

CoH Applications Committee Debriefing Meeting

September 13, 2018, 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.

Florida Department of Health in Volusia County

1845 Holsonback Drive, Daytona Beach, FL 32117

Meeting Agenda

Welcome	Carrie Baird
Debriefing on recent HUD NOFA Scoring and Ranking Process <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Logistics and Timeline (Community Force, Timeline, Number of Proposals and other technical issues)2. Application Questions/Components and Applicant Instructions3. Objective and Subjective Scoring Criteria for Renewals, New Proposals and CoC Core Functions (HMIS, Coordinated Entry)4. Scoring Analysis and Ranking Process	All
Process and Timeline for Upcoming Volusia County ESG competition	All
Other Items Not on the Agenda	All
Schedule Next Meeting & Adjournment	All

Recommendations for Consideration

Submitted by Carrie Baird, Chair

Strategic Approach for Committee Decision Making

- As a committee of the Commission on Homelessness, we want to ensure the best utilization of our allotted resources and make strategic decisions to increase the resources allocated to our system of care.
- When considering the continuation of existing programs, we should consider measurable performance and how well the program addresses priority needs and serves priority populations.
- When considering new programs for funding, we should consider how well the program addresses an identified need or gap in our system of care and how well the proposing agency demonstrates its ability to effectively and efficiently implement the proposed program.

Strategies Specific to the HUD Collaborative Application

- Our goal is to submit the most competitive consolidated proposal possible to meet HUD requirements & priorities and fund the most effective and efficient programs.
- We anticipate that HUD will continue to look favorably on consolidating applications and encourage agencies to consolidate like grants.
- Continue to look at reallocation of resources from lower performing projects to open up opportunities for new programs that address priorities identified by the HUD and the CoH.
- Encourage new proposals from agencies with the capacity to effectively deliver services.
- The ranking process must:
 - Preserve the ARD
 - Seek to increase our ARD through receipt of available bonus funding
- Core operation of HMIS and Coordinated Entry must be ranked highest in our consolidated application
- New programs proposed, through reallocated funding or bonus funding, must address priorities (type of program and target population)

Timeline of Actions

- The Applications Committee will work with CoC staff to develop a performance measurement process for all Renewal programs that includes an analysis of objective data prior to the release of the 2019 HUD NOFA. This data and performance measurement process will result in a ranking of programs eligible for renewal and programs earmarked for possible reallocation.
- The Applications Committee will prepare a standard Local Application for New Programs (via reallocation or bonus funds) with applicant questions and scoring criteria prior to the HUD NOFA being released. Once the NOFA is released, the standard Local Application will be modified to address any new HUD criteria and forwarded to United Way to be added to Community Force.
- Proposed General Timeline:
 - Applicants will have 3 weeks to submit new proposals.
 - Reviewers will have 2-3 weeks to review and score proposal.

- The Applications Committee will convene and make financial decisions on the ranking of renewal and new proposals at least 4 weeks prior to the deadline for the Consolidated Application.

CoH Applications Committee Debriefing Meeting

Summary of Feedback & Recommendations

Logistics and Timeline (Community Force, Timeline, Number of Proposals and other technical issues)

1. A standard local application (questions and scoring criteria) should be finalized by the committee and CoC staff prior to the release of annual HUD NOFA. Modifications to the local application, based on details contained in the HUD NOFA, should be approved by the committee prior to submission to United Way for preparation of Community Force.
2. Community Force should be finalized and verified prior to opening it up for scoring
3. More than 1 week should be allotted to review and score proposals
4. If a large number of new proposals are submitted, consider assigning a fewer number of proposals to each reviewer to reduce the work load (i.e. not all reviewers would review and score each proposal)
5. The scoring criteria should align with the proposal question/responses and all items should be consistently numbered
6. A comment field should be added to each section
7. Radio buttons should be used for yes/no questions
8. The committee should only be able to view scoring questions and proposal responses that are the committee's responsibility to score

Application Questions/Components and Applicant Instructions

1. Leverage responses and documents should be specific to the proposed program (not the same information for the whole agency)

Objective and Subjective Scoring Criteria for Renewals, New Proposals and CoC Core Functions (HMIS, Coordinated Entry)

1. Renewal applications should be scored solely on past performance measures. New proposals should be scored based on capacity to deliver proposed program and how well the proposal addressed funding priorities.
2. Criteria should be developed and clearly outlined for the scoring of performance for renewal projects to include: administrative criteria (PIT participation, COH participation), HMIS, Housing First compliance, Coordinated Entry compliance and financial measures.
3. Committee members should participate in APR training to fully understand data available through HMIS and HUD reporting.
4. Performance Scoring of Renewals should be completed prior to the NOFA release to inform the ranking process and possible reallocation decisions.
5. The Renewal Performance scoring meeting agenda should only include discussion by committee members with technical support from CoC staff. Results should be presented to agencies at a separate debriefing session.
6. The committee should only review and score criteria that is subjective in nature—not objective criteria that can be documented and scored through HMIS reports, calculations or a staff review of information already collected.
7. The committee should provide subjective input on whether or not the proposed program is **realistic, innovative, effective and meaningful.**

8. Housing First compliance should be measured/scored by CoC Coordinated Entry documentation for renewal projects and the weight should be reduced
9. Consider different (simplified) process to score/rank core CoC programs (HMIS and Coordinated Entry)
10. A brief program summary should be requested to include: type of program, target population, number of proposed people/families to be served and a general description of how funding will be used.
11. The criteria for scoring priority population should be re-addressed and address both population and number to be served
12. A question related to cost per bed, client, household should be added.
13. Set a maximum reallocation amount based on the performance scores so that agencies have a guide when conceptualizing new projects funded through reallocated dollars.
14. Have an open community reallocation meeting to discuss the best direction for new programs through reallocation where new agencies are invited to apply.

Scoring Analysis and Ranking Process

1. New projects proposed to expand or enhance Coordinated Entry and HMIS should not necessarily be ranked highest (as are the core/basic grants to operate these functions)
2. The presentation/analysis of combined scoring prepared prior to the committee meeting in spreadsheet format for ranking discussion is effective and should be continued.