

Continuum of Care Grant Committee Meeting Minutes

General Functions of the CoC Grant Committee (6/14/16)

- Review HUD publications including the Competition Debriefing to identify needed improvements and changes to the:
 - Systems response and performance for serving persons who are homeless that achieves CoC strategic plan goals & *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness* (Coordinated Entry)
 - Individual agency response and performance (implementation of Housing First model, persons obtaining/sustaining permanent housing)
 - Capacity building supports for agencies (technical assistance workshop)
 - Review/Ranking tools (Scoring form, Cover Sheet)

- Develop and recommend tools and process for reviewing and ranking project applications- integrating HUD funding priorities and performance measures
 - Solicit feedback from CoC membership
 - Research best practices/tools used in other communities
 - Cross-check Scoring Form to stated HUD priorities and performance measures
 - Select objective and quantifiable measures for HUD priorities and performance goals

- Provide ongoing education and training to CoC membership on HUD priorities and performance measures, the application process, and best practices for achieving strategic plan goals and performance measures

- Review draft application for quality content and general edits

6/23/16

Review of Cover Sheet and Reviewer Scoring Form:

Inclusion of HUD Priorities and Performance Measures 6/23/16

Instructions: For each of the HUD Priorities and Performance Measures listed below, check the Cover Sheet and Reviewer Scoring Form to see if the Priority/Performance Measure is included. Mark Yes if it is included or No if it is not included in the Cover Sheet and the Reviewer Scoring Form. Use the Comments column to add any notes to guide next steps and changes to the forms. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks! Lisa

HUD Priority/ HUD Performance Measure for Agencies	Cover Sheet- Project Applicants provide information related to the Priority/Performance Measure. YES/NO	Reviewer Scoring Form: There is an objective & quantifiable measure for the	Comments:

		Priority/Performance Measure YES/NO	
1. Reducing the length of time people experienced homelessness	NO	NO	HUD expectation of 21 days or less
2. #/% Persons exiting to Permanent Housing (Transitional, Rapid Rehousing, PSH)	YES	YES	Current form has this measure for Transitional but not for Permanent Housing (PSH, RRH)
3. #/% of persons remaining in permanent housing for greater than 6 months (Permanent Housing projects)	YES & NO	YES	Needs standardization for measuring. Coversheet isn't specific in addressing this. Not all projects would comment on it. Length of time not specified
4. Agency prioritizes non-dedicated PSH beds for use by persons experiencing chronic	NO	NO	See page 5 CPD-14-012 Prioritizing for chronic homelessness does not mean 100% of resources reserved for persons who meet chronic definition. Provide guidance to project applicants. The scoring sheet lists chronic next to other populations; however, it isn't a specific score. Amy would like to train on this topic
5. Number of CoC Program Funded	NO	NO	See page 5

PSH beds dedicated to persons experiencing chronic homelessness			CPD-14-012 Not necessarily specific in the scoring sheet. Key word is "dedicated"- Amy would like to train on this
6. Priority of Permanent Housing strategies (Permanent Supportive Housing, Rapid Re-housing) over other types of homeless assistance (Transitional Housing, Supportive Services Only)	NO	NO	Unsure on what this is saying.
7. Cost effectiveness and efficiency of project	NO	YES & NO	Not super specific as to how you decide if funds were used appropriately. Need to figure out how to measure this; improve on this though
8. Commitment to Housing First practices substantiated i.e. agency policy, participant handbook	YES	NO	It's on the checklist but doesn't appear to be clear. The "somewhat" answer may need to be looked at. Or direct individuals to address "somewhat" and "no" answers at the bottom.
9. Participation in Coordinated entry system and standardized assessment tool	YES	YES	If we mean VI-SPDAT, sort of
10. Low barriers for accessing funded programs	NO	NO	Not addressed. This was in the Project Application
11. Partnerships and processes in place with mainstream resources	NO	NO	This seems to be an area we should look at regarding SOAR. There are ways to get feedback

			on use of SOAR and other benefits. Sort of on Agency Activity sheet
12. Use of an assessment tool to determine persons with the greatest need	NO	YES	VI-SPDAT
13. Source of income measure: Increase or maintain income (Permanent Housing)	YES	YES	
14. Source of income measure: Increase or maintain income from sources other than employment (Permanent Housing)	YES	YES	
15. Source of income measure: Increase income through Earned Income (Transitional)	YES	YES	
16. Source of income measure: Increase income from sources other than employment.	YES	YES	
17. Programs to end youth and family homelessness	NO	YES & NO	The scoring sheet doesn't identify youth but does score for HUD priorities. Youth only included on Cover Sheet as a population served
18. Compliance with Order of Priority for CoC funded Permanent Supportive Housing- Dedicated Beds 1 st Priority- Chronically Homeless Individuals & Families with longest history of homelessness & with most severe service needs. 2 nd Priority- Chronically Homeless Individuals and Families with the longest history of homelessness 3 rd Priority- Chronically Homeless Individuals with the most severe service needs 4 th Priority- All other Chronically Homeless Individuals and Families	NO	YES/NO	See page 6-8 CPD-14-012 Yes, but vaguely. Needs to be expanded?
19. Order of Priority in Permanent Supportive Housing Beds not dedicated or prioritized for persons experiencing permanent housing	NO	NO	See page 8-10 CPD-14-012

Summary Comments for the Grant Committee Review of Cover Sheet and Reviewer Scoring Form: Inclusion of HUD Priorities and Performance Measures

Discussed and documented on 6/23/16

Grant Committee members present: Teresa McClain, Georgia Walker, Ramona Quinn, Mindy Householder, Julie Wilber-Parks, Cindy Taylor, Robbie Phillips, Lisa Fleming. (Amy Bickford submitted her review and comments prior to the meeting.)

Instructions: For each of the HUD Priorities and Performance Measures listed below, check the Cover Sheet and Reviewer Scoring Form to see if the Priority/Performance Measure is included. Mark Yes if it is included or No if it is not included in the Cover Sheet and the Reviewer Scoring Form. Use the Comments column to add any notes to guide next steps and changes to the forms. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks! Lisa

HUD Priority/HUD Performance Measure for Agencies	Cover Sheet Project Applicants provide information related to the Priority/Performance Measure. YES/NO	Reviewer Scoring Form: There is an objective & quantifiable measure for the Priority/Performance Measure YES/NO	Comments:
<p>1. Reducing the length of time people experienced homelessness</p> <p>Measure 1: Length of time persons remain homeless= time spent in Emergency shelter, safe haven, transitional housing</p>	NO	NO	<p>HUD expectation of 21 days or less- need a decision when the clock starts (when the apply, when they enter shelter, if living on the streets). 2015 NOFA 3B-2.2 <i>“Describe the CoC’s plan to rapidly rehouse every family that becomes homeless within 30 days of becoming homeless on the street or entering shelter.”</i></p> <p>How is this being tracked in MAAC? Right now it is a range of days. Nothing in the APR. Is this a system measure?</p> <p>Tracked through the Coordinated Assessment process- HUD looking for progress in reducing the number of days homeless, but important to know individual agency performance because a low performer can negatively impact overall CoC performance. Challenge of factoring in Chronic Homeless. Discuss the scoring for agencies who serve/designate beds for persons who are chronically homeless- this will impact their outcome/performance</p>

			measure for length of time homeless. There will be a disparity/disadvantage to these agencies Would it be the most recent episode of homelessness?
<p>2. #/% Persons exiting to Permanent Housing (Emergency Shelter, Safe haven, Transitional, PH-Rapid Rehousing)</p> <p>Measure 7b: 1: Change in exits to permanent housing destinations</p>	YES	YES	Current form has this measure for Transitional but not for Permanent Housing (PSH, RRH) PH section it says 6 months and exited. It is combined. See Collaborative Application 3A-4b p. 40 Persons in SSO, TH and PH-RRH “Of the persons in the Universe above, how many of those exited to permanent destinations?”
<p>3. #/% of persons remaining in permanent housing for greater than 6 months (Permanent Housing projects)</p> <p>???? Metric 7b.2</p>	YES & NO #5	YES	Needs standardization for measuring. Coversheet isn’t specific in addressing this. Not all projects would comment on it. Length of time not specified. The measure is looking at how many stayed in the PH (except RRH) and of those who exited, did they go to permanent housing. See Collaborative Application 3A-4b. Exit to or Retention of Permanent Housing. Persons in all PH projects except PH-RRH. “Of the person in the Universe above, indicate how many of those remained in applicable PH projects and how many of those exited to permanent destinations?”% Successful retentions/Exits.
<p>4. Agency prioritizes non-dedicated PSH beds for use by persons experiencing chronic homeless</p>	NO	NO	See page 5 CPD-14-012 Prioritizing for chronic homelessness does not mean 100% of resources reserved for persons who meet chronic definition. Provide guidance to project applicants. The scoring sheet lists chronic next to

