

Ranking and Evaluation Committee

March 1st, 2023

Present

- Emma C (Three County CoC)
- Janna T (CAPV)
- Teri K (Three County CoC)
- Michele L (Three County CoC)
- Katie D (Three County CoC)
- Andy K (Eliot)
- Dave C (Hilltown CDC)
- Deb M (Way Finders)
- Calpurnya R (MHSA)

First thing

- Today: going over changes to Monitoring form, asking Committee questions about our unanswered
- Introductions
- Going over changes to Monitoring Form
 - Adding max score rather than 'expectations'
 - Changing the point spread so not as subjective
 - Adding Housing First question
 - Increasing points for Participant File Review
 - Corrective actions – now looking at if there were some last year
 - Changed because of comment from HUD monitoring of us (lack of documentation of corrective actions), overall trying to make this more objective and clear about how and what we are scoring
 - Increased to 95% because that is the goal HUD has set
 - Not scoring on HMIS timeliness because of system migration and manual re-entry of participants
 - First year we will be looking at accuracy
 - HUD recommends reviewing client files and making sure it matches what's in HMIS
 - Questions? Feedback?
 - Calpurnya: racial equity? Perfect segue...not sure how we are going to do it this year, bringing this up to the Committee
 - Janna: could keep it separate from monitoring form, and make it clear WHERE the data is coming from... clear process from year to year
 - Dave: Self eval form was HUD tool to help grantees prepare for monitoring, to me that's what it is, not required but helpful to prepare
 - Katie: the evaluation process being virtual vs what it was like pre COVID...life piece could be valuable for equity evaluation piece

- Janna: if no one has strong opinion about where it lives as long as we do it, can be up to us to figure out what works best...as objective as possible, people getting points on same criteria.
 - Calpurnya: line 157 “30% of participants meet a high need category” where did that number come from?
 - Michele: it’s a number we’ve been using for past couple of years but can’t remember why we picked it... most if not all programs have a much higher percentage so could probably think about increasing if we wanted to
 - Getting LGBTQ data?...HUD planning to include LGBTQ status for PSH projects in new October data standards
 - Unsure what the percentage is off top of head...at least 40-50%, sometimes programs barely meet it but most are over
 - Janna: maybe track during monitoring, and next year considering raising
 - Change the spread? Increase this year?
 - Katie: might want to wait
 - Deb: look at last year data and see where programs fall and if they all get it, raise the bar
 - Dave: priority populations are important, probably will eventually make it a requirement
 - Janna: hearing that we want to change it now!
 - Under 30 should be 0 since all but 1 project hit that last year ... removing LGBTQ from outcome measure since that is something we don’t require info on
- More questions for committee
 - Monitoring meeting virtual? Send documents and then schedule?
 - Katie: something similar to accreditation period
 - Dave: like an audit in a lot of ways, requires you to collect a lot of documentation....yes makes sense to do that, think about type of secure system you want to use...important to make the technology work
 - Janna: we have Citrix ShareFile we use for client data
 - Anti-retaliation policy
 - For next year
 - Equity factors
 - Discussed that doesn’t matter where it’s placed but wondering if we discussed HOW it’s assessed...first year outside team did it, is that something we think is important to put together? Or should CoC come up with internal way to evaluate them? If no strong feelings, might try to develop internal way because time it takes
 - Deb: whatever easiest for yall; Dave: you gotta make it work for you
 - Calpurnya: maybe see if REP has something you could use