

Minutes of Ranking Committee

October 20, 2014

The committee meeting was called to order at 10:30am at the MUTEH conference room, 201 W. Capitol Street, Suite 800, Jackson, MS 39225.

The Committee consists of the following members: Martha Mitternight (Homeless Advocate, prior Board Chair), Kathy Garner (CoC funded, Special Population), Florida McKay (CoC funded). The committee selected Florida McKay as the chairman. Also present during the meeting were MUTEH staff members Louise Meyer and Ledger Parker, and Board President Stephanie Johnson.

We adopted appeal process as follows:

1. New Applicants will receive a summary of the threshold review on or before October 20th.
2. Applicants will be required to complete and submit their application in esnaps by the end of the day on Friday, October 24th, 2014.
3. Agencies that wish to appeal must submit appeal to the Executive Director within two days. The Appeals process that was adopted by the Board will be followed and a copy will be sent with the funding notice to agencies.

Applicants should note that the committee will not use the appeals process as an opportunity to reconsider funding decisions without a clear explanation of problems with the grant making process. The committee will use this process to address deficiencies with process or procedures.

Louise presented the listing of CoC Goals as outlined in the NOFA:

1. Progress towards ending chronic homelessness
2. Increasing housing stability
3. Increase participants income
4. Increase # participating in mainstream services
5. Using RR a method to reduce from homelessness

\$3,240,473 Tier 1

Includes a 2% cut

We should consider planning grant

Louise presented HUD priorities for funding from NOFA:

1. renewal PSH projects
2. new Reallocated PSH for 100% CH

3. new Reallocated RR for homeless HH w children
4. renewal TH
5. CoC Planning
6. UFA Costs
7. SSO for centralized/coordinated assessment
8. renewal HMIS
9. all other renewal SSO
10. any project app submitted by CoC that was not included in HUD-approved GIW

The committee discussed strategies for determining how to implement cuts and/or reallocation:

Options include across the board 2% cut for all renewals, reduce renewals by the amount of \$ sent back, programs meeting outcomes and performance should not be cut, rank project type exclusively based on HUD priorities, target populations receive special consideration.

Rating factors:

The committee rejected the strategy of an across the board 2% cut, and will base ranking and funding decisions for all projects; reallocated, new and renewal, on the following priority order:

- 1) Permanent housing projects whether renewal or reallocated will be protected from cuts
- 2) target population as identified by unmet need analysis. Transitional Projects that did not chose to reallocate were evaluated. It was determined that TH and ASC target populations must be given priority.
- 3) project type as outlined by HUD
- 4) reduction of renewals by \$ sent back to HUD from most recent APR available. PGV cut SSO due to partnership with CABHI
- 5) reduction of TH/HMIS by pro-rata share of amount needed be able to fund all projects in Tier 1
- 6) ranked by performance within project type based on CoC adopted standards from most recent APR available and Monthly Progress Reports generated by HMIS

The committee then reviewed each project and ranked their performance on each of the following CoC adopted performance standards:

- 1) 65% of participants exiting program were placed in permanent housing
- 2.) 80% of participants in PH stayed in project for 6 mos or more

- 3.) 96% of participants had increase in income while in project or upon exit from project
- 4.) 85% of participants accessed mainstream resources while in project or upon exit from project

The committee decided to combine the ranking for performance measures 3 and 4 based on the understanding that if a participant did not have an increase in employment income then it would be necessary to see an increase in mainstream resources in order to offset the lack of employment income.

Ledger Parker then presented the average MPR grade for each CoC renewal project using the grades over the previous 12 months. He discussed the factors that are used in determining the letter grade and give an overview of the HMIS participation performance of each project. It should be noted that Oak Towers is prohibited from entering data into the community-wide data base due to being a DV provider. The grades were as follows:

Project Name	Grade
MPHA I	A
MPHA II	B
CANS	A
STEPS	A
PROJECT HOPE TRANSITIONAL	C
121 HAVEN HOUSE	B
CATS	A
HOYO	A
PROJECT HOPE PERMANENT	B

The committee then reviewed spreadsheets with all performance data and ranked the each project within three spreadsheets: exits to permanent housing, staying longer 6 months, and income.

The committee reviewed and discussed the results of the performance ranking for each renewal project and determined that each project was performing well and all should be considered for renewal funding. No project was performing at such a low level that would result in the committee rejecting their application for funding in this year’s CoC application.

The committee then reviewed the new and reallocated projects that were submitted for funding in this year’s competition.

Lighthouse Ministries, Covenant Community Development Corp, Southwest Ms Christian Ministries and Wesley House submitted applications that did not pass threshold review. The committee discussed the threshold review scores. Kathy Garner moved that the committee verifies and concurs with the results. Stephanie Johnson seconded, passed with sign of aye.

USM/IDS submitted an application to provide Rapid Rehousing for homeless households with children. This application is submitted as a reallocation of their previous SSO project. Project Recovery II, a Medium Term Rapid Rehousing program would allow them to provide housing assistance in a more effective and cost effective way. The committee discussed the geographic area that would be covered by this project and agreed that the services were needed in those areas. There has been a gap in many areas of the state due to the strategies used by the Mississippi Development Authority – the ESG grant recipient – to award funding with no preference for geographic areas served. It was decided that USM/IDS application for RR would be included in the Tier 1 allocation.

Catholic Charities submitted an application to provide Rapid Rehousing for homeless households with children. This application is submitted as a reallocation of their previous SSO project. A Medium Term Rapid Rehousing program would allow them to provide housing assistance in a more effective and cost effective way. The committee discussed the geographic area that would be covered by this project and agreed that the services were needed in those areas. There has been a gap in many areas of the state due to the strategies used by the Mississippi Development Authority – the ESG grant recipient – to award funding with no preference for geographic areas served. It was decided that Catholic Charities application for RR would be included in the Tier 1 allocation.

Bolivar County CAA submitted an application to provide Rapid Rehousing for homeless households with children. This application is submitted as a reallocation of their previous Transitional Housing projects. A Short and Medium Term Rapid Rehousing program would allow them to provide housing assistance in a more effective and cost effective way. The committee discussed the geographic area that would be covered by this project and agreed that the services were needed in those areas. There has been a gap in many areas of the state due to the strategies used by the Mississippi Development Authority – the ESG grant recipient – to award funding with no preference for geographic areas served. It was decided that USM/IDS application for RR would be included in the Tier 1 allocation.

MUTEH Planning Grant would be included in this year’s Tier 1 allocation to include funding for Coordinated Assessment and Intake procedures, evaluation and monitoring of outcomes for CoC and ESG projects and CoC application submission.

The committee then added the reallocated and new projects to the ranking spreadsheet and prioritized all projects; renewal, reallocated and new based on HUD project priorities.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00pm.

Respectfully submitted:

Florida McKay, Ranking Committee Chair