CoC Application & Ranking Committee Meeting Summary   October 7, 2019

Present	Alex O'Reilly	**Absent**	LaMont Green
Dan Burton	Joseph Seia	Mike Wong	Leeze Castro
Colleen Chalmers	Kate Speltz	Hedda McLendon	Mory Sylla
Kelli Larsen	Triina Van	Merina Hanson	Eileen Denham
			Derrick Bellgarde

Agenda Item	Action Steps and Follow Up
CoC Briefing	Members were informed of the final outcome of the Rank Order recommendations approved by the Coordinating Board and action taken since then.
Feedback Activity	Members reviewed process points and action taken since committee's commencement and discussed what went well, areas for improvement, and other ideas members had to be included in a synthesis of community reflections of this year's CoC process. A synthesis of the committee's comments is included below, followed by a photo of the notes tracked during the meeting. **Action:** All Home staff will be conducting debriefing sessions with members of the lived experience groups which will be synthesized with committee's comments and taken to the November Coordinating Board meeting.

Synthesis of Discussion:
Centering the voices of lived experience, utilizing CAC and YAB leadership in the site visits and interviews, and ensuring CAC/YAB seats on the committee were identified as strengths of this year's process and reflects the direction of where the system is headed. (Given the desire to continue these efforts, the group recommended intentionally designing interviews/site visits into next year's process and to begin them earlier.)

While the conversations had in committee were valuable and important, they also elevated the various tension points where authority and role were either unclear or in contradiction to other points in the system:
- CoC Values and how they relate to broader system values and priorities
- The relationship between capital funding processes and the CoC funds
- How new organizations and other by/for organizations have access to CoC funding

While some of the issues identified may be solved for with the development of the Regional Authority, there were specific ideas elevated that could address some of the challenges noted:
- Connecting the to-be developed Ombuds office with funding decisions to more intentionally address some of the concerns raised by lived experience members during interviews, site visits and rank order discussions.
- More deeply address equity through contract monitoring in advance of the CoC application process.
- Consider strategies to disrupt processes that maintain the status quo (evaluate how competing for funds creates disincentives for creative solutions driven by equity and consider alternative approaches akin to a recent funding process conducted by UWKC for YYA providers).
- Evaluate the costs to agencies associated with administering and monitoring these funds, as well as the true project costs when including that and increased wages for employees.

What Went Well?   Do Differently?   Other Ideas?

What Went Well?

- Convos highlighted power of org — relative to the broader system
- Values convo.
- Reflects the direction of the system + where its headed (Process)
- Lived experience voice being central
- LE members part of interviews/ site visits
- YAB/CAC members seated
- Facilitated mtg.

  - Start earlier
  - include in perf. measures
  - defined parameters
  - feedback loop

Do Differently?

- Capital $ → driving CoC $
  - Citing orgs work in (CoC committee) (Cap. $) → elevate committee's input to ensure utilized
  - By/for orgs — example
  - Equity
- Limited by how our work interacts w/ HUD (what they would question)
- Need place for broader discussions to stay focused on CoC App.
  - How to connect the dots from R.A. $ to CoC + back
- How to disrupt status quo → creative solutions
- Begin w/ "new" process steps planned interviews/site visits — ↑ predictable
- Interviews/site visits across more projects — ↑ equity

Other Ideas?   (& what other mechanisms) (tie to $ processes)

- Ombuds
- Support to orgs
- Elevate equity issues as contract monitoring — advance of CoC process
  - CoC Board
  - R.A. Gov Board
- Formal action needed
- UMKC $100K to YVA providers example
- Values created by committee > interaction w/ Coord. Board
- Apps to R.A. who makes $ allocations but determines which $ sources to use — are the $ or the way structured more stable
- Costs to the agencies — Scrutiny + administering
- Workers rights, $ staff, cost of overall project
- Set up > competition + bar that maintains status quo + $ robust → Part of bigger system