Three County CoC Ranking and Evaluation Committee Meeting

April 24, 2020

Meeting notes

Present: Deb, Michele, Kim, dave, Brooke, Kate, Rebecca, Justine

***site monitoring:***

We are working to streamline the process for site monitoring. Likely we will be sending a longer questionnaire than usual that is inclusive of billing process, programmatic questions and client file response. This will include request for a packet of information to be sent to us, and then we will schedule zoom meetings to discuss issues, concerns, etc. A more thorough evaluation may be scheduled for times when the country/state are more opened up. This monitoring will mostly coinside with what we need to learn for ranking and evaluation specifics.

The good news is that we are already in a good place with most projects in terms of billing processes and CAPV has already required projects to send along two months of back up for the match documentation and feel a level of confidence surrounding this, that we wouldn’t have if this hadn’t already been done.

* ***Feedback/ideas regarding streamlined processes.***

Ability to scan, firewalls for confidentiality.

Taking response at face value.

The form and the formula have boxes that are routinely ticked, shift more of the administrative box ticking to us. For example the environmental reviews only need to be done once. We could use last year’s evaluation. Be strategic on what we need to know

Dig in deep to what problems they are experiencing from their side, paying attention to their processes.

HUD may be waiving it. Look at the trends for issues that exist.

This will be the first time that CHD and Dialself have been evaluated. Establish the line of expectation.

**Current Renewal Project ranking**:

Reminder of timeline/usual procedures for ranking/evaluation – HUD may be moving the timeline back for annual applications, we hope for reduced submissions – act of congress to change annual renewal.

* CoC Threshold Requirements –***look at the tool, and renewal and expansion Threshold.***
* **Coordinated Entry Participation**
	+ Last year we separated it in to four areas. Shouldn’t include “performs vulnerability assessments.” . Group shared concerns about removing it. Suggested just TH be evaluated for doing it.
		- * **They should be:** Provides the CoC with vacancy information, Pulls from the CE by names list for new participants, participates in Case Conferencing when openings exist or when partner engagement needed.
* **Housing First and Low Barrier**
	+ How do we evaluate?
		- Review files for when project reject or decline a referral.. look at why and make sure equitable and following Fair Housing
		- Review files for terminations… make sure all steps taken to avoid termination and that done following Fair Housing

 - **Project has reasonable costs per permanent housing exit as defined locally”**

* + What does this mean? Why and how are we tracking this?
		- * Hilltown never really got a good plan for this – dig deeper and ask projects to give full info on funding. Represents some of what is really apple and oranges/housing costs are not the same in our broad geography. Some have subsidies. Footnote this and summarize as part of the narrative.
* **Active CoC participation** –What is a member in good standing
	+ - * points for attending meetings, and chairing committees – this was hilltown’s. Does activity include work they are doing on the ground that can be making an impact to end homelessness – what is their strength? Think of this in terms of layers – do a survey to understand what people are doing at multiple layers.
* **Bed Utilization** – what do we do for new projects? – agency explanation in narrative? COVID-19? First year processes. Weigh their score? ***From a nuts and bolts perspective – we need to approve a new threshold for new projects – held to a 50% rate? Group agreed.***
* **In terms of these new projects** – at some point, will HUD pull money if they don’t spend the money? Yes, sometimes bed utilization is affecting funding usage, sometimes it isn’t.
* **Project narratives –** need to consider how this looks with COVID-19.
* ***renewal and expansion rating tool.*** Annual Performance Report will give us some of these identifiers. TIMEFRAME: we will choose dates from Spring of 2019-spring of 2020 to run an APR to be sure that the information is the same timeframe, specifically to have more time to evaluate new projects.

Don’t spring changes, but consider what might be time consuming or doesn’t add a lot of value that we can do this year to streamline the ranking and evaluation.

Spreadsheet is not a requirement, just need to have an objective process and a grievance option. You can look at the NOFA, what are the points related to carrying out the NOFA – criteria in the NOFA that gives more points for having certain things that are part of the ranking process. Match it to the NOFA requirements in previous NOFAs. Can vary a lot across CoCs.

Next meeting date: May 22nd, 9-10:30am.