



Minutes

Committee: HUD COC and ESG Committee

Date: 2/6/2019

Duration: 9:00 – 11:00

Meeting Place: ECHO
300 E. Highland Mall Blvd

Attendance:

P = Present

TC = Attended via Dial in

A = Absent

CoC and ESG Members							
P	Stephanie Green	P	Erin Whelan	P	Kali Gossett	A	Rick Rivera
A	Christa Noland	A	Caitlin Bond	P	Dylan Shubitz	P	Christina Montes
A	Erin Goodison	A	Greg McCormack	A	Kate Bennett	P	Naomi Tejero
P	Hosie Washington	A	Kathy Ridings	P	Mamadou Balde	A	Melinda Cantu
A	Natasha Ponczek	P	Delia DeLeon	P	Jennifer Mishler	P	Jason Phillips
P	August Weems	P	Trey Nichols	P	Rachel Connors	P	Laura Poskochil
ECHO Staff							
P	Kate Moore	P	Laura Evanoff	P	Tim Long	P	Melissa Wheeler
A	Sharyn Malatok	P	Axton Nichols	P	Whitney Bright	P	Richard Dodson

AGENDA		DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
I. Welcome & Jan 2019 Minutes	E. Whelan & K Gossett	Review and Approve January 2019 Minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Approved with no revisions] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved with no revisions
II. CoC Business	K Moore	MC Recap <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appeal policy was adopted by CoC/ESG and sent to MC for Jan meeting, pushed to Feb. MC had questions about policy and more details (when to appeal, what grounds, etc.). Request for MC to approve Scorecard Appeal Policy will be postponed until after Performance Scorecard revisions are presented and approved. Rank and Review Policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renewal projects are measured on performance Renewal projects that score over benchmark score of 65% are prioritized over new projects and placed in Tier 1 ranking Renewal projects are placed on Performance Improvement Plan if score is below 60% on Quarterly Scorecard. Current scoring process prevents creation of new projects, stifling innovation. D. Shubitz: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendation to increase benchmark standards - minimum performance score is too low and should be increased 70%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION
--------	------------	--------

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendation that IRT have more discretion to approve new projects. ○ Concern expressed that IRT may not understand community needs and overall impact when approving new projects ○ D. Shubitz recommends more robust enforcement of Housing First practices or stated more clearly in the program rules. 	
--	--	--	--

<p>III. CoC Performance Scorecards</p>	<p>L Evanoff</p>	<p>COC Performance Scorecards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented Scorecard Change Comparison Chart that outlines how the revised scorecard differs from the current scorecard. • Changes potentially not being implemented for this year’s NOFA Competition • Review of scorecard process • Proposed new scorecard does not include HMIS performance component. Suggestion to have separate scorecard for HMIS measures which will total 21% of score during the NOFA. • Performance Scorecard without the HMIS component will total 44% of total score. • Requested comments and suggestions surrounding proposed scorecard changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Financial Measures: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Positive feedback on spending tracking. ▪ Concern about programs that primarily have operating costs vs programs with mainly rental assistance costs. ▪ Concerns about differences in spending patterns between RRH and PSH programs ▪ Recommendation that 1.3 uses the bed number as the denominator. ○ Housing First Measures: 2.1 – 2.4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2.1: Recommendation to not include 2.1 on Scorecard because it’s a funding requirement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L Evanoff – recommending keeping on scorecard as an ongoing compliance check in case there is a program entry that is not in compliance, it is caught early. Recommending points in order to reward ongoing monitoring. ▪ 2.1: Recommendation to train and help projects improve data quality especially around enrolling new household members to an existing program entry (e.g., new baby, new significant other). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L Evanoff will send out a survey monkey to vote on their preferences for scoring items and number of points allocated.
---	------------------	--	--

AGENDA

DISCUSSION

ACTION

- *L Evanoff to make correction on 2.2: Score needs to be reversed. Lower percentage should equal more points*
 - 2.3: Discussed benchmark standards and setting benchmark to 45 days vs 30 days.
 - Need additional data to inform discussion
 - Recommendation that referral to enrollment should also be tracked on scorecard
 - In order to measure referral to enrollment, standards need to be developed so there is common understanding of what data entry looks like (unable to locate clients, clients refusing services, etc.)?
 - Recommendation to consider using referral acceptance as a measure in the future for number of days from referral to enrollment.
 - 2.4 (percent of hard to serve clients) – expressed concern with measure being impacted by Coordinated Entry referrals and programs not being able to control measure.
 - Could measure through creating benchmarks from BNL.
 - Recommendation to consider additional measures of hard to serve: VI Score, Housing Barriers (disabling condition, criminal background)
 - Should “hard to serve” be reassessed at some point after move-in as a measure of program outcomes.
- Housing Stability Measures: 3.1 – 3.3
 - Recommendation to consider not including deceased clients in report for 3.2. HUD does not consider this a negative exit but a neutral exit.
- Financial Stability Measures
 - 4.2 (health insurance) recommendation to include MAP in measure. HUD has previously said MAP does not count as health insurance, but MAP does allow clients to access healthcare
- Investing in Community and Learning: 5.1 -5.3
 - Discussed types of assessment tools allowed to use. Will programs decide for themselves or should it be standardized across CoC?

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussed 5.2: Purpose of measure is to guide conversations around employee turnover and have a way to document trends over time. This could help identify needs across the system. ▪ Should this measure project rate (of turnover) or program rate? Recommendation of focusing on project. 	
IV. Workgroup Updates	<p>T Long</p> <p>M Wheeler</p> <p>PIT Count WG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 days since PIT. HMIS nearing completion of data entry. • Next PIT Count workgroup meeting is on 2/21/19 • Plans for 2020 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Going digital with survey ○ Increasing volunteer engagement throughout the year leading up to PIT Count <p>HMIS WG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HMIS Workgroup is working on HMIS Training Policy changes and will be presented to HUD CoC and ESG Committee during March 2019 meeting. • Working on new webinar trainings to be hosted on ECHO website. • Training homework and Q&A with Richard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Created a Q&A that is attached to the webinar video assigned for homework. ○ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Art Report Training Webinar • Webinar Q & A • Send Melissa Wheeler any questions after watching training video and she will add to Q&A document.
V. Other Business	<p>R Rivera</p> <p>Income & Employment WG update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report out. <p>HMIS ROI (Erin)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will reschedule for March meeting <p>VAWA Housing Protections Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next meeting will be on Monday 2/11/19 <p>Feedback on Community Force from 2018 NOFA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add HMIS ROI to March agenda.
VI. Adjournment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Meeting: March 6, 2019 9:00AM – 11:00AM; ECHO Training Room, 300 E. Highland Mall Blvd 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •