Category	Ref Number	Recommend By	Improvement Area	Solution/Action	By Who	uiding Principle Doc
NOFA Design	1.1	Danforth Kiff Pierce Pocekay Schwartz	Award recommendation hierarchy (threshhold criteria)	Adopt something like the following as the committee's north star: 1. Strategic Plan - overall project type gaps 2. Long-Term Funding Strategy 3. New gaps identfied or right-sizing comparison 4. Project Performance or estimates Note: clear definition of what constitutes geographic equity is needed -Analyze funding by region over a time period to inform geographic equity -Collaborative appliations by Sonoma County region as a possibility	F&E Strategic Planning	Yes
	1.2	Providers Pierce	Project scoping and analysis	Funding scope be declared to the F&E committee and in the NOFA language (i.e. is the opportunity primarily project renewals, open to new projects, funding enhancement of ongoing projects etc)	F&E	
	1.3	Pierce Pocekay	Comprehensive Project Budget	Projects should submit a complete annual budget indicating what other funding opportunities have been applied for, if any particular funding request would fund a necessary program component or would increase number of clients served and/or permanently housed; some projects labeled as being 'new' appeared to be additions or addon's to exiting projects - should be defined and standardized	Staff	
	1.4	Providers LaLonde-Berg	Setasides and/or special funding uses decided in advance	Also beging compiling an historical list of grants NOFA language clearly locks the funding uses in advance of release	F&E/Staff	
	1.5	Pierce Pocekay	Separate processes for Renewals vs. New	Strategic Plan priorities can be met this way, but for contract renewals, use performance based decisions	F&E	
	1.6	La-Londe Berg Pocekay	Separate capital and other special project types from core homeless services	Map to Strategic Plan and ensure additional funding sources are identified in advance of deliberations	Staff	
NOFA Process	2.1	Providers Pocekay	Site Visit Protocols	Site visits and applicable process will be discussed by the F&E in advance of the NOFA release and may not be appropriate for all funding opportunities. If Site Visits are to be coducted, applicants will be made aware through the NOFA language and all scheduling will be done by staff	F&E Written Guidance	Yes
	2.2	LaLonde-Berg Pierce	No corrections of late applications submitted after deadline	Applicants should be provided comprehensive information to start	Staff	Yes
	2.3	Providers	NOFA curative process	NOFA language should be clear about what those supports are and when they can happen, applicants should follow all stated deadlines including late submissions not accepted	F&E	Yes
	2.4	Pocekay	NOFA process timing- CoC board should NOT adjust membership once nofa has been released	F&E becomes more involved with decision support frameworks	Staff	
		Pierce	Discussions about the project types to fund should be driven by progress of the Strategic Plan, not sidebar conversations between staff and committee membes	Formal F&E training accompanied by Strategic Plan knowledge should support this	F&E	Yes
	2.6	Kiff	Preliminary Staff Evaluations Provider Release	Timeline issues, use timeline chart	Staff	Yes
	2.7	Kiff	Technical use of the submission portal	Offer t/a sessions to support technical submission process	Staff	
F&E Interaction	3.1	Kiff Pocekay	Clarify F&E Member Recusal Process	Recusal process should be updated via the CoC Charter and details made clear using a signed statement by Committee or Working Group members; can include instructions for providers to present during time-certain periods and support the committee havingn one-by-one project discussions and motions	CoC Governance	Yes
	3.2	Pocekay	Have dedicated non-conflicted application workgroup to review	This will work IF the decisions supports are properly constructed, new workgroup parties are trained and understand the local funding ramifications based on strategic goals and project performance expectations	F&E to Governance	Yes
	3.3	Pocekay	Other funders should serve on the recommendation process such as Measure O, Community Development, local Foundation	Could be situation dependent, and other non-conflicted would need substantial training to understand the Strategic Plan framework, process and HMIS data	F&E to Governance	
	3.4	Kiff Pocekay	Recommend funding on the entire submission pool		F&E	
	3.5	Kiff Pocekay	Constrain F&E involvement to no more than two sessions	Ok, but only with proper preparatoin and review in advance to unersatnd	F&E	Yes
	3.6	Providers Pocekay	Preliminary recommendations be informed by Providers making their own recommendations as a weighted data point OR make recommendations as a general data point PRIOR to the F&E makes final recommendations	Need more clarification as to scenario in either case	F&E	Yes

Decision Supports	3.7	Kiff	Follow Client Process/Protection Protocols	Participating committee members mandated to sign client privacy policy prior to deliberations (HMIS privacy language can be used)	**Staff**	Yes
	3.8	La-Londe Berg Pocekay	Prohibit outside (ex-parte) communcations or site visits by F&E Members, no sidebar conversations between committee members and staff	Incorporate into F&E Guiding Principles	**F&E**	Yes
	3.9	Providers	Ensure F&E members are knowledgeable enough to make recommendations	Process review in advance of deliberations and member guide	**F&E**	Yes
	3.10	Pierce	Lived experience input or questionairre data	Design next opportunities so that voices of persons experiencing services are incorporated, could be an anonymous survey etc Process would need to be formally designed to support reliability	**F&E**	

Decision Supports						
	4.1	Providers Pierce	Evaluation Tools	Decision support tools be presented in F&E for review and approval in advance of their use, once approved NO changes should be made to the tool sets to maintain consistency	**F&E/Staff**	
	4.2	Pierce	Data Analysis	Data points used for evaluation should be project specific where possible and include a glossary for committee members not familiar with HUD data; also the funding process should continue to include pertinent meta-data elements such as total funds applied for by project category, define 'new' as brand new projects to the funding stream etc.	**Staff**	
	4.3	Pierce	Monitoring Results	Staff includes monitoring 'findings' in their report along with current status of the findings	**Staff**	
	4.4	La-Londe Berg Pierce	Budget Summarization by Project Type	Formatting request, with primary budget categories easy to analyze based on project type, better application direction around calculating personnel costs	**Staff**	
	4.5	La-Londe Berg Pierce	Performance metrics achievable at the project level	Program-level performance metrics such as days in service by proejct type, permanent housing move-in date etc. (would also clarfy confusion for applicants); avoid holding providers to any system-level metrics since projects can't significantly affect the system	**F&E/Staff**	
	4.6	La-Londe Berg Pocekay	Cost Per Service Unit	Providers should have a chance to identify what drive program per unit of service costs, whether due to quality of service, length of program enrollmenet etc; also using the full project amount will standardize cost per outcome calculations	**Staff**	
	4.7	Providers Pocekay	F&E Interview Questioning	F&E committee to approve project interview questions in advance of deliberations and identify unacceptabel questions that put providers in a bad light, should be applicable to project types and providers should not be expected to provide comparison responses, only to nationally published baselines	**F&E/Staff**	Yes

Other						
	5.1	La-Londe Berg	CoC Board never expressed overall vision for F&E	Tighten up the governance charter around committee roles and updates from other committees; determine which committee requests data sets and those definitions	**F&E/Staff**	
	5.2	La-Londe Berg	Funding Period	Consider next opportunity as a tw-year funding cycle to better evaluate against the Strategic Plan (wold involved a policy change at the county)	**F&E/CoC Governance**	
	5.3	Kiff La-Londe Berg Pocekay	Restructure F&E subcommittee	Later F&E discussion item with pro's and con's identified; would involve more staff work to properly onboard persons unfamiliar with the F&E process and earlier evaluations	**CoC Governance**	Yes
	5.4	La-Londe Berg Pierce	Establish Quarterly Project evaluations	Schedule evaluations for project types being recommended to shift according to the long term funding strategy	**F&E**	
	5.5	Kiff La-Londe Berg	CoC monitoring review	This could be an enhnace role of the F&E Committee with a schdule	**Staff**	
	5.6	La-Londe Berg Pocekay	CalAIM leveraging	CalAIM lightly acknowleged in the Strategic Plan, would that committee consider another discussion? May not be a Strategic Plan enhancement, but a newer mechanism to achieve strategic plan results	**Strategic Committee**	