			<p>other populations; however, it isn't a specific score. Amy would like to train on this topic. In the FAQ there is a lot of information- a lot of other CoC's struggling with this, too. Ramona will get this info to Amy.</p>
<p>5. Number of CoC Program Funded PSH beds dedicated to persons experiencing chronic homelessness</p>	NO	NO	<p>See page 5 CPD-14-012 Not necessarily specific in the scoring sheet. Key word is "dedicated"- Amy would like to train on this. It speaks to it in the application What did you put in your application. Amy reviews for this in her site visits.</p>
<p>6. A Priority of Permanent Housing strategies (Permanent Supportive Housing, Rapid Re-housing) over other types of homeless assistance (Transitional Housing, Supportive Services Only)</p>	NO	NO	<p>Kansas does prioritize Permanent Housing (PSH, PH-RRH) over Transitional Housing, Supportive Service only. Missouri has not prioritized PH over Transitional in the past competitions. While HUD gives 2 messages- Prioritize PH over TH, it also gives message for CoC to decide what is best for their community. Look at how Kansas did this process of prioritization. Did anyone find this in the Collaborative Application?</p>
<p>7. Cost effectiveness and efficiency of project</p>	NO	YES & NO	<p>Not super specific as to how you decide if funds were used appropriately. Need to figure out how to measure this.</p> <p>Is this connected with HUD's SNAPS In Focus: FY 2015 CoC Program Competition Recap: Factors That Informed the FY 2015 Competition: <i>Research on Homelessness</i> – much of the research, including the Family Options Study, have clearly indicated that permanent housing strategies, such as permanent supportive housing and rapid re-housing, are more cost effective and achieve the</p>

			<p><i>same or better outcomes than other types of homeless assistance. We work to support these research-based strategies through the Competition and encourage communities to adopt them.</i></p>
<p>8. Commitment to Housing First practices substantiated i.e. agency policy, participant handbook</p>	<p>YES - checklist</p>	<p>NO-</p>	<p>It's on the checklist but doesn't appear to be clear. The "somewhat" answer may need to be looked at. Or direct individuals to address "somewhat" and "no" answers at the bottom. Some agencies had trouble with this form. Need to have more training. Look at different tools for measuring this. Option-Project applicants submit policies, handbook, MOU. Louisville, Kentucky uses an 11 questions form. (Assign someone to contact Louisville to get a copy of their questions. They score based on the number of Yes answers to Housing First indicators)</p> <p>From HUD "Housing First Practices - Projects that committed to using housing first practices received more points and were more likely to be funded than those that did not. Over 80 projects totaling nearly \$9 million were not funded, but would have been if they had committed to using housing first practices"</p> <p>Collaborative Application: 4B-2 p 59. <i>What percentage of CoC Program-funded PSH, RRH and TH have adopted a Housing First approach, meaning that the project quickly houses clients without pre-conditions or service participation requirements? Missouri: 43 of 47 (91%) Housing First.</i></p>
<p>9. Participation in Coordinated entry system and</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>If we mean VI-SPDAT, sort of. Also talks about taking people from the registry (#2 on</p>

<p>standardized assessment tool</p>			<p>Scoring Tool)</p> <p>Challenge- we use the VI-SPDAT scores, but we are focused on housing vets. Does not follow the expectations to house those with highest need first</p>
<p>10. Low barriers for accessing funded programs</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>This was in the Project Application. Need clarity on what is considered a Barrier. Collaborative Application 4B-1. P 59 states “Based on the CoC’s FY2015 new and renewal project applications, what percentage of Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH), Transitional Housing and SSO (non-Coordinated Entry) projects in the CoC are low barrier? Meaning they do not screen out potential participants based on those clients possessing a) too little or little income, b) active or history of substance use, c) criminal record with exceptions for state-mandated restrictions, and d) history of domestic violence.</p> <p>Consider how we can use the information collected from the Eligibility Criteria form distributed by the Housing team. If there are agencies who indicate barriers, consider having Amy intervene with those agencies in advance of the NOFA submission. Although we had high percentage- 46 of 47 (98%) of agencies reported being low barrier</p>
<p>11. Partnerships and processes in place with mainstream resources</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>This seems to be an area we should look at regarding SOAR. There are ways to get feedback on use of SOAR and other benefits. Sort of on Agency Activity sheet. Instead of coming out throughout the year- do it all at the same time</p>

			<p>makes sense to some. But for other agencies, it is better to spread out information that is needed (The agency activity form was not used for scoring) Got bonus points, though. Training/communication to funded agencies about required documents.</p>
12. Use of an assessment tool to determine persons with the greatest need	NO	YES	<p>VI-SPDAT. As a community we have not officially declared the VI-SPDAT is the assessment tool used to determine persons with the greatest need. But it is being used by agencies participating in the Registry. Recommendation: make decision prior to NOFA release.</p>
<p>Income Information</p> <p>System Performance Measure</p> <p>Measure#4: Employment and Income Growth for Homeless Persons in CoC Program Funded Projects</p>			<p>-Income (earned and other sources) is included in the APR. In the Collaborative Application, earned income through employment was not included. Accessing Mainstream Benefits included section 4 A. In question 4A-2 <i>Based on the CoC's FY 2015 new and renewal project applications, what percentage of projects have demonstrated that the project is assisting project participants to obtain mainstream benefits, which includes all of the following within each project: transportation assistance, use of a single application, annual follow ups with participants, and SOAR-trained staff technical assistance to obtain SSI-SSDI?</i> Missouri Number of Projects answering yes: 34 out of 45 (76%) said yes.</p>
13. Source of income measure: Increase or maintain income (Permanent Housing)	YES	YES	<p>MAAC is programmed only to show Increased. There is different scores for earned income source and income</p>

			from other sources. Recommendation for making these even, other say no. Hash out later
14. Source of income measure: Increase or maintain income from sources other than employment (Permanent Housing)	YES	YES	Look at this whole section on income. HUD has different measure between PH and TH
15. Source of income measure: Increase income through Earned Income (Transitional)	YES	YES	
16. Source of income measure: Increase income from sources other than employment.	YES	YES	
17. Programs to end youth and family homelessness	NO	YES & NO	The scoring sheet doesn't identify youth but does score for HUD priorities. Youth only included on Cover Sheet as a population served
18. Compliance with Order of Priority for CoC funded Permanent Supportive Housing- Dedicated Beds	NO	YES/NO	See page 6-8 CPD-14-012 Yes, but vaguely. Needs to be expanded? HUD has clear guidance, other communities looking at this as well. Our Housing Team does not function in this order. Kansas is doing this. MO is not. Using score, and also they are prioritizing vets. 1 st Priority- Chronically Homeless Individuals & Families with longest history of homelessness & with most severe service needs. 2 nd Priority- Chronically Homeless Individuals and Families with the longest history of homelessness 3 rd Priority- Chronically Homeless Individuals with the most severe service needs 4 th Priority- All other Chronically Homeless Individuals and Families

19. Order of Priority in Permanent Supportive Housing Beds not dedicated or prioritized for persons experiencing permanent housing	NO	NO	See page 8-10 CPD-14-012
4B-7 p 61- Is CoC requesting to designate one or more of its SSO or TH projects to serve families with children and youth defined as homeless under other federal statutes?			Missouri answered No. Shouldn't this have been Yes?

