



Administrative and Finance Committee

Current date: May 17, 2024

Next meeting: June 14, 2024

Attendance: - Ali Hilton, Becky Poitras, John Tramel, Lynn Rose, Rachel Erpelding, Tehani El-Ghoussein, Suslia Jones, Paris Mendoza, Robbie Phillips

Staff: - Amber Bauer, Shida McCormick, Nehemiah Rosell

Public: Amanda Stadler, Amy Copeland, Brandi Blair

5/17/24 Agenda

1. Review and Approve meeting minutes for May 10th meeting.
2. Review and Discuss score card ranking based on percentages of points earned.
3. Determine what threshold could be established in scoring to bypass local competition.
4. Discuss, edit, and approve revisions to Ranking and Prioritization policies as deemed necessary.
5. Share update on Healthcare and Housing Committee Meeting.
6. Public Comment

4/19/24 Minutes

Objectives/ Agenda	Owner/ Speaker	Action items/Results
Call to Order	John Tramel	
Review and Approve meeting minutes for April 10 th meeting.	John Tramel	Allison Hilton moved/ Robbie Phillips second. Minutes approved.
Review and Discuss score card ranking based on percentages of points earned.	John	Shida McCormick sent scorecards and project ranking. The new rankings are based on the new measures. There was a review of the discussion last week about not receiving referrals impacting points. If you had zero referrals but had zero exits and used all your funds you get full points. If you have full points on funds left unspent and zero exits, you get full points. If you had full points on funds unspent and had exits, half

		<p>points. If you had no points on funds left unspent and no exits, no points. This will move projects accordingly: 11 to 7, 13 to 6, and 14 to 8. Should these be separate criteria? Shida said this is possible. These will be three separate categories.</p> <p>Shida McCormick has sent questions from last week to HUD TA and is waiting for a response.</p> <p>SimTech can assist with building a performance scorecard for CE and HMIS but there needs to be another group (CE or HMIS Governance?) to decide what measures should be used. This is not currently on the CE Governance action plan for this year, per Tehani El-Ghoussein who is on the CE Governance committee. The questions were asked if it is up to each committee to decide to do this or if it's the admin responsibility to state that it needs to be done. Do we wait for the CoC Governance Committee or put this on a list of goals to happen once the committee is established. However, we are required to evaluate these programs and we are going into a 2-year NOFO and shouldn't push this down the line.</p> <p>At BOS, there are CE projects, but they haven't been scored competitively yet. There is only one HMIS project that hasn't been evaluated competitively because it's the only one. There is no scoring mechanism because it runs the HMIS so it's always placed at the top of the list.</p> <p>The first step is to determine the metrics and find out where we pull the metrics from and verify we can pull all the metrics. All CE projects should be evaluated, including GKCEH.</p> <p>Has there been any guidance from HUD about what to do in a 2 year NOFO if you have projects that are struggling. Becky Poitras stated HUD is looking at a mid-year process for evaluations. Local field office indicated that local transfers are slow right now. Dana Buckner has been promoted and this is slowing down the process. Should we have a threshold score mid-NOFO to determine what projects are performing?</p> <p>We agreed to get further guidance from other communities and HUD TA.</p> <p>Motion by Lynn Rose to approve new scorecard, Allison Hilton Second. Motion passed.</p>
<p>Determine what threshold could be established in scoring to bypass local competition.</p>	<p>John Tramel</p>	<p>Is there a threshold we want to set – Discussion set out from last week. How do we decide the threshold? Lynn noticed there was a jump between the 15th and 16th ranked projects so should we take the top 15? Does this include all types of projects, including HMIS and CE? Do we need to identify what our community priorities are first? The discussion has been getting away from ranking people just on how well grant writers write the grant and looking at the data. We could do the</p>

		<p>top % of projects instead of a number of projects. Or we could do a % of points. If a project is changing in anyway, the project will have to</p> <p>Becky Poitras moves to approve the top 10% of non-protected projects (full projects) from the local competition. Lynn Rose second, motion passed. This needs to be put into the ranking and prioritization policies.</p> <p>Discussion: what happens if projects have the same score. If there are multiple projects in the top 10% with the same score, they all pass.</p>
Discuss threshold for unspent funds	John Tramel	<p>Do we set a threshold or formula for projects having unspent funds that impacts score. Nehemiah Rosell shared spreadsheet of percent of funds remaining at the end of last completed grant cycle. This would exclude 1st and 2nd year projects. The data is the most recently completed grant year. There was discussion about whether we need to exclude the 2nd year projects. We have to look at projects that have completed 3 full years because that data would be included in their first APR. There was discussion about protecting expansions for 1 year? Discussion about excluding expansion because it takes a while to get staffed up and get the funds expended depending on type of project and when the project begins.</p> <p>There was an idea last week that the committee come up with a percentage and a dollar amount threshold.</p> <p>John Tramel recommended the committee meet sooner than next scheduled meeting and Exec. Team will make recommendation to how the percentage could be determined and what that could be.</p>
Discuss, edit, and approve revisions to Ranking and Prioritization policies as deemed necessary.	John Tramel/ Amber Bauer	<p>Review of Prioritization and Rank & Review policies. Do we need to include information specific to how projects are ranked in the Prioritization policy? Ranking is mentioned in the Prioritization policy as an overview and points to the Ranking policy for details. We could use language in the prioritization policy that is broad and allows for changes in the ranking policy that is more detailed and describes the percent of projects that do not have to do the local application. (Becky gave language that could possibly be used.)</p> <p>Becky Poitras brought up discussion about the need to review and evaluate CE and HMIS projects. Our policy currently protects HMIS projects but we haven't evaluated either type of projects. Examples were given from other CoC's that protect both types of projects and do we want to put these projects in a position to possibly be defunded?</p>

		<p>Need to review policies as we determine possible metrics for CE projects. We need to state if specific projects are going to be recommended for prioritization.</p> <p>Can we look at these policies in leadership meeting for a policy recommendation to bring back to next meeting?</p>
Share update on Healthcare and Housing Committee Meeting.	Rachel Erpelding	Rescheduled to June.
Public Comment		<p>Amanda Stadler – question about new scoring and taking CE referrals -what is the definition of unspent funds? We advocate for a point reduction for unspent funds. Review of consideration of current grant spending rather than looking at past performance because there are many things that impact grant spending outside of an agency’s control.</p> <p>Amy Copeland –Will a notice be sent out for when the next meeting will be scheduled. Had a question about the scoring for projects that didn’t take referrals – what about projects that didn’t take referrals because they voluntarily reallocated money to provide supportive services.</p>
Adjourn		

Recorded and submitted by:
Rachel Erpelding