



PARTNERS IN CARE

Oahu's Continuum of Care

Our mission is to eliminate homelessness through open and inclusive participation and the coordination of integrated responses.

Q&A on NOFA 2018 Tools and Procedures

Monday, July 16, 2018

9:00am – 11:00am

Conference Line: (515) 604-9577; Access Code: 131975

Participants: Karen Thomas, Sharon Baillie; Connie Mitchell, Marya Grambs, Tom McDonald, Linda Ikeda, Annie Valentin, Kim Cook, Jen Stasch – by phone.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome/Action
Rubrics Overview	<p>Tom provided overview—for new projects and renewals, HMIS, and CES. Noted that bulk of scoring pertained to performance, then financials and CoC participation.</p> <p>Jen noted that weights could be changed in accordance with community preference provided total remained the same (150 points); reminded group that we remain on a short timeline.</p> <p>Marya could view only 1 rubric type, was advised to use e.versions.</p>	
Renewal Projects	<p>Connie noted problems in drawdowns for consolidated projects. Tom suggested addressing problems in narrative, noting efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>Karen asked how categories relate; did not specify her concerns.</p> <p>Connie asked about timeliness of applicant submissions and why late submittal of proposal wouldn't result in non-consideration. Jen noted that projects, in the past, had been allowed to correct for minor deficiencies.</p> <p>Wrt CoC participation, Connie raised possibility of attendance w/o participation. Tom noted that those involved in committees were generally active, though not always assigned tasks. Re participation in CES, Connie noted that this may not be as important as the ability to house those projected for housing.</p> <p>Kim asked about higher participation scores in HMIS and CES rubrics. Jen noted that these made up for the absence of performance measures on housing.</p> <p>Questions surfaced re reasonableness of budgeted costs. There was discussion of merits of using medians or means, vs cost averages (Kim). Tom recommended samples of different types; noted that FMR for rentals (for instance) was less critical than other costs.</p> <p>Re HUD audit, projects would be expected to have no uncorrected findings. Re financial audit, there would be expectation of no exceptions, risks, or findings.</p> <p>Connie asked if measures were by unit or person; noted that project based housing was</p>	<p>Tom recommended acceptance of rubrics with clarification (new language) on cost-effectiveness. This needs to be in place by Thurs. to gain BOD approval.</p> <p>Connie and Kim to email Tom/Linda if further questions/comments.</p>

	<p>maybe more efficient but that scattered sites also had their place. Group raised difficulty of applying measures to hybrid programs. Tom noted that HMIS and other data could be used to corroborate return to homelessness; Connie agreed.</p> <p>Re spend down, Connie noted ramp-up issues or, as in her case, spending without the ability to invoice (due to technical problem); proposed 6-mo vs quarterly measures; noted that billing took place after 30 days. Tom suggested consideration of both timely use <i>and</i> utilization of grant funds; this could be reflected on scorecard at 4 points ea (now combined at 8 points).</p> <p>Kim suggested that project presentations be an avenue for these issues to be brought up/resolved. Kim and Connie suggested an additional column, in rubric, for notes.</p> <p>Re 10% increase in employment among participants, Connie noted that voc training should be included; wanted to avoid penalizing projects serving those most difficult to employ. Kim agreed that some (e.g., disabled, unable to return to work) should be excluded from measure. It was also unclear if measure pertained to project leavers or stayers, w/ Tom suggesting that it had relevance for both. Connie asked about timeline for 10% increase—from start of project or start of enrollment? Kim suggested adherence to annual assessment timeline.</p>	
New Projects	<p>Narrative will be focused on experience, esp w/ Housing First, and effectiveness. Connie asked about basis for determining unmet needs. Tom suggested that this had already been addressed by focus on chronic homelessness w/ mental health or substance abuse issues or chronic homelessness among trimorbid seniors.</p> <p>Connie asked if/how rubric had been changed from last year. Re experience w/ target pop, asked about projects where provider had no experience, but relied on partners. Tom suggested that partner experience would be sufficient for scoring. Connie questioned the ability of reviewers to recognize substance from empty assurances.</p> <p>Tom suggested 3 categories of response: no description, no experience no description, some experience satisfactory description, satisfactory experience for both recipients/subrecipients.</p> <p>Comments were made about the importance of supportive services.</p> <p>Tom suggested 30 points for effective design meeting needs of target pop w/ reduction in points across other categories. Connie</p>	<p>Rubric to be released with NOFA RFP. Scorecard will be accordingly revised.</p>

	suggested 10 points for experience. Tom will email scorecard mark-up for reference. It was suggested that HMIS apply as a new project given new lead and administration.	
	Though much remained to be covered, meeting was adjourned in the interest of time.	Adjourn.

(Informal) minutes recorded by Linda.