

**BOSCOG Steering Committee
Meeting Agenda
March 4, 2010
COHHIO Office – 175 S. Third St. - Suite 250 - Columbus, Ohio 43215**

Meeting called by:	Jonda Clemings, COHHIO	Note taker:	Erica Mulryan, COHHIO
Members present:	Doug Bailey, ODMH; Douglas Argue, Jonda Clemings, Erica Mulryan, Paula Jenkins, Tom Knox, Sarah DeAnna, COHHIO; Scott Gary, ODOD		
Agenda Items			Person(s) Responsible:
# 1: Review of Cumulative APR milestones			Jonda
Discussion:	<p>Jonda distributed/reviewed spreadsheets providing three years of outcomes/performance info for all BOSCOG projects, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Movement from TH to PH • Remaining in PH more than 7 months • Greater than 20% employment at exit • Individual/Family bed capacity • Negative reasons for leaving • Discharge with no income/benefits <p>Performance on these outcomes will be the basis for determining which projects to target for development of quality improvement plans (QIP)</p>		
Conclusion:	Cte agreed these were all valuable outcomes to review		
Action Items:			
# 2: Review of Performance Improvement Process			Erica/Jonda
Discussion:	<p>Jonda reviewed the draft process the Outcomes & Performance Cte developed for targeting projects for quality improvement planning (QIP) and the factors/issues that the Cte thought should be considered (see above). Projects that had been identified in previous Exhibit 1s and that have multiple years of very poor performance will be targeted first. Then Jonda/Erica will have to determine how many projects they believe they have the time to work with.</p> <p>Scott suggested COHHIO host a webinar to review performance concerns, the process regarding targeting for QIP that reaches all BOSCOG programs. Those programs targeted for QIP would be required to attend the webinar and then also participate in the intensive TA process. The Cte agreed that OHCP would need to be the one mandating participation in the webinar.</p> <p>Doug, ODMH, asked at what point a project would not be allowed to renew HUD funding b/c of poor performance. Douglas reviewed the process of defunding the program in Wooster a couple years ago. Erica reviewed the development of the QI process that is in the process of being implemented. Essentially, the Cte is setting the foundation for disallowing renewal funding for projects that had been targeted for QIP and still do not improve performance over the course of a couple years.</p> <p>The Cte asked about the benefit of posting the project outcomes spreadsheet on the COHHIO website for full transparency and to avoid the need to send out individual letters to every project reviewing program outcomes. Scott will check with ODOD/OHCP to see if the dept would be okay with that at this point.</p> <p>Douglas suggested that the QIP letter for targeted projects more explicitly state that OHCP is mandating project participation in this process but that COHHIO staffs, i.e. Erica/Jonda, are responsible for implementing it. Douglas also suggested we consider removing 'outputs' from the QIP summary chart b/c it may lead to Erica/Jonda providing more TA on how to</p>		

	<p>develop a QIP instead of actual implementation/improvement processes.</p> <p>Jonda asked the Cte if there were HMIS milestones/outcomes that should be considered as part of the project application review and/or the QIP process. Scott said that ODOD needs to revisit ways/steps to improve HMIS data quality generally and will be doing some of this in preparation for the state HAG application process soon. Scott will report back to the group after ODOD has developed some processes/steps/scoring around this.</p> <p>Doug, ODMH, asked if the Steering Cte was typically apprised of HUD audits/findings of BOSCOG projects. Scott indicated that the Cte did not receive formal communication about these things, but he would ask HUD field office if the Cte or ODOD could be included on these things.</p>		
Conclusion:			
Action Items:	<p>Jonda/Erica will inform the Cte of final decisions about which projects to target for QIPs.</p> <p>Erica will update the QIP letter for targeted projects and send back to OHCP for review.</p> <p>Jonda/Erica will host a Webinar on the new outcomes/QIP process the last week of April.</p> <p>Erica will draft the webinar announcement for BOSCOG projects</p> <p>Scott will check with ODOD staff/legal to see if they are ok with all BOSCOG project outcomes being posted in a spreadsheet on COHHIO's website.</p> <p>Scott will check on HMIS steps and report back to Steering Cte.</p> <p>Scott will talk with Tom Bilodeau, HUD field office, and request that ODOD/Steering Cte be included on formal correspondence re: findings from HUD audits of BOSCOG projects.</p>	<p>Jonda/Erica</p> <p>Erica</p> <p>Erica/Jonda</p> <p>Erica Scott</p> <p>Scott Scott</p>	<p>3/12/10</p> <p>3/12/10</p> <p>April, 2010</p> <p>3/12/10 ASAP</p> <p>5/6/10 3/4/10</p>
# 3: AHAR/HMIS name changes – Update from HMIS Core Team		Scott & Paula	
Discussion:	Jonda asked about status of this process. Scott indicated that it has all been put on hold but will be revisited soon.		
Conclusion:			
Action Items:			
# 4: Update on completion of additional HMIS reports		Scott	
Discussion:	Jonda asked about the status of the completion of additional HMIS reports for BOSCOG projects. Scott said this was also put on hold b/c of HPRP but that it will be revisited again in summer of 2010.		
Conclusion:			
Action Items:			
# 5: Review and approval of January Steering Committee minutes.		Jonda	
Discussion:	Jonda provided Jan. 2009 meeting notes and asked if formal approval of the notes was needed. The Cte agreed the notes were fine.		
Conclusion:			
Action Items:			
# 6: Review and approval of February Outcomes and Performance Committee minutes.		Jonda	
Discussion:	Jonda provided the group with minutes from the Cte meeting.		
Conclusion:			
Action Items:			
# 7: For the good of the order			
Discussion:	The Cte discussed how to handle scoring/reviewing new project applications, which are due 3/12/10, given that the 2009 awards have not been announced and the 2010 NOFA has not been released. If the 2009 application scores too low to fund new projects, will we allow those projects		

