Three County CoC Ranking and Evaluation Committee Meeting

July 24, 2020

Mtg notes

Present: Brooke, Deb M, Michele, Dave, Rebecca.

**Updates:**

* Wayfinders - Hampshire county – RAFT funds are available, COVID ESG.
* Hilltown – got around half a million in cares act funding (14 towns businesses and food security efforts/local farm stands and mobile markets – setting up in Cummingtun, Blanford and other small hilltowns – CDBG funds. Moritorium was extended for two months – stepping up staffing and still closed to the public. Lots of staff changes happening, Michelle is connecting with Michele and Brooke and is getting closer to catching up on things, hired an assistant to support audit and finance needs.
* CAPV is moving towards 50% capacity

**update on site monitoring & NOFA planning updates:**

* site monitoring responses going out today/this weekend
* have not found time to really dive in to the new project evaluation planning.

**Presentation of initial Project ranking and decision making & issues/ presentation of new form.**

**This has been an amazing learning experience – hats off to Kate for her ability to do this on her own last year, because it has overwhelmed us.**

Summary table/decision making – Brooke

**General Points**

* Use Ranking and Evaluation tool based on tool resource tab, information from Hilltown, and Rankin and Evaluation Committee
* Inherited tool and now that we see how it is used, we are looking to make some changes next year- including using the updated HUD form that has the Joint Component

**Rating System**

* Used APR and site monitoring to complete rating points
* For some of the elements, we decided standardized scoring because we either were not sure what question was intending to measure and had no precedent to work from or were not able to determine points equitably due to APR Errors
* All projects met threshold requirements

**Elements Rating System** \*red indicates standard score given

***Performance Measures***

* ***For TH projects*** *Length of Stay:* Unclear based on APR. Description read as people were placed 180 after entering system, meaning projects placed into TH so we gave all projects 20 points
* *Remain or Exits to PH:* Based on APR, if data not entered, project given 0.
* *New Earned Income Stayers: All* projects given 2.5 because of APR data quality issues
* *Nonearned Income Stayers:* All projects given 2.5 because of APR data quality issues
* *Earned Income Leavers:* Based on APR, all projects with leavers given points if met threshold
* *Nonearned Income Leavers:* Based on APR, all projects with leavers given points if met threshold
	+ \*\*Deceased program participants not considered to be leavers

***Serve High Need Populations***

* *Zero Income at Entry:* Based on APR, scored on meeting threshold
* *More than one disability type:* Based on APR, scored on meeting threshold

***Project Effectiveness***

* *Project has Reasonable Costs:* All projects given full points due to unclear calculation for criteria. CoC determined costs reasonable based on number of beds and total budget. Will reevaluate rating element and scoring next year.
* *Housing First and/or Low Barrier:* Based on Housing First and/or Low Barrier policy described in HUD, policies presented during site monitoring, and actual practice by projects.

***Other and Local Criteria***

* *Applicant Narrative:* Will be based on presentations, for now everyone given 0. \*As note, new HUD form ranks this based on site monitoring score so may include that next year
* *Geographic Coverage:* Everyone given full 10 points. Criteria unclear. CoC determined that each project serves unit needs in the geographic coverage including: eligibility requirements, size of unit, unit types, services offered, etc.
* *Chronic Homelessness:* Based on APR, scored on meeting threshold
* *Data Quality:* Based on APR using standardized formula to measure average data quality per section of APR, scored on meeting threshold
* *Bed Utilization:* Based on APR and CoC tracking of beds, scored on meeting threshold. \*New projects scored on meeting 50% threshold instead of 88%
* *Priority Populations:* Based on Written Standards priority populations per project type.
* *Client eligibility documented:* Based on site monitoring, scored on meeting threshold
* *Financial Practices:* Based on site monitoring and monitoring throughout year.
* *Participation/Leadership:* All projects given 5 pts for chairing committee and 2.5 points for committee/workgroup attendance. No projects are currently chairing committees so none received the 5 points.
* *Coordinated Entry- Pulling from List:* Based on CE tracking and whether or not program participants placed were from the CE system/on the By Names List
* *Coordinated Entry- Posting Vacancies on List:* Based on communication with CoC regarding openings during period evaluated.
* *Coordinated Entry- Appropriate Case Conferencing Attendance/Communication:* Based on whether or not case conferencing was attended regularly when unit opening and attended periodically or periodic communication when no openings.
* *Coordinated Entry- Assessing Clients:* Based on whether or not project conducts CE Assessments. Many of project did not get points for this, as they do not conduct assessments.

**Preliminary ranking/differences from last year and similarities:** so far there is no tier structure, due to the fact that the NOFA has not been released so HUD has not determined tier 1 and tier 2 amounts of the annual renewal demand.

Small Programs – are the patterns for these small programs able to be aligning it.

**Geographic coverage pts** concerns/considerations – how do the committee members feel about the “geographic coverage” pts. Moving forward it doesn’t make sense to keep this in here if we have arrived at what we decided this year – giving all projects these points – the CoC feels strongly that we should not give 10 extra points to TH’s. It was discussed that TH’s should make the effort to be funded by DHCD for TH/Shelters instead of using the CoC funds. We need to be adding RRH. We also need to set up this CoC to respond to HUD’s interests as well. Members said that it’s appropriate for the CoC to promote collaborations for relationships between folks and Technical assistance providers. Can the CoC go to the delegation about proactive support for transitioning these programs.

THs also just support us as well in the PIT count. Between the Continuum and the Network we need to include them in the coordination of the system level efforts.

Our THs lost points based on data quality and CE participation. We know this isn’t representative of the work that is being done. We also had great conversations with TH and really all programs in site monitoring.

The CoC is working to support them with HMIS support between now and February.

**Discussion of Board presentation agenda/Next steps:**

* Project Presentations to the Board were moved to August 6th from 2-4pm. Projects will be given 5 minutes each for presentations, which is significantly less than in previous years.

* Learning management system – this will help us to prepare folks for training on information
* Forms will be added to the new website as well.
* APR issues are ongoing – DHCD is aware, but it is def affecting the PIT count as well as the stayers/leavers information. It is currently even more difficult to access the reports. If they are correct before the NOFA is released then we could go through and redo.

**next steps/next meeting planning:**

This group will meet again on 8/21 from 9-10:30am over zoom. The group has been send a meeting invitation.