

Evaluation Tool Subcommittee

MINUTES

DATE 9-16-16

START TIME 9:30AM

MEETING CALLED BY	Amanda Borta
NOTE TAKER	Mandee Russell
ATTENDEES	<p>Present: Otha Gaston, Perry Vietti, Kathy Wilson, Adriana Camarda, Debbie Culpepper, Mandee Russell, Padma Thangaraj, Patsy Flynn, Mayon Yen</p> <p>Absent: Sherri Allen Reeves, Keith Richardson</p> <p>Staff: Amanda Borta</p>

Agenda topics

REVIEW OF AGENDA AND MINUTES	<p>Reviewed agenda – no changes</p> <p>Reviewed and approved August minutes - Perry motions, Kathy seconds. Passed.</p>
2017 EVALUATION PROCESS: PROJECT COMPONENT	<p>Kathy shared SPEC recommendations from last meeting. Concerns/feedback included ensuring that the Instrument matches HUD priorities, eliminates potential program model biases, considers removing leveraging since no longer on COC application, and considers changes with CRS/One List. SPEC also wants to ensure that the Evaluation Instrument emphasizes performance as to not reallocate high performing projects</p> <p>Threshold: Utilization (Q1) – used HMIS/bed list last year, may change data collection method this year; Most recent APR (Q2) – clarify “most recent” due to confusion, tech issues, etc. (FY14); Add question - <i>Is the project able to meet and document the 25% match requirement?</i> *Remove question/spreadsheet from Project Operations section and no longer assign points by moving to Threshold section. Reasoning- HUD now requires documentation of match at grant agreement and match/leverage was removed from this year’s COC application. Do we need to give extra incentive to go beyond 25% match by adding points at a later time?</p> <p>Site Visit Checklist: Best practices (Q7-11) – Provide clearer recommendations at future date to the Site Visit process on what documentation to accept, questions to ask, etc.</p> <p>Project Operations: HUD expenditures (Q1) – <i>Did you spend 100% of funds? (3 pts awarded for 100%, 2 pts awarded for 95%-99%). If no, how much was unspent (\$/%)? Would you reallocate and attach spreadsheet? (TBD pts awarded).</i> <i>*Discussed revising question and scoring this year for LTRA projects. Considerations included the emphasize placed on returned funds (3 million last year), how to incentivize, and project’s difficulties in spending 100% of funds for reasons outside of their control (i.e. staff turnover, tenant rent portions, no rental increases, unit capacity, etc.).Committee decided to finish discussing at next meeting due to time constraints and for SPEC feedback.</i></p> <p>APR (Q3) – Informational question last year. Score this year but utilize extension date instead of grant end date.</p> <p>HMIS Implementation and Data Quality: Padma shared recommendations from HMIS team and has requested by the committee will provide exact wording of revised question(s) at next meeting for further discussion. Recommendations included the need to no longer score participation but rather emphasize compliance and adding informational questions regarding timeliness and updated bed lists to provide warning to projects for future scoring (2018).</p> <p>Leading Practices (maybe combine with System Priorities section): Written eligibility (Q1) – move to System Priorities section; Housing First (Q2) – move to Threshold now that a HUD requirement; 90 day rule (Q3) – move to Site Visit checklist</p>
NEXT STEPS	<p>Review the Agency Component (specifically Q7), finish the Project Component (Systems Priorities and Performance sections), finalize point allocations, make final recommendations to SPEC for approval. Reviewing Timeline - Oct 6th @ DFSS (9:30am-11:30am); Oct 20th @ Thresholds (10 am-12 am)</p>
OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS	<p>Site Visit Process Update – 6 completed, still expecting to meet goal of at least 10 site visits this year</p> <p>NOFA – COC application was submitted on time, will receive 10 bonus pts for providing system performance measures</p>

	2016 PIT – released this week, reduction numbers (changed methodology for CTA)	
ADJOURNMENT:	MINUTES SUBMITTED BY:	APPROVED BY:
11:00am	Mandee	