Other discussion:

- **New Grant Committee members:** Georgia Walker, Cindy Taylor, Becky Poitras and Deasiray Norris
- **Submission of information related to the Collaborative Application-** Recommendation to request all information at same time rather than spreading out during the grant year especially when points earned for submitting. Example: Agency Activity Form- project applicants earned bonus points for on-time submission of information. The request made during CoC meeting and via email.
- **Housing First indicators form-** Some agencies found the form difficult (double negatives). The form adapted from the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness “The Housing First Checklist” publication.
https://www.usich.gov/resources/uploads/asset_library/Housing_First_Checklist_FINAL.pdf
- The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) plans to open the System Performance Measures (Sys PM) module in the [HUD Homelessness Data Exchange \(HDX\)](#) web portal on **Thursday, June 16, 2016**. Continuums of Care (CoCs) must submit their 2016 System Performance Measures data by **Monday, August 1, 2016 at 7:59:59 PM EDT** in the HDX in order to be considered complete. Meeting the data submission deadline is a factor considered by HUD in the annual CoC Program Competition.

Next Meeting: Friday July 1, 2016 at Rose Brooks Center

Agenda: Begin discussions on recommendation:

- **Items to be scored by Review and Rank Panel**
- **How to measure and report**
- **Points allocated to each item**

7/1/16

CoC Grant Meeting: Friday July 1, 2016

Agenda:

- **Items to be scored by Review and Rank Panel**
- **How to measure and report**
- **Points allocated to each item**

Attending: Teresa McClain, Becky Poitras, Amy Bickford, Georgia Walker, Julie Wilber-Parks, Mindy Householder, Deasiray Norris, Robbie Phillips, Ramona Quinn, Cindy Taylor, Kelly Welch, Lisa Fleming, Heather Bradley-Geary

Discussion Topics:

- **NOFA Announcement:** Amy sent the NOFA announcement out to membership via email. She has the full membership email list for Kansas and Missouri. Amy will send full membership the Project Application Timeline and Technical Assistance Workshop announcement.
- **Timeline:** Due date for Collaborative Application is September 14, 2016. Kelly and Lisa will create timeline on Wednesday 7/6 using HUD timeline requirements and CoC practices for early submission. (Submit 2 days prior to HUD due date, Project Applications due 30 days prior to HUD due date, notification of programs not recommended for funding 15 days prior to HUD due date). The timeline will be very similar to the 2015 competition.
- The Board would like to vote on the Scoring Form at their July 8, 2016 meeting. The Grant Committee will make every effort to finalize the Scoring Form by that date.
- Next Meeting Date: Tuesday July 5th 8:00 to 9:30 at Rose Brooks Center
- Committee reviewed each identified HUD Performance Measure and Policy Priority (listed below- compiled from Debriefings and the 2016 NOFA). The Committee made consensus decision on whether to include or not include each listed item as a scored item in the Review and Ranking Scoring Form. Guidance: anything scored by HUD should be scored in Review and Ranking. In order to meet the July 8th deadline, the group did not decide on how to measure many of the items including:
 - Earned Income and Other Sources of Income performance measures
 - Use of Housing First approach- including low barrier to entry
 - Cost effectiveness
 - Coordinated Assessment/Entry

At our next meeting 7/1/16, the Committee will develop recommendations for the point allocation for each scored item. The Committee recognizes that there will be several significant challenges:

- We do not know the exact method for measuring each scored item (example cost effectiveness, Housing First, Income)
- Question on some scored items as to whether we are scoring for actions taken in the previous year or going forward
- Merger of 2 CoC's- different expectations set for each continuum
- Fairness to agencies who have dedicated units to persons who are chronically homeless when it comes to performance measures
- The merged CoC's are at different stages of Coordinated Entry process. Question as to whether VI-SPDAT officially adopted, etc

- Reallocation-do we have an idea of which agencies are likely to be reallocated- either voluntarily or involuntarily?

Committee Member Assignments:

- Lisa will create Excel spreadsheet with all of the selected items to be scored
- Task: Collect or create tools for measuring scored items. It would be helpful to have 3-4 methods to choose from. Seek out information & tools from the top ranked CoC’s mentioned by Norm.
 - All Committee members to think about methods for measurement for each item to be scored
 - Heather will contact the Houston CoC
 - Julie will contact the remaining CoC’s mentioned by Norm
 - Becky will contact Louisville, KY
 - Teresa will get information on _____ from San Mateo and _____.

Summary Comments for the Grant Committee Review of Cover Sheet and Reviewer Scoring Form: Inclusion of HUD Priorities and Performance Measures. Updated with 2016 NOFA Priorities

HUD Priority/HUD Performance Measure for Agencies to be scored in the Review and Ranking Process	Cover Sheet	Reviewer Scoring Form:	Comments:
<p>#2 – The #/% Persons exiting to Permanent Housing (Emergency Shelter, Safe haven, Transitional, PH-Rapid Rehousing)</p> <p>Measure 7b: 1: Change in exits to permanent housing destinations</p>		YES	<p>Keep/Score this item. Need to reword</p> <p>Current form has this measure for Transitional but not for Permanent Housing (PSH, RRH) PH section it says 6 months and exited. It is combined. See Collaborative Application 3A-4b p. 40 Persons in SSO, TH and PH-RRH “<i>Of the persons in the Universe above, how many of those exited to permanent destinations?</i>”</p>
<p>#3- The #/% of persons remaining in permanent housing for greater than 6 months (Permanent Housing projects)</p> <p>System Performance Measure Metric 7b.2 and Metric 2b- calculation of # of persons who return to homelessness within 24 months</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Measure 6a: Preventing returns to Homelessness within 6 & 12 months among this subset of Families and Youth</p>		YES	<p>Keep /score this item</p> <p>NOFA does not specify length of time in permanent housing. Needs standardization for measuring. Coversheet isn’t specific in addressing this. Not all projects would comment on it. Length of time not specified. The measure is looking at how many stayed in the PH (except RRH) and of those who exited, did they go to permanent housing. See Collaborative Application 3A-4b. Exit to or Retention of Permanent Housing. Persons in all</p>

			PH projects except PH-RRH. <i>“Of the person in the Universe above, indicate how many of those remained in applicable PH projects and how many of those exited to permanent destinations?”% Successful retentions/Exits.</i>
<p>#4 Agency prioritizes non-dedicated PSH beds for use by persons experiencing chronic homeless</p> <p>#9. Participation in Coordinated entry system and standardized assessment tool</p> <p>Section II: HUD’s Homeless Policy & Program Priorities Page 7</p> <p>Section VII: Application Review Information Page 34</p> <p>Section II: HUD’s Homeless Policy & Program Priorities - End Chronic Homelessness pages 8-9</p>		NO	<p>Keep/score this item. Combine with #9 & #9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need clarity and to fully inform CoC Project Applicants on difference between Dedicate and Prioritize • Is this evaluated for past actions or future? <p>Consider having this as a Bonus Point. We haven’t expanded to all</p> <p>Challenge- we use the VI-SPDAT scores, but we are focused on housing vets. Does not follow the expectations to house those with highest need first</p> <p>See page 5 CPD-14-012 Prioritizing for chronic homelessness does not mean 100% of resources reserved for persons who meet chronic definition. Provide guidance to project applicants. The scoring sheet lists chronic next to other populations; however, it isn’t a specific score. Amy would like to train on this topic. In the FAQ there is a lot of information- a lot of other CoC’s struggling with this, too. Ramona will get this info to Amy.</p>
<p>#5- Number of CoC Program Funded PSH beds dedicated to persons experiencing chronic homelessness</p> <p>Section II: HUD’s Homeless Policy & Program Priorities - End Chronic Homelessness pages 8-9</p>			<p>Keep/score this item</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Wyandotte and Balance of State used this as a scored item • <p>See page 5 CPD-14-012 Not necessarily specific in the scoring sheet. Key word is “dedicated”- Amy would like to train on this. It speaks to it in the application What did you put</p>

			in your application. Amy reviews for this in her site visits.
<p>6. #6- A Priority of Permanent Housing strategies (Permanent Supportive Housing, Rapid Re-housing) over other types of homeless assistance (Transitional Housing, Supportive Services Only)</p> <p>Page 8: Review transitional housing projects Section II: HUD’s Homeless Policy and Program Priorities. Section B. CoC Program Implementation. #17.C <i>Project Type</i></p>		NO	<p>Keep/score this item</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation to keep point spread very slim • Combine with #18: Compliance with Order of Priority Section • Consider point allocation for TH that serve a priority sub-population (Youth, Families, _____) <p>Kansas does prioritize Permanent Housing (PSH, PH-RRH) over Transitional Housing, Supportive Service only. Missouri has not prioritized PH over Transitional in the past competitions. While HUD gives 2 messages- Prioritize PH over TH, it also gives message for CoC to decide what is best for their community. Look at how Kansas did this process of prioritization. Did anyone find this in the Collaborative Application?</p>
#7- Cost effectiveness and efficiency of project		YES & NO	<p>Not super specific as to how you decide if funds were used appropriately. Need to figure out how to measure this.</p> <p>Is this connected with HUD’s SNAPS In Focus: FY 2015 CoC Program Competition Recap: Factors That Informed the FY 2015 Competition: Research on Homelessness – <i>much of the research, including the Family Options Study, have clearly indicated that permanent housing strategies, such as permanent supportive housing and rapid re-housing, are more cost effective and achieve the same or better outcomes than other types of homeless assistance. We work to support these research-based strategies through the Competition and encourage communities to adopt them.</i></p>
#8- Commitment to Housing First practices substantiated		NO-	<p>Keep/Score this item. Discussion on HUD expectation From HUD “Housing First Practices - Projects that committed to using housing first practices received more points and</p>

<p>Program Priorities Page 9-10</p> <p>Section VII: Application Review Information Page 35</p> <p>Section II: HUD's Homeless Policy and Program Priorities. Section B. CoC Program Implementation. #17.d. <i>Commitment to Policies Priorities</i></p> <p>See Handout</p>			<p>were more likely to be funded than those that did not. Over 80 projects totaling nearly \$9 million were not funded, but would have been if they had committed to using housing first practices”</p> <p>Collaborative Application: 4B-2 p 59. <i>What percentage of CoC Program-funded PSH, RRH and TH have adopted a Housing First approach, meaning that the project quickly houses clients without pre-conditions or service participation requirements?</i> Missouri: 43 of 47 (91%) Housing First.</p> <p>75% of programs to be Housing First. Although HUD does not have expectation of transitional housing to adopt Housing First, we want at least 75% of our projects to be Housing First and as a CoC we have this as a system response goal. Would be necessary for Coordinated Entry to have low barrier to entry to all programs.</p> <p>HUD specific as to what are core elements of Housing First and what is considered low barrier.</p>
<p>#10 - Low barriers for accessing funded programs</p> <p>Section II: HUD's Homeless Policy & Program Priorities Page 10</p> <p>Section VII: Application Review Information Page 35</p>	NO	NO	<p>Keep/include in scoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine with Housing First • Be very clear on what is considered low barrier- HUD defines this • Low barrier is an element of Housing First model <p>This was in the Project Application. Need clarity on what is considered a Barrier. Collaborative Application 4B-1. P 59 states “Based on the CoC’s FY2015 new and renewal project applications, what percentage of Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH), Transitional Housing and SSO (non-Coordinated Entry) projects in the CoC are low barrier? Meaning they do not screen out potential participants based on those clients possessing a) too little or little income, b) active or history of substance use, c) criminal record with exceptions for state-mandated restrictions, and d) history</p>

			<p>of domestic violence.</p> <p>Consider how we can use the information collected from the Eligibility Criteria form distributed by the Housing team. If there are agencies who indicate barriers, consider having Amy intervene with those agencies in advance of the NOFA submission. Although we had high percentage- 46 of 47 (98%) of agencies reported being low barrier</p>
<p>Income Information</p> <p>System Performance Measure Measure#4: Employment and Income Growth for Homeless Persons in CoC Program Funded Projects</p>			<p>Keep/score Income performance measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation of Earned Income and Other Sources of Income are scored the same amount • Challenge of meeting Earned Income performance target when serving persons who have significant disabilities that prevent them from gaining employment • <p>-Income (earned and other sources) is included in the APR. In the Collaborative Application, earned income through employment was not included. Accessing Mainstream Benefits included section 4 A. In question 4A-2 <i>Based on the CoC's FY 2015 new and renewal project applications, what percentage of projects have demonstrated that the project is assisting project participants to obtain mainstream benefits, which includes al of the following within each project: transportation assistance, use of a single application, annual follow ups with participants, and SOAR-trained staff technical assistance to obtain SSI-SSDI?</i> Missouri Number of Projects answering yes: 34 out of 45 (76%) said yes.</p>
<p>13. Source of income measure: Increase or maintain income (Permanent Housing)</p>		YES	<p>MAAC is programmed only to show Increased. There is different scores for earned income source and income from other sources. Recommendation for making these even, other say no.</p>

			Hash out later
14. Source of income measure: Increase or maintain income from sources other than employment (Permanent Housing)		YES	Look at this whole section on income. HUD has different measure between PH and TH
15. Source of income measure: Increase income through Earned Income (Transitional)		YES	
16. Source of income measure: Increase income from sources other than employment.		YES	
17. #17- Programs to end youth and family homelessness Section II: HUD's Homeless Policy & Program Priorities Page 9		YES & NO	<p>Keep/score this item</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include not only the type of priority population served but also include the number served • This priority population question does not include Chronic <p>The MO scoring sheet doesn't identify youth but does score for HUD priorities. Youth only included on Cover Sheet as a population served</p>
18. #18 Compliance with Order of Priority for CoC funded Permanent Supportive Housing- Dedicated Beds Section II: HUD's Homeless Policy and Program Priorities. Section B. CoC Program Implementation. #17.C <i>Project Type</i>		YES/NO	<p>Keep/score this item</p> <p>See page 6-8 CPD-14-012 Yes, but vaguely. Needs to be expanded? HUD has clear guidance, other communities looking at this as well. Our Housing Team does not function in this order. Kansas is doing this. MO is not. Using score, and also they are prioritizing vets.</p> <p>1st Priority- Chronically Homeless Individuals & Families with longest history of homelessness & with most severe service needs. 2nd Priority- Chronically Homeless Individuals and Families with the longest history of homelessness 3rd Priority- Chronically Homeless Individuals with the most severe service needs 4th Priority- All other Chronically Homeless Individuals and Families</p>
19. #19 Order of Priority in Permanent Supportive Housing Beds not dedicated or prioritized for persons experiencing permanent housing		NO	See page 8-10 CPD-14-012

4B-7 p 61- Is CoC requesting to designate one or more of its SSO or TH projects to serve families with children and youth defined as homeless under other federal statutes?			Missouri answered No. Shouldn't this have been Yes?
---	--	--	---

Eliminated Items. HUD Priority/ HUD Performance Measure for Agencies	Cover Sheet	Reviewer Scoring Form:	Comments:
4. Reducing the length of time people experienced homelessness	NO	NO	Discontinue/Do not score. This is a System Performance Measure. This is baseline year. Inform agencies that this is a HUD performance measure priority. HUD System Performance Measure Measure 1: Length of time persons remain homeless= time spent in Emergency shelter, safe haven, transitional housing
11. Partnerships and processes in place with mainstream resources Section II: HUD's Homeless Policy & Program Priorities Page 8: Maximize the use of mainstream and other community-based resources	NO	NO	Do not keep/score This is a part of the Collaborative Application This seems to be an area we should look at regarding SOAR. There are ways to get feedback on use of SOAR and other benefits. Sort of on Agency Activity sheet. Instead of coming out throughout the year- do it all at the same time makes sense to some. But for other agencies, it is better to spread out information that is needed (The agency activity form was not used for scoring) Got bonus points, though. Training/communication to funded agencies about required documents.
12. Use of an assessment tool to determine persons with the greatest need		YES	Do not keep/score VI-SPDAT. As a community we have not officially declared the VI-SPDAT is the assessment tool used to determine persons with the greatest need. But it is being used by agencies participating in the Registry. Recommendation: make decision prior to NOFA release.

