Administrative and Finance Committee

Current date: Jul 21, 2023	Next meeting: Jul 28, 2023

Attendance: Ali Hilton, Becky Poitras, John Tramel, KK Assmann, Lynn Rose, Rachel Erpelding, Susila Jones, Tehani El-Ghussein

Staff: Amber Bauer, Patricia Hernandez, Shida McCormick

Public: Brandi Bair, Director of Grants and Compliance at Hope House; Amy Copeland, Department of Mental Health; Amanda Stadler, Homelessness Services Coordinator at Department of Mental Health

7/21/23 Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes
3. DMH Concern
4. DMH presentation (5 minutes)
5. Committee questions to DMH (5 minutes)
6. NOFO Timeline and Training
7. Review Grant Scoresheet and Other Documents (including scorecards)
8. Public Comment
9. Next Meeting
10. Adjournment

7/21/23 Minutes

Objectives/ Agenda	Owner/ Speaker	Action items/Results
Call to Order	John	Called the meeting to order at 9:04am
Approval of Minutes	John	Lynn **moved to accept the minutes** as presented, and Becky seconded. Minutes were approved as presented.
DMH Concern & Presentation	John, Amanda Stadler, Amy Copeland	John explained that each party will have the floor for 5 minutes, DMH to present and Committee to ask questions. This is not the time for discussion. Lynn volunteered to act as timekeeper. Amanda shared that they were recently monitored by GKCCEH. They thought they had prepared in advance, having been through HUD monitoring previously. They realized they did not have a full understanding of the CoC monitoring expectations. They then reached out with questions and a request for action by

		this committee. Specific request is that the committee develops a written monitoring process, to be approved by membership, that includes expectations of the monitoring visit and includes client informed consent regarding disclosure of personal health information (PHI) and personally identifying information (PII). Amanda explained that DMH wants to work with the CoC but needs more information to prepare.
Committee questions to DMH	John	John opened the question/answer period. Multiple committee members asked questions, and both DMH representatives responded. What were the issues DMH was unprepared for? ● 1) Thought monitoring was for the most of the grant year, not for anyone still enrolled regardless of when they enrolled. 2) Because it included all open files, DMH did not have them redacted and does not have written consent to share PHI/PII. DMH had clients from the current year redacted and ready for review. Are you providing mental health services? ● Yes Are those medical records a part of the client file? ● Yes, at least inclusive of care coordination through which medical issues could be revealed. Do you have a ROI in place for HMIS? ● Yes. There is a ROI for HMIS, but not for GKCCEH staff for the purpose of monitoring. The info in the file is above and beyond what is entered into HMIS and includes care coordination. Was GKCCEH staff asking for PHI? Committee began discussion about whether such information could be kept separately until John reminded the group that this time was meant for Q&A only. Committee moved on to the next question. Did the notice provide how far back info would be looked at? ● No Parties thanked one another for listening and sharing. Committee will review the shared information and provide a written response.
NOFO Timeline	Amber	HUD has not released anything new yet so much is still on hold. The Committee's leadership agreed to postpone the deadline of the LOI and monitoring from Friday 7/28 to Monday 7/24 at 5pm because Zoomgrants was down for a day. This was announced at the membership meeting and went out by email. Several committee members have heard from National Alliance conference attendees that HUD is saying eSnaps will open by early next week. Most recently distributed email with timeline did not include the mandatory trainings. The correct version with these dates will be uploaded online and sent by email with language that explains that updates will be added as they are released by HUD. Info is forthcoming and may change.
NOFO Training	Amber	Amber asked members of the committee (and others) to lead portions of the **mandatory trainings**. The following agreed:

		● **John** and Evy Duffy - Equity & Inclusion (John may be out and Evy is prepared) ● **Tehani** and **Kaylee** - Trauma Informed Care ● **Lynn** and **Becky** - HUD grant info, include MOHIP, ESG ● **Marquiea** and **Amber** - Program Types Amber will send out last years and we can revise by next Friday.
Review Grant Scoresheet and Other Documents (including scorecards)	Shida	Shida shared that for RRH programs, the HIC only records those enrolled with a move-in date, not those who are enrolled without a move-in date. There are lots more people enrolled compared to the number with a move-in date. Shida recommends that we look at why people are not being housed. Is it staffing? Is it data entry? Is it FMR? Is it something else? This needs to be fixed otherwise it will continue, regardless of whether more RRH projects are funded. Shida recommends HMIS run this data quarterly so CE staff can speak with RRH programs to understand the discrepancy. Susila raised the question, if our community isn't effective at RRH, are we setting up for success if CoC expands the # of RRH projects? She stated she doesn't disagree with the need for more housing, rather she questions the effectiveness of funding projects. In her work at Cross-Lines, and what she understands from Doug at Hope Faith, se consistently sees that agencies don't have the capacity for the front-end work, hence the need for SSO-CE projects. Lynn asked Shida, would leasing up more people in currently funded projects be enough to move the needle on what HUD is looking for in the NOFO? Yes, Shida responded. She also shared that positive housing destinations and housing retention is higher in RRH than other project types, so those who get housed are staying housed most consistently. Committee members with outreach and SSO-CE projects noted themes they see, which included: Not paying app fees, not paying deposits, not engaging, among others Who are these organizations? How can we provide TA about how CoC funds - or match - can be used? Recognize that standards are in the works and that there is a need for grantees to be educated on expectations and to be held accountable. Underscores the importance of knowing which projects are not performing / meeting needs. Committee asked, do we need to fund more SSO projects this year afterall? Members determined we first need to evaluate how they are functioning, how well they meet a community need, part of the plan, how and when to refer CE participants to the housing navigators and housing liaisons (likely earlier in the process). Members expressed concern around and the repetition of this discussion. It was suggested that, without consistent monitoring / evaluation and accountability, we will continue to have this discussion. Detailed expectations allow for preparedness and accountability so this could be a priority for this committee, in conjunction with others, to establish. Members discussed the purpose of SSO-CE projects being primarily about providing access to the CES, not necessarily the lease-up process, but clarified that some SSO projects are funded for property manager engagement and housing navigation. No opposition to the idea that current, and new, projects are evaluated on whether

		they have capacity to provide housing search process and other supportive services. Discussed without finalizing a decision about what to include for scoring this year? What for future? ● Returns to homelessness
Public Comment	Open	Amanda shared that DMH agrees with using data and performance based standards to evaluate projects. She expressed concern about making evaluatory changes in the NOFO period as it doesn't give renewal applicants the opportunity to address any issues learned in the changed process. ● Shida responded that this data is reported on through HUD's system performance measures and therefore should not be new/changes. Brandi inquired about how VSPs, who may not require PII collection for confidentiality reasons, and data quality of PII - is that taken into consideration when evaluating the data quality of PII. Could it instead by "n/a" for VSPs? ● Shida shared that HUD's data standards that will change in October 2023, partial SSN will no longer count as an error. Tehani raised concern over the scorecard's last section, which agencies have no control over because all referrals come through CE. Several members concurred and noted different program types also have different eligibility criteria. For example, RRH doesn't require HoH having a disability, yet being scored negatively if client's don't have >1. Brandi shared that she appreciated this discussion, seeing that the committee is aware of the areas of concern that grantees are experiencing in relation to the scorecards.
Next Meeting	John	Next meeting is scheduled for next Friday, July 28, 2023, in person at Drumm or virtually.
Adjournment	John	Ali moved and Becky seconded, and the motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 10:14am.

Information submitted by Department of Mental Health:

GKCCEH Monitoring Considerations for Finance and Admin Committee

1. GKCCEH create a CoC monitoring notification form with the ability of the CoC Membership to comment and approval by CoC. Essential elements could include:
   a. Date(s) and time(s) of monitoring
   b. Grant(s) to be monitored
   c. Scope of monitoring (project period of documents to be monitored)
   d. Documents to be monitored
   e. Questions GKCCEH would like answered during monitoring
2. CoC create a monitoring policy with ability of CoC Membership to comment. This policy could address:
   a. Frequency of monitoring
   b. Scope of monitoring (i.e. questions, documents, etc.)
   c. How to address monitoring issues

       d.   How monitoring information is collected and presented to agencies

       e.   Technical Assistance expectations for GKCCEH to offer providers who have monitoring deficiencies

       f.   Allow agencies to redact files for clients who do not have a release of information for GKCCEH to review their PII/PHI for file monitoring

3.   GKCCEH create a Release of Information for all CoC Funded Agencies to provide to clients related to GKCCEH reviewing their PII/PHI specifically for project monitoring not care coordination. This will allow for client-informed consent of the release of their personal information to a party for reasons other than care coordination.

Recorded and submitted by: Tehani El-Ghussein