MARICOPA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS
302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490

January 20, 2016

TO: Members of the MAG Continuum of Care Board

FROM: Kevin Hartke, Vice Mayor, City of Chandler, Co-Chair
Darlene Newsom, UMOM New Day Centers, Co-Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Meeting - 1:30 p.m.
Monday, January 25, 2016
MAG- 2nd floor Ironwood Room
302 N. 1st Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85003
(Parking is available from the garage below the building. Bring your parking ticket to the meeting for validation.)

The next MAG Continuum of Care Board (CoC Board) meeting will be held at the time and place noted above. Members of the CoC Board may attend either in person or by phone. Supporting information is enclosed for your review.

The meeting agenda and resource materials are also available on the MAG website at www.azmag.gov. In addition to the existing website location, the agenda packet will be available via the File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site at: ftp://ftp.azmag.gov/ContinuumOfCareRegionalCommitteeonHomelessness
This location is publicly accessible and does not require a password.

Please park in the garage underneath the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting, parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

In 1996, the Regional Council approved a simple majority quorum for all MAG advisory committees. If the Human Services Technical Committee does not meet the quorum requirement, members who have arrived at the meeting will be instructed a legal meeting cannot occur and subsequently be dismissed. Your attendance at the meeting is strongly encouraged.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

If you have any questions, please call the MAG office.

MAG CONTINUUM OF CARE (COC) BOARD
TENTATIVE AGENDA
January 25, 2016

	COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED
1. Call to Order	
2. Call to the Audience An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the CoC Board on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless CoC Board requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.	2. Information.
3. Approval of Consent Agenda Prior to action on the consent agenda, members of the audience will be provided an opportunity to comment on consent items that are being presented for action. Following the comment period, Committee members may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda. Consent items are marked with an asterisk (*)	3. Approval of the Consent Agenda.

ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONSENT*

*3A. Approval of the November 2, 2015 CoC Board Meeting Minutes The draft minutes for the November 2, 2015 meeting will be posted with the meeting materials.	3A. Approve the CoC Board meeting minutes of November 2, 2015.

*3B. Community-wide Data Sharing

The work group is comprised of 18 members dedicated to quickly producing a Data Sharing Plan. The plan will include items like: client privacy, informed consent, case conferencing, data management and usage and data sharing MOUs. The workgroup had its first meeting on January 15. At that meeting, Michelle Thomas from CIR and Ty Rosensteel from CASS were selected to co-chair the group. The group decided that all meetings would be open to anyone interested. The work group agreed to produce a draft document to be distributed to the Continuum of Care by mid-February and hold public meetings to review the draft and make edits throughout the rest of February. A formal draft will be presented to the CoC Committee in March and presented to the CoC Board in April for approval. The work group will be holding weekly meetings on Friday afternoons at MAG throughout this process.

3B. Information only.

*3C. Coordinated Entry Oversight Work Group (CEOWG)

The CEOWG has met twice with it's new six members. Two additional non-voting individuals have also been asked to participate in the biweekly meetings: David Bridge and Mattie Lord. The workgroup recently voted to keep the meetings open to the public, with executive sessions called as necessary. Future work includes review of policies and procedures for both single and family entry points to the continuum of care. Kelli Donley project manager at ADHS/DBHS is chair. The group meets every other Thursday from 8:30-10:30 at MAG.

3C. Information only.

*3D. 25 Cities/Zero: 2016 Initiatives

The 25 Cities Pilot Program is in place with the CRRC to implement Coordinated Entry and GPD referrals. CIR and the City of Phoenix are collaborating on a by-name list for veterans to determine housing placements and needs of veterans engaged in outreach programs or accessing emergency shelter. The aim of 25 Cities is to develop a robust CE System (CES) and provide rapid connection to appropriate services. Victory Place IV is prioritizing placement of homeless veterans currently staying on the Campus.

ADOH Director Michael Trailor has stepped in to guide Zero: 2016, a local and statewide effort to end chronic homelessness. Currently the project is working with the single adult CES to generate the by-name list for chronically homeless individuals and incorporating the new HUD definition and record keeping requirements using the Coordinated Entry database, Homelink. The community is receiving continued support and technical assistance from Community Solutions. Initiative is working on ways to support the CES in their a housing referral system implementation.

Both initiatives are awaiting the community data sharing plan to enable community-wide case conferencing.

3D. Information only.

*3E. Point in Time Count

The 2016 Point in Time Count will take place tomorrow, January 26, from 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Coordinators are in place from Wickenburg to Gila Bend, Buckeye to Chandler to conduct the count. Important changes to the Point in Time count include capturing information that will identify those experiencing chronic homelessness utilizing the newly released HUD definition and an increase focus on youth. We have also incorporated a process to partner with health care providers to count families and individuals experiencing homelessness that access health care services.

3E. Information only.

4. Continuum of Care Updates

   MAG staff will update the Board on priorities and upcoming issues.

   4. Information only.

5. Continuum of Care Program Performance Report Score Card

   The Continuum of Care Committee approved a revised Program Performance Report Score Card on December 9, 2015. Discussions were held at the November and December Committee meetings and were reviewed by the Performance Standards and Data Quality Group at the November 16, 2015 and December 14, 2015 meetings. A copy of the revised score card is included with the agenda and meeting materials.

   The Program Performance Report Score Card will be presented for adoption by the Board.

   5. Information, discussion, and possible action.

6. 2016 NOFA Ranking and Review Process

   The Continuum of Care Committee approved a revised Ranking and Review Process on December 9, 2015. The Committee is making recommendations to revise the process of membership on the Ranking and Review panel and to make changes in the process of ranking and reviewing the 2016 NOFA applications for funding. A copy of the revised process is included with the agenda and meeting materials.

   The 2016 Ranking and Review Process will be presented for adoption by the Board.

   6. Information, discussion, and possible action.

7. Performance Standards and Data Quality Work Group Roles and Responsibilities

   The Performance Standards and Data Quality Work Group approved roles and responsibilities on November 30, 2015. A draft of the Roles and Responsibilities document is included with the agenda and meeting materials.

   The PSDQ Roles and Responsibilities will be presented for adoption by the Board.

   7. Information, discussion, and possible action.

8. Homeless Management Information System Lead Agency Recommendation

   During the 2015 NOFA ranking and review process, the Ranking and Review Committee recommended that an RFP be developed for the HMIS Lead Agency. The Performance Standards and Data Quality Work Group has met to consider the recommendation and will be recommending that the Board not proceed with an RFP but support working with Community Information and Referral to improve performance through an action plan.

   The HMIS Lead Agency Recommendation will be presented for adoption by the Board.

8. Information, discussion, and possible action.

Adjournment.

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (MAG)
CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD
November 2, 2015
MAG Office Building, Ironwood Room

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Brad Bridwell, Cantwell Anderson-Cloudbreak
Moises Gallegos, City of Phoenix
#Marisue Garganta, Dignity Health
Scott Hall, Community Bridges Inc.
*Kevin Hartke, City of Chandler, Vice Mayor, Chair
Theresa James, City of Tempe
Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County
Nick Margiotta, Phoenix Police Department
Darlene Newsom, United Methodist Outreach Ministries (UMOM) New Day Center
Amy Schwabenlender, Valley of the Sun United Way (VSUW)
Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections
Tami Linkletter, Save the Family

*Neither present nor represented by proxy.
#Attended by telephone conference call.
+Attended by video conference.

OTHERS PRESENT

Libby Bissa, City of Phoenix
James Claymon, Phoenix Shanti Group
Ken Curry, SBH
Jen Dangremond, Native American Connections (NAC)
Steve Degroot, NAC
Mark Dobay, A New Leaf
Dr. Maria E. Garay-Serratos, Sojourner Center
Deanna Grogan, City of Mesa
Vicki Helland, CBI
Marcie Herzog, SBH
Rosalie Hernandez, A New Leaf
Michael Hughes, A New Leaf
Teri Houser, Sojourner Center
Michelle Jameson, U.S. Vets
Margaret Kilman, Maricopa County Human Services Department (MCHSD)
Stephanie Knox, DES
Karen Kurtz, CBI
Mattie Lord, UMOM
Nancy Marion, House of Refuge
Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound
Ken McKinley, Tumbleweed
Lisa Miller, UMOM
Dennis Newburn, City of Mesa
David Olivares, Terros
Catherine Rea, Community Information and Referral (CIR)
Edward Pinot, Terros
Laura Peters, LCSA
Ty Rosensteel, CASS
Laura Skotniki, Save the Family
Charles Sullivan, ABC Housing
Chela Sullivan, UMOM
Steven Sparks, Labor's Community Service Agency (LCSA)
Nicky Stevens, ABC
Mike Shore, Hom Inc.
Jacki Taylor, Save the Family
Michelle Thomas, CIR
Keith Thompson, Phoenix Shanti Group
Dorian Townsend, Sojourner Center
Will Vucurevich, House of Refuge
John Wall, Arizona Housing Inc.
Ted Williams, ABC Housing
Kim VanNimwegen, VSUW
Pilar Vargus, Chicanos Por La Causa
Amy Vogelson, SBH

Celina Brun, MAG
Brande Mead, MAG
Anne Scott, MAG

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Darlene Newsome, United Methodist Outreach Ministries (UMOM) New Day Center, Co-Chair of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board, called the meeting to order at 9:02 p.m. Introductions of the Committee and audience proceeded.

2. Call to the Audience

Audience members were given an opportunity to address the Committee on items that were not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. There were no comments from the audience.

3. Approval of the September 28, 2015 CoC Board Meeting Minutes

Addressing the first order of business, Co-Chair Newsom asked if the Board reviewed the September 28, 2015 CoC Board meeting minutes and if there were any comments. There were no comments. Co-Chair Newsom entertained a motion to approve the September 28, 2015 Board meeting minutes. Moises Gallegos, City of Phoenix, motioned to approve the September 28, 2015 CoC Board meeting minutes. Theresa James, City of Tempe, seconded the motion to approve the September 28, 2015 CoC Board meeting minutes. Co-Chair Newsom opened the floor for comments on the meeting minutes from the audience. There were no comments. The motion passed.

4. Approval of CoC 2015 NOFA Ranking and Review Recommendations

Ranking and Review Panel representatives, Amy Schwabenlender and Theresa James, presented recommendations to the CoC Board on behalf of the Ranking and Review Panel. Discussion areas are listed below.

- Approval of the renewal projects and voluntary reallocation.
- Approval of the reallocation recommendations to fund the new Coordinated Entry Project.
- Approval of the 2015 NOFA Permanent Housing Bonus Projects.

Co-Chair Newsom: stated her conflict of interest and recused herself from the discussion.

Ms. James: requested Anne Scott, MAG, to provide a brief introduction of the Ranking and Review process before Ms. James and Ms. Schwabenlender, VSUW, presented their recommendations from the Ranking and Review Panel.

Ms. Scott: discussed the points as listed.

- The scoring tool used for the 2015 CoC Program application was approved by the CoC Board in 2014.
- In September 2015 the Board requested that at smaller group of Board members meet in October to discuss how to fund coordinated entry and make a recommendation to the Board.
- The Ranking and Review Committee had a pre-meeting and then met for 3 days reviewing applications, interviewing applicants, and then ranking each project.
- Projects were ranked on the criteria listed below:
    - Project score
    - Project type
    - Geography (was the provider the only one in a certain area)
    - History of low scoring over last three years
    - Leverage (what was the agency bringing to the table to fund the project)
    - Effective Use of funds
- Ms. Scott noted that information shared in the presentations was factored during the ranking process. Also worked to understand utilization rates-which were a threshold that was included in the scoring tool.
- The scoring process highlighted above led the committee to tier the projects according to HUD's guidelines for Tier one and Tier two.

- The PSDQ work group met on October 28, 2015 to review the HMIS project separately and prepare recommendations for the Board.

Co-Chair Newsom: asked Ms. Scott to explain to the audience what Tier one and Tier two meant.

Ms. Scott: HUD requires projects to be ranked as priority projects in Tier one and then projects at risk of funding, in Tier two. HUD has required tiering for the last few cycles of the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA).

Brande Mead, MAG: for the 2015 NOFA cycle, HUD requires that 85 percent of the available funding be in Tier one and 15 percent of funding fall in Tier two.

Ms. James: thanked all members of the Ranking and Review committee, and MAG staff. She added that it was brought to the attention of the Ranking and Review committee that the mathematical standard deviation used to calculate scoring was incorrect. So the committee corrected it however, there were no major changes to the ranking as a result. Furthermore, Ms. James clarified the ranking decisions between the Transitional Housing projects and Permanent Supportive Housing projects in relation to funding reallocation for Coordinated Entry.

Ms. Schwabenlender reiterated what Ms. James said and emphasized that the reasons for the scoring included housing placements and finding support for Coordinated Entry. What may not be clear is that UMOM submitted applications for the campus and Family welcome center-both locations for Coordinated Entry. She then referred to Tier two, number 50 which was only supportive services and was not treated as housing only.

Co-Chair Newsom: before the decision on funding is determined, the Board will make comments, followed by the audience.

Nick Margiotta, Phoenix Police Department emphasized that the decisions made at this meeting will set precedence for future decisions on performance, funding, reallocation, scoring, and suggested that the Board spend some time discussing those areas. HUD has priorities and we need to include those. At some point we need to live with our ranking tool. We facilitated the development of the tool and need be begin aligning with the tool. Mr. Margiotta reiterated that the standard deviation method was selected as a method to accurately highlight underperforming projects. If you are under the standard deviation, you are significantly underperforming. If you are a standard deviation below, then we should look at complete defunding. If you are on the cusp, then we should look at partially cutting.

Ms. Schwabenlender: the work group that looked at funding options was not an official board meeting because there was no quorum. The suggestions from the meeting were used in addition to the data that was presented at the interviews.

Mr. Margiotta agreed with Ms. Schwabenlender, adding that he was focused on form rather than making quick decisions.

Co-Chair Newsom: inquired if Board members had further comments.

Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections: she appreciated the work of the Ranking and Review committee. She hopes the work of the Boards recommendations gets stronger and that the CoC never stops listening to the community voices that present.

Bruce Liggett, Maricopa County: he was impressed and appreciative of the caliber of the Ranking and Review committee. He asked if the elements used to score and rank the projects were written down and solidified somewhere.

Ms. Scott: providers were asked about bed utilization.

Ms. Mead: a list of what was used to rank and review project could be sent to the providers as reference.

Discussion continued.

Ms. Schwabenlender: the CoC must begin a monitoring process before the next NOFA cycle begins.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Margiotta: go with the two lowest ranked projects which equate to a little over $400, 000, plus the Lifewell project which for various valid reasons should be removed and equates to about $130,000. All three projects total about $650,000, which leads to the questions of which projects should share the remainder of the pain. He added that the Board made a clear point that Domestic Violence (DV) projects would not be eliminated in-and-of-itself; however the Board also recognizes that DV is not a CoC priority since there are non-CoC channels available for DV.

There were no further comments from Board.

Co-Chair Newsom: opened the floor for comments from the audience.

Michael Hughes, A New Leaf: appreciative of the work of the Ranking and Review committee and noted that his project would likely close due to the reduction in funding.

Brad Bridwell, Cantwell Anderson-Cloudbreak: there are other CoC communities that are less compassionate than we are and would have cut many of the projects that are currently listed for less funding.

Mr. Margiotta: after doing the math, if the Board went with his proposal and added the monetary value of the four projects that are facing funding cuts, it is about two million dollars, so if there was a 10 percent across the board cut on the four projects that would equal the $200,000 gap.

Mr. Liggett: was astonished that representatives of the projects taking the largest funding cuts were not speaking up.

Steven Sparks, Labor's Community Service Agency (LCSA): the need for Transitional Housing is a very important component and LCSA offers a unique system where they have larger units. He also appreciates that Tiered approach over a full sweep because it allows the LCSA to improve on areas that are negatively impacting the organization's overall score.

Dr. Maria E. Garay-Serratos, Sojourner Center: appreciates the comments from the Board and audience. She added that she is strongly concerned that training is not a part of the CoC for providers and that her organization will have severe consequences from a lack of funding.

Mr. Gallegos: our continuum does not have the funding and resources to make the decision that should ideally be made; however the continuum needs to move forward. He then sought clarification on whether the funding for the new projects was new money or reallocated money.

Ms. Scott: the money for the new bonus projects is new money. Since the competition is on a national level the new projects are competing against new project in other continuums. The new projects are still ranked within their respective CoC and would provide new funding into their respective CoC were they approved. She also noted that the ranking of the new projects puts all projects in Tier two at risk.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Bridwell: asked Dr. Garay-Serratos if Sojourner Center requested technical assistance.

Dr. Garay-Serratos: they did contact MAG for technical assistance.

Mr. Bridwell: sought clarification with Ms. Mead if MAG followed up with the request.

Ms. Mead: MAG did respond to the request with feedback on what Sojourner could do to improve their application for the next NOFA cycle. Ms. Mead added that MAG has submitted a request to HUD for technical assistance.

Mr. Margiotta: if we dismiss technical assistance because it is slow then we are doing our CoC harm, however, if we wait for HUD technical assistance we will not be able to move forward. The slow technical assistance is just a factor that we will need to work with. Furthermore, he motioned to sweep the two bottom projects in Tier two, number 47 and 45, which is Sojourner and Chrysalis, that is roughly $440,000, and go with the Permanent Supportive Housing voluntary request to remove Lifewell, that is roughly another $217,000 which puts us at $657,000, and then the remaining $200,000 or $198,000 is evenly shared by percentage

amongst the bottom four projects; A New Leaf, ABC, Labor's Community Service Agency, and Southwest Behavioral (listed as 56, 55, 54, 48 on the project listing). Collectively these projects equal two million dollars in funding, the continuum's funding gap is $200,000 and ten percent of the two million would meet the gap. He reiterated that the statement above is his motion.

Mr. Bridwell: seconded the motioned as written above.
Marisue Garganta, Dignity Health: suggested adding technical assistance for 2016 and work on providing it more efficiently into the motion. There must be a way to collectively help those in need. She also requested quarterly reporting from any agency receiving funding.

Mr. Margiotta: accepted Ms. Garganta's suggestions as amendments to his motion.

Ms. Schwabenlender: countered the motion on the table and motioned to accept the recommendations from the Ranking and Review Committee as presented for all the reasons given.

Mr. Liggett: inquired with Ms. Schwabenlender on her thoughts regarding Mr. Margiotta's motion.

Co-Chair Newsom: requested a Board member to second Ms. Schwabenlender's motion before moving to discussion.

Ms. Garganta: seconded the motion to accept the recommendations from the Ranking and Review Committee as presented for all the reasons given.

Ms. Schwabenlender: part of the issue with ranking the projects was that she was not a part of the meeting to determine funding for Coordinated Entry. Furthermore, there is no formal process in place to codify the decisions being made. Being a part of the Committee in one way or another for at least ten cycles, the process did not change when there wasn't tiering. The tiering process is new and this approach of not penalizing one or two programs and actually addressing Tier two is the most difficult work. Some members of the Ranking and Review Committee were new and brought new perspective. Everyone here is concerned about the people in our community experiencing homelessness and the Ranking and Review Committee worked hard to come to the recommendations presented at this meeting.

Mr. Margiotta: praised the work of the Ranking and Review Committee and believes that the Board should be responsible for determining the financial fate of low performing programs.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Bridwell: to inflict the least amount of pain, the Board should consolidate programs where it can.

Ms. James: the Ranking and Review Committee had two Board members and the committee worked hard to follow the recommendations from the coordinated entry funding options group as much as possible. It is very important that the CoC Board follow the recommendations from the Board because these actions will send a message to providers that changes are being made to under-performing programs. She understands both motions and recognizes the difficulty of the decision that must be made.

Discussion continued.

Co-Chair Newsom: requested Ms. Scott to repeat the first motion, made by Mr. Margiotta.

Ms. Mead: repeated Mr. Margiotta's motion to consider defunding the voluntary projects that gave up their funding in the amount of $91,344, to defund Chrysalis at 100 percent, and to defund the Sojourner project at 100 percent and the Lifewell project at 100 percent, which totals $641,144 leaving a difference of $214,014 and to spread that out by taking 10 percent from Southwest Behavioral Health, ABC House of Refuge, A New Leaf, and Labor's Community Services Agency.

Board members were requested to vote on the motion. Three members voted yes, four members voted no, two members recused themselves. The motion did not pass.

Co-Chair Newsom: requested Ms. Scott to repeat the second motion presented by Ms. Schwabenlender.

Ms. Scott: the second motion was to adopt the recommendations of the Ranking and Review Committee as presented.

Board members were requested to vote on the second motion. Six members voted yes, two members voted no. The second motion passed.

Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections: need to begin looking at local solutions for technical assistance.

Ms. Mead: a CoC planning grant for another full time position focused on project monitoring and technical assistance has been prepared for submission. Furthermore, the PSDQ group reviewed the HMIS project application and fully supports that the HMIS funding remain in

number two of the project listings because of the importance of having HMIS funding in the community. The PSDQ group did suggest that we look at potentially issuing an RFP (Request For Proposals) between now and the next NOFA and wanted to ensure that the Board was aware of proposal as information only. In addition, the lead agency could apply for that project funding.

Ms. Scott: to clarify, the PSDQ group is supporting this recommendation which was made by the Ranking and Review Panel.

5. Coordinated Entry Oversight Work Group (CEOWG) Report and Recommendations

The Coordinated Entry Oversight Work Group was approved by the CoC Board in June, 2015, to address critical issues related to the implementation of the Regional Coordinated Entry System. A CEOWG representative would provide recommendations to the Board for approval. The recommendations are listed below.

- Establishment of the CEOWG as a formal, permanent workgroup that reports directly to the Board (until policies and processes are finalized), based upon feedback from the Family Housing Hub and the Welcome Center.
    - Establish scope of activities
    - Ensure feedback loop
    - Enable real-time resolution of provider issues
- The CEOWG determines thresholds and limitations for side-door usage.
- The CEOWG ensures processes and policies are adequate. Review and revision of the processes and policies are done annually or as needed.
- That no RFP process for CE be put in place, for at least two years (2018).
- That CE implementation plans be provided by the FHH and WC, which include project objectives and timelines, and goals (for the next 6, 12, 18 and 24 months) and that these be presented to the board and accepted, by January 15, 2016 date.
- That this workgroup be expanded to include: a COC Board Member, a PSDQ committee member and one other non-provider person. In addition, representatives from the FHH and WC and one other provider agency, will serve as advisory members of this workgroup.
- That this workgroup provide roles, responsibilities and commitments of local stakeholders in carrying out this plan.
- That the board address and create a plan to begin formal commitment to the CE system, which includes their contributing monetarily and this plan should be reported to the COC Board in January of 2016; furthermore provide agencies with the technical assistance and resources (such as contributing with training costs), that are necessary

for them to make the changes needed at their agency level to support the system wide transformation.

- That the CE workgroup provide the board with identified areas that need improvement within the current system, by December 15th and which includes specific outcomes and timelines that will be assessed to ascertain whether and to what extent proposed improvements are occurring.
- That there is development of monthly dashboards, for reporting and monitoring CE system progress that will be shared with the board. Request authority to obtain bi-monthly reports from the Family Housing Hub and the Welcome Center in order to provide accurate oversight and recommendations to the CoC Board.
- That the board actively align existing resources, expand public and private resources and increase cross-system collaboration to support this progress.
- The ESG providers should be immediately engaged in creating a The CEOWG serves as the entity that receives complaints and grievances upon formulating a grievance policy.

Mr. Gallegos: motioned to accept the recommendations with the caveat that the language regarding to two entry points is changed to the "lead provider". Ms. James: seconded the motion to accept the recommendations with the caveat that the language regarding to two entry points is changed to the "lead provider". The motion passed. There were no further comments.

6. <u>Coordinated Entry Oversight Work Group (CEOWG Membership Recommendations</u>

The CoC Committee Chairs have reviewed a slate of candidates to recommend additional individuals for membership on the Coordinated Entry Oversight Work Group. The CoC Committee Chairs would provide recommendations to the Board for CEOWG membership.
CoC Committee Chair Lord: the Committee recommended to the Board in June to create ad-hoc working group with a slate of five members, which the Board has official made a permanent group. Since the approval, membership has declined from members retiring being promoted or resigning. Membership was down to two individuals and the Committee would like to recommend new slate of members, listed below.

- Anne Scott, Maricopa Association of Governments
- Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing
- Liz Morales, City of Mesa
- Theresa James, City of Tempe
- Kelli Donley, Arizona Department of Behavioral Health Services

Mr. Bridwell: motioned to accept the membership slate as presented.

Mr. Liggett: sought confirmation that membership was not fixed but members could be added in the future.

Tami Linkletter, Save the Family: seconded the motion to accept the membership slate as presented. The motion passed. There were no further comments.

7. CoC Board Strategic Planning Session

Ms. Schwabenlender provided the update on developing the regional plan to end homelessness. She stated that having board input would be helpful. Furthermore, with the new members of the board, Ms. Schwabenlender suggested having a new planning session or retreat with all board members to align community ideologies and goals.

Marisue Garganta, Dignity Health: supported the idea of a retreat.

Mr. Gallegos: suggested taking an inventory of how all groups fit together (initiatives, groups, etc.).

Co-Chair Newsom: sounds like the Board should set aside a day for brainstorming.

Ms. Scott: will send out a doodle for a December 2015 meeting.

Ms. Garganta: suggested including a facilitator.

There were no further comments.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items

There were no requests for future agenda items.

9. Comments from the CoC Board

Co-Chair Newsom opened the floor for comments.

Bruce: working with the Funders Collaborative to extend the contract and continue to provide overflow services in connection with Lodestar Day Resource Center.

Brad: In December, Victory Place Phase Four will open, providing housing for more Veterans experiencing homelessness.

Moe: announces the official retirement of Libby Bissa from the City of Phoenix. The city is in the process of identifying a replacement for the newly vacant position.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Co-Chair Newsom at 10:57 am. The next Board meeting is scheduled for January 25, 2015.

MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness
Program Performance Report – Part I

Agency Name: **Program Name:**

Program Type (Component): **McKinney-Vento Funding Amount:**

Date of Assessment: **Completed by:**

*Applicable measures adjusted to HUD Goals, 80% of points set equal to HUD Goal

Goals	**Performance Standard**	**Data**	**Points Available**	**%**	**Points**	**Section Points**
1: Project serves "harder to serve" homeless population.	Percentage of households served by program that meet locally defined "harder to serve" conditions at entry: -Meet the HUD definition of chronically homeless -Mental Illness -Alcohol Abuse -Drug Abuse -Chronic Health Conditions -HIV/AIDS -Developmental Disabilities -Physical Disabilities -Sex Offenders	From "Physical and Mental Health Conditions at Entry" question in APR and client records for service of sex offenders.	***TOTAL - 10 pts.*** 25% of households 1 condition 1 pt. 2 conditions 2 pts 3 conditions 3 pts 50% of households 1 condition 4 pts 2 conditions 5 pts 3 conditions 6 pts 75% of households 1 condition 7 pts 2 conditions 8 pts 3 conditions 10 pts		**/10**	**/10**
2: HUD Objective: Increase Housing Stability.	**Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH) Programs Only**: Percent of homeless persons age 18 and older in PH program who remained in or exited to PH during the operating year. – As reported in the APR. (HUD Goal 80%= 80% of points)	APR – Housing Stability Measure	***TOTAL 10 pts.*** *10 pts = 95%+* *9 pts =89-94%* *8 pts =80-88%* *7 pts =70-79%* *6 pts =60-69%* *5 pts = 50-59%* *4 pts = 40-49%* *3 pts =30-39%* *2 pts = 20-29%* *1 pt = 10-19%* *0 pts = <9%*	*%*	**/10 or N/A**	**/10**
	Transitional Housing (TH) Programs Only: Percent of homeless persons in TH program who exited to PH during the operating year. – As reported in the APR. (HUD Goal 80% = 80% of points)	APR – Housing Stability Measure		*%*	**/10 or N/A**	
	Safe Haven (SH) Programs Only: Percent of homeless persons in SH program who remained in SH or exited to PH during the operating year. – As reported in the APR. (HUD Goal 80% = 80% of points)	APR-Housing Stability Measure		*%*	**/10 or N/A**	
3: HUD Objective: Increase project participant's income. ****For each project component type (PH or TH), answer either A OR B (not both)*** ***<u>AND</u>*** ***C.***	***A - Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH) Programs Only**: The percent of persons age 18 and older who maintained or increased their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the operating year or program exit. (HUD Goal 54% = 80% of points)	APR – Increase Total Income Measure	***TOTAL - 5 pts.*** *5 pts = 64+%* *4 pts = 54-63%* *3 pts = 44-53%* *2 pts = 34-43%* *1 pt = 24-33%* *0 pts = <23%*	*%*	**/5 or N/A**	PH /5 or N/A
	***B - Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH) Programs Only**: The percent of persons age 18 through 61 who maintained or increased their earned income (i.e., employment income) as of the end of the operating year or program exit. (HUD Goal 20% = 80% of points)	APR – Increase Earned Income Measure	***TOTAL - 5 pts.*** *5 pts = 25+%* *4 pts = 20-24%* *3 pts = 15-19%* *2 pts = 10-14%* *1 pt = 5-9%* *0 pts = <4%*	*%*	**/5 or N/A**	
	***A-Transitional Housing Programs (TH) Only**: The percent of persons age 18 and older who increased their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the operating year or program exit. (HUD Goal 54% = 80% of points)	APR – Increase Total Income Measure	***TOTAL 5 pts.*** *5 pts = 64+%* *4 pts = 54-63%* *3 pts = 44-53%* *2 pts = 34-43%* *1 pt = 24-33%* *0 pts = <23%*	*%*	**/5 or N/A**	TH /5 or N/A
	***B-Transitional Housing (TH) Programs Only**: The percent of persons age 18 through 61 who increased their earned income (i.e., employment income) as of the end of the	APR – Increase Earned Income Measure	***TOTAL - 5 pts.*** *5 pts = 25+%* *4 pts = 20-24%* *3 pts = 15-19%*	*%*	**/5 or N/A**	

	operating year or program exit. (HUD Goal 20% = 80% of points)		*2 pts = 10-14%* *1 pt = 5-9%* *0 pts = <4%*			
	A-Safe Haven (SH) Program Only: The percent of persons age 18 or older who maintained or increased their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the operating year or program exit. (HUD Goal 54% = 80% of points)	APR – Total Income Measure	***TOTAL - 5 pts.*** *5 pts = 64+%* *4 pts = 54-63%* *3 pts = 44-53%* *2 pts = 34-43%* *1 pt = 24-33%* *0 pts = <23%*	*%*	**/5 or N/A**	SH /5 or N/A
	C-For PH, TH and SH Programs: The percent of persons age 18 or older who maintained or increased their non-cash benefits as of the end of the operating year or program exit. (HUD Goal 56% = 80% of points)	APR – Non-Cash Benefits Measure	***TOTAL - 5 pts.*** *5 pts = 66+%* *4 pts = 56-65%* *3 pts = 46-55%* *2 pts = 36-45%* *1 pt = 26-35%* *0 pts = <25%*	*%*	**/5**	/5
*****3: Subtotal***	**Total of 3 available measures (3A, 3B and 3C) in question 3**					**/10**
4: Effective use of federal funding.	Percent of expended HUD funding for the most recent operating year.	LOCCS Report	*5 pts = 95-100%* *4 pts = 90-95%* *3 pts = 85-89%* *2 pts = 80-84%* *1 pt = 75-89%* *0 pts = <75%*	*%*	**/5**	**/10**
	Percent of HUD funding drawdowns were made at least quarterly. (Number of Drawdowns from LOCCS, Ex. Four drawdowns = 100%)	LOCCS Report	*5 pts. – 4 or more* *4 pts. – 3 draws* *3 pts. – 2 draws* *2 pts. – 1 draw*	*#*	**/5**	
5: HMIS; Data Quality and Training.	Percentage of complete data (not null/missing, "don't know" or "refused" data), except for Social Security numbers. Need to review scoring process	APR	5 pts = 90-100% 4 pts = 80-89% 3 pts =70-79% 2 pts = 60-69% 1 pt = 50-59% 0 pts = <49%	*%*	**/5**	**/10**
	Percentage of staff that have completed at least on HMIS training course within the past year (Insert HMIS GY)	HMIS Lead Agecny	5 pts = 90-100% 4 pts = 80-89% 3 pts =70-79% 2 pts = 60-69% 1 pt = 50-59% 0 pts = <49%	*%*	**/5**	
6: Leverage	Program leverages additional resources as part of overall program budget. Points based on percent of leverage compared to project funding.	Project Application	5 pts. = >150% 4 pts. = 125 -149.9% 3 pts. = 100 -124.9% 2 pts. = 75 - 99.9% 1 pt. = 50 - 74.9% 0 pts. = <50%	*%*	**/5**	**/5**
7: Community Priorities and Standards	**5 points - To be determined** *up to 10 points for meeting commitment to and alignment with Community Priorities and Standards*					**/5**
8. CoC Engagement and Participation	**8 points** for agency having a representative as a current member of the CoC Committee and who attended at least 75% of meetings. **If awarding points – Provide name of member and committee:**	Self-Report/ Meeting Minutes	*8 points*	*N/A*	**/8**	**/15**
	5 points for participation in one of the workgroups (refer to workgroup document) **If awarding points – Provide name of person and workgroup (refer to workgroup listing if unsure of the name of the workgroup):**	Self-Report/Confirmation with work group chair	*5 points*	*N/A*	**/5**	
	2 points for participation in the unsheltered PIT count **If awarding points – Provide name of person and municipality of count:**	Self-Report	*2 points*	*N/A*	**/2**	
Total Score Part I (*Please complete Part II on the next page for a FINAL SCORE) - 75 Points Available*						**/75**

MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness
NOFA Addendum: Program Performance Report – Part II

Agency Name:	**Program Name:**
Program Type (Component):	**McKinney-Vento Funding Amount:**
Date of Assessment:	**Completed by:**

Goals	**Performance Standard**	**Data**	**Points Available**	**%**	**Points**
9. HUD Ranking Priorities: *up to 15 points will be based on HUD Priorities as established in the relevant NOFA*		From Project Application	15 points	N/A	**/15**
10. Commitment to Policy Priorities: *up to 10 points for commitment to and alignment with HUD Policy Priorities*		From Relevant Source	10 points	*N/A*	**/10**
Total Score Part II - 25 Points Available					

Total Score Part I ***(75 points available)***	
Plus Total Score Part II (25 points available)	
FINAL Score (Sum of Total Score Part I and II) ***(100 points available)***	

Threshold

In addition to the scoring criteria, all renewal projects must meet a number of threshold criteria. A threshold review will take place prior to the review and rank process to ensure baseline requirements are met. All renewal projects must meet the following thresholds. If threshold criteria is not met, the Review and Rank Panel and the CoC Board will be notified to determine severity of non-compliance with threshold criteria and action needed. The NOFA indicates that HUD will also conduct a threshold review. Please refer to the NOFA for information on HUD's threshold review.

Check all boxes that this project is in compliance with:

- ☐ Project must have full and active HMIS participation, indicated by every HMIS user of the project completing training and/or passing the annual HMIS recertification exam (implemented in April 2015), unless the project is a victim services agency.
    - Project must participate (or agree to participate) in Coordinated Entry
    - *Per HUD contracts, contractors are required:*
        - *To use the centralized or coordinated assessment system established by the Continuum of Care as set forth in §578.7 (a) (8). A victim service provider may choose not to use the Continuum of Care's centralized or coordinated assessment system, provided that victim service providers in the area use a centralized or coordinated assessment system that meets HUD's minimum requirements and the victim service provider uses that system.*
- ☐ Project must meet applicable HUD match requirements (25% for all grant funds except leasing).
- ☐ Project must report point in time bed or unit utilization rate during the operating year (percent reported in the APR – average of four point-in-times in the APR). Low utilization must have a valid explanation as well as the plan to increase the utilization rate.
- ☐ Project must be responsive to outstanding or pending HUD program monitoring findings. If there are currently unresolved monitoring issues, the program must fully describe and explain the agency's plan to resolve them.
- ☐ Project must be able to meet the HUD threshold requirements for renewal projects (Refer to NOFA).

COC NOFA AD HOC WORK GROUP
REVIEW AND RANK PROCESS RECOMMENDATION

The Review and Rank Process that is used to review and evaluate all CoC project applications submitted in the local competition.

GENERAL PROCESS

Prior to NOFA release:

- The CoC Committee and its working groups conduct a formal needs assessment by reviewing all available data sources to determine community needs and gaps in resource portfolios.
- The CoC Committee meets, reviews, and revises the process and scoring materials.
- The CoC Committee and PSDQ make recommendations to CoC Board for review and approval.
- The CoC Committee and CoC Board review and approve a process and scoring materials, subject to necessary changes due to the NOFA.
- The Collaborative Applicant (MAG) recruits a non-conflicted Review and Rank panel. The process for recruitment and selection will be transparent to the members of the CoC. The panel should ~~(strongly recommended)~~ include at least one ~~CoC Board member (more if possible) and a~~ non-conflicted provider (ideally a provider with experience administering federal, non-CoC grants), with a focus on having a diverse Panel and some Panel consistency from year to year. CoC Board members are prohibited from serving on the panel. Panelists sign conflict of interest and confidentiality statements.
- A Collaborative Applicant representative attends Review and Rank panel meetings to act as a resource.

After the NOFA is released:

- The Collaborative Applicant will convene an emergency ad hoc group of CoC Committee members to determine how to utilize the 25 points on the score card to reflect HUD's priorities in the NOFA.
- Project applicants are invited to attend launch session; CoC Program requirements, process and timeline are explained. Deadlines are clearly outlined. Scoring tools and application materials are reviewed.
- Applications are prepared and submitted.
    - Applications received after the deadline will not be accepted.
    - Incomplete applications cannot be cured for Review Panel scoring, but must be

corrected prior to HUD submission. The original application (not the copies) will be examined to determine if all pieces of the application have been submitted.

- Collaborative Applicant finalizes Review Panel membership and prepares final information for Review Panel.
- Review Panel members are oriented to process, trained, receive applications and review materials and then over a one- to two- week period review and score applications.
- CoC staff ensures all applications pass Threshold Review (additional detail below).
- Review Panel members meet to jointly discuss each application and conduct short, voluntary interviews with applicants either in person, by phone, or video conference. The purpose of the in-person interviews is to: 1) have questions answered about projects and/or applications; 2) provide feedback to applicants on ways to strengthen their application; 3) review applicant's and committee's scoring sheets to ensure consistency.
    - Renewal projects that score less than 50% of total points will be flagged for review. The Review Panel will recommend that such projects be reallocated in favor of a new project that is aligned with HUD's priorities. (Insert HUD-eligible project language for the year).
    - The Review Panel may recommend that projects with consistently low scores, fewer than 50% of total points, should be considered for reallocation in favor of a new project aligned with HUD's priorities.
    - If a transitional housing project voluntarily reallocates its funding and submits a new project application to use those funds for permanent housing, the funds shall be awarded to that project provided that the application is at least comparable in quality to other applications of the same component type.
- Projects are given feedback from Panel on quality of application and ways to strengthen the application before submission to HUD.
- Renewal HMIS Projects undergo a threshold review and project evaluation by the Performance Standards and Data Quality (PSDQ) Group. The PSDQ Group will provide feedback to the Review and Rank panel on their evaluation of the HMIS project.
- Applications for CoC Planning funds are reviewed by the Review and Rank Panel.
- Scoring results are delivered to applicants with a reminder of the appeals process. Only projects receiving less funding than they applied for or that are placed in Tier II may appeal, and only on the basis of fact. Any projects eligible to appeal will receive a complete breakdown of scores awarded for each factor as well as a complete list of the recommended project ranks and scores. A non-conflicted work group of the CoC Board will hear appeals. To provide information and support, MAG staff and one member of the original Review Panel will attend the appeals panel to provide information but will not be members of the appeals panel or have a vote.
- Appellate hearings, if any.
- Emergency Procedure: MAG staff will do everything possible to ensure that an

application is submitted to HUD for all funds possibly available to the community. Therefore, if/when all on-time applications have been submitted and it appears that the community is not requesting as much money as is available from HUD, then the CoC staff may solicit additional applications. In addition, if, after the Review Panel has reviewed applications and made priority determinations, an applicant decides not to submit their application to HUD, MAG staff will do everything possible to submit applications for the full available amount, with projects representing HUD priorities.

- In addition to the numeric scores, the Ranking and Review panel will consider qualitative factors such as subpopulation needs, improvement plans, project performance, and potential impact to the community's system of care when generating recommendations for the CoC Board.
- The Ranking and Review panel will present multiple options to the CoC Board in a public meeting and will articulate the potential pros, cons, and impact of each recommendation. The meeting will be scheduled to allow for explanation, questions, and meaningful dialogue between the members of the Ranking and Review panel and the CoC Board.
- The CoC Board will consider/approve rank order of new projects and submission of renewals.
- Consolidated Application is made available to community for inspection on MAG's website.
- Consolidated Application is submitted to HUD.
- Stakeholders are advised that the application has been submitted.
- Projects have opportunity to debrief scores with CoC staff. All projects are welcome to request a debriefing and receive a complete breakdown of their scores within 30 days.
- 2015 Process Debriefing.

APPEALS PROCESS

The Review and Rank Committee reviews all applications and ranks them for funding recommendations to HUD. That ranking decision is communicated to all applicants by email within 24 hours of the determination. All applicants are hereby directed to contact Anne Scott at (602) 254-6300 (ascott@azmag.gov) if no email notice is received.

1. Who May Appeal

An agency may appeal an "appealable ranking decision," defined in the next paragraph, made by the Review and Rank Committee concerning a project application submitted by that agency. If the project was submitted by a collaboration of agencies, only one joint appeal may be made.

2. What May Be Appealed

"An appealable ranking decision" is a decision by the Review and Rank Committee that (a) reduces the budget to a lower amount than applied for, (b) ranks the project in Tier 2, or (c) recommends the project for reallocation.

3. Timing

The ranking decision is communicated to all applicants within 15 days of the NOFA due date. Applicants have until 12:00 p.m. on the day after the CoC Board funding decision to decide if they are going to appeal and contact Anne Scott at (602) 254-6300 (ascott@azmag.gov) for more information, with a formal written appeal (no longer than 2 pages). If an appeal will be filed, other agencies whose rank may be affected will be notified

as a courtesy. Such agencies will not be able to file an appeal after the appeals process is complete. They may file an appeal within the original appeals timeline.

4. Initiating the Formal Appeal
The Formal Appeal must be submitted by 12:00 p.m. the day after the CoC Board funding decision. The appeal document must consist of a short, written (no longer than 2 pages) statement of the agency's appeal of the Review and Rank Committee's decision. The statement can be in the form of a letter, a memo, or an email transmittal.

The appeal must be transmitted by email to Anne Scott (ascott@azmag.gov).

5. Members of the Appeal Panel
A three-member Appeals Panel will be selected from the CoC Board or its designees. These individuals have no conflict of interest in serving, as defined by the existing Review and Rank Committee conflict of interest rules. Voting members of the Appeal Panel shall not serve simultaneously on the Review and Rank; however, a Review and Rank Panel member and a MAG staff person will participate in the Appeals Panel to inform discussion.

6. The Appeal Process, Including Involvement of Other Affected Agencies
The Appeal Panel will conduct an in person or telephone meeting with a representative(s) of the agency/collaborative who filed the appeal to discuss it, if needed. The Panel then will deliberate. The Appeal Panel will inform appealing agencies of its decision.

The CoC Board or its designee will approve the final project list for submission. The decision of the CoC Board will be final.

Reallocation
It is possible that funds will be reallocated from projects that will not receive renewal funding, or who's funding will be reduced. This is a recommendation made by the Review and Rank Panel, and approved by the Board, and will be based on HUD priorities and CoC Board funding priorities. When considering reallocation, the Review and Rank Panel will:

- Consider unspent funds and the ability to cut grants without cutting service/housing levels
    - Panel members will receive guidance about the limitations related to spending CoC funds.
    - For projects receiving leasing or rental assistance, information about unspent funds will be presented together with information about agency capacity (serving the number of people the project is designed to serve).
- Consider history of reductions (e.g., if grant reduced one year, will not be apparent in spending the following year)
- Consider alternative funding sources available to support either new or renewal project(s) at-risk of not being funding
- Consider renewal HUD "covenant" concerns

- Consider impact on consolidated application's score
- Consider impact on the community in light of community needs
- Consider non-compliance issues identified during the Review and Rank process or project monitoring
- Consider projects with consistently low scores

The impact of this policy is that high scoring projects may be reallocated if these considerations warrant that decision. In addition, if a project receives less than 50% of total points, then the Panel should strongly consider reallocation of funding.

Threshold

In addition to the scoring criteria, all renewal projects must meet a number of threshold criteria. A threshold review will take place prior to the review and rank process to ensure baseline requirements are met. All renewal projects must meet the following thresholds. If threshold criteria is not met, the Review and Rank Panel and the CoC Board will be notified to determine severity of non-compliance with threshold criteria and action needed:

- Project must have full and active HMIS participation, indicated by every HMIS user of the project completing training and/or passing the annual HMIS recertification exam (implemented in April 2015), unless the project is a victim services agency.
- Project must participate (or agree to participate) in Coordinated Entry (to the capacity the Coordinated Entry system is built out in the community)
    - *Per HUD contracts, contractors are required:*
      To use the centralized or coordinated assessment system established by the Continuum of Care as set forth in §578.7 (a) (8). A victim service provider may choose not to use the Continuum of Care's centralized or coordinated assessment system, provided that victim service providers in the area use a centralized or coordinated assessment system that meets HUD's minimum requirements and the victim service provider uses that system.
- Project must meet applicable HUD match requirements (25% for all grant funds except leasing).
- Project must report point in time bed or unit utilization rate during the operating year (percent reported in the APR – average of four point-in-times in the APR). Low utilization must have a valid explanation as well as the plan to increase the utilization rate.
- Project must be responsive to outstanding or pending HUD program monitoring findings. If there are currently unresolved monitoring issues, the program must fully describe and explains the agency's plan to resolve them.
- Project must be able to meet the HUD threshold requirements for renewal projects including that there are none of the following:
    - Outstanding obligation to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon;

- Audit finding(s) for which a response is overdue or unsatisfactory;
- History of inadequate financial management accounting practices;
- Evidence of untimely expenditures on prior award;
- History of other major capacity issues that have significantly impacted the operation of the project and its performance;
- History of not reimbursing subrecipients for eligible costs in a timely manner, or at least quarterly;
- History of serving ineligible persons, expending funds on ineligible costs, or failing to expend funds within statutorily established time frames.
- History of non-compliance with HUD CoC Program funding requirements, defined in the HEARTH Act and/or NOFA.
- Program components and project types must meet HUD funding contracts and program regulations, refer to HUD's HEARTH Act and/or HUD's SHP Desk Guide for guidance on project regulations.

Recommendation to CoC Board
PSDQ Roles and Responsibilities
December, 2015
DRAFT

OBJECTIVES

Oversee creation of system-wide performance measures reports based on direction of the CoC Board and Committee community wide performance standards and targets.

Collaborate with CoC stakeholders to create and implement a comprehensive data share plan.

Conduct analysis of data and perform research as needed and per the direction of the CoC Board and Committee.

HMIS Action Plan:

- Oversee implementation of HMIS Action Plan.

Performance Measurement:

- Oversee creation of system-wide performance measures reports based on direction of the CoC Board and Committee community wide performance standards and targets.
- Work with HMIS lead agency to develop metrics for program management and HEARTH performance monitoring. Advise HMIS lead agency on the creation of HMIS 'dashboard' report generation of agreed upon metrics.

Data Sharing:

- Develop system-wide data sharing policy and implementation plan for CoC in collaboration with Committee and HMIS Lead Agency.

Budget:

- Advise HMIS Lead Agency on scope of project budget to ensure the project has the resources and capacity needed to meet community needs.
- Provide project resource development support.

Policies and Procedures (P&Ps):

- Propose/recommend P&Ps for CoC Board adoption (project management, end user requirements, data sharing, privacy, security, data uses and disclosures).
- Advise HMIS Lead Agency on system-wide change recommendations (e.g. implementation of Coordinated Entry

processes as related to HMIS, dashboard creation for community-wide reports, and others as needed).

- Establish a grievance process for project and client data as related to HMIS policies, data sharing, performance measures, HMIS Lead Agency or other relevant issues.

Lead Agency Evaluation:

- Establish evaluation plan and tools for the evaluation of the HMIS lead agency performance.
- Assess the technical capabilities of the current Maricopa HMIS database structure and make recommendations on the usability of ServicePoint based on the assessment (HUD approved technical assistance).
- Develop and recommend, for CoC Board adoption, a communication plan and strategy to increase awareness of CoC approved data (public release of PIT, census, system-wide performance measures, ad hoc reports, etc.).

Analysis and Research:

- Conduct or procure analysis of data and perform research as needed and per the direction of the CoC Board and Committee, as PSDQ skill level allows.

Governance and Compliance:

- Ensure HMIS Lead Agency is compliant with HUD, State, and local legislative requirements and policy directives.
- Assess, document, and communicate the HMIS lead's roles, responsibilities and performance expectations to the Board.
- Clearly define management, oversight, governance role in relation to CoC Board and HMIS Lead Agency.
- Determine what functions HMIS can play in supporting the CoC's Coordinated Entry System design (intake, assessment, client-to-housing matching, managing referral process, managing prioritization order, tracking status of housing placements, etc.) in collaboration with the Coordinated Entry Oversight Work Group (CEOWG), Committee and Board