

**MEETING MINUTES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendees: RANK AND REVIEW** | | |
| **Clark Harrison** | **Jaha Martin** | **Catherine Middlebrooks** |
| **Rae Sanchez** | **Tara Blue** | **John Sanders** |
| **Linda Crockett** | **Present: Dawn Taylor- No vote** | **Deb Little- No vote** |
|  | **Sherri Allen- No vote** |  |
| **Location:** Virtual In person Hybrid , 129 West Fowlkes Franklin, TN | | |
| **Date:**  Thursday September 23, 2021 | | |
| **Time:** 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Lasted until 3pm | | |
| **Facilitator:** Rae Sanchez **called the meeting to order at 11:05am.** | | |
| **Explanation of process:** | The Rank and Review Board (RR) Committee established a process to review and rank project applications submitted for U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding through the CoC. In the work of monitoring and evaluating funded agencies and project applicants, the Committee requested HMIS data to better inform the process. Based upon program activity reports of funded agencies the Committee conducted a thorough discussion of where each program stands. Rae Sanchez reviewed the policy approved by the CoC membership. The tools used to review and rank programs such as the Renewal Project Scoresheet and the New Project Application were reviewed. Each project was scored by each member then divided by the number of voting members and given a median score by which they were ranked. | |
| **Review and Discuss FY22 Project Applications:** | Project Submissions APR Summary were given to each member of the Review and Ranking Committee then they listened to the reading of each project applications by Rae. Rae Sanchez reviewed projects submissions that were renewals first and opened the table up for discussion. The Discussion around the renewals stemmed from not enough projects having participants that exited with more earnings. Based upon the priority of the COC the HMIS project was talked about with standards in mind. Each member was called on individually to give the ultimate score after each question was read. | |
| **Rank & Review Tool:** | Deb little gave an overview of the HMIS scores and how the projects ranking were valued according to the scoring tool. Each member was sent the applications for renewals and the APR for the renewals via email ahead of the meeting. (Jaha couldn’t open hers, so Deb sent it during meeting.) We began to read through each project that was a renewal and allow committee members to score the projects based upon their understanding of the answers and the tool given. We review 5 total renewal projects and were getting into the new projects when we needed to stop due to time constraints (it was 2pm) and decided to review the remaining 3 projects via email based upon the process that been taking place over the last 3 hours. Rae Sanchez called for a decision via email of each member reading over and writing down the scores of the new projects based upon the tool given in the beginning. | |
| **Re-Allocation Process** | Under the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (HEARTH), the HUD reallocation process allows Continuums of Care (CoC) to reallocate funds from renewal projects to provide funding for new projects and to create additional permanent housing. It is therefore the intent of the Western Virginia Continuum of Care to develop a Reallocation Policy that is: aligned with HUD and HEARTH Act policy guidance; performance based as specified with the annual HUD NOFA; and finally, based upon local needs, data and use of common assessment tool. Due to the continuums approved discussion of the re-allocation of the City of Clarksville projects the committee was able to re-allocate the funding for these two projects and open the process for new projects. The COC received two new RRH projects and one CE project to be ranked. | |
| **2021 Rank & Review Results:** | We were able to go over overall ranking and listen to the feedback from Deb Little on areas of growth. Overall, our score went from 46-66 based upon the total of all scores divided by the number of scoring committee members. Scores are physically filed in the Rank and Review file at CHP the lead agency office. The final scores put the ranking as follows:   1. FCD 2. SCFC renewal 2. FHA 4. SCFC New project 3. COH 6. CHP 4. MISI New project 8. Crossroads New project | |
| **Next Scheduled Meeting:** | September 27, 2021 at 3:00 pm VIA email | |
|  |  | |