

MINUTES

DATE: FRI, SEPT 4, 2015 START TIME: 9:05AM

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Alice Merrifield, Co-Chair
<b>NOTE TAKER</b>	Kathy Booton Wilson, Secretary
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	Sherrri Allen Reeves, Kathy Booton Wilson, Adriana Camarda, Joyce Coffee, James Conlon, Robert Cunningham, Elizabeth Dunn, Ken Keibler, Kyu Yup Kim, Kevin McCullough, Alice Merrifield, Mandee Russell, Norma Samame, Robret Simpson, Larry Smith, Gwen Turner Alternates: Mayon Yen, Amanda Ciura, Anne Le hockey, Charles Rucell, David Mowery, Chris Bohlander, Melvin Alexander, B.Milo AC Staff: Dave Thomas, Loren Seeger and Elizabeth Perez
<b>QUORUM?</b>	Yes.

Agenda topics:

<b>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</b>	Alice opened the meeting and welcomed attendees. Attendees introduced themselves. Liz Dunn announced that today is her last day at Sarah’s Circle, and that she will be working at Mercy Housing.
<b>REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>	The group reviewed the minutes of the August 7, 2015 HMV meeting. Norma Samame moved for approval of the minutes and Gwen Turner seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.
<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>HUD/NOFA Update:</b> Loren Seeger reported that the NOFA has not yet been released.</li> <li>• <b>Charter Implementation Update:</b> Loren reported that on September 15<sup>th</sup> the Service Providers Commission will meet to do strategic planning and determine the process for recommending service providers for committee slates. CEO’s, ED’s, and other higher level agency staff members are encouraged to attend. The meeting will be at the Michael Barlowe Center from 10:00AM – 2:00PM.</li> </ul>
<b>SITE VISIT SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT</b>	Robert Cunningham and Loren Seeger reported for the site visit subcommittee. The most recent site visit went well. The subcommittee felt that the process is going well. More service providers and people with lived experience will be needed to participate in site visits. There were also some miscommunications regarding the Consumer Engagement sessions at some agencies, and attendance may have been lower than hoped.
<b>2016 EVALUATION PLANNING – AGENCY COMPONENT</b>	<p><b><u>Priorities for Agency Component</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CoC Participation</li> <li>• Consumer Representation</li> <li>• Financial Sustainability</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Threshold Questions</u></b>          Discussion took place on whether an agency policy on consumer rights should be included in the Agency Threshold component. The consensus was to forward the question to the sub-group that works on the Agency Component for further discussion. There was also discussion of how the question of coordinated access might be addressed in the instrument.</p> <p>There was discussion of match/leverage, which will be raised in the Project Component.</p> <p><b><u>Certification Checklist</u></b>          Q.15.f. <i>Off-site, ongoing one-on-one support:</i> It was suggested that the question is vague. All of the items in question 15 will be reviewed by the sub-committee workgroup. Some also felt that items c – f can be merged.</p> <p><b><u>Agency Governance</u></b></p>

Q.2. *Does the agency encourage consumers to participate in the day-to-day operations of the agency?*  
This question will be moved to Consumer Focus and Representation.

Q.3. *Does the agency have standards or policies in place to ensure that continuous quality improvement processes are used to improve project operations?* The group talked about how this would be demonstrated. The Committee would like to see a written formal process, or a process that can be documented in writing, in order for agencies to receive points on this question. The question will be referred to the Site Visit Sub-Committee and to the sub-committee that works on this section of the instrument.

**Consumer Focus and Representation**

The question on “*Does the Agency encourage consumers to participate in day-to-day operations of the agency*” was added to this section. There was discussion on whether there is redundancy in the questions. The sub-committee will look at combining questions, and will also review question #5 which concerns hiring staff members who have had lived experience. Loren pointed out that there would be confidentiality issues with verifying past homelessness of staff members. There was additional argument to enhance the question and to encourage hiring of people with lived experience at all levels of agency staff. The sub-committee will also review this question. This question will also be reviewed by the Site Visit Sub-Committee.

The group affirmed that an **Agency Component Sub-Committee** will be needed: Kevin McCullough, Kyu Yup Kim, Norma Samame, Mandee Russell, Robret Simpson, Alice Merrifield, Robert Cunningham, Gwen Turner and David Mowery volunteered to serve on that sub-committee.

**Threshold**

- Utilization
- APR Submission
- Program Models Chart Alignment (updated to current Chart)
- Family Project Requirements

There was a question as to whether participation in coordinated access or CRS would be a threshold question. There was a suggestion to include a question on coordinated access as an informational question that may eventually become a scored or threshold question. This could also be included in the Program Models Chart piece of the threshold. This question will be reviewed by the sub-committee.

**Certification Checklist**

It was mentioned that Environmental Review is addressed in the instrument twice.

