

July 14, 2016

Planning & Investment Committee meeting

In Attendance: Michael Butler, Eric Wilka, Jennifer Dyer, Kay Wiles, Tracy Aldrich, Karin Thornburg, Terri Bailey, Amanda Cox, Lia Hicks, Mary Jones, Alan Witchey, Delsie Cavanaugh, Scott Armstrong, Kirk Taylor, Gabie Benson, Daniel Melin, Jami Schnurpel

- Open with welcome and introductions – Mary Jones
- Mary asked the members of Planning and Investment to identify themselves
- Kirk: we should be thinking about who we are trying to serve
 - Need more money to serve more people
 - Hence the NOFA
 - PATA and the Work Group have been building on last year's ranking process.
 - Need to get 18 points for reviewing project applications
 - Need objective data to do so
 - Monitoring process-must have a plan and a method
 - Leverage-not in the NOFA
 - Now we have a 95 point ranking tool
 - Could just add In housing first for five point to return to 100 point scale
 - Missing Data-data is not always entered in a timely manner, which makes it difficult to use most recent data
 - Quarterly monitoring meetings
 - Use scoring tool and/or APR and System Performance Measures
 - Possible on-site compliance monitoring
 - Operating Year Issues
 - How do we decide what dates to use?
 - Programs want to use most recent year, but grant years have different start and end dates
 - This causes some programs to have to use grants completed in 2015, while others get to use 2016 completions due to cut off date.
 - APR-drill down for entry date
 - Unduplicate-by enroll date
 - Gives better bed utilization data
 - Next meeting is the 21st at 3:30
- Monitoring-to work towards a goal in the future of having agencies run their own reports
 - HMIS would be built out to create the report
 - This makes them look at their data and take ownership of it
- Want to review System Performance Measures each meeting or quarterly
 - Use it as part of the reviewing process
 - Scoring tool name-Project Performance Monitoring
 - Official review will be quarterly
 - One issue-System Performance Measures are used to look at the bigger picture of a CoC, so there will be little change from quarter to quarter. this may not be clear to the rest of the committee.

- We can have Julian Center submit the full data set for the ranking
- Highlight HUDs standards for APR
 - Put those in the project performance monitoring
- Eventually, once we've decided on the metrics MIS can standardize reporting requirements and timelines for submission
- This process is not a "gotcha" it is to identify best practices and agencies that need to improve performance. The goal is to provide TA to agencies needing to improve to assist the overall community.
- How do we standardize our operating year?
- Kirk will review NOFA for a cutoff data for APR consideration
- Mary recommended we develop a "cheat sheet" with the scoring/ranking tool and a recommendation from the committee about how the scores are calculated
- PATA will own the scoring and ranking documents
- Planning & Investment will own the monitoring process
- We need to define the monitoring process and start it. Delsie is writing a draft procedure for review at next meeting on July 21, 2016.
- How do we get 2 monitorings in before the NOFA is due on September 14?
- We should mark the spreadsheet with scores that fall below the standard
- The scoring and ranking report, and the project performance monitoring results should be submitted to this committee for review at each meeting
- When CHIP/HMIS generates the scores and ranks, they will highlight the standard and below

The meeting adjourned