

NYC CCoC Evaluation Committee 2011-12

December 9, 2011

DHS 9.30 a.m. – 11 a.m.

MEETING RECORD

Meeting Attendees

Jim Mutton; Michael Zuriff; Eileen Lynch; Jeanette Ruffins; Gerni Oster; Sandra Jackson; Riva Kelton; Christina Fragola; Suzanne Sperling; Thea Jandzio; Robyn Gundy; Jeffrey Seward; Erin Palmer; Maya Leszczynski; Eleni Toumarides; Ashlee Warren; Jacqueline Williams; Irma McEachnie

Opening Remarks

- Members introduced themselves and Michael/ Jim thanked the committee for their efforts to date, noting that the bulk of the work on drafting a 2012 Evaluation tool had been accomplished and recommendations successfully presented to the Steering Committee at the November meeting. Today's meeting was essentially to follow up on some of the more controversial scored/ non-scored items and review a recent meeting between the Evaluation Committee co-chairs and CUCS staff to discuss future scoring.

Key Meeting Discussion Points

2011-12 Evaluation Instrument

(a) Transitional Housing Scoring/ Length of Stay

Ashlee presented length of stay statistical information gathered from the 2011 Evaluation scoring (based on reported participants leaving transitional and permanent housing and S+C projects during the year). Of concern was that only 68% of providers had bothered to answer this question, with some answering in months and others in days as a numerical (the 2012 tool will use days as the appropriate measure). However, the data appeared to illustrate that the CoC was largely accomplishing its work. Graphs presented indicated that upwards of 75% of clients were remaining in Transitional Housing for less than six months, while 90% of clients were remaining in Permanent Housing/ S+C projects for longer than six months. A suggestion was raised as to whether the CoC might consider different benchmarks for various types of transitional housing, noting that not all licensed mental health housing for example was classified as transitional under HUD. This may also be an issue to explore in the upcoming Strategic Planning sessions in January. In addition, a change will be made to the Excel formula on the Housing Performance sections so that the respondent must answer the Average Length of Stay question in order to proceed with the evaluation tool.

(b) Chronic Homelessness

With the HUD definition now expanded to include Families as chronically homeless units, the CoC definition is finally a step closer to a direct match. The committee has already recommended adopting the HUD definition for the Evaluation tool. The larger question (discussed at November Steering Committee meetings) as to whether providers can still keep up with the scoring threshold in 2012 by locating appropriate chronically homeless clients may be eased somewhat by the expanded population pool. The committee recommends that scoring remain the same for 2012 and outcomes be examined for 2013.

(c) Data Quality

DHS and the Data Management Committee are still examining the data quality issues from the 2011 Evaluation instrument. Obviously, the CoC is striving toward a goal of eliminating all null or missing variables. A larger strategic question was raised at the November 15 meeting with the Co-Chairs about whether this section could be scored in 2012, e.g. establishing variables for scoring and agreeing on baseline common fields. Another issue concerns translation problems between uploaded data from AWARDS and other software systems. It was recommended that Foothold attend either a Data Management and/ or Steering Committee meeting to address these concerns. However, the committee is not comfortable introducing scoring on data quality until all is resolved. Training on APR variables will certainly be key for 2012.

Evaluation Threshold/ Benchmark Issues – Ranking & Training Recommendations

At the November 15 meeting with the Co-Chairs, numerous questions were raised about what to do with programs that repeatedly fail to meet evaluation performance targets, especially in the area of Transitional to Permanent housing placements. In addition, what about programs that miss key CoC submission deadlines, despite regular reminders? Could a program be given a point penalty for missing deadlines? In addition, how could Corrective Action Plans become more useful both to the CoC and the program, and be better measured from year to year? Of note, CUCS has also been awarded a technical assistance grant to assist the lowest scoring programs with TH to PH targets.

The Evaluation committee made the following recommendations:

- Repeat low scoring programs should be required to participate in technical assistance with CUCS in 2012
- Corrective Action Plans should be in written form only; and subject to a 6-month and 12-month review by the CoC to follow-up on progress
- 2012 Evaluation instrument training will be mandatory for all programs seeking renewal funding. There will be two sessions, each one week apart

TAPR and Final APR Comparison Sheet

The committee reviewed the one-page guide prepared by Riva. Other than changing Beds to Units as the measurement, the guide is ready for use in 2012. Many programs will still be ~~using the referring to the~~ Transitional APR ~~when completing the Evaluation Instrument in the first half of 2012.~~

Evaluation Timeline

The committee will recommend a full review and approval of the 2012 Evaluation Instrument at the January 2012 Steering Committee meeting, with a planned go-live date of February 1 and a due date of mid March (6 weeks later). Evaluation committee members will participate in a soft-launch in January to iron out the kinks.

Consumer Satisfaction Survey

- The committee needs to follow up with the Consumer Committee concerning the recommendation about sharing anonymous qualitative responses with participating programs
- It was also recommended that Questions 11-13 be changed to a 4-point answer scale if possible
- The questionnaire needs to be reviewed by a competent Spanish speaker to determine appropriate content

Next Steps

- (1) Prepare a summary of recommendations for dissemination at the December 16th Steering Committee Meeting
- (2) Follow up on data quality issues
- (3) Next Evaluation Committee meeting scheduled for Friday January 13th at 9.30 a.m. at DHS (Room 2004) to review tool and discuss soft launch.