

PAC Meeting 8/22/22 Minutes

Attendance: Paul Miller, Chas Olson, Anny Libengood, Anita Deranleau, Melissa Morehead, Davis Schofield, Denise Albertson, Sherry Scudder, Stephanie Marshall, Jamie Kirsch, Dawn Sikkink, Pauletta Red Willow

Administration of Microsoft Teams continuance discussed.

Difficulty with accessing documents, at this time SDHA is unable to provide admin rights to the group as a result of technology limitation.

IT department has been working on figuring out another platform for sharing documents.

Ranking and Rating Process Tool

Changes that have been made

Some was just suggested grammatical changes

Added 1 to the narrative about project renewal

Changes made in the scoring system

Remove Agency participation for SDHHC quarterly meetings

Discussion of the value of having the meeting requirements

Lowering the amount of meetings needed to be scored, lowering the points, or removing the requirement completely, tiering the points

Can we provide separate reimbursement with these funds?

Instead of using admin dollars are there scholarships available?

Add option with participation items?

It was noted that since adding points to the tool, there has been more active participation in the SDHHC meetings.

It has been decided that we tier it for right now where every meeting attended and to re-evaluate the scoring for this at the time and review how to best decide to improve participation at meetings.

Discussion breaking out and adding race or other minority populations to encourage re-examination of barriers and current programming in place. Can the narrative be added to the percentage of population served and asking them to explain what they have done to assess and remove barriers for each of these populations.

Can we break out each barrier in number 7

Tie the narrative and section 7 together.

Should we number it out?

Have agencies scored on cultural competency?

Can we just add the question about what training was attended or completed.

Number 2 program type- add a category for unsheltered

Add street outreach to supportive services.

Number 3- Coordinated Entry

Removing penalization for rejecting a referral. From a CE standpoint the referrals are considered rejected if the client declines the service. If referrals are rejected, it should indicate as to why. The broken down referrals will remain

Add how the project is contributing to the committee.

Coordinated entry updates should be occurring in coordinated entry and documenting activity and activity should be documented in HMIS.

Number 4- HMIS Data Quality- Personal Identifying Information

Change language back to what HUD uses

Number 5- Funds Expended

Adding explanation of expended funds and the circumstances.

Number 6 HUD Compliance

Changing title back to HUD language

Audits discussed and explained.

Number 7-

Move barriers to the narrative section or add narrative and reconfigure the points

Project performance

Change back to what is able to be evaluated in the APR because these are related to questions.

Change it back to HUD guidelines for the percentages.

Table for now the changes for the first section of that and moving the narrative part.

Number 8- completion of application

No changes in this section.

Number 9- New Project Application

Unsure of how to implement the changes and asking to hold until the next time edits occur.

New applicants must be fairly judged in an attempt to even out the playing field.

Will add section to input the score.

The changes that have been suggested that may be more in depth will be discussed and implemented for the next ranking system.