Meeting Minutes

Continuum of Care Steering Committee
Tuesday, March 17, 2009
11:30 am – 2:30 pm
Community Shelter Board

Attendees

Steering Committee Members

Present:
Adam Ruege, Veterans Administration
Barbara Poppe, Community Shelter Board
Beth Fetzer-Rice, Salvation Army, CCH
Colleen Bain Gold, NCR, CCH
Dave Simmons, Citizens Advisory Council
Don Strasser, CCH
Doris Toland, Twin Valley Behavioral Healthcare
Emily Savors, The Columbus Foundation
Gloria Kilgore, Citizens Advisory Council
James Ragland, City of Columbus
Joe McKinley, United Way of Central Ohio
Kim Stands, City of Columbus
Mark Paxson, Franklin County (for Jim Schimmer)
Nina Lewis, Columbus Public Health
Ronald Baecker, Citizens Advisory Council
Sheila Prillerman, Citizens Advisory Council
Susan Lewis Kaylor, ADAMH Board
Ted Jones, Corporation for Supportive Housing
Tom Dobies, CMHA
Mike Tynan, CHN, CCH (for Virginia O'Keeffe)

Absent:
Michelle Morgan, FCDJFS
Douglas Lay, Veterans Service Commission
Emily Crabtree, Legal Aid Society
Karen Kerns-Dresser, Ohio Capital Corp. for Housing

Community Shelter Board Staff
Leslie Gant
Lianna Barbu
Subha Lembach
Tiffany Nobles

Guests
Adwoa Agyei-Gyampo, Columbus Public Health
Anthony Penn, Community Housing Network
Carrie Mularz, Huckleberry House
Kathy Neal-Sourelis, YWCA
Lori Criss, Amethyst, Inc.
Meredith White, CATF
Elaine Haines, ADAMH
Shannon Easter, Faith Mission
Michelle Dragomir, Huckleberry House

Introductions & Opening Comments
Barbara welcomed the group and provided an overview of the process used to get us to the proposed documents for consideration today. She explained that input from providers, Columbus Coalition for the Homeless, key funders and the CAC was included in the development of these proposals. Barbara further explained that the intents of the streamlined process are to (1) leverage Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative (RLFC) role in the new RL Plan, (2) meets HUD requirements, (3) reduce time commitments for volunteers on the CoC Steering Committee (CoC SC), (4) be fair to consumers, providers and community representatives, (4) reduce administrative burden and costs to providers and CSB, and (5) maximize funds from ODOD and HUD.

Barbara explained that we need to achieve clarity and make decisions using active listening and respect in our discussions. She explained that a Decision Council with Majority Decision confirmation would be the decision making process used during today's meeting. Barbara also reminded the group that CSB only votes in the case of a tie vote.

It was noted that Tiffany would amend all documents online during the meeting so that we had finalized documents at the end of the meeting.

Agenda Review & Approval
The group reviewed the agenda. It was noted that the minutes from the November 18 meeting were issued previously.

Motion: Sheila moved and Mark seconded to approve the agenda as proposed.

Amendment to Motion: Mike recommended amending the agenda by moving the approval of the FY10 Performance Standards to a separate meeting if time did not allow for sufficient discussion. There was unanimous support on voting on amended motion.

Vote on Amended Agenda: Unanimous approval. No abstentions.

Proposed CoC Process
Barbara presented the proposed CoC Process.

Motion: Ron moved and Susan seconded to adopt the CoC Process as proposed.

Clarifying Questions:
1. Colleen asked if the new PSH project process was requested by OHFA. It was noted that the new PSH projects must be approved by the RLFC and the CoC SC if they are to be considered for the Samaritan Bonus in the HUD application. OHFA does consider local priorities in its decision-making process. A joint committee representing the two groups is used to develop recommendations for consideration by the full RLFC and CoC SC.
2. Nina asked is Pater Noster House (PNH) was included in the one-on-one meetings with CSB. It was noted that the meetings are optional. PNH was invited to participate but a response had not yet been received.
3. Don suggested that a proposal be made to the RLFC to include consumers and providers in its membership. It was noted that a proposal could be taken to the RLFC for consideration.
4. Question asked about the CoC's achievement of HUD requirements. It was noted that we believe we achieve them but we want to ensure this continues.

Amendment to CoC Process: Kim suggested amending statement "meet minimum HUD requirements" to reflect "meet or exceed minimum HUD requirements". There was unanimous support on amending document before adoption vote.

Vote on Amended CoC Process: Unanimous approval. No abstentions.

CoC Policy Statements
Barbara presented the proposed CoC Policy Statements.

Clarifying Questions:
Question asked about RLFC membership on HUD Technical Review Committee (HUD TRC) and ODOD Technical Review Committee (ODOD TRC). It was noted that this would be considered at the next RLFC meeting May.

Clarification made that Steering Committee members representing provider agencies who receive HUD funding could participate on the HUD TRC if they do not have a program under consideration by the HUD TRC.