Q.3. It was pointed out that HUD has not been out to do monitoring in the past two years. All projects will mark “N/A”.

There were concerns that some questions are redundant with other sections. There can be a note in the instrument that identifies when a question relates to or is similar to another question in the instrument.

**Project Operations**

Q.1. *Was the project able to draw down from HUD and expend 100% of the funds for this project for the grant term that just ended?* The group discussed how to incentivize full draw down of funds or reallocation. The question might need to be considered separately for rental assistance vs. other types of funds. There could be different thresholds, such as 100% spending for services and operations, and a smaller percentage for leasing. In the leasing question, there could be an additional question that rewards reallocation. There could also be a narrative. The sub-committee will review this question.

Q.2. *What dollar amount of match and leverage can the project provide for the upcoming award year?*  
The Committee considered the Service Providers Commission-Executive Committee motion regarding State funding. That motion stated: “**Submit a request to HMV to consider the loss of state funds which is traditionally used as a match when developing scoring for match/leverage in the Evaluation Tool.**”  
There was a suggestion to reduce points on this question. An additional consideration is that the Continuum of Care received 0 points on Continuum Leveraging in the national competition. Alice asked for data on how projects scored on this question. There was also a suggestion to increase technical assistance for projects on this area. There were suggestions of making it a percentile question or

2016 EVALUATION  
PLANNING –  
PROJECT  
COMPONENT

	<p>allowing points for percentage improvement from the previous year. The question will be referred to the sub-committee.</p> <p>Alice mentioned that one of the other continua (San Francisco or Ohio) gave points on cost per participant or unit to reward cost efficiency. One Committee member was concerned that this might disincentivize projects showing match and leverage. There are also differences in populations served and cost variances in different areas of the city. This topic will be an HMV Committee discussion at a later date.</p> <p><b><u>HMIS Implementation and Data Quality</u></b></p> <p>Q.2. This question is about projects turning in the quarterly data quality reports on-time. There was discussion of the definition of “on time”, as there is an original submission deadline and another deadline for submitting corrections.</p> <p>Q.3. Will be removed.</p> <p>Q.4. <i>Do you have 5% or less missing values on the HUD required Universal Data Elements (UDE’s) and Program Specific Data elements for the reporting period?</i> There could be incremental points for projects that have fewer than 4%, 3%, etc. missing elements. There was also mention that there are new UDE’s required this year. There was a suggestion that this become an informational question, and another that it be unchanged.</p> <p><b><u>Leading Practices</u></b></p> <p>There are some redundancies that can be addressed by the sub-committee. There can be more clarity in the instruction guide about the depth of explanation required in the narrative.</p> <p>Q. 1 – 3: Could these questions be combined? Some thought that Q.1. is vague, or could have varying interpretations.</p> <p>There will be a Leading Practices sub-committee that will review this section and the Certification Checklist.</p> <p><b><u>Instruction Manual</u></b></p> <p>There was a point raised that the Instruction Manual needs to provide more detailed explanation on many of the questions. There will be a sub-committee created to review the Instruction Manual. There was a suggestion that Frequently Asked Questions from last year be integrated into this year’s Instruction Manual.</p>
<p>EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEES /WORKGROUP PLANNING</p>	<p>Sub-committees will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Agency Component:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Kevin McCullough, Kyu Yup Kim, Norma Samame, Mande Russell, Robret Simpson, Alice Merrifield, Robert Cunningham, Gwen Turner, Loren Seeger and David Mowery</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Project Operations</b> (including Leading Practices, Match/Leverage and System Priorities): Robret Simpson, Ken Kiebler, Kyu Yup Kim, Sherri Allen-Reeves, Jimmy Conlon, Amanda (from Heartland – Norma will ask her to participate) and Dave Thomas</li> <li>• <b>Project Performance</b> ( including incorporating the new program models chart and revisiting percentiles by project type): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Kathy Booton Wilson, Mayon Yen, Melvin Alexander, Priscilla (Sherri Allen-Reeves’ alternate from Renaissance Collaborative), Alice Merrifield, Chris Bohlander and Amanda Borta. This sub-committee still needs a rapid rehousing provider.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Instruction Manual:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To be determined at the next meeting. Loren Seeger will be on the Instruction Manual Committee.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Each committee will include a staff member from AllChicago. Larry Smith requested that he be informed of all meetings so that people from the Lived Experience Committee can be recruited for the sub-committees.</p>

<b>NEXT MEETING</b>	Friday, October 2, 2015 from 10:00AM – 12:00PM at AllChicago, 651 W. Washington.	
<b>ADJOURNMENT:</b>	<b>MINUTES SUBMITTED BY:</b>	<b>APPROVED BY:</b>
The meeting adjourned at 11:57AM.	Kathy Booton Wilson	