7/16/16

Grant Committee Meeting 7/16/2016

Participants: Mindy Householder, Becky Poitras, Georgia Walker, Arica Roland, Ramona Quinn, Cindy Taylor, Amy Bickford, Lisa Fleming

Next Meeting: Wednesday July 13, 2016 8:00 to 9:30 a.m. at Rose Brooks Center

- The Board approved the recommended Items to Be Scored and Point Allocation
- The Board decided to not have an appeal process for Project Ranking
- The Board did not decide on whether to share completed Score Form with project applicants. Grant Committee discussion on this topic tabled pending completion of tasks needed for 7/19/16 NOFA Technical Assistance
- Mohart not available on 7/19 9:00 to 11:00. Discussion on whether to change time or to pursue change of location options.
 - Amy will check with MARC and Library
 - Lisa will check with Salvation Army (Ramona)
 - Other possibilities: Sam Rogers and new East Patrol Division that has a community room
- The Review and Rank Committee will select the Review and Rank Panel. Vickie does training for the Panel
- Pending Projects due before the 7/19/16 Technical Assistance
 - Tool for measuring implementation of Housing First/Low Barrier- Becky is taking notes from today's meeting and will work on a draft for our next meeting. See below for details
 - Update Renewal Score Form
 - Update the New/Reallocation Score Form- Georgia reported that not many changes needed other than adding in Commitment to Housing First/Low Barrier
 - Update Letter of Intent template for New/Reallocation- Georgia reports that not many changes needed
 - Update Project Applicant Guide/Instructions
 - Determine method for measuring/reporting Cost Effectiveness
 - Review Income measure range- Georgia and Becky
 - Confirm Housing measure- exit to Permanent Housing range stays the same
 -
- Pending Projects before the Review and Ranking Process
 - Update Review Panel Guide
 - Update the Review Panel Reviewer Form
 -
- Tool for measuring implementation of Housing First/Low Barrier
 - Discussion on whether the answers to Housing First/Low Barrier questions apply to past operations/grant year or going forward. Transitional Housing in Wyandotte not expected in last year to use Housing First/Low Barrier. The expectation of using Housing First/Low Barrier approach has been introduced in previous NOFA's.
 - Decision to measure for past use of Housing First/Low Barrier. Add in 2 bonus points for project applicants to commit to using Housing First/Low Barrier in the future. Use the indicators of Housing First HUD lists in the project application. Amy will fill in this points after she receives the esnaps project application. This is intended to ensure a minimum of 75% of projects agree to use Housing First/Low Barrier, no matter housing component.

- The Committee reviewed each element of Housing First/Low Barrier listed on the documents below and decided whether to keep or exclude. See below for the decision outcome. Some elements are duplicates but with different wording
- Becky will work on a draft form for Project Applicants to complete and that will score up to 20 points and a 2 point bonus for commitment
- The new form is completed on the Honor System
- In the T.A. training, be sure to inform project applicants that if they commit to using Housing First/Low Barrier for FY 2016, accountability to this commitment will reviewed during Monitoring Visits.

Example #1- Compilation of Housing First/Low Barrier taken from multiple sources including the HUD NOFA for FY 2016, the USICH Housing First Checklist, Louisville KY, Houston CoC)

Applies to current operating policies and procedures:

Are applicants required to have income prior to admission? Keep	Yes 0 points	No 2 points
Are applicants with addictions to alcohol or substances required to cease active use before accessing housing and services? Keep	Yes 0 points	No 2 points
Are program participants required to participate in services? Keep	Yes 0 points	No 2 points
Are program participants required to participate in disability-related services?- Exclude	Yes 0 points	No 2 points
Are participants/tenants able to be evicted for not following through on their services and/or treatment plan? Exclude- see Louisville wording	Yes 0 points	No 2 points
Are victims of domestic violence required to file criminal charges against their abusive partner or file for an order of protection in order to be eligible for the program? Keep – adjust the wording	Yes 0 points	No 2 points
Does project prioritizes rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing. Keep	Yes 2 points	No 0 points
Does project identify and recruit landlords of units in the geographic areas so that when an individual or family needs housing, potential units that those individuals or families may choose from have already been identified, speeding up the housing process. Keep	Yes 2 points	No 0 points
Applicants are not seldom rejected on the basis of poor credit or financial history, poor or lack of rental history, minor criminal convictions, or behaviors that indicate a lack of “housing readiness.” Keep with changes. Take out seldom and “replace” with “not”. Take out “minor”	Yes 2 points	No 0 points
Housing accepts referrals directly from shelters, street outreach, drop-in centers, and other parts of crisis response system frequented by vulnerable people experiencing homelessness. Exclude	Yes 2 points	No 0 points
Use of alcohol or drugs in and of itself (without other lease violations) is not considered a reason for eviction. Keep: Want to have statement that alcohol/drug use not screened out <u>and</u> will not be evicted/terminated for use.	Yes 2 points	No 0 points

Services are informed by a harm reduction philosophy that recognizes that drug and alcohol use and addiction are a part of tenants' lives, where tenants are engaged in non-judgmental communication regarding drug and alcohol use, and where tenants are offered education regarding how to avoid risky behaviors and engage in safer practices. Exclude	Yes 2 points	No 0 points
Program does not require sobriety or medication/treatment compliance as a condition of housing attainment or retention. Exclude	Yes 2 points	No 0 points
Project Applicants answers (yes/no???) to all Housing First questions in esnaps for proposed project FY 2016 – See description for Bonus Points		

Any housing project application that indicates a Housing First approach and low barriers and is reviewed, approved, and ranked by the CoC and is awarded Fiscal Year 2016 CoC Program funds will be required to operate as a Housing First and low barrier project.

Example #2

Louisville Metro Continuum of Care Application Questionnaire October 15, 2015

Please answer the following questions projects you are submitting for funding, new and renewal, to the CoC in 2015. If you are completing the questions for a new project assume the questions are asking you if you are going to

Use a separate form for each project.

Please return your questionnaire by way of email to mfschafer@louhomeless.org by **Wednesday Morning October 21st at 7:00 AM.**

Agency Name	
Project Name	
Person completing this form with contact information	

		Yes	No
1	Before entering this project, is there a requirement that the person or family have:		
	a Keep-Income?		
	b Keep-A period of time sober?		
	c Keep- use HUDF NOFA language-A clean criminal record (not including state mandated restrictions)?		
2	If there is domestic violence are the following required: Keep		
	a A protective order?		
	b A period of separation from the abuser?		
	c Law enforcement involvement?		
3	Does this project terminate clients for:		
	a Keep-Failing to participate in supportive services?		
	b Keep-Failing to make progress on a service plan?		
	c Keep-Loss of income or failure to improve income?		
	d Keep-Being a victim of domestic violence?		
	e Anything not covered in a lease agreement? ie: anything not typically found in a lease here in the Metro Louisville area. -SSO's go to the next question.-		

e	If you are an SSO with a housing goal, do you make referrals to the Common Assessment to ensure the client has been assessed for appropriate housing?		
The following questions are for Transitional Housing projects only			
4	Does this program have expectations of clients that discourages or prevents them from moving on to permanent housing? Exclude		
5	Does this project require that clients be ready for housing before referring them to housing options?		
6	Does this project encourage clients to apply for all possible housing options as one of the first activities of their case plan? ie: Section 8, other affordable housing programs Exclude		
7	If a client is participating in a program offered by this project, is the client allowed/encouraged to take other housing options that are offered while in this project? Exclude		
8	Does this project require clients to complete any type of program before discussing further housing options? Exclude		

Please use this space to further describe your project's requirements for entry and exit.

