all CoCs, approximately 83.38% and 80%, respectively (see table 1). Below are the Chicago CoC’s scores by category (see Table 2). Percentage scores are calculated as the earned scores divided by the total points possible for that section.

### Table 1. Total Scores across all Continuums of Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 16 - FY 17 (Comparison)</th>
<th>FY 17 - FY 18 (Comparison)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Overall Scores All CoCs</td>
<td>Diff w Chicago</td>
<td>Overall Scores All CoCs</td>
<td>Score (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest score for any CoC</td>
<td>187.75</td>
<td>93.88%</td>
<td>-6.38%</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>95.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Score for any CoC</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>39.50%</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
<td>57.75</td>
<td>28.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score for all CoCs</td>
<td>154.50</td>
<td>77.25%</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
<td>147.5</td>
<td>73.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Mean Score for all CoCs</td>
<td>160.70</td>
<td>80.35%</td>
<td>7.15%</td>
<td>159.75</td>
<td>79.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2016</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Score Possible</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight(^1)</td>
<td>25.50%</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
<td>50.50%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Score (points)</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Score (%)(^2)</td>
<td>95.10%</td>
<td>88.90%</td>
<td>80.70%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2017</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Score Possible</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight(^1)</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
<td>41.00%</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Score (points)</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>177.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Score (%)(^2)</td>
<td>81.00%</td>
<td>81.50%</td>
<td>94.50%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>88.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 2018</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Score Possible</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight(^1)</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>24.50%</td>
<td>38.50%</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Score (points)</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>171.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Score (%)(^2)</td>
<td>83.65%</td>
<td>80.61%</td>
<td>86.36%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>85.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 16 - FY 17 (Comparison)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Possible Score</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Weight</td>
<td>-0.50%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>-9.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Earned Score (%)</td>
<td>-14.10%</td>
<td>-7.37%</td>
<td>13.82%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 17 - FY 18 (Comparison)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Possible Score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Weight</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>-2.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Earned Score (%)</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
<td>-0.91%</td>
<td>-8.15%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-3.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CoC NOFA Subsections Deficiencies & Opportunities for Improvements

I. *CoC structure and governance.*
   Deficiencies:
   1. Lost 5 points on project ranking & selection.
   2. Possibly lost points in the following areas: Moving-on Strategy & Lack of CoC Non-Discrimination Policy
   Opportunities for Improvement:
   1. Develop ranking strategies and policies that are reflective of system priorities and performance.
   3. Develop a CoC Non-discrimination policy and training.

II. *Data collection and quality.*
   Deficiencies:
   1. Lost 2.5 points on Bed Coverage
   Opportunities for Improvement:
   1. Improve PSH Bed Coverage focusing on veterans’ resources & HOPWA resources.
   2. Monitor impact of a corrective change of TH beds in the HIC.

III. *CoC performance and strategic planning.*
   Deficiencies:
   1. Lost 5.5 points on System Performance Measures
   2. Scored 0 points for rapidly rehousing families with children.
   Opportunities for Improvement:
   1. Focus on key SPMs: Reducing length of time homeless; PH placements & retention; Returns to homelessness; & Jobs/Income growth.
   2. Increase Rapid Rehousing inventory.

IV. *Cross-cutting policies.*

   The weight of this category remained generally the same as the previous year. The CoC scored 100%, as it did in FY 2017.

The HUD debrief was very limited in scope, with scores only for questions deemed as high priority. Nevertheless, there are clear opportunities for improvement, particularly in the governance and structure category, data collection and quality category, and performance and strategic planning sub-category.