

**February 26, 2019**

Funding committee: MEETING I  
Room 408, City Hall  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
10 a.m. – 12 p.m.

## **MINUTES**

### Local Competition Process

- Community likes the PRESTO system, reports were easy to review; would love more attention to making the match process smoother (whose letterhead, timing, etc.)
  - HB: we'll be creating a match template form for projects that receive match from HSH; we'll try to clarify things from the start with regard to match from HSH
- Prenatal Program: great communication; meeting at Google Community Space to troubleshoot was the best meeting
  - HB: we've considered holding additional computer labs – seeing a lot of nodding heads for this, so we'll be sure to do this

### Proposed Renewal Scoring Tool Revisions

- Moving points out of 1A
  - This is a good move – addresses some of the concerns we had
  - If there are inequities in the scoring tool, those have been magnified in 1A, so this will help reduce that
  - Need to revisit how we look at project types – will do so in March
- Increased income for youth programs
  - Could we include a breakout by age range for RRH serving families as well? E.g., 18-24? We do have youth in our other projects as well
  - What about someone who goes from 17 to 18 during the year?
  - What if we included a supplemental question about the number of people in the TAY range, and then of those, how many were enrolled in educational programs?
  - HomeBase will explore this further, to think about how we could measure for projects that aren't exclusively TAY

- Unit utilization
  - Maybe we should all get the 3 points this year for utilizing 90% of grant funds and not increase the points on unit utilization because of the issue with getting referrals and fully leasing up, and then next year we will be at a better place to be measured on this?
    - HB: we're really aware of this, but we'll make sure those difficulties are presented to the priority panel, and this is also something you can bring up in your project narrative to flag for the panelists, so they can increase your score
    - The reason we're trying to get away from automatically awarding points is so the scoring process is more meaningful
  - Could a compromise be to expand the scale – increments of 1 instead of 2?
    - HB: yes, we can do that this year, and see how it goes
  - It was July 1, 2017 that CE happened, so this is the year we'll see the big impact on utilization – so, wondering if there's a way to do a test right now to see if there's going to be a substantial difference in performance?
    - HB: yes, if we can gather the APRs, we could do that test before the March meeting
    - The panel should be generous in adjusting points on this if it is an issue
- Participation in CoC meetings
  - HB: in March, we'll start talking about other meetings to include for 2020
  - LHCB meeting – 12/12 meetings feels punitive when not also considering the rest of the meetings that we're all attending
    - We could make 11 or 12 full points, or consider giving full points if you attend other meetings – will discuss more in March, and decide which meetings to include starting in 2020
    - HSH: 12 isn't overly burdensome, and these are critical meetings
    - This is a lot easier for larger organizations, more of a burden for smaller organizations
    - What about subcmtes of LHCB as well? Either 12 LHCB or cmtes?
    - We'll look at tracking this better moving forward
- HMIS Data Quality
  - Clarity encourages folks to use the don't know field for SSI

- SSI is one where you can indicate in the project narrative that it's because you're serving undocumented clients—we'll come up with a way for you to indicate that without necessarily calling out undocumented status (e.g., there was an effort to collect, but the client did not want to or could not provide that information)
- Low Barrier
  - We won't be dinged if the landlord is conducting the check (e.g., in a RRH project)—it's just about whether the project is doing the check
- Remove remaining 1A factors
  - Should look at recidivism for 2020 if we can measure it by then
  - Should clean up the time to access PH for RRH projects for 2020
  - We'll discuss these factors for 2020 at the March meeting
  - Want to make sure we aren't hurting ourselves in not calling out recidivism on the scoring tool – will we lose points on the CoC app? – We'll look at that
- RRH for youth
  - LSYS: good change, it builds more structural equity into the tool; YHDP include a non-time-limited project as well, so will PSH for youth be included as well?
    - We can make that change this year in anticipation of 2020, but the YHDP projects will be held harmless this year anyway
- Remaining Scoring Factors
  - 1C carveout for people in educational programs- why no similar change to 1D?
    - We didn't think it was needed because it's *maintain* or increase
    - The list of mainstream resources could be expanded to include some entitlements that are youth-specific – we'll discuss more in March
  - Distribution of points between 1C and 1D
    - Feels like double-points between the two factors if you demonstrate an increase
    - Should be less emphasis on increase, more on maintaining?
    - We adjusted the scale last year on 1C so you only need 60% of your clients increasing to get full points—this is pretty generous
    - This encourages folks to get COLAs in, report changes, etc.

- There's also a question about how annual assessments impact this – we'll discuss this more at the March meeting
- There are some families that could come in and their income goes up and down a lot more frequently... so that is impacted by assessment timing as well
- Consider making points 10 and 10 between 1C and 1D
- Other next steps for March
  - Want a different way of holding harmless the YHDP projects – not just the APR data factors, but entirely held harmless
    - We'll also discuss community priorities at the March meeting
  - We'll come back next time with an updated renewal scoring tool