

**CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding
Committee
Agenda
November 6th, 2025
1:00pm-2:30pm**

[Join Zoom Meeting](#)
Phone: 1 646-876-9923
Meeting ID: 88041862364

Meetings are public. Alameda County residents with lived experience of homelessness are encouraged to attend. Public Comment will be taken at the beginning of each meeting and is limited to 2 minutes per person.

Helpful links:

- **CoC, Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee Google Drive:**
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ZcUw-W73sqkW7AS8tHp3ed-NCaZHnEi2?usp=drive_link
- **CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee Webpage:**
<https://everyonehome.org/about/committees/coc-standards-compliance-and-funding-committee/>
- **Acronyms and Glossary:** <https://everyonehome.org/main/continuum-of-care/coc-member-resources/>
- **Alameda County Data Dashboard:**
https://homelessness.acgov.org/data_homeless_response.page

Committee Purpose

The purpose of the CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding (SCF) Committee will be to support preparation of applications for CoC funding and support the Leadership Board in fulfilling its obligations as outlined in the HUD's CoC Program Interim Rule at 24 CFR 578.8. You can learn more about the Committee Purpose [here](#).

Meeting Purpose / Overview

The November meeting of the Standards, Compliance, and Funding (SCF) Committee: (1) reviewed proposed definitions for the Collaborative Applicant Self-Evaluation Template evaluation metrics, and (2) discussed the [Evaluation Definitions Project Proposal](#).

Agenda

<p>1. Welcome, Introductions, and Icebreaker</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Ground Rulesb. Agendac. Icebreaker
<p>2. Approval of Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Minutes for October 9, 2025 were approved.
<p>3. CoC SCF Committee Public Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. No public comments.
<p>4. Announcements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Community Meeting:<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Registration is now open for the Fall Community Meeting on November 18th! Please register by Friday, November 7th at this link.ii. You can find the full agenda and more information on the EveryOne Home website.iii. Please email alameda@homebaseccc.org if you have any questions.b. Subscribe to the Homebase newsletter and the EveryOne Home newsletter to stay up to date on federal changes and guidance! Current Homebase resources:<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Homebase Newsletter on impacts of HR1ii. Homebase Newsletter on potential losses of CoC funding and advocacy to takec. There were no community announcements.
<p>5. Evidence Based Solutions Committee (ESC) Update (Ms. Shelley Gonzalez and Sunita Garret)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Committee members are invited to visit the ESC Webpage.b. Next Meeting: Thursday, December 11th from 11am to 1pm. Zoom Meeting Link, Meeting ID: 816 4917 6975.
<p>6. Collaborative Applicant Self Evaluation Template: Evaluation Definitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. <u>Overview</u>:<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. The SCF Committee will conduct an evaluation of the Collaborative Applicant, consistent with US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requirements and the expectations outlined in the Governance Charter and Collaborative Applicant Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). For more information about the Collaborative Applicant Evaluation, please review the Collaborative Applicant Evaluation Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ).ii. At the October 9, 2025 meeting, the Committee voted to approve the Collaborative Applicant Evaluation Template, but that the template would be supplemented with definitions for the evaluation terms. The Committee agreed to vote on proposed definitions at this Committee meeting.iii. Homebase staff prepared proposed evaluation definitions, which were provided to Committee members by email prior to the meeting.

Committee members were asked to provide feedback on the definitions by November 3, 2025. No feedback was received

- b. The Committee members reviewed the proposed evaluation definitions, which were:
 - i. Exceeds Expectations: Achieves all required standards and responsibilities laid out in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and demonstrates clear added value, such as implementing improvements, going beyond scope, or modeling best practices that advance system goals.
 - ii. Meets Expectations: Achieves all required standards and fulfills responsibilities as defined by project scope or contractual obligations.
 - iii. Needs Improvement: Does not consistently meet required standards or deliverables; improvement plans should be developed and monitored.
- c. Discussion:
 - i. Kris Maun clarified that the only Committee members with conflicts are employees of Alameda County, who is the Collaborative Applicant. They will abstain but their attendance will count towards quorum. No other Committee members have conflicts.
 - ii. Ray Corona: I don't see a follow-up to Needs Improvement to lift them up and help them meet the expectation. Also, what about concrete examples?
 - 1. Kris Maun: Thank you for lifting the idea of examples! When Lyn and I were originally drafting these definitions, we did include examples. We ended up removing them because we were concerned that instead of being illustrative that they would be become restrictive. So we removed them, just to explain why there aren't any examples in this draft.
 - 2. Ray Corona: That answers it, thank you!
 - iii. Sunita Garrett: I really want everyone to understand that. we must collaborate with other agencies to make it happen, and the county, and the city. So, I just really want to make sure that somewhere in this language, that is included that collaborative participation of other agencies may not be required, but it is expected, and it's a part of the process.
 - 1. Lyn Nesbitt: I appreciate you lifting that up. If it helps, I think we might have to just think about what we're looking at in terms of the collaborative applicant evaluation template. SCF is charged with giving them this template, so then the collaborative applicant will evaluate themselves, and then we review that evaluation they can come back and talk to us. I do agree with what you're saying, in this case, I think this is more so we're trying to make sure that the collaborative applicant understands, hey, this is what exceeding expectations looks like. How do you rate yourself from this given scale? It's less about if we are partnering with other agencies or things like that, in this context, and more so about did you do this job that we agreed on in the MOU? And then one more thing I just wanted to say was, I think you talked about updating the MOU?
 - 2. Sunita Garrett: All I'm saying is that in the self-evaluation, there should be something in there regarding assistance and participation from other programs. So that we can say that, yes,

we were able to abide by these rules and regulations. And, with the assistance of these other programs, this was able to happen. I'm just saying that that should somewhere be a part of that information.

3. Lyn Nesbitt: I think I see what you're saying. What I think I hear you saying is meet expectations, is in the MOU, or in the evaluation template, since they reflect each other, meet expectations is the collaborative applicant is just doing the job as agreed upon, but exceed expectations would be doing what you're saying they've gone past just, hey, we're, you know, this is the governance thing we need to do these are the other things that we need to do. We're also making sure we partner with other organizations and finding other things we can do.
4. Sunita Garrett: And with exceeding a part of how we were able to exceed by partnering with these agencies. Just to have that in there so that we know we're not just doing this all by ourselves, one agency at a time, that this is a full collaborative effort between the county, the city, nonprofits, and the state, like, we're all working together. That's all I'm saying.
5. Lyn Nesbitt: You're almost saying, like, if we're looking here at the definitions, exceeds expectations would be, like, so right here where it says achieves all required standards and responsibilities laid out in the Memorandum of Understanding, or MOU, and demonstrates clear added value, so this kind of gets to where you're talking about, such as implementing improvements, going beyond scope, right here when it says Going Beyond Scope, I almost feel like you're saying we should have examples of what that looks like. Is that so if we were, like, going beyond scope and in parentheses, we were, partnering with agencies, but not so prescriptive.
6. Sunita Garrett: Yes, just a quick example so that people know, like, oh, okay, that makes sense. Because right now, it just looks like you're that one agency has exceeded the expectations on their own without any added support. There must be a collaboration somewhere for that to happen. And as a direct service provider that's what we do, to ensure that the clients received expected and beyond expected services. We go into HMIS, and we look for other agencies that they probably have partnered with and try to find someone at that agency that we can work with even if they are getting referred by the county. We go to that agency, and we work with them to ensure that everything meets the expectations even though we are the service-providing agency, the primary service-providing agency. I just think that that's important to note that we don't do this work by ourselves. We do it in collaboration. It would be in exceeds expectations, because they have gone beyond what they're doing to reach out to other agencies for supportive services that either they are not able to provide, or their agency may no longer provide, or they're sunsetting those services, you know what I mean? They need support to get there. They're working trying to do it themselves, and then they realize exceeding expectations that, yes, they can

do the work, but they also need that collaborative partners support. And by receiving that this is how much more service was able to be provided to participants that are coming into the program.

7. Lyn Nesbitt: That makes a lot of sense. And the reason why I started talking about it looking at the three different missions and kind of classifying them with the ad of what you were saying is because I think when we add that example in the rest of the definition kind of has to then reflect that there has been added in, so that way they know, like, okay, if I'm not doing what I need to do in the MOU, and I'm not going on beyond the scope, what do I need? I need to know that I need support with those things, and I think that kind of gets into what Ray was talking about in terms of maybe that means we might need to have an example and needs improvement that says, hey, you didn't do this, this, like, maybe you didn't do the MOU, like responsibilities and you also did not try to go above and beyond, too. So, what can we do to get you even to meeting the MOU expectations? And then, what can we do to get you to go beyond that, if it feels that way.
- iv. Marcell Lloyd: I just wanted to make sure that these proposed evaluation definitions are solely just definitions for the evaluation template that organizations will fill out, and so I went back, and I did find from our last month's meeting that the collaborative application and the responsibilities in each section, whether it exceeds, meets expectation, or needs improvement. And so, based off the questions or responsibilities that they're going to be checking to see if they meet these, I do think these definitions help give the clarity that we were asking for last month and what is exceeds expectations and meets expectation and needs improvement.
- v. Ray Corona: I like the idea of kind of having, like, a more in-depth scope. I just don't think the ratings should depend on, like, another agency's performance. And, like, what that means is just, like. It shouldn't focus on what the collaborative application itself does. It should evaluate what the collaborative applicant itself does, not the performance of partnering. So having that example is definitely key to giving it a more in-depth scope which is really vital to this is the direction you should go in. This is, like, what we define exceeds, also. But it should also have that the evaluation is not focusing on who you partner with, it's focusing on how you lead. Am I keeping it fair? You know what I mean? It should have an example, but with the clarity that it's not who you partner with, it's about how you are leading being the collaborative applicant.
- vi. Kris Maun: Serena made a really great suggestion in the chat. That I think could probably walk that ground between what Sunita is recommending and what Ray has raised. And that is that adding in where we have demonstrated clear added value, such as implementing improvements, going beyond scope. "Modeling best practices, including partnership and collaboration that advanced system goals". And I think, Sunita, that gets to elevating the value of what you were saying and partnership and collaboration. But Ray not tying it to, I'm only going to be successful in my evaluation based on someone else's performance and my ties to them. Would that be a good way to balance those two things?

1. Ray Corona: Yeah, I like that idea. I like the way you put it, too. Perfect. That pretty much sums it up for me.
 2. Kris Maun: Also clarifying that these definitions will only apply to the Collaborative Applicant Evaluation.
- vii. Sunita Garrett: I wasn't talking about tying performance to collaboration at all. [Due to technical issues, part of Sunita's statement cut in and out so not all of it could be heard or recorded]. I wasn't saying that performers should be tied to collaborative service, you know. What I was saying is when you're speaking of exceeding expectations. That should be a part of exceeding expectations that there was supportive services outside of what was offered, and it was from another agency. And this is how we are able to provide more services. I wasn't talking about needing improvement or meeting expectations. I was just speaking specifically about exceeding expectations. And what should be a small part of.
- viii. Lyn Nesbitt shared what the proposed suggestion from Serena to the Exceeds Expectations Definition. Sunita Garrett agreed that was responsive to what she had been sharing.
- ix. Stanley Wong: Based on my understanding of the conversation so far, collaboration with other organizations is just one of the ways that the program can be rated exceeds expectation, but collaboration exceeds expectation is not necessary. You have to be collaboration with others. But collaboration could be one of their factors that makes the program or the score to be exceeds expectation, right? It's just one of the criteria that possibly put them in that high level of scoring, but it's not a must. Is that what we'll be saying?
1. Lyn Nesbitt: I think that's exactly right and that's why we're trying to say or instead of and we say you can do these different things, but it doesn't have to be all of them. It could be one of them as long as they meet expectations, That is what we do need. However, I hear you all saying that we do need to have a definition and expand a little bit on the exceed expectations definition. Which is what Sunita, Ray, and Serena added to that.
- d. Action Item: The Committee will vote on whether to approve the evaluation definitions for the Collaborative Applicant Evaluation Template.
- i. Marcell Lloyd moved to approve the following evaluation definitions:
 1. Exceeds Expectations: Achieves all required standards and responsibilities laid out in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and demonstrates clear added value, such as implementing improvements, going beyond scope, or modeling best practices, including partnership and collaboration, that advance system goals.
 2. Meets Expectations: Achieves all required standards and fulfills responsibilities as defined by project scope or contractual obligations.
 3. Needs Improvement: Does not consistently meet required standards or deliverables; improvement plans should be developed and monitored.
 - ii. Tunisia Owens seconded the motion.
 - iii. The motion passed unanimously with 8 yes's and one abstention.
 - iv. Due to technical issues, Sunita Garrett's vote could not be heard or recorded.

e. Next Steps:

- i. The Collaborative Applicant will be provided the Collaborative Applicant Template with the approved definitions to complete.
- ii. From December through February, the Collaborative Applicant will complete the evaluation and present the rules to the SCF Committee.
- iii. A detailed timeline is available in the [Collaborative Applicant Evaluation Frequently Asked Questions \(FAQ\)](#).

7. Evaluation Definitions Project Proposal

a. Overview:

- i. At the October 9, 2025 meeting, the Committee identified a need to define evaluation terms, including Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Needs Improvement.
- ii. While the Committee has taken immediate action to define these terms for the Collaborative Applicant Evaluation, this has identified an opportunity for the SCF Committee to develop CoC-wide evaluation definitions, which can be adopted across multiple evaluations and monitoring.
- iii. The [Evaluation Definitions Project Proposal](#) was prepared for the SCF Committee to discuss whether it wants to develop evaluations definitions through a collaborative process and will recommend the results to the Leadership Board for adoption. The proposal was shared with Committee members prior to the meeting.

b. Why Should SCF Consider this Project:

- i. Aligns with the SCF Committee's purpose and with the EveryOne Home Governance Charter:
 1. The purpose of the CoC Standards, Compliance, and Funding Committee is to support preparation of applications for CoC funding and support the Leadership Board in fulfilling its obligations as outlined in the HUD's CoC Program Interim Rule, (24 CFR 578.8.)
- ii. SCF Committee members came up with this idea:
 1. Committee members identified the need to define the Collaborative Applicant Evaluation Metrics
 2. Based on what you identified, Homepage facilitators put together this proposal for the committee to review, to give shape to potential projects that could be worked on.
- iii. The CoC conducts multiple evaluations and monitors projects throughout the year.
 1. The need for evaluation metrics to be defined is consistent in other evaluations such as HMIS, and Coordinated Entry evaluations happening in other committee spaces within the CoC
- iv. Creating CoC wide evaluation definitions has the potential to:
 1. Create consistency between all the CoC-Wide evaluation metrics
 2. Promote understanding for evaluators and
 3. Improve transparency
- v. If the Committee chooses to work on the Evaluation Definitions Project:

- 1. The SCF Committee would develop evaluation definitions through a collaborative process and then give those recommendations to the leadership board for review and if they choose to, adopt them across all CoC-wide evaluations.
 - c. Discussion:
 - i. Marcell Lloyd: Well done!
 - 1. Lyn Nesbitt: Well done to y'all, y'all brought this up we expanded on it.
 - ii. Ray Corona: To clarify, if we could just go through what it looks like. As far as what exceeds expectations, right? And just adding a fairness and if it needs improvement, right? We're not just, like, stamping the needs improvement title on it, and, like, kind of letting it be. But we have a way to help follow up so that possibly can meet the middle. If it doesn't exceed it. Just want to be fair, right? Like, what does exceed mean? Will we be able to just evaluate the definitions a little more later?
 - 1. Lyn Nesbitt and Kris Maun confirmed this vote would just be for the SCF Committee to take up the project. The SCF Committee would spend more time on the definitions themselves as part of the project.
 - d. Action Item: The Committee will vote on whether to approve the Evaluation Definitions Project Proposal.
 - i. Marcell Lloyd moved to approve the Evaluation Definitions Project Proposal.
 - ii. Ray Corona seconded the motion.
 - iii. The motion passed unanimously with 9 yes's.
 - iv. Due to technical issues, Sunita Garrett's vote could not be heard or recorded.
- 8. Closing**
- a. The next meeting of the Committee will be December 4th 2025, from 1:00pm to 2:30pm.

Committee Members

Jennifer Lucky	Absent
Riley Wilkerson	Present
Josh Jacobs	Present
Stanley Wong	Present
C'Mone Falls	Absent
Erik Martinez	Absent
Tunisia Owens	Present
Ivan Ortiz	Present
Marcell Lloyd	Present
Lindal Sambrook	Present
Sunita Garrett	Present

Varon Brown	Absent
Ray Corona	Present
Ms. Shelley Gonzalez	Present
Annette Sanders	Absent

Public Attendance:

- Lyn Nesbitt, Homebase
- Kris Maun, Homebase
- Christoverre Kohler
- Serena Clayton