Amendments to CoC Policy Statements:
Mike moved that the membership of the CoC SC be amended to include one K-12 education representative which would increase the total membership to 25. Specific suggestion made to include Project Connect (PC). There was a unanimous decision to not include this amendment.

Kim moved to amend the CoC SC membership to state "a total of 24 members (to be increased to 25 should Project Connect agree to participate) shall be annually approved for participation." Suggestion made to assess PC interest in participation before adding them to membership list. Suggestion made to footnote PC in the Policy Statements to outline what it is. There was a unanimous decision to amend CoC Policy Statements to reflect change.

Additional Clarifying Questions: Question asked about "request a waiver from compliance with specific program performance standards." It was noted that this is current practice (i.e. Amethyst submitted a request for consideration of exception regarding program occupancy).

Motion: Sheila moved and Ron seconded to adopt CoC Policy Statements as amended.

Vote on Amended Policy Statements: Unanimous approval. No abstentions.

Annual Plan Matrix
Tiffany presented the proposed Annual Plan Matrix.

Motion: Ron moved and Dave seconded to adopt the Annual Plan Matrix as proposed.

Clarifying Questions: There was clarification made around process for HUD TRC making recommendations on new PSH projects. The process assumes that there will continue to be a Samaritan Bonus available for a new project to be considered. It was noted that VOAGO Edgehill Place is slated for 2009 and CHN Inglewood Court is slated for 2010.

Amendments to Motion or Annual Plan Matrix: None.

Vote on Motion: Unanimous approval. No abstentions.

FY10 Performance Standards

Group considered Mike's suggested amendment to the agenda regarding sufficient time for discussion and consideration of the FY10 Performance Standards. There was unanimous agreement that there was adequate time to discuss and consider.

Lianna outlined the FY09 Performance Standards that were approved by the CoC SC in June 2008 and issued as a handout today. She then presented the proposed FY10 Performance Standards.

Motion: Ted moved and Emily S. seconded to adopt the FY10 Performance Standards as proposed.

Amendment to FY10 Performance Standards:
Kim moved to amend "turnover rate" to state "Some level of turnover is acceptable" as opposed to "an annual 20% turnover rate is desirable." Consensus was not achieved on approval of the amendment.

Clarification was made that non-CSB funded agencies would not be in breach of contract if those standards that are monitored but not evaluated are not met.

Clarification made that including standards that are monitored but not evaluated for all programs eliminates the administrative burden for CSB to produce reports on these standards outside of the original reporting schedule.

Ron moved and Sheila seconded to amend "turnover rate" to state "some level of turnover is anticipated." Consensus was achieved on approval of the amendment.

Clarification made that QII process can be triggered at the time of the 6-month evaluation period unless a significant program and/or systemic issue occurs.

Colleen moved to amend the title of the document to reflect "Program Performance Standards and Reporting." Consensus was achieved on approval of the amendment.

Mike moved to amend Interim Housing Stability percentage to reflect 75% instead of 82%. It was noted that the 82% reflects what was reported in Exhibit 1. Consensus was not achieved on approval of the amendment.

Ted moved to amend Interim Housing Stability percentage to reflect 81% - which was achieved the previous year. Consensus was achieved on approval of amendment.

Clarification was made that data would be pulled from CSP not the APRs.

Amended Motion: Sheila moved and Dave seconded to approve the FY10 Performance Standards as amended.

Vote on Amended Motion: Unanimous approval. No abstentions.

Membership Question Regarding Provider Representation
Barbara presented the proposed options regarding provider representation on the CoC SC.

Motion: Colleen moved and Mike seconded that the CoC SC adopt option #2 - Add two (2) supportive housing providers (all SHP and/or S+C recipients are eligible) in addition to four (4) CCH-selected providers for a total of six (6) provider representatives.

Clarification was made that whatever option was adopted the resulting changes to the membership would be made to the CoC Process and Policy Statements to accurately reflect the CoC SC membership.

Suggestion made that we ensure that there is diversity in provider representation.

Clarification made that supportive housing providers would only need to be CoC-funded not necessarily Columbus Coalition for the Homeless members.

Amendments to Option #2 or Motion: None.

Vote on Motion: Unanimous approval. No abstentions.

NEXT MEETING: To Be Determined – will be announced under separate correspondence.

Columbus & Franklin County
2009 Continuum of Care Process

Overview
The Columbus & Franklin County Continuum of Care (CoC) Steering Committee annually prioritizes $8-9 million in funding from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for local homeless housing projects[1]. In addition, the CoC Steering Committee certifies community programs applying for funding through the annual Ohio Department of Development[2] (ODOD) application process.

In an era of increasingly constrained resources, the Community Shelter Board (CSB) proposes the CoC processes be streamlined to:
1. meet or exceed minimum HUD requirements;
2. reduce administrative burden and costs for provider agencies and CSB;
3. reduce time commitments of volunteers serving the CoC;
4. leverage the Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative's expanded role to oversee the now comprehensive community plan to address homelessness (Rebuilding Lives Plan); and
5. continue to receive the maximum funding possible for homeless assistance programs from HUD and the State of Ohio.