Louisville:

Does the project ensure that participants are not screened out based on the following items? (Check all that apply)

- Having too little or no income
- Active or history of substance abuse
- Having a criminal record with exceptions for state-mandated restrictions
- History of domestic violence (e.g. lack of a protective order, period of separation from abuser, or law enforcement involvement)
- None of the above

Does the project ensure that participants are not terminated from the program for the following reasons?

- Failure to participate in supportive services (not including case management)
- Failure to make progress on a service plan Loss of income or failure to improve income
- Being a victim of domestic violence
- Any other activity not covered in a lease agreement typically found in the project's geographic area
- None of the above

7/13/16

CoC Grant Committee Meeting July 13, 2016

- Review & approve the Housing First Scoring Tool
- Date range for Cover Sheet- suggestion is to use July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. (Last NOFA we used 9/1/2014 through 8/31/15)
- Cost effectiveness
- Assignments for presenters

Co-presenter(s) for Technical Assistance Workshop

- I. HUD Policy and Performance Priorities _____
- II. Project Timeline _____
- III. Review and Ranking Process/Scored Items/Process for selecting scored items _____
- IV. Instructions for Cover Sheet _____

Suggestions for Calculating and Evaluating Cost Effectiveness

Option #1: Eliminate measure for Cost Effectiveness

#1 scoring Houston has posted their 2016 Scoring Tool- no measure for cost effectiveness. All measures are connected to performance, Coordinated Entry, and Housing First. Every year we discuss how to measure cost effectiveness considering all of the variables- type of population served/acuity levels, type of housing component, amount of other dollars going in to program, etc. We have never come up with a measure that gets us what we think is a fair and balanced measure.

Option #1: Persons served

From JoAnne- It is familiar measure for project applicants. Dealing with averages, I think we're okay. And HUD is more concerned with getting people out of homelessness, not with the number of nights we give them service. I think moving a family directly from shelter to homelessness and getting them to paying their own rent quickly should count as much as a person who needs more help so gets services longer.

Option #2: Bednights/Days in Service (Date of enrollment to date of exit from program.)

From Amy: To discuss Cost Effectiveness...those of you that have a program...go to MAAClink, and run a "clients in program" report for your most recently ended grant year. Then bring it to the Grants Meeting. Those reports will help inform our discussion on cost effectiveness.

From Cindy: I ran a "clients in program" query and even with a defined date range of my most recent operating year – i could not get the days a client was in the program "JUST" during that operating year – the report gives all the days that client has ever been in the program. I called Howie at MAAC – he said that the number could still be obtained by exporting to an excel spreadsheet that would do a secondary calculation and give the # of days a client was active in a program for the date range of the grant's most recent operating year.

Howie said that MAAC staff could train someone on how to do the calculations –

Georgia – I will reach out to the NAEH and see if they have any guidance re: cost effectiveness & cost efficiency.

From Ramona- Cindy you and I discovered the same thing so I just counted mine by hand. I too am looking through HUD and NAEH stuff related to cost effectiveness but so far all I have found speaks to performance outcomes in relationship to getting people housed and keeping them housed as being cost effective along with the old materials on how it is far more cost effective to have permanent supportive housing instead of TH...not what I was looking for. Also I looked up how my United Way grant calculates cost effectiveness.

We also figured this out, using the 2014 APR tab, but the days calculated are one off of my calculations, except the clients who discharged, so I'm assuming the APR data is not counting the first day of the date range or the last day if someone discharges.

From JoAnne- Considerations

- **Needs to be easy to calculate and everyone needs to do it the same way.**
- **Bednights do or do not include the time the person spends in After Care - they are in permanent housing, but still getting services**
- **That nights or persons are only counted if being paid for with HUD funds.**
- **Do we count bed nights for every person in a family - if there are 7 people getting services for 180 days, is that 180 bed nights or 1260 bed nights?**

7/14/16

Today we reviewed the Renewal Project Cover Sheet draft and cross checked it with the Scored Items for Renewal Project Summary. We decided on wording for the following:

- Priority Population to be Served
- Dedication of beds for persons experiencing chronic homelessness
- Prioritization of beds for persons experiencing chronic homelessness
- Special Needs Population served
- Housing Performance Measure
- Income Performance Measure
- Bed Rate Utilization
- Percentage of HUD funds expended
- Narrative questions

In other words, we got a lot done in a short amount of time- again!

Next Steps:

-Lisa will update the Summary of Scored Items for Renewal (Completed & attached)

-JoAnne will update the Renewal Project Cover Sheet and Instructions. Target completion time is this afternoon. She will email latest version to Grant Committee.

-All Grant Committee members will review/proofread the 1) Renewal Project Cover Sheet, 2) the Cover Sheet Instructions, & 3) Summary of Scored Items for Renewals prior to Monday's meeting. If you are unavailable to attend Monday's meeting, please email your edits to Lisa.

-Robbie will update the Letter of Intent templates for New Projects and Re-Allocation projects

-Lisa will send Becky message points on the Grant Committee's process for developing Cover Sheet and Scoring Matrix

-At Monday's meeting we will make final edits to the 1) Renewal Project Cover Sheet, 2) the Cover Sheet Instructions, & 3) Summary of Scored Items for Renewals

-At Monday's meeting we will update the New and Re-allocation Project Cover Sheet

7/25/16

CoC Grant Committee Meeting - 7/25/16

Members Attending: Amy Bickford, Becky Poitras, Teresa McClain, Georgia Walker, Robbie Phillips, Ramona Quinn, Heather Bradley-Geary, Lisa Fleming

- I. **Review and revision of New/Re-Allocation Project Cover Sheet-** The Committee reviewed the draft Cover Sheet.
- Eliminated “Percentage of HUD income expended for HUD grants” This information is included in the ESNAPS project application in the question
 - Discussion on how to objectively measure an agency’s capacity to administer a HUD grant. This information described in the ESNAPS application: **Screen 2B. Experience of Applicant, Subrecipient and Other Partners. 1.** *Describe the experience of the applicant in effectively utilizing federal funds and performing activities proposed in the application, given funding and time limitations. Project applicant must provide concrete examples that illustrate their experience and expertise in the following: 1) working with & addressing the target population’s identified housing and supportive service needs; 2) developing and implementing relevant program systems, services, and/or residential property construction/rehabilitation; 3) identifying and securing matching funds from a variety of sources; and 4) managing basic organization operations including financial accounting systems.*
 - #17 changed to “Lisa services to be provided by project that support housing and income performance measures.
 - Other options for scored item are included in the ESNAPS project application
 - Cost Effectiveness: (Some) Information to measure cost effectiveness is included in Cover Sheet and ESNAPS application. See Section II of notes
- II. **Reviewed options for New/Re-Allocation scored items. See notes in Table below**

Draft: 2016 New and Re-Allocation Project Review and Ranking Score Form (7.25.16)

Rapid Re-housing (RRH) and Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)

- Scored Items pulled directly from the HUD NOFA: Section II: HUD’s Homeless Policy and Program Priorities and Section VII: Application Review Information
- Kept all of the Renewal Project Scored Items with exception of Performance Measures (Housing, Income and Occupancy Rate)
- On 7/20/16 Lisa reviewed the instructions for New PSH and RRH projects. Pulled options for Scored Items from the questions listed for PSH and RRH. The questions and Options for Scored Items listed below are the same (as far as I can tell) for PSH and RRH
- On 7/25/16, the Grant Committee reviewed each item and made recommendation on which items to be scored.

