

2016 CONTINUUM OF CARE LOCAL APPLICATION PROCESS

Focus Group Feedback

APPLICATION/TIMELINES

Applicant Feedback:

Like that the process includes provisions for appeal.

ZoomGrants (local application submission software) is easy to use.

Some local application questions were difficult to understand.

Shorter time frame this year.

Short notice of meeting schedule and mandatory training sessions.

Overall process is too time-consuming. Heavy administrative burden on agencies to complete the process.

ESNAPS formatting is not user-friendly.

ESNAPS process is redundant to ZoomGrants application.

Suggestions:

Scorecards from monitoring should be sent to providers early enough to comment and make corrections before final submission.

Reduce number of Local Application questions; Ask more targeted questions.

Federal & Local apps should mirror each other.

New process for MOUs/ avoid duplicate signings.

APPLICATION/TIMELINE

Scoring and Ranking Debrief Feedback:

Ask less questions on local application.

Set up time frames for local application prior to HUD's release.

Be proactive in determining requirements at local level vs. waiting for HUD's requirements.

Clean up scoring/weights of local application questions.

TRAINING

Applicant Feedback:

Seemed as though some committee members were unprepared, not knowledgeable about agencies.

Applicant Suggestions:

Offer one-on-one assistance and feedback from collaborative applicant to agencies on application improvements.

- A print out of the previous application and helpful hints on how the organization can improve on each question; where they lost points; why they lost points.

Scoring and Ranking Members should visit agency sites to be familiar with agency programs.

Break up the technical assistance training between new and returning applicants. Have a condensed version for returning applicants.

TRAINING

EWG Scoring and Ranking Debrief:

Debrief applicants on the score of their application.

There should be mandatory training for EWG member on the scoring and ranking process.

Improve and increase participation on the scoring and ranking team:

- Get more non-profits (depending on time involved) and set community standards in the policies and procedures
- Set a target number of team members in order to recruit
- Identify agency/person to approach via personal invitation
- Set a time limit on how long a team member can serve (i.e. sit on team for 1 year, then commit to mentoring the next 2 years)
- Formalize mentorship
- Only invite non-profits

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES (SCORING AND RANKING)

Applicant feedback:

Process seems futile. Seems as though everyone is funded regardless of scoring and ranking.

The process and procedure for ranking was not clear to the providers observing.

The process and procedure changes year by year, making it difficult for agencies to navigate.

Points seemed to be arbitrarily assigned to each question.

Committee members with applications should not be able to discuss applications under consideration.

Make the scoring time period more brief.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Applicant Suggestions:

If a readjustment of scores occurs, record should be kept/shared of how and why scores/scorecard are readjusted throughout the process.

An outlined procedure of the scoring and ranking process should be approved by the CoC Board and shared with applicants in advance.

Each person reviewing and scoring the application should provide a note on the rationale for each score.

Process/procedure should not change during scoring.

Have the Scoring/Ranking team rotate in and out (i.e. 3 yr. cycle) with a core group of veterans and less new team members

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

EWG Scoring and Ranking Debrief :

Have prioritization conversation open to community and include the prioritization into policy and procedures.

Create new guidelines for presentations (possibly remove presentations from process, or hold presentations for new projects only).

Evaluate blocks of time for ranking process to accommodate non-profits.

Make the scoring and ranking process more brief.

Policies and procedures need to be solidified and communicated.

Evaluate separate processes for new projects vs. renewal projects.

Monitoring Working Group gives a time limit (probationary period) to sub-performing projects. If project doesn't raise to standard, the project won't be included in the CoC application.

Scoring and Ranking Team should have access to all applications whether they are scoring them or not.

NON-APPLICANT FEEDBACK:

4 agencies represented:

- 1 agency currently providing housing with other funding sources
- 3 agencies providing mental health and/or employment services

Feedback:

Desire to be a part of full CoC

- Want to be more involved
- Want to impact the community
- Want to continue networking

Desire to expand agency and collaborations; reduce silo effect of service delivery

NON-APPLICANT FEEDBACK

Concerns with CoC Process:

Funding source is rigid.

Too many restrictions on how to spend the funding.

Regulations appear myopic/goals tough to reach.

Intimidated by competing with big agencies (repeat applicants seem to get the funding each year).

Restrictions may make it difficult to address the true needs of the population.

Want safe & stable collaborations; concerned with relying on other agencies as fiscal agents.

Suggestions:

Want assistance with building collaborations.

Survey organizations on additional roadblocks to participating in CoC application process.

2016'S PROCESS AND CONSTRAINTS

The timeframes for the process were contingent upon when the HUD Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) was released.

Due to the early HUD release of the NOFA, the Monitoring process had to be shortened, which resulted in the change from onsite monitoring to a desk audit.

2016'S PROCESS AND CONSTRAINTS

The information requested as part of the local application process may or may not be part of the NOFA in order to give the EWG sufficient information to make informed decisions. This may result in additional questions and redundant requests being asked from providers for information that is necessary to complete the consolidated application.

The majority of the project questions from the local application are identical to the questions in E-Snaps, which inform the project portion of the consolidated application. New questions may be asked to inform the community's section of the consolidated application.

2016'S PROCESS AND CONSTRAINTS

Email communication regarding the monitoring process was sent to providers detailing the monitoring process, tools that would be used, and explanation as to why modifications to the monitoring process were made.

The local application process should occur prior to the release of the NOFA. As a result, unexpected changes may arise due to the applicants' submissions and NOFA requirements.

The local application questions and scoring and ranking process were reviewed and approved by the EWG.

2016'S PROCESS AND CONSTRAINTS

www.HelpHopeHome.org is a resource that is available to providers and the public. All documents that were included in the process were posted on the website.

As a result of the ongoing questions submitted by the providers regarding the local application process, a list of frequently updated FAQ's were posted on the Help Hope Home website.

NEXT STEPS

The Evaluation Working Group is establishing the following small groups to focus on and make improvements in the following areas;

- Communication/Education
- Application/Timeline
- Training
- Policies and Procedures
- The EWG looks forward to reporting back to the CoC board on actions outlined from the small groups at a future date.