The proposed changes assume that HUD[3] and ODOD[4] requirements are consistent with those of 2008. The proposed changes are also consistent with the Rebuilding Lives plan which called for increased streamlining of processes.

Purpose of the Continuum of Care Steering Committee (CoC SC)
The work of the Steering Committee should be revised and categorized into four (4) areas described below.
- Establish annual plan and policies
- Monitor programs which receive HUD funding
- Oversee activities required for annual HUD application and approve submission
- Provide certification for programs applying for ODOD funding[5]

The Committee structure should be revised to include two standing committees. Membership for these committees should be reviewed and updated annually.
- **HUD Technical Review Committee** (HUD TRC)
- **ODOD Technical Review Committee** (ODOD TRC)

---

[1] All HUD funded projects are supportive housing. Prevention, outreach, and emergency shelter programs cannot receive HUD Supportive Housing Program (SHP) or Shelter Plus Care (SPC) funding.

[2] ODOD homeless assistance funding is for a broad array of programs, including, prevention (mediation, eviction prevention, mortgage foreclosure prevention, housing counseling), emergency shelter, direct housing, and supportive housing.

[3] At this time, it is not known whether the new administration will substantially revise the HUD Homeless funding requirements. If there are significant changes, it will be necessary to review and consider what changes would need to be implemented to conform to HUD requirements.

[4] ODOD is reviewing its requirement for local Continuum of Care certification. Clarification is expected at the time ODOD issues its NOFA.

[5] If ODOD requires CoC certification.

For 2009, CSB recommends that the Steering Committee meet four times:

Timeframe	Purpose
March	Review and consider CSB process recommendations Review, modify, and adopt 2009 annual plan & policies
After HUD NOFA issued	Review and approve Exhibit 1
After ODOD NOFA issued	Review and approve ODOD certifications
December	Evaluate new process and recommend changes for 2010

CoC SC Membership

The CoC SC should continue to have organizational members in order to meet HUD requirements (26 members).

Category	Entity	# Seats
Consumers	• Citizens Advisory Council	4
Local Government	• City of Columbus Administration • Columbus City Council • Franklin County Commissioners • Franklin County Job & Family Services	4
Providers	• Columbus Coalition for the Homeless	4
	• Supportive Housing Operators/Developers	2
Health Care	• ADAMH • Columbus Public Health • Twin Valley Behavioral Health Care	3
Housing	• CMHA • Corporation for Supportive Housing • Ohio Capital Corporation for Housing	3
Veterans	• Veterans Services Commission • VA Outpatient Clinic	2
Philanthropy	• The Columbus Foundation • United Way of Central Ohio	2
Legal Services	• Columbus Legal Aid	1
Homeless Services Planning	• Community Shelter Board	1
	Total members	26

Annual Plan & Policies
The CoC SC should meet annually to review and approve its annual plan and policies which will govern the work of the Steering Committee. Among the topics considered will be:
- ⟨ Membership of committees
- ⟨ Program performance standards
- ⟨ Point In Time Count plan
- ⟨ Columbus ServicePoint implementation

Ongoing Program Monitoring & Evaluation
The CoC SC will receive CSB's monthly Communiqué for updates on public policy, projects, programs and Columbus ServicePoint. [current practice]

CSB will produce monthly occupancy reports; quarterly, semi-annual and annual System & Program Indicator Reports (SPIR); and the annual Program and System Evaluation. These reports will be issued to the CoC SC and providers electronically and will be posted on www.csb.org [current practice]. CSB will also review HUD Annual Progress Reports from agencies [current practice]. Ongoing concerns about program performance revealed through these reports will be addressed through the QI Process described below. [new]

Programs of ongoing concern will be handled by CSB through a **Quality Improvement Intervention** (QII) process [new]. This process has been used successfully with CSB-funded programs. It is based on quarterly one-on-one dialogues between CSB and the provider agency and considers agency plans and progress on addressing program issues. CSB and a provider agency enter into quarterly QII if a program experiences long-standing and/or serious program issues and/or systemic agency concerns. If the agency and/or CSB find that the QII process is not working, either may refer the concerns/issues to the HUD Technical Review Committee (HUD TRC) for handling. The provider will be given an opportunity to present its case to the HUD TRC before it makes its recommendation to the Steering Committee. This process would eliminate special reports and presentations to the Steering Committee by the provider.

Annual HUD application Process
The CoC SC will meet annually to review and approve Exhibit 1 including all relevant charts and tables and the Housing Inventory Chart. The Community Shelter Board will coordinate the applicant submission of Exhibit 2s, prepare Exhibit 1 and submit the consolidated application on behalf of the CoC.

Projects will generally be renewed annually on a non-competitive basis [new]. Programs that are consistently poor performers will be considered by the HUD TRC for phase-out if QII does not result in improved performance; the final decision to phase-out a program will rest with the Steering Committee.