Pending Action Steps:

- Make recommendations for points available for scored items. The points listed below are the points used for Renewal Projects
- Discuss and recommend methods for objectively measuring scored items
- Submit recommendations to the Board for their review and approval
- Cost Effectiveness- seek Board recommendations on method for evaluating cost effectiveness. Needs to be a comparison of same housing component types (PSH-Chronic Compared to other PSH-Chronic, RRH to RRH, TH to TH)

Options for Scored Item	Points	Method of Measurement/Comments
<p>All required documents submitted <u>and</u> submitted on time</p> <p>Source: Project Applicant Spreadsheet prepared by HSC staff (Amy)</p>	<p>YES 15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover Sheet • Match • Housing First form • Most recent audit letter/summary
Alignment with Opening Doors		
<p>Agency dedicates beds for persons experiencing chronic homelessness</p> <p>Source: Application</p>	<p>YES 3</p>	<p>100%- 3 points Portion – 1 point None- 0</p>
<p>Agency prioritizes beds for persons experiencing chronic homelessness. This is a "going forward" item</p> <p>Source: Application</p>	<p>YES 1</p>	<p>Yes or No. When beds/units turnover, will accept individual/family who meets definition of chronic homeless first before accepting someone who does not meet chronic definition</p>
<p>Project serves a priority population</p> <p>Source: Cover Sheet</p>	<p>YES 3</p>	<p>Vets, Youth, and/or Families with Children. 3 Points awarded for serving at least 1 priority population</p>
<p>Commitment to participation in Coordinated Entry system, use of standardized assessment tool selected by CoC, and comply with Coordinated Entry policies and procedures</p> <p>Source: Cover Sheet</p>	<p>YES 1</p>	<p>Awarded point if project applicant states commitment to participating in Coordinated Entry starting with fiscal year 2017</p>
<p>Commitment to Housing First practices. (CoC Goal: 75% Housing First)</p> <p>Source: Housing First form</p>	<p>YES 22</p>	<p>Adapt this for New Projects -Up to 22 points available for current project's use of Housing First elements.</p>
Agency Capacity and Experience		
<p>Extent to which the project applicant describes experience effectively utilizing federal funds and performing activities proposed in the application, given funding and time limitations. Project applicant must provide concrete examples that illustrate their experience and expertise in the following: 1) working with & addressing the target population's identified housing and supportive service needs; 2) developing and implementing relevant program systems, services, and/or residential property construction/rehabilitation; 3) identifying and securing matching funds from a variety of sources; and 4) managing basic organization operations including financial accounting systems.</p> <p>Source: ESNAPS application</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Notes: Becky will work on a matrix for this section</p>

Extent to which project applicant describes experience in leveraging other Federal, State, local and private sector funds. Source: ESNAPS application	YES	
Are there any unresolved monitoring or audit findings for any HUD grants (including ESG) operated by the project applicant	YES	Yes or No
Housing First approach Q.3b. Description #5 d. This automatically populates based on answers to Housing First questions Source: ESNAPS application	YES	Yes = ____ points No= 0 points Keep this- it is a cross-check to the answers given in the Housing First form
Location of service/ requirement to live in a specific structure ***** HUD asks project applicant to explain why project applicant “has chosen to enforce this requirement”***** Source: ESNAPs application	NO	Do not use at this time. HUD may have added this to get a baseline- could be a future policy
The extent to which the project applicant describes how participants will be assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing. Source: ESNAPs application	YES	
The extent to which the project applicant describes the how the participants will be assisted both to increase their employment and/or income and to maximize their ability to live independently. Source: ESNAPs application	YES	
*** For the following 5 questions- I recommend these be included in Amy’s spread sheet so the Review panel can focus time on the narratives- Are there other CoC non-project applicants who could help Amy with the Technical Review and tracking this information on the spreadsheet?		Enlist help from Jason Bohn- in line with the support included in Wyandotte contract
Transportation assistance to clients to attend mainstream benefits appointments Source: ESNAPs application	YES	Yes= ____ points No = 0 points
Use of single application form for 4 or more mainstream programs Source: ESNAPs application	NO	Yes= ____ points No = 0 points
Regular follow-ups with participants to ensure	YES	Yes= ____ points

mainstream benefits are received and renewed. Source: ESNAPs application		No = 0 points
Project participants will have access to SSI-SSDI technical assistance provided by the applicant, a subrecipient, or partner agency Source: ESNAPs application	YES	Yes= ___ points No = 0 points
Staff person who will provide the technical assistance completed SOAR training in the past 24 months. Source: ESNAPs application	YES	Yes= ___ points No = 0 points
Scored Item	Points	Method of Measurement/Comments
Fiscal Practices		
Budget accurate	YES 2	Budget matches Cover Sheet
Reasonable expenditure of HUD funds	NO	
CoC/Community Involvement		
Attended Mandatory Technical Assistance Training on July 19, 2016	?	
75% attendance at CoC membership meetings Source: Source: Project Applicant Spreadsheet prepared by HSC staff (Amy)	5	Possible matrix- 75-100%= 5 points 50-74% = 3 points 1-40% = 1 point 0 meetings= 0 points CoC Meetings- tracked by Sign In Sheets at the monthly Continuum of Care meeting
Participated in a for a CoC committee Source: Cover Sheet?	YES 2	Discussion- may be a disadvantage to agencies new to CoC. But both CoC's have invited//encouraged non-HUD funded agencies to participate in committees. Include, but recommend low points Provide list of CoC Committees – Cover Sheet
TOTAL		

8/1/16

CoC Grant Committee Meeting – 8/1/16

Pending Action Steps:

1. Make recommendations for points available for scored items. The points listed below are the points used for Renewal Projects
2. Discuss and recommend methods for objectively measuring scored items

3. Submit recommendations to the Board for their review and approval
4. Cost Effectiveness- seek Board recommendations on method for evaluating cost effectiveness. Needs to be a comparison of same housing component types (PSH-Chronic Compared to other PSH-Chronic, RRH to RRH, TH to TH)
5. Recommendations for scoring Renewal Projects that do not have contracts or just got contracts
6. Recommendations for HMIS ranking

See table below for summary of 8/1/16 discussion and recommendations for

1. Points available for scored items- New and Re-allocation Projects
2. Recommendations for objectively measuring New & Re-allocation Scored Items

Other discussion topics:

- Request Board Action on: Project Applicants that did not attend the Mandatory Training-
 - Decide if eligible to submit an application.
 - In Balance of State- project applicants who did not attend mandatory training are not eligible to submit.
 - Discussed website announcement- it is considered the Public Notice.
 - Amy will attend the Board Meeting to explain/provide details

July 12th email from Amy Bickford:

Hello...Please see the updated NOFA Timeline. The change made is regarding the NOFA training scheduled for July 19th, as the location has been secured.

July 19th, MANDATORY NOFA Training, 9-11AM, at the Downtown Public Library, in the Vault Room, downstairs.

If you were at the GKCCCEH Meeting last month, this training will occur in the same place.

If you are planning on submitting an application for this year's NOFA (either renewal or new bonus project) you must have representatives at this training session.

The updated Timeline is attached for reference.

- Began discussion on Grant Committee recommendations on how the Review and Ranking Committee to rank New Bonus Projects.
 - Points available for Renewal = 114 and New = 109
 - Last year- New Projects ranked at top of Tier 2
- Request Board actions to make recommendations on how to rank HMIS project. Last year, KC/LS/Independence CoC ranked #1 and #2.

New and Re-allocation Projects Scoring Matrix Recommendations

Options for Scored Item	Points	Method of Measurement/Comments
All required documents submitted <u>and</u>	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover Sheet

submitted on time Source: Project Applicant Spreadsheet prepared by HSC staff (Amy)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Match • Housing First form • Most recent audit letter/summary
Alignment with Opening Doors		
Agency dedicates beds for persons experiencing chronic homelessness Source: Cover Sheet	1	<p>-ESNAPS application- RRH do not answer this</p> <p>-Serving Chronic a community & HUD priority</p> <p>-We have not done a gaps analysis to determine what is needed most- PSH or RRH</p> <p>-Grant Committee vote- Option 1: Keep same scoring as Renewals (3 votes) Option 2: Keep as a scored item, but lower points (7 votes) or Option 3: Eliminate as a scored item (0 votes)</p> <p>Decided to reduce from 3 points to 1 point</p>
Agency prioritizes beds for persons experiencing chronic homelessness. This is a "going forward" item Source: Cover Sheet	1	<p>Yes = 1 point</p> <p>No = 0 point</p> <p>Yes or No. When beds/units turnover, will accept individual/family who meets definition of chronic homeless first before accepting someone who does not meet chronic definition</p>
Project serves a priority population Source: Cover Sheet	3	<p>Vets, Youth, and/or Families with Children.</p> <p>Serves at least 1 priority population = 3 points</p> <p>Does not serve a priority population = 0 points</p>
Commitment to participation in Coordinated Entry system, use of standardized assessment tool selected by CoC, and comply with Coordinated Entry policies and procedures Source: Cover Sheet	1	<p>Awarded point if project applicant states commitment to participating in Coordinated Entry starting with fiscal year 2017</p> <p>Yes = 1 point</p> <p>No = 0 points</p>
Commitment to Housing First practices. (CoC Goal: 75% Housing First) Source: Housing First form	22	<p>Adapt this for New Projects -Up to 22 points available for current project's use of Housing First elements.</p>
Agency Capacity and Experience		
Extent to which the project applicant describes experience effectively utilizing federal funds and performing activities proposed in the application, given funding and time limitations. Project applicant must provide concrete examples that illustrate their experience and expertise in the following: Source: ESNAPS application	7	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) working with & addressing the target population's identified housing and supportive service needs (2 points) 2) developing and implementing relevant program systems, services, and/or residential property construction/rehabilitation; (2 points) 3) identifying and securing matching funds from a variety of sources; (1 point) 4) managing basic organization operations including financial accounting systems (2 points)
Extent to which project applicant describes	2	0 points = Not described

<p>experience in leveraging other Federal, State, local and private sector funds.</p> <p>Source: ESNAPS application</p>		<p>1 point = Partially described 2 points = Fully described</p>
<p>Are there any unresolved monitoring or audit findings for any HUD grants (including ESG) operated by the project applicant</p>	2	<p>0 points = Project applicants answers Yes 2 points = Project applicant answers No</p>
<p>Housing First approach Q.3b. Description #5 d. This automatically populates based on answers to Housing First questions</p> <p>Source: ESNAPS application</p>	2	<p>The results of Project Applicant's answers to Q. 3b. #5 a., b, c, and d results in the answer of: Yes = 2 points No= 0 points</p> <p>Keep this- it is a cross-check to the answers given in the Housing First form -This is the equivalent of the Renewal Project bonus points for commitment to Housing First in the next grant year</p>
<p>The extent to which the project applicant describes how participants will be assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing. Source: ESNAPS application</p>	20	<p>-Each sub-topic of this question is scored 0= Not answered 1= Partially answered 2= Fully answered</p> <p>+++Need help from group on this- what are the 5 items? -This scored item is the equivalent of the Renewal Housing Performance Measure results 1. Describe plans to move program participants from the streets, 2. Describes needs of the target population 2. Describes plans to address those needs through current and proposed case management activities 3. Established arrangements and coordination with landlords & other homeless providers. ????</p>
<p>The extent to which the project applicant describes the how the participants will be assisted both to increase their employment and/or income and to maximize their ability to live independently. Source: ESNAPS application</p>	20	<p>Each sub-topic of this question is scored 0= Not answered 2= Partially answered 4= Fully answered</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describes the needs of the target population 2. Supportive services to assist participants 3. Availability and accessibility of supportive services 4. Description of how project applicant will coordinate with other homeless services

		<p>providers & mainstream systems</p> <p>5. Describe how service delivery leads directly to program participant employment, program participants accessing SSI, SSDI or other mainstream services, and how requested funds contribute to program participants becoming more independent.</p> <p>Note: Education plays an important role in the personal development of program participants particularly youth participants, and should be considered a strategy to maximize their ability to live independently.</p>
<p>*** For the following 5 questions- Recommend these be included in Amy's spread sheet so the Review panel can focus time on the narratives- Are there other CoC non-project applicants who could help Amy with the Technical Review and tracking this information on the spreadsheet?</p>		<p>Enlist help from Jason Bohn- in line with the support included in Wyandotte contract</p>
<p>Transportation assistance to clients to attend mainstream benefits appointments Source: ESNAPs application</p>	1	<p>Yes= 1 point No = 0 points</p>
<p>Regular follow-ups with participants to ensure mainstream benefits are received and renewed. Source: ESNAPs application</p>	1	<p>Yes= 1 point No = 0 points</p>
<p>Project participants will have access to SSI-SSDI technical assistance provided by the applicant, a subrecipient, or partner agency Source: ESNAPs application</p>	1	<p>Yes= 1 point No = 0 points</p>
<p>Staff person who will provide the technical assistance completed SOAR training in the past 24 months. Source: ESNAPs application</p>	1	<p>Yes= 1 point No = 0 points</p>
Scored Item	Points	Method of Measurement/Comments
Fiscal Practices		
Budget accurate	2	Budget matches Cover Sheet
CoC/Community Involvement		
<p>Attended Mandatory Technical Assistance Training on July 19, 2016</p>	?	<p>Request Board action: Are project applicants who did not attend Mandatory Training eligible to submit? Consider Bonus points for agencies attending the Mandatory training</p>
75% attendance at CoC membership meetings	5	<p>75-100%= 5 points 50-74% = 3 points</p>

Source: Source: Project Applicant Spreadsheet prepared by HSC staff (Amy)		1-40% = 1 point 0 meetings= 0 points CoC Meetings- tracked by Sign In Sheets at the monthly Continuum of Care meeting
Participated in a for a CoC committee Source: Cover Sheet?	2	2 points = Selected at least 1 CoC Committee 0 points = Did not participate in a CoC Committee listed on the Cover Sheet Provide list of CoC Committees – Cover Sheet
TOTAL	109	Discussion: Maximum score for Renewals is 114

8/2/16- Reviewed and discussed scoring matrix. Sent via email the drafts for the 3 scoring matrixes:

1. Renewal with Contract Projects
2. Renewal without Contract Projects
3. New and Re-allocation Projects

Committee members to review and send Reply All with their corrections/edits by 12 noon August 3rd. Lisa will make the corrections by end of day and send final recommendations to Greg, Kelly and Heather for Friday's Board Meeting. Plans are for Lisa to meet with Kelly tomorrow to fill her in on the discussions we have had regarding the recommended scoring matrixes.

Out next meeting is Monday August 8th at 8:00.

8/3/16- Final edits on Scoring Matrix

1. Added in 10 points for attending the Mandatory Training to all 3. I took out notes about our discussion/recommendation to make agencies ineligible to apply if they do not attend. I have added this to a separate "For Next Year" document.
2. Correct typos JoAnne & Ramona found - Points available for New/re-allocation Housing and Income measure, wording for a few Scored Items, etc
3. Removed notes about suggestion for compiling information into a spreadsheet for the R&R Panel. Added these to my "Review and Ranking Panel Guide" document.

Other: JoAnne asked if we should get board approval now for our recommendation for next year's competition to make agencies ineligible for submitting application if they do not attend Mandatory Training. I would prefer to have this Board vote occur after the NOFA.

8/8/16- The Grant Committee spent most of the meeting discussing the point allocation for the Housing Performance Measure and the Income Performance Measure. Attached is the latest draft of the Renewal Project with Contract Scoring Matrix. At the time of the meeting, we were not sure how to instruct agencies on what to report for the Income Measure. We checked in with Becky. She shared *"I believe the APR provides the % calculation for income from all sources in the outcomes section, so no math needed, just pull directly from the APR. It calculates based on program type so*

TH % is calculated based on increasing all income sources, and PH % is based on maintaining or increasing all income sources."

We decided not to meet again this week so that all of you could have time to work on your own project applications. Instead, please review the attached scoring matrix on your own. If there are changes/questions please Reply All. I'd like to finalize this on Wednesday.

8/16/16- Grant Committee reviewed and discussed the 2016 Review and Ranking Guidance document. The document emailed to all Grant Committee members for review.

8/22/16- Grant Committee finalized the 2016 Review and Ranking Guidance document. Members attending: Becky Poitras, Julie Wilber-Parks, Amy Bickford, Lisa Fleming.

8/23/16- Grant Committee provided edits and suggestions for 2016 Collaborative Application