

Evaluation Tool Subcommittee

MINUTES

DATE 6-16-16

START TIME 9:30AM

MEETING CALLED BY	Amanda Borta
NOTE TAKER	David Melnick
ATTENDEES	<p>Present: Kathy Wilson, David Melnick, Adriana Camarda, Otha Gaston, Keith Richardson, Perry Vietti, Mandee Russell, Kyu Yup Kim</p> <p>Absent: Billy Sharpe</p> <p>Guests: Mayon Yen, Debbie Culpepper</p> <p>Staff: Amanda Borta</p>

Agenda topics

REVIEW OF AGENDA	Consensus achieved
REVIEW OF MINUTES	Otha motions, Kyu seconds, passes
2016 SITE PROCESS UPDATE	<p>Kathy is making an update to the process to further clarify who receives a site visit before others.</p> <p>Informational sessional for selected programs. Two scheduled this month and two per month moving forward. NOFA might alter the schedule based on capacity.</p> <p>Consumer engagement – one agency asked if facilitators could be bilingual, this was brought to LEC, Billy has a friend who might be able to help out, Liz Perez is staffing the consumer engagement and is preparing a bilingual survey. Youth providers asked that facilitators be youths. Amanda is planning on reaching out to other providers for possible youth facilitators.</p>
2016 EVALUATION PROCESS FEEDBACK REPORT	<p>Slightly fewer responses than last year. Surveys are done by various positions within the organization.</p> <p>Only 3 participants attended the SurveyGizmo training – it might not be offered next year or in a recorded format.</p> <p>Discussion of percentiles for project performance measures. Are there some metrics where percentiles aren't the best way to compare between different projects. Need continues for differentiating between projects for purpose of ranking.</p> <p>FAQ's added during the process. Amanda added questions on the bottom.</p> <p>All Chicago is working on updating the website.</p> <p>Include in the webinar a section on how to run the report and what the data looks like</p> <p>Push towards using HMIS is deliberate and will continue in the same fashion</p> <p>For agencies with multiple projects, the first might take a while, but later ones tend to be quicker. Include a more subjective question regarding how long things take. Include a qualitative question regarding how difficult each part of the process is.</p> <p>Requests to be able to skip between pages of the survey. All Chicago continues to explore options.</p> <p>Project size is difficult to deal with, where an issue with one client can cause a drop out of the threshold range.</p> <p>There is now an option for the pdf to show only visible questions.</p> <p>For Evaluation Report, show PSH in first tab since that is the most commonly used. Training should help. HMIS updating is slow, and report running is slow, David brought up scheduling reports each morning</p> <p>For non cash benefits, people were concerned about clients who are not eligible for NCB or who don't want to be enrolled in NCB. HUD doesn't allow for these nuances in their reporting, but it is difficult to know who is eligible, other than client report. Debbie expressed concern about timeframe for how long getting NCB take. No way to show increase in NCB. This is a question that we need to address in the new version of the Evaluation Instrument</p>
COC SCORE SUMMARY	<p>Consuella has a meeting to advocate for more transparency within our CoC scores.</p> <p>Leveraging system wide with the health system as opposed to on a project level.</p> <p>Prioritizing beds for CH within PSH can improve scores. Documentation for CH is very difficult and this prevent people from prioritizing beds for CH.</p> <p>Illinois scored low and HUD is focusing on TA for the state as a whole.</p>

2017 EVALUATION PROCESS DISCUSSION	Decided to go over scores as a group. Needs to be finished and approved by SPEC. Send draft over to SPEC by October. Dive in once we get all the data from Amanda. Kathy expects that easy sections can be done first, then tougher ones (performance). Everything was "red-flagged" at the last meeting, so we can jump in next meeting.	
ADJOURNMENT:	MINUTES SUBMITTED BY:	APPROVED BY:
11:00am	David	