Annually, the **HUD Technical Review Committee** (HUD TRC)[6] will review new projects and make recommendations to the full Steering Committee for its consideration, action and inclusion in the consolidated HUD application [current practice]. The HUD TRC will also establish the new

---

[6] The HUD TRC will not need to meet in 2009 as the 2009 Samaritan Bonus project was determined in 2008. All currently funded HUD SHP/SPC projects will be non-competitively renewed. In 2010, HUD TRC may need to meet only if any HUD SHP/SPC projects are referred for phase out or fund reduction. It will not need to meet to consider a new project as the 2010 Samaritan Bonus project was determined in 2008.

permanent supportive housing (PSH) priority for consideration by the Ohio Housing Finance Agency [current practice as part of the OHFA/HUD prioritization committee]. As part of the process, new projects will be presented to the CoC provider group and the CAC. Both groups will provide recommendations to the HUD TRC prior to its decision. [current practice] The project developer will also be asked to make a presentation to the HUD TRC to respond to questions about its proposal [current practice as part of the OHFA/HUD prioritization committee].

As needed, the HUD TRC will also review referral of existing projects which CSB and/or the provider agency believes should be considered for phase-out or funding reduction (if permissible by HUD) [current practice]. Only projects which have not addressed long-standing, serious administrative and/or program performance issues will be considered for phase-out.

The HUD TRC will <u>not</u> conduct annual reviews and site visits of existing programs [new]. The "Local Supplement" will no longer be required.

The HUD TRC will be a joint committee comprised of three CoC Steering Committee representatives (at least one must be a provider), two Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative (RLFC) representatives, and two Citizens Advisory Council representatives. One of the RLFC representatives will serve as chair and the CSB Program Manager Adult Services will staff the committee. CoC Steering Committee members representing provider agencies who receive HUD funding may participate on the committee, if they do not have program(s) under consideration by the HUD TRC.

Annual ODOD Application Process

To fulfill its obligation to the ODOD Application Process, an **ODOD Technical Review Committee** (ODOD TRC) will annually review applications and make recommendations regarding certification to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will consider and act on these recommendations. The ODOD TRC will be a joint committee comprised of three CoC Steering Committee representatives (at least one must be a provider), two Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative representatives and two Citizens Advisory Council representatives. One of the CoC Steering Committee representatives will serve as chair and the CoC Coordinator (CSB Program Administrator) will staff the committee.

Pending clarification from ODOD on the intent and requirements of local certification, the ODOD TRC should streamline and reduce the materials required from providers in order to be certified.

Provider programs which receive HUD funding will continue to be expected to:
1. Submit an annual program outcome plan in line with HUD and CoC requirements and update program descriptions through CSB annual contracting process.
2. Submit Exhibit 2 per HUD timeline and instructions.
3. Submit required data through Columbus ServicePoint.
4. Meet relevant program standards and achieve program outcome goals.
5. Submit copy of HUD APR to CSB (rather than submit concurrent with Exhibit 2, providers will be expected to submit it concurrent with APR submission to HUD).

Provider programs will no longer be required to:
1. Prepare and submit local supplement as part of the HUD application timeline.
2. Participate in the annual Provider/CAC review process.
3. Submit semi-annual reports on compliance with conditions and progress on challenges.

Role of the Community Shelter Board (CSB)

CSB will continue to support the CoC process and activities:

1. Coordinate activities related to preparation and submission of the annual HUD application; including the HUD mandated Point-In-Time count and assisting providers to prepare Exhibit 2 applications.
2. Maintain the community's HMIS – Columbus ServicePoint – in compliance with HUD standards
   - Administrator meetings
   - User training
   - System implementation and maintenance
   - On-site monitoring
   - Technical assistance to agencies
   - Standard report templates
   - Support for custom reporting
3. Provide meeting support for committees and distribute materials in advance of meetings.
4. Support the Citizen's Advisory Council
5. Organize and implement communications and consistently post materials to www.csb.org
6. Organize and implement system and program monitoring and evaluation activities
   - Annual evaluation
   - Quarterly & annual indicator reports
   - Monthly occupancy reports
7. Serve as liaison to HUD and ODOD
8. Assist providers, as requested
9. Raise funds to support CoC process and activities
10. Be open to community, consumer, and provider suggestions to improve the process.

CSB will continue to provide QI support to its funded agencies that also receive HUD funding and expand this service to non-funded agencies (Amethyst, CATF and Huckleberry House). This includes:
   - Spring one-on-one discussions on agency's proposed plans for upcoming year
   - Fall one-on-one dialogue to seek agency input on CSB's work
   - Follow-up on issues of potential concern, e.g. low occupancy, leadership changes, etc.
   - Intentional QII meetings on issues of ongoing concern, e.g. low performer on annual evaluation, persistent low occupancy, non-compliance with standards, etc.

Time and Cost Savings

CSB expects that these changes will reduce volunteer time from two-hour monthly meetings to three to four meetings per year that occur at times relevant to the activity. Additionally, TRC members will not need to review and score three-five renewal applications, attend the evaluation training briefing, and participate in a day long annual application review meeting. For the typical volunteer this should reduce the annual time commitment by 30 hours.

CSB expects that its staff time to support the Steering Committee processes will be reduced significantly. Other costs related to providing meeting food/beverage and consultant support will be reduced.

Since there will no longer be site visits as part of the HUD application process, CSB will save costs on consultants to conduct the site visits and facilitate meetings. In addition, TRC members will not need to participate in the site visits and provider programs will not have to prepare for the visits.

CSB estimates that providers will save annually at least 12-16 hours per CoC program in preparing materials, reports, etc. As agencies also generally attend Steering Committee meetings, they should also realize a time savings of 12-14 hours for meeting attendance.

Coordination with the Rebuilding Lives Plan
In accordance with the Rebuilding Lives Plan, new strategies to address homelessness are overseen by the Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative. For more about the plan and strategies go to www.csb.org.

Columbus & Franklin County Continuum of Care Steering Committee Policy Statements

Overview

The purpose of the Continuum of Care Steering Committee (CoC SC) is to submit an annual application to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for local homeless housing projects[1] and to evaluate ongoing progress in meeting CoC goals. In addition, the CoC SC certifies community programs applying for funding through the annual Ohio Department of Development[2] (ODOD) application process.

The policy statements below govern the work of the CoC SC. The policies are organized into different areas and are intentionally global in scope. The CoC SC will meet annually to review and approve its annual plan and policies.

The categories are:

- Structure
- HUD Mandated Activities
- Provider Activities
- Other Activities

Structure

1. **Steering Committee Membership**
   The CoC SC membership will comport with HUD requirements. The categories of membership are consumers (4), local government (4), providers (6), health care (3), housing (3), veterans (2), philanthropy (2), legal services (1), and homeless services planning (1). A total of 24 members (to be increased to 25 should Project Connect agree to participate) shall be annually approved for participation. Regular attendance is expected. The CSB executive director shall chair the Steering Committee.

2. **Conflict of Interest**
   Any individual participating in or influencing Steering Committee decision making must identify actual or perceived conflicts of interest as they arise and comply with the letter and spirit of this policy. Disclosure should occur at the earliest possible time and if possible, <u>prior</u> to the discussion of any such issue. Individuals with a conflict of interest should abstain from voting on any issue in which they may have a conflict. An individual with a conflict of interest who is the committee chair, shall yield that position during discussion and abstain from voting on the item.

   Annual written disclosure statements will be provided by each committee member by January 31. Members will not be permitted to participate until the statement is on file at CSB.

---

[1] All HUD funded projects are supportive housing. Prevention, outreach, and emergency shelter programs cannot receive HUD Supportive Housing Program (SHP) or Shelter Plus Care (SPC) funding.

[2] ODOD homeless assistance funding is for a broad array of programs, including, prevention (mediation, eviction prevention, mortgage foreclosure prevention, housing counseling), emergency shelter, direct housing, and supportive housing.

3. **HUD Technical Review Committee**
Annually, the HUD Technical Review Committee (HUD TRC)[3] will review new projects and make recommendations to the full Steering Committee for its consideration, action and inclusion in the consolidated HUD application. The HUD TRC will also establish the new permanent supportive housing (PSH) priority for consideration by the Ohio Housing Finance Agency. As part of the process, new projects will be presented to the CoC provider group and the CAC. Both groups will provide recommendations to the HUD TRC prior to its decision. The project developer will also be asked to make a presentation to the HUD TRC to respond to questions about its proposal.

The HUD TRC will be a joint committee comprised of three CoC SC representatives (at least one must be a provider), two Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative (RLFC) representatives, and two Citizens Advisory Council representatives. One of the RLFC representatives will serve as chair. Steering Committee members representing provider agencies who receive HUD funding may participate on the committee, if they do not have program under consideration by the HUD TRC. CSB will provide staff support for the committee.

The HUD TRC will also review ongoing projects that have participated in QII at the request of the provider and/or CSB. The Steering Committee will act on recommendations from the HUD TRC.

4. **Citizens Advisory Council (CAC)**
The CoC SC values input and participation by the CAC in all processes. These shall include:
〈 Designated seats on all committees.
〈 The opportunity to review and comment on new projects prior to HUD TRC review.
〈 The opportunity to review and comment on CoC annual plan, policies, and program standards.

HUD Mandated Activities
5. **Columbus ServicePoint Implementation**
CSB will maintain the community's Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) – Columbus ServicePoint – in compliance with HUD standards and coordinate all related activities including training, maintenance and technical assistance to agencies. Each participating agency will be expected to participate in the CSP Administrators Group which oversees CSP operations. CSB will publish policies and procedures for CSP management. Annually, CSB will conduct an anonymous Administrator/User survey and provide the results of that survey to the CoC SC.

6. **Point in Time Count Plan**
Consistent with HUD requirements and in concert with the Ohio Count, an annual Point In Time Count will be conducted. Participation in the Homeless Count Work Group will be open to all interested. The Steering Committee will review and approve the Point in Time Count Plan annually and empower CSB to lead coordination efforts to conduct the count.

---

[3] The HUD TRC will not need to meet in 2009 as the 2009 Samaritan Bonus project was determined in 2008. All currently funded HUD SHP/SPC projects will be non-competitively renewed. In 2010, HUD TRC may need to meet only if any HUD SHP/SPC projects are referred for phase out or fund reduction. It will not need to meet to consider a new project as the 2010 Samaritan Bonus project was determined in 2008.

7. **HUD Application Process**
   The CoC SC will meet annually to review and act on Exhibit 1 including all relevant charts and tables and the Housing Inventory Chart. The Community Shelter Board will coordinate the applicant submission of Exhibit 2s, prepare Exhibit 1 and submit the consolidated application on behalf of the CoC.

Provider Activities

8. **Provider Input**
   The CoC SC values input and participation by the HUD providers in all processes. These shall include:
   〈   Designated seats on all committees.
   〈   The opportunity to review and comment on new projects prior to HUD TRC review.
   〈   The opportunity to review and comment on CoC annual plan, policies, and program standards.

9. **Provider Program Requirements and Rights**
   The Steering Committee expects that Providers will meet requirements to receive HUD Funding and intends to treat all providers fairly.

   Requirements:
   〈   Meet relevant program and HUD standards and achieve program outcome goals.
   〈   Submit an annual program outcome plan in line with HUD and CoC requirements and update program descriptions through the annual CSB Gateway process.
   〈   Submit Exhibit 2 per HUD timeline.
   〈   Submit required data through Columbus ServicePoint.
   〈   Submit a copy of HUD APR to CSB concurrent with submission to HUD.

   Rights:
   〈   Participate in Quality Improvement Intervention (QII) prior to HUD funds being reduced or eliminated by the Steering Committee.
   〈   Appeal to the Steering Committee if it disagrees with a recommendation by the HUD TRC or the ODOD TRC.
   〈   Request a waiver from compliance with specific program performance standards.

10. **Program Performance Standards**
    Program performance standards will be established by the CoC SC and incorporate HUD requirements and local standards. The Community Shelter Board will incorporate these standards into annual program agreements with each provider agency. An annual Program Outcome Plan (POP) will be part of the agreement. If CSB and the agency disagree on the annual POP, the agency may appeal to the CoC SC (if not CSB-funded) or CSB Board Chair (if CSB-funded). CSB will monitor program performance and provide monthly, quarterly, semi-annual and annual data reports. Program performance standards will be reviewed annually by the Steering Committee.

11. **Quality Improvement Intervention**
    CSB will address programs of ongoing concern through a Quality Improvement Intervention (QII) process. The QII process is based on quarterly one-on-one dialogues between CSB and the provider agency and considers agency plans and progress on addressing program issues. CSB and provider agency enter into quarterly QII if a program experiences long-standing

and/or serious program issues and/or systemic agency concerns. If the agency and/or CSB find that the QII process is not working, either may refer the concerns/issues to the HUD Technical Review Committee (HUD TRC) for handling. The provider will be given an opportunity to present its case to the HUD TRC before it makes its recommendation to the Steering Committee.

12. **Letter of Support and Certification**

Programs and services which meet the needs of homeless families and individuals in Franklin County, Ohio are eligible to request letters of support or certification from the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will only provide letters of support or certification to agencies which have a record of providing quality services to persons who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, and for projects that are consistent with the local priorities established by the CoC. New agencies must demonstrate the ability to provide high quality services. Projects may receive letters of support or certification if they:

⟨ Document the need for the program;
⟨ Provide a clearly defined program with attainable outcomes;
⟨ Demonstrate collaboration with other community-based organizations;
⟨ Demonstrate the provision of high quality services; and
⟨ Deliver services in a highly cost-effective manner.

Other Activities

13. **Annual Plan**

The CoC SC will meet annually to review and approve its annual plan and policies which will govern the work of the Steering Committee.

14. **ODOD Application Process**

To fulfill the ODOD Application Process, an ODOD Technical Review Committee (ODOD TRC) will annually review applicants/projects and make recommendations regarding certification to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will act on these recommendations.

The ODOD TRC will be a joint committee comprised of three CoC SC representatives (at least one must be a provider), two Rebuilding Lives Funder Collaborative representatives and two Citizens Advisory Council representatives. One of the CoC SC representatives will serve as chair. CSB will provide staff support for the committee.

15. **Meeting Support**

CSB will provide meeting support for CoC SC and all committee meetings by scheduling meetings, developing agendas, issuing meeting materials and posting all relevant documents to www.csb.org.

⟨ Steering Committee members may suggest agenda items
⟨ Agenda and meeting materials will be released one week prior to scheduled meetings.
⟨ The agenda will be reviewed and adopted at the start of the meeting; changes may be offered for consideration.
⟨ Meeting notes will be produced and distributed within 30 days of the meeting.
⟨ Materials will be distributed electronically to all CoC SC members and provider agency designees.

16. **Costs**

Every effort will be made to keep process costs to the minimum necessary to achieve full funding. CSB will work to raise funds to support the processes of the CoC, including central administrative requirements related to HMIS and the PIT Count.

Month	Activity	2009	2010	Steering Committee	HUD TRC	ODOD TRC	CSB	Providers
January	Receive & review HUD score for annual application (pending HUD awards announcement)	x	x				x	
January	Conduct Point-In-Time Count	x	x				x	
January	Determine ODOD TRC (if needed)		x	x				
February	Issue Program Outcome Plan (POP)/Program Descriptions forms to agencies	x	x				x	
March	Approve Annual Plan & CoC Policy Statements	x	x	x				
March	Review and approve CoC Steering Committee membership lists	x	x	x				
March	Submit program description and POP (CSB funded agencies also submit budget) *Due date 3/13/09*	x	x					x
April	Participate in Agency & CSB 1-on-1 meetings (individually scheduled)	x	x				x	x
May	Approve HUD application schedule (electronic approval - pending CoC NOFA release)	x	x	x				
May	Process appeals for CSB funded programs (CSB Board Chair)	x	x				x	
May	Handle POP appeals for CoC Provider Agencies (electronic approval)	x	x	x				
May	Review CoC NOFA (pending CoC NOFA release)	x	x				x	
May	Facilitate HUD Application Review & TA Meeting (pending CoC NOFA release)	x	x				x	
May	Prepare Draft Exhibit 1, including PIT Count data (per HUD application schedule)	x	x				x	
May	Secure RLFC approval of new CoC process (5/28/09)	x					x	
June	Review ODOD RFP and recommend next steps to Steering Committee (electronically)	x	x				x	
June	Submit Exhibit 2 to CSB (per HUD application schedule)	x	x					x
June	Review & approve Exhibit 1 (per HUD application schedule)	x	x	x				
June	Issue Program Evaluation	x	x				x	
June	Receive annual Program Evaluation (electronic format)	x	x	x				

Month	Activity	2009	2010	Steering Committee	HUD TRC	ODOD TRC	CSB	Providers
June	Submit requests for ODOD certification	x	x					x
June	Recommend ODOD certification and support letters (pending release of ODOD application & schedule)	x	x			x		
June	Handle ODOD TRC appeals (pending release of ODOD application & schedule)	x	x	x				
June	Approve ODOD certifications (pending release of ODOD application & schedule)	x	x	x				
June	Review CSB HMIS performance (concurrent w/ ODOD activities)	x	x	x				
June	Complete ODOD certifications (after CoC Steering Committee approval)	x	x				x	
June	Review Exhibit 2's (per HUD application schedule)	x	x				x	
June	Finalize Exhibit 1 after CoC SC approval (per HUD application schedule)	x	x				x	
July	Submit Consolidated Application to HUD	x	x				x	
October	Participate in Agency & CSB 1-on-1 meetings (individually scheduled)	x	x				x	x
October	Review new projects for 2011 and beyond		x				x	
October	Recommend new HUD project for 2011		x		x			
October	Consider CSB referrals of ongoing programs of concern & recommend action to CoC Steering Committee (if needed)		x		x			
December	Approve plan/process for unsheltered count	x	x	x				
December	Approve new HUD project for 2011		x	x				
December	Handle HUD TRC appeals		x	x				
December	Approve Performance Standards for FY2011	x		x				
December	Announce HUD awards (pending HUD announcements)	x	x				x	

Note: The 2009 New Project is VOAGO Edgehill Place; for 2010 New Project is CHN Inglewood Court.

Proposed FY2010 Program Performance Standards and Reporting for programs that receive HUD funding

The Continuum of Care Steering Committee, (CoC), at the recommendation of the CoC TRC approved on 06/24/2008 the FY2009 Program Performance Standards. These standards are based on HUD required performance standards that are included in the annual CoC application for funds through our community's Exhibit 1 and on our CoC local goals that were historically collected through the Local Supplement. These performance standards, their achievement and program ratings are to be included in the CSB's annual Program Evaluation based on six months of data, between 7/1/2008 – 12/31/2008. FY2009 is the first year for the HUD only funded programs to be included in CSB's Program Evaluation and to be evaluated and rated on their performance in a comprehensive way that combines local CoC performance goals and HUD requested performance metrics (reported through the annual APR and Exhibit 1).

The Program Evaluation also contains goals for the projects, to be achieved in the FY2010, starting July 1, 2009. There are no new evaluated measures added for FY2010, compared with FY2009, with the exception of "Pass Program Certification". This measure, however, was separately evaluated in prior years but not included in a formal evaluation. CSB is recommending the addition of a few "monitored" measures that are better informing the community about the efficiency of the HUD-funded programs and the addition of a measure that will be benchmarked in 2010, thus not measured. Only the metrics that will be "evaluated" in FY2010 will be counted towards the program's performance rating. CSB is asking the CoC to approve the recommended measurements for FY2010, as described below:

Program Performance Standards and Reporting
Based on HUD standards, CoC local standards and best practices program performance.

