



Administrative and Finance Committee

Current date: 2/16/2024

Next meeting: 3/8/2024

Attendance: Ali Hilton, Becky Poitras, Heather Bradley-Geary, John Tramel, Lynn Rose, Rachel Erpelding, Robbie Phillips, Susila Jones, Tehani El-Ghussein

Staff: Marqueia Watson, Amber Bauer, Shida McCormick

Public: Amanda Stadler, DMH

2