	to compete for new funding in 2010? Scott suggested that after new project applications are received the Steering Cte send back correspondence confirming receipt of the application and informing the applicant that they will be notified about next steps after 2009 awards are announced and that we will allow 2009 projects to re-apply if they aren't funded b/c of overall Exhibit 1 score. The Cte agreed with this approach.		
Conclusion:			
Action Items:	Erica/Jonda will draft this letter and send to OHCP for approval	Erica/Jonda	3/12/10
# 8: Next meeting			
Discussion:			
Conclusion:			
Action Items:	Next Steering Committee Meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 6th, 2010, 9am – 11:30am at COHHIO		

Ohio Balance of State Continuum of Care
Outcomes and Performance Committee
Meeting Minutes
February 2, 2010

Members present: Erica Mulryan & Jonda Clemings

1. Performance Improvement Process

- a. BOSCOG is moving forward with the development of a process for handling performance improvement for programs.
 - i. Erica has completed a letter template that can be sent to poorer performing programs that addresses the need for a performance improvement plan.
 - ii. That template has been submitted to ODOD and initial approval has been received – ODOD is deciding if the letter should come from ODOD or COHHIO.
 - iii. Jonda needs to compile APR data into outcomes spreadsheet so that committee can review. Decision will then need to be made regarding whom to target for performance improvement.

2. Performance Improvement Priorities

- a. Projects that have been included in the Exhibit 1 application for two years for needed improvement will be targeted.
- b. Projects that have been included in the Exhibit 1 application for previous year will be targeted.
- c. Projects that have fell below HUD milestone thresholds (employment, movement from TH to PH, and staying in PH over 6 months) for three years.
 - i. Those projects that are below both thresholds will be prioritized over those projects that have only one threshold below HUD's standard.
 - ii. BOSCOG threshold areas will be secondarily reviewed.
- d. Projects that have fell below HUD milestone thresholds (employment, movement from TH to PH, and staying in PH over 6 months) for two years.
 - i. Those projects that are below both thresholds will be prioritized over those projects that have only one threshold below HUD's standard.
 - ii. BOSCOG thresholds areas will be secondarily reviewed.
- e. Projects that significantly fall below HUD's threshold will be prioritized over those projects that barely missed the thresholds.
- f. Other factors as deemed appropriate may be prioritized (size of project, HUD or ODOD monitoring concerns, etc.)

3. Minimum Expectations for Quality Improvement Plans

- a. All projects that have been requested to complete quality improvement plan, will be given a due date.
 - i. If projects do not respond by due date, reminder email will be sent by committee members.
 - ii. If projects do not respond to reminder, committee members will inform BOSCOG Steering Committee with possible recommendation that program not be included in renewal.
- b. Performance and Outcomes Committee will review all quality improvement plans.
- c. Performance and Outcome Committee will schedule a conference call to discuss plan and review ongoing monitoring of the plan.
 - i. Committee will provide feedback and recommendations regarding the performance improvement plan, approve any necessary changes to the plan, and develop schedule to review and monitor progress.

- d. Quarterly conference calls will be scheduled with participants.
 - i. Participants will be required to run HMIS report regarding their outcomes and performance of programs. That report will be sent to Performance and Outcomes Committee.
 - ii. Performance and Outcomes Committee will review the HMIS report with programs during quarterly conference calls.
 - iii. Programs will report on their success and challenges of meeting outcomes and determine if adjustments need to be made with their performance improvement plan.
4. Performance and Outcomes Committee doesn't expect that all programs targeted for performance improvement will meet HUD and the BOSCOG thresholds by the end of the year.
 - a. Programs will be monitored for a minimum of one year.
 - b. Programs that have not met their performance improvement plan for the first year will update and revise their plan.
 - c. Programs that have two or more years of poor performance and are unable to improve their programs are at risk for not being included in the consolidated application. Performance and Outcomes Committee will make recommendation to Steering Committee for same. Steering Committee will review and discuss and take to Advisory Committee for final determination of excluding a project from the consolidated application.
 - d. Programs that meet their performance goal on their next APR, will continue to be monitored but at a performance retention rate.
5. Failure to follow-up for quarterly conference calls will result in a notice being sent to provider regarding the need to schedule a meeting with Performance and Outcomes Committee.
 - a. If there is no response for a meeting once Committee has made request, the committee will inform the Steering Committee.
 - b. Recommendations will be made to steering committee that the project may not be included in the consolidated application.
6. Additional template will be needed for documenting Performance and Outcomes Committee interventions with the programs. Erica to work on this template.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonda Clemings, MEd, LSW