PSH – Permanent Supportive Housing; TH = Transitional Housing; SPC = Shelter Plus Care

Measurement	Measured in FY09?	Rationale	Annual Metrics	FY10 Evaluation
Households served	√	HUD required, APR reported	Set based on prior year(s) attainment and program capacity.	Evaluated
Successful housing outcome (%)[1]	√	CoC Local goal for PSH/SPC; HUD required, Exhibit 1 reported for TH	At least standard below or greater if prior year(s) achievement was greater • At least 80% for PSH and SPC • At least 77% for TH	Evaluated
Successful housing outcomes (#)	√	HUD required, APR reported	Calculated based on the Successful housing outcomes % measurement.	Evaluated
Housing Stability	√	CoC Local goal, APR reported	At least standard below or greater if prior year(s) achievement was greater • At least 12 months for PSH (goal to be set not to exceed 24 months, actual attainment may be greater than goal)	Evaluated

---

[1] Fixed minimum threshold – no allowable variance as HUD benchmark is fixed.

Measurement	Measured in FY09?	Rationale	Annual Metrics	FY10 Evaluation
			• Up to 4 months for TH • At least 12 months for SPC	
Program Occupancy Rate	√	CoC Local goal	Full occupancy (>95%).	Evaluated
Employment status at exit[1]	√	HUD required, Exhibit 1 reported	At least 19% of households exiting will have employment.	Evaluated
Housing Retention	√	CoC Local goal	≤5% of those who obtain housing will return to shelter.	Evaluated
Pass program certification	No	HUD required, Exhibit 1 reported	Compliant with all HMIS/CSP standards	Evaluated
Negative Reason for leaving	√	HUD required, APR reported CoC Local goal	Less than 20% leave for non-compliance or disagreement with rules	Evaluated
Interim housing stability[1]	√	HUD required, Exhibit 1reported	• At least 81% of persons remain in permanent supportive housing for at least 6 months	Evaluated
Increase in income from entry to exit	√	CoC Local goal	• At least 45% of tenants in PSH and SPC • At least 50% of clients in TH	Evaluated
Cost per household	Yes[2]	HUD required, APR reported	Cost per household will be consistent with budget.	Monitored, not evaluated
Cost per successful housing outcome	Yes[2]	Measure of efficiency	Cost per successful housing outcome will be consistent with budget.	Monitored, not evaluated
Cost per unit	Yes[2]	HUD required, APR reported, Measure of efficiency	Cost per unit will be consistent with budget.	Monitored, not evaluated
Turnover Rate	Yes	Measure of success and system planning	Set based on prior year(s) attainment. Some level of turnover is anticipated.	Monitored, not evaluated
Change in income[3]	No	Measure of success	Measured annually and upon exit. TBD – benchmarked in FY2010, measured in FY2011.	Not evaluated in FY2010

---

[2] TRC reviewed this data through the annual renewal process.
[3] New measurement for change in income to be benchmarked during FY2010

Measurement Standards

Each performance goal is assessed as achieved (Yes), not achieved (No), or not applicable (N/A). *Achieved Goal* is defined as 90% or better of a numerical goal or within 5 percentage points of a percentage goal, except where a lesser or greater value than this variance also indicated an achieved goal, or if the benchmark/metric is fixed. *Not Applicable* is assigned when a performance goal is not assigned; the reason for this will be explained in the footnote for the respective program.

Each program will be assigned a performance rating[4] of High, Medium, or Low as determined by overall program achievement of performance outcomes for the evaluation period. Ratings are based on the following:

Rating	*Achievement of Program Outcome Measure* [5]
High	achieve at least 75% of the measured outcomes and at least one of the successful housing outcomes (either number or percentage outcome)
Medium	achieve at least 50% but less than 75% of the measured outcomes
Low	achieve less than 50% of the measured outcomes

Programs rated as "Low" or experiencing long-standing and/or serious program issues and/or systemic agency concerns will be handled by CSB through a **Quality Improvement Intervention** (QII) process. This process has been used successfully with CSB-funded programs. It is based on quarterly one-on-one dialogues between CSB and the provider agency and considers agency plans and progress on addressing program issues. If the agency and/or CSB find that the QII process is not working, either may refer the concerns/issues to the HUD Technical Review Committee (HUD TRC) for handling. The provider will be given an opportunity to present its case to the HUD TRC before it makes its recommendation to the Steering Committee. This process would eliminate special reports and presentations to the Steering Committee by the provider.

For interim (quarterly) reports, programs which meet less than one-half of measured outcome goals will be considered a program of concern.

---

[4] In some instances, the program is too new to evaluate; therefore, a performance rating is not assigned.

[5] If serious and persistent program non-performance issues existed prior to evaluation, then the program was assigned a lower rating than what its program achievement of performance outcomes would otherwise warrant.