

## TPCH Performance Evaluation & Monitoring Committee Minutes 7/6/2018

9:00am-1:00pm

Sullivan Jackson Employment Center

400 E. 26<sup>th</sup> St.

Presiding: Jason Thorpe

Agenda Item	Who (Moved & seconded or reported)	Discussion/Motions/Decision(s) (Major discussion points if no decision)	Next steps/Responsible
6/27 minutes draft	1. Steve Nelson 2. John Roldan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Motion</b> to approve <b>6/27</b> minutes.</li> <li>2. There was discussion in regard to inaccuracies in the minutes. One was not having the actual motion noted in the minutes. Another was that there was a motion that wasn't passed unanimously. The committee asked that the minutes be more structured, where we number the items that were discussed and motioned. <b>Motion failed.</b> CA will take the feedback of the committee and correct the minutes and present at a later meeting.</li> </ol>	CA will take the feedback of the committee and correct the minutes and present at a later meeting.
NOFA Process Timeline Review and Approval	Jason	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The timeline was reviewed and discussed.</li> <li>2. Committee discussed that all reallocations must notify the CA by the close of business July 20 by 4:59:59pm.</li> <li>3. For the week of August 20<sup>th</sup>, under the CA role, the date from August 21 was changed to August 23 for training and providing packets to the review panel.</li> <li>4. For the week of September 10<sup>th</sup>, the date for submission of the application was changed from the 14<sup>th</sup> to the 17<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>5. <b>Motion</b> to approve the NOFA timeline with the edits. The CA moved, and was 2<sup>nd</sup> by John Roldan. <b>Motion passed</b>, unanimously.</li> </ol>	The CA will make the updates to the timeline.
Incorporation of Community Priorities into the Rating and Ranking Process	Jason	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Motion:</b> to remove community priorities from the rating tool and direct the review panel to incorporate community priorities into ranking. Motion was moved by Lindey Eulberg, and was 2<sup>nd</sup> by Ana Lucero. <b>Motion passed</b>, 6 approved and one abstained.</li> </ol>	
Rating Tool	Jason	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It was discussed the tool should have a drop down for project type.</li> <li>2. There should be check boxes for whether a project is going to be a consolidation project or a transition project.</li> </ol>	The CA will make updates to the tool and bring it back for the PEM committee to vote on.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. There was also discussion on cost effectiveness. Committee agreed that it shouldn't be for points, but documented. Committee discussed the cost effectiveness that was done for monitoring wasn't correct, and that they wanted to represent the budget plus the match over the total person staying or exiting to positive housing destinations.</li> <li>4. The group discussed that Bonus point for the populations served should be removed from the rating tool because of the motion that was passed that priority populations is a ranking thing not a rating thing.</li> </ol>	
<p>Rating Process Document Review</p>	<p>Jason</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It was discussed that anywhere in the document that stated TPCCH Administrator, it would be switch to the Collaborative Applicant.</li> <li>2. Draft needed to be added to the document.</li> <li>3. Throughout the document wherever there was a 2017, it would need to be switched to 2018.</li> <li>4. On page 3-4, there is red wording that needs to be updated by the CA in regards to what is current this year for reallocation, bonus, and renewals.</li> <li>5. Dates and locations were updated in the process document.</li> <li>6. The bonus points for priorities were taken out, and community priorities were listed in the process document.</li> <li>7. There was discussion that the CA will do threshold review on all projects except its own projects will be reviewed by the CoS committee.</li> <li>8. The scoring categories that were updated on the rating tool will need to be updated in the Process Document for renewal projects that have completed a full grant cycle and those projects that haven't complete a grant cycle.</li> <li>9. Updates to the technical assistance and contact information was made to just include the CA and the HMIS lead.</li> <li>10. Appendix B – FY18 Rating and Ranking Project Form was updated to include project type, cost effectiveness, updated dates, and updates to the monitoring questions.</li> </ol>	<p>The CA will make the edits to the Process document and the Appendixes and bring it back to PEM to review and approve.</p>

		11. Appendix C needs to be updated to include the only reasons why a project can appeal.	
New Business	All	1. No new business at this time.	

Name		Organization	Email address
Jason	Thorpe	Our Family Services	jthorpe@ourfamilyservices.org
Steve	Nelson	Pima County	steve.nelson@pima.gov
Ana	Lucero	Primavera Foundation	alucero@primavera.org
Guillermo	Andrade	La Frontera	gandrade@lafrontera.org
John	Roldan	Community Member	john@johnroldan.com
Lindsay	Eulberg	OPCS	leulberg@helptucson.org
Gilbert	Gutierrez	La Frontera	ggutierrez@lafrontera.org
Dia	Nonaka	COPE	dnonaka@copecommunityservices.org
Sasha	Hawman	CPSA/TPCH	Sasha.hawman@communitypartnersinc.org

**Next Meeting: Wed., July 11, 9:00-11:00am, Sullivan Jackson Employment Center, 400 E. 26<sup>th</sup> St.**

Submitted by: Sasha Hawman