

## Continuum of Care Steering Committee meeting - September 8, 2016

### RATING AND RANKING DECISIONS

1. Discussion – Modification to the Rating and Ranking Process to resolve an issue caused by small Permanent Supportive Housing Projects with limited bases for determining performance as a result of the need to use exit information.

Background: In July, the Continuum modified the process determining the performance score of Permanent Housing projects with 3 or fewer exits in a year. The purpose was to prevent penalizing small PH projects for retaining residents in the project. The change was to give all PH projects with 3 or less exits the average score of all projects.

Issue: While this helped “level the playing field” for projects with no exits or with no results, it also eliminated the potential and incentive for performing well: For example, a project which had for 3 exits and increased employment income for all 3, would now only receive the average score for the criteria (3 points) when they would have received 10 points for 100% achievement under the old system.

Proposal: For performance which results in a data universe of 3 or fewer cases on which to measure performance, use either the average score for all grants or the actual score of the project, whichever is the greater.

Recommendation of the Steering Committee: [Suggested try using the APR stayer information for the client base of the income-related performance criteria. Data referring to the income \(maintained or gained\) by stayers in all projects will be incorporated into the scoring in addition to the current system where income maintained or gained for leavers is incorporated.](#)

2. Ranking Decisions: Determination of where to place the two Bonus applications in the Project Priority Listing in Tier 2.

Background: The Continuum currently has \$6,049,089 in Renewal Need. The HUD NOFA allows 93% of those funds to be available for Renewal, Reallocation and New Bonus Fund projects in Tier 1. The remaining 7% of funds generated by Renewal Need (\$423,4300) is to be placed in Tier 2.

The Continuum’s approved guidelines call for all Reallocation projects (3 in 2016) to “be placed in Tier 1 (at the bottom of Tier 1) in recognition of their cooperation to change their existing renewal-eligible grant to improve their program outcomes and relate their projects more strongly to the priorities of the Continuum and HUD. The guidelines also call for Renewals to be ranked in Tier 1 and Tier 2 in order of their rating. HUD also allows the Continuum to apply for up to \$302,454 in Bonus funds (resulting in two projects in 2016). We announced in the 2016 RFPs that Bonus projects would compete in Tier 2. It has been the Continuum’s policy to aggressively pursue additional funding. Therefore, \$423,430 in Renewals will be placed in Tier 2 along with \$302,454 in Bonus Fund applications. We need input on where in Tier 2 to place the Bonus projects.

Proposal/Options (note: To eliminate conflicts of interest in funding decisions, the guidelines call for the Continuum Steering Committee to discuss and recommend the ranking order but that the final decision will be decided by a non-conflicted Ranking Committee). Following are some options for placement:

1. Place the Renewals in order in Tier 2 and place the number one bonus project in the upper 1/2 and the second rated Bonus project in the lower 1/2.
2. Place both Bonus projects in tier 2 after all other Renewals are ranked above them.
3. Place both Bonus projects at the bottom of Tier 2.
4. Place the number one Bonus project in the top 50% of Tier 2 and the second rated Bonus at the bottom of Tier 2.

Final Recommendation of the Steering Committee to the Rating Committee: *Place the first rated Bonus project at top of tier 2 and second Bonus project at bottom of tier 2. If there are renewals performing poorly, give consideration of moving the second bonus project ahead of them on the priority list.*

*Also discussed but not recommended: Bonus at top of tier 2 and second at bottom.*

3. Discussion: The Continuum Executive Committee has been in initial discussions with organizations serving Youth, regarding the potential for pursuing a relatively large Youth Homeless Demonstration Program grant for either/or the rural or urban areas of the Continuum. Strong interest has been shown by the organizations and the Department of Commerce has expressed interest in assisting in the process. November 30<sup>th</sup> deadline. \$33 million for 10 CoCs to apply. If selected, CoCs can apply for specific \$1-\$15 million available to CoCs. 6 urban CoCs and 4 rural CoCs will be selected. Commerce will need local help on info for the application from grantees and local continuums.

Proposal: Aggressively pursue the grant opportunity.

Decision of the Steering Committee: *Urged the Youth Committee and Commerce to pursue the grant.*

## **GOVERNANCE CHARTER/POLICIES AND PROCEDURES DECISIONS**

4. Discussion: HUD has encouraged through the annual competition process, more involvement in the direction and operation of the McKinney-Vento Grants which it oversees as the Collaborative Applicant for the 33-county Balance of State Continuum. We need to update the Policies and Procedures by incorporating new language which specifically outlines the following, including how we assess the grantees' capacity (scored by HUD):
  - a. Tighten the requirements and procedures for prioritizing the most vulnerable populations in the Coordinated Entry System. Clearly describe how the most vulnerable populations receive priority. *Update, tie in improved CES, etc,*

- b. Require annual reporting of the compliance with Drawdown rates (minimum of Quarterly Draws). *TA to those who aren't complying and bonus funded projects. Quarterly – tie in with C.- survey?*
- c. Monitoring of grantee fund usage/Early identification of agencies with high funds return rates/Consider stronger action with grantees who frequently return large sums of grant funds unused. This is scored by HUD. *Yes, use the Quarterly Report on draws as a base. When issues found, provide TA and request from the grantee a plan for how to resolve.*
- d. Monitor timely submission of Annual Performance Reports (APRs) in order to provide timely information on performance to the grantees and to the Continuum and to identify projects with low performance for TA and, as appropriate, begin discussions about potential for reallocation of funds to a new grant in the next NOFA. *Commerce sends a reminder 90 days before due plus a reminder 30 days before due. Have them send a pdf of the APR. Commerce will track the submission. Try to correct as they are submitted.*
- e. Assess the effectiveness of our system of tracking and recording of recidivism, especially among youth and families with the goal of preventing it for at least 12months. *HMIS currently tracks recidivism by county and state-wide but not certain about youth and families breakdown or by project type, etc.*
- f. Annual check with grantees to determine compliance with Hearth Act on coordination with schools on child education responsibilities of grantees/inform families with children their rights, eligibility, etc. (began this year). *Semi-annual Survey and TA as needed.*
- g. Determine how to effectively monitor compliance of grantees to avoid denying admission based on sex, gender, age, or disability. *Request grantees to send in written procedures and forms and information on why denied. Ask what information is provided to the client at entry. Ask for their written grievance/appeal process. Provide formatted information to grantees on rules/rights so they can make information available to clients as a matter of course, and indicating where the clients can appeal if feel discriminated against. Use HMIS data to see if grantee data is comparable to local data?*

Decision: Whether to update specific sections of the Continuum Policies and Procedures as indicated above.

Steering Committee Decision: *The Committee agreed to incorporation of the updates in the Policies and Procedures as indicated in each of the items above.*

**Other future discussions:** *The below was briefly introduced and will be followed-up on in future meetings (perhaps the next in-person meeting in September?)*

1. Need to obtain additional Public Housing Authorities to adopt homeless admission preferences. Have a discussion with PHAs which have M-V grants.
2. Consideration of establishing priorities (locations, population types, housing types (RRH or PSH-CH) for funding several months before the NOFA

3. Consider re-starting the quarterly HMIS systems performance monitoring and reporting that we used to provide as part of meetings or another effective method of disseminating systems performance results (add measure of average length of homelessness, \_\_\_\_\_). Use HDX?
4. Serious discussions on whether to move forward with UFA designation by next spring (before the NOFA). There is \$90,000 available to administer the responsibilities if we are designated.
5. Determine how to effectively monitor length of time homeless; how we track and record it and develop strategies to reduce the times.