Three County CoC Ranking and Evaluation Committee Meeting

November 20, 2020

Meeting notes

Present: Justine Dodds; Michele LaFleur; Jonathon Morey; Deb McPartlan; Dave Christopolis; Keleigh Pereira

NOFA Updates:

* Justine was in meeting where presentation included information that HUD may not have full NOFA Process
* Usual NOFA process very time consuming and we have been preparing for it by doing ranking of subrecipient projects
* We’ve been hoping they will do something different since it is so late this year and where we all are with work due to COVID
* Takes an act of congress to make a change to the CoC funding response structure. Know that they would need to push this through congress but hasn’t been possible with current administration.
* Possible plan for NOFA
	+ HUD would establish process for recipient to notify HUD of any corrections or changes needed
	+ Planning grants – supporting subrecipients, planning
	+ Hope is that we’re able to pass this so that subrecipients are not needing to submit applications

Presentation of Three County 2021 new Ranking and Evaluation for current projects, scoring plan – for committee feedback.

* CoC changing process for how ranking and evaluation process because we have bene going through YHDP process and is allowing us to see how HUD is moving in different directions so wanted to make recommendations based on that
* Areas
	+ Length of stay area in outcomes
	+ Income and employment
	+ Project effectiveness
	+ High needs populations
	+ Priority populations
	+ Other and local criteria
* Last meeting talked about how much weight we wanted to give to each category – wanted to make sure ranked certain areas higher
* Recommendation that we keep numbers lower and reasonable
* We ended up with is…
	+ that for the total overall points for program with the most point, which would be TH/Joint = 200 points
	+ Higher in terms of points for last year but scoring things a little differently
* Scoring plan for each category
	+ Length of stay: TH/joint = 60; RRH = 45; PSH = 25
		- Average/median length of participation in TH = 15
		- Length of time between project start and housing move-in = 10
		- Limited returns to homelessness = 15
		- Obtain/maintain permanent housing = 20
	+ Income/employment = 10 points total
		- Increased income = 2.5 each
		- Increased income resources = 2.5 each
		- Participant employment (RRH/PSH) = 2.5
		- Keleigh- not sure about the scoring here, may need help on the match
		- Comment: changed so that not separating out stayers and leavers
		- Should we say 10% or more?
		- Goal that we have for increase is 8-10% for earned income? So should we have more for participant employment?
		- Do we want to do 8 or 10%? Most folks think 8%... agreed
		- Jonathon:
			* Can we say 25% of project participants are employed?
			* Dave- right now might be too ambitious especially during the pandemic
			* Keleigh – for smaller projects may be possible but larger projects may be difficult
			* If 90% of people who someone housed is on SSI or SSDI the likelihood of people being employed is less
			* Dave- population tends to be chronically homeless, multiple disabilities, permanently disabled
		- Michele:
			* I think we need to understand what is the current numbers are now for employed? We can look that up…
			* Looked at one of project- they would get a 0 because everyone has SSI and only have 4 participants
		- Good points- have to be in here for YHDP projects but maybe only reasonable for YHDP projects
	+ Project effectiveness = 60 points total
		- Housing First/ low barrier = 5 points
		- Eligible costs and fiscal management = 80% of time meets 5pts?
		- Effective utilization of funds = 5 pts
		- Written organizational policies and procedures = 5 pts if in place but need work, 10 pts if meet criteria
		- Client identifier – eligibility documentation = 3 out of 4 files have docs = 5 pts; needs major improvement 2.5; if major concerns 0 pts
		- Client identifier – Rent and occupancy charges = 3 out of 4 files have docs = 5 pts; needs major improvement 2.5; if major concerns 0 pts
			* What happens if project doesn’t have rent or occupancy? Would get maximum points
			* If we can’t measure something for someone, can’t give them a 0
		- Client identifier – Supportive services = demonstrates commitment 5 pts; needs improvement; 2.5; major concerns 0 pts
		- Client identifier – housing units and leases = no issues 10 pts; under 5, 7.5 pts; 10 identified, 5 pts; more than 10, 0 pts.
			* Proposing to make this just a 10 and 5 pts
		- Corrective actions = none 10 pts; corrections completed 5pts; not completed
	+ High needs population = 5 points
		- Serving marginalized groups/high need groups
	+ Priority populations = 20 total points
		- Age? Should we be adding age into priority populations?
	+ Other and local criteria = 45 total points
		- Bed utilization = 10 pts
		- Data quality = 10 pts
		- Participation/leadership = 5 pts for being committee chair, 2.5 pts for participation
		- Project annual narrative participation = 5 pts
		- CE – filling vacancies 5
		- CE- CoC notifications of vacancies 5 pots
		- CE – attends case conferencing needed/conduct assessments – 5 pts
			* Question –are we to assume that projects get the points until they don’t do this? So if no openings, will not be docked for not using CE when there is not necessarily a reason to

Discussion of CoC goals and Core Competencies for new project application and draft application and scoring tool.

* Still want to be prepared for possibility around any current subrecipients deciding that they aren’t moving forward
* need to have an application process ready
* Have taken what CoC created for YHDP process and adjusted for CoC in general for new threshold form and application

New Project Scoring Tool

* Measuring if they have passed the threshold before we are bringing to anyone
* Threshold questions are based on what we have as threshold already – yes/no questions and ask to see an audit
* Sections
	+ Experience
		- Experience and capacity to operate: Have you ever run before? Are you able to manage project?
		- Experience successfully operating similar services: Experience operating similar services? Served homeless populations before? Respond to RFP
		- Data collection/reporting
		- Fiscal management structure
		- Audit
	+ Project Approach
	+ Populations Served
	+ CoC Goals & Core Principles – group supported the following list:
		- Maintaining Housing First, Low/No Barrier Program Access
		- Serving participants with little to no income
		- Serving high needs and priority populations
		- Supportive services
		- Racial equity
		- Stable housing
		- Trauma- informed care
		- Social/emotional well-being
		- Increased health outcomes
		- Education and employment
		- Move on strategies
	+ Project Requirements (see application)
	+ Scope and Implementation
		- Geographic coverage
		- Other
	+ Budget
		- Whether or not it’s reasonable
		- Whether budget includes eligible expenses
		- Can they secure match?

next steps/next meeting planning

* Next meeting, finalized application for new projects and YHDP performance evaluation sharing, finalize ranking tool for the new project applications.
* Date: December 17th, 11-12:30pm.