

## Project Review Committee (PRC) Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, May 27, 2025 | 10:00 am to 11:30 am



SACRAMENTO  
STEPS FORWARD

This meeting is not recorded. The chat is below the minutes.

### Attendance:

Member	Membership Status	Present
Bridget Alexander	Voting	Yes
Caitlyn (Cait) Paulson	Voting	Yes
Carol Roberts	Non-Voting	Yes
David Husid	Non-Voting	No*
Dawn Basciano	Voting, Co-Chair	No
Erica Plumb	Non-Voting	Yes
Kristy Smith	Voting	Yes
Majorie Beazer	Voting	Yes
Sarah Bontrager	Voting, Co-Chair	Yes

*\*Notified SSF Staff they would be absent in advance/excused.*

SSF Staff	SSF Title
Geoffrey Fralick	Program Analyst - Youth
Jesse Archer	CoC Program Manager

Agenda Item	Presenter(s):	Time	Item Type
<b>I. Welcome, Introductions, &amp; Announcements</b>  <b>Approval of 4/22/25 Meeting Minutes</b>  Supporting Material: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">4/22/25 PRC Meeting Minutes</a></li> </ul> Resource: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">CoC PRC Private Webpage</a> (password: prccoc)</li> </ul>	Sarah Bontrager, PRC Co-Chair	10:00 am (5 minutes)	Action
Sarah called the meeting to order at 10:04 AM.  <b>Announcements/Introductions:</b> No announcements were made.  The April 2025 CoC PRC meeting minutes were not reviewed.  <b>Action Item:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The April 2025 CoC PRC meeting minutes will be placed on the June meeting agenda for review/vote.</li> </ul>			
<b>II. CoC PRC Recruitment Follow Up (Interviews &amp; the Next Steps)</b>	Sarah Bontrager, PRC Co-Chair	10:05 AM (10 minutes)	Informational
This item was not discussed.			
<b>III. May PRC Meeting Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">DEI discussion</a>, what reframing looks like, and</li> </ul>	Jesse Archer, SSF CoC Program Manager	10:10 AM (50 minutes)	Discussion

<p>our next steps (Meeting Focus)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Can we invite specific consultants/others to this meeting?</li><li>• <u>Panel of CoC Providers - “Listening Circle”</u> asking them what is your experience filling out your apps/looking at your data/telling their story (pros/cons). Dive into specific questions (e.g. involvement in the CoC)</li><li>• <u>Develop a “Summer Strategy”</u> for the CoC PRC &amp; identify areas of collaboration with other departments at SSF (Finance, Grants, or HMIS) or other committees of the CoC.</li><li>• <u>Monitor Findings</u> How will the “Monitor Findings” factor be further fleshed out?</li></ul> <p>Supporting Material:</p>			
<p><b>Identifying Low Performing Programs:</b> What metrics define “low performance”? (e.g., housing retention, unit utilization, timely drawdown, returns to homelessness)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Can the metrics used to determine “high performing” projects be used to identify “low performance”?</li><li>• Is there a basic threshold that triggers a CQI Plan for a project?</li></ul>			

- Currently there is no “low performance threshold”. Renewal projects simply fall within Teir 2 and either fall before or after new project proposals on the ranked list.
- Should the bottom 10% of projects automatically undergo a CQI plan?
- This “CQI process” will need to take place annually for it to be impactful.
- Utilization & Retention are the primary metrics (Bridget)
- Exits out of homelessness could be an indicator of program performance from a client-centered perspective (Kristy)

Should thresholds differ by project type (e.g., PSH vs. RRH) and/or population (youth)?

- CQI plans should be project-type specific as the performance metrics (utilization & retention) differ significantly.
- DV programs were called out as a unique difference.
- Youth programs (YHDP) were also called unique.

What data sources are available and reliable (APR and monitoring reports)?

- Quarterly QPR reports from HMIS could be a good indication of low performance identification.

Should we consider both quantitative and qualitative information (e.g., staff turnover, community feedback)?

- Qualitative information is helpful around “past performance” for the entire agency. This is where the project can explain how things like staff turnover
- An ideal system will provide quarterly HMIS data reviews, the HMIS department would flag low performers based on agreed upon metrics, those projects would then be notified and the PRC would review CQI trends overtime.
- If the PRC is able to review project performance data year-by-year, then R&R is able to determine agency “past performance”

Will this be an annual, quarterly, or rolling review?

- Quarterly reviews (Bridget)

### **CQI Plan:**

What are the required elements of a CQI plan (goals, timelines, responsible parties, metrics)?

- An agency-specific narrative response/justification would be ideal.
- Timeline to hold projects accountable leading up to the NOFO.
- Utilization and Housing Retention are the primary metrics.

Should plans include technical assistance?

- First year of funding requires more support (Bridget)
- Second year of funding also requires more support/reminders (Bridget)

Will there be a standard template or a customizable plan per agency?

- Agencies often have very unique reasons why certain metrics are low. Perhaps, giving the agency an opportunity to identify their own reason for the low metric & how the agency plans to correct this via a narrative response. (perhaps a Microsoft form, or some sort of document that gets filled out & submitted).

What are the consequences of non-compliance or failure to improve? Impacts on NOFO?

- This CQI process will inform where a renewal project is placed (before or after new projects) during the NOFO.
- The “consequence” is baked into the end result of the NOFO.

#### **Monitor CQI Plan:**

How often will progress be reviewed (monthly, quarterly)?

- If SSF can run the numbers quarterly, that would helpful for the PRC to review.
- High-level system-impacts of this regular data review could be shared at the COC Board level.

Who will be responsible for check-ins (SSF, PRC)?

- SSF would be responsible for the data sharing & trigger the CQI plan.

How will progress be tracked, documented, and shared?

- The PRC will review this report/data visualization for low performing projects over time and provide context leading up to the NOFO Rank & Review.

What happens if a project improves mid-year? Is there an exit process?

- The way the CQI plan/process is currently being discussed; it is an on-going system-wide information sharing process.

Can successful strategies from CQI plans be shared systemwide?

- Ideally, SSF could provide common problems & solutions funded projects face to the community.

#### **IV. Open Discussion on Recent Actions / Events**

Open to All

11:20 AM  
(10 minutes)

Discussion

### **Renewal Scoring Tool Schedule:**

- June & July create an updated Renewal Scoring Tool
- August, obtain stakeholder feedback
- September, finalize the scoring tool
- October, the CoC Board approves final scoring tool
- (Sarah) table the October CoC Board Approval in case HUD requests specific scoring tool changes
- Develop a youth-specific scoring tool through a working group around youth program scoring. (ensure that the stakeholders are not conflicted)

### **V. Meeting Adjourned**

**The next CoC PRC Meeting:** Tuesday, June 24, 2025, 10:00 AM to 11:30 AM.

**2025 CoC PRC Meetings:** Jan 28 | Feb 25 | Mar 25 | Apr 22 | May 27 (In-Person) | Jun 24 | Jul 22 | Aug 26 | Sept 23 | Oct 28 | Nov/Dec meeting date is TBD.

Resources:

- [CoC PRC Private Webpage](#) (password: prccoc)

For CoC related questions, please email [cocboard@sacstepsforward.org](mailto:cocboard@sacstepsforward.org)

Meeting was in-person, no meeting chat