



PARTNERS IN CARE

Oahu Continuum of Care

Partners in Care is a coalition of Oahu's homeless service providers, government representatives and community stakeholders working together in partnership to end homelessness.

PIC Planning Committee Meeting Minutes
200 North Vineyard Boulevard, Suite 210
August 28, 2018

Attendees: Sharon Baillie, Tom McDonald, Kim Cook, Dana Manners, Phil Acosta, Bill Hanrahan, Jillian Okamoto, Leslie Uyehara, Marya Grambs, Samantha Church, Connie Mitchell, and Sarah Murray. **Phone:** Annie Valentin.

Topic	Discussion	Outcome/Action
Call to Order, Approval of Minutes	<p>Tom McDonald called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All parties present introduced themselves at this time. <p>The August 2018 Meeting Minutes were approved by unanimous consent.</p>	
<p>New Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Grant Review • CoC Competition Ranking Review 	<p>Planning Grant Review</p> <p>It was mentioned that Planning funds might possibly be reallocated towards projects that deal with housing.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about the breakdown of the Planning Grant on Page 25 and 26 with all of the Director's salary being covered under Planning Funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was mentioned that not all of the Director's salary can come from Planning funds. - Where would the rest of the funds for the Director's salary come from, and what is that percentage? - Would that percentage then be put towards one of the other 8 eligible categories under Planning Grant, possibly towards consultants, office space, etc.? <p>Planning Committee would like direct involvement in the allocation of planning funds, etc.</p> <p>CoC Competition Ranking and Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The notes provided from the evaluator meeting were read out loud. • Notes provided by an Evaluator were read to the Committee. • We have never placed a Bonus Project in Tier 1 before, doing this puts existing projects at risk for losing funding. HUD suggests placing Bonus in Tier 1 to get the funding but could potentially mean a loss of funding for Tier 2 Projects if HUD decided not to fund all requests. • BY MOU with A UW HMIS will be ranked in Tier 1. • Reallocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sharon explained why a higher scoring project was chosen for reallocation by the evaluators - MHK New to be fully funded by reallocation 	<p>The PIC Planning Committee approved the overall amount of the Planning Grant. With the caveat of looking at the percentage breakdown of the FTE's.</p> <p>Sarah will check with HUD and Norm on the allowable expenses for the Director FTE.</p> <p>Sharon will send out the Director's job description to the Planning Committee.</p> <p>All conflicted members left the meeting and the non-conflicted members of Sam, Marya, and Annie remained to discuss the final project ranking.</p> <p>Sam moved and Marya seconded that, <i>"With the understanding that HMIS and all renewal projects which have not started yet or completed a full grant year will be prioritized, the remaining renewal projects will be ranked per their score. The lowest scoring renewal projects are subject to reallocation. Those projects are HIS PSH 2018 and HIS No Place Like Home. For the DV Bonus, the A UW CES and Women In Need projects will be included for a total of \$413,241."</i></p> <p>The motion passed and project ranking/reallocation was approved by the three (3) non-conflicted members.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SHDC New to be Bonus - Kim said she is very much about being fair. We need to talk about being objective. • The Planning Committee wants to re-rank the projects by raw score, give the DV Bonus to AUW and WIN – cannot give to CFS since same type as AUW and raw score was lower. • Concerns were raised that the CES DV Bonus Project didn't really follow a Housing First Model. • CFS/WIN wil not be able to re-write their proposals to make better. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fairness across the board. No agencies will get to redo application. 	
Next Meeting	September 25, 2018 at PIC – Suite 210 from 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.	



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.

Regarding renewals:

One of my biggest concerns relates to the skipping or non-scoring of criteria that were either N/A, not available, and/or not provided. Some of the applications included numerous “blanks” or non-scored items. While the overall scores were calculated as a percentage of possible points (excluding those that were not scored), this methodology results in a reweighting of the items that were scored. For example, in some of the applications, all three audit-related items were not scored because no audit was provided, and in some cases, this occurred in combination with non-scored items on some or almost all of the project performance items. This results in a heavier reliance on items that were scored, e.g., items like Coordinated Entry Participation proposed at 95% (which was already heavily weighted), timely submission, and participation in the COC, all of which were received full points all applications. In some cases, actually submitting a document or data resulted in a lower score because it identified a deficiency or unmet expectation, whereas if they had instead not included that information, they might have received a higher ranking. I am not suggesting that agencies were attempting to game the system but I am concerned that scores cannot be compared across applications.

I am also concerned about the overall design of the rubric. I believe there are numerous ways it could be improved to help agencies put forth informative and meaningful proposals. I would like to recommend a few major changes. First, I would recommend the project performance assessments be revised. I recognize that these are indicators of particular importance to HUD but they prevent the evaluator from considering the unique challenges and goals of any given program. I would support a revision that would request applicants to respond to each of these items, outline the challenges they have faced meeting their goals, and what they have or plan to do to achieve these goals in the coming year. For example, instead of having a criterion like, “ $\geq 10\%$ increase in income from employment for project leavers” and then having the responses of $< 5\%$, $\geq 5\%$, and $\geq 10\%$ (which does not even line up with the prompt; it is a Yes or No answer). Why not, as part of the application ask some think like (potentially replacing parts of the narrative):

What percentage increase (if any) in income from employment is associated with project leavers? _____

Please identify the employment goals for the program:

Please describe any barriers you have faced in achieving your employment goals:

Please describe how you plan to overcome barriers and meet your goals in the coming year:

Application evaluators could then be tasked with reading these responses and scoring them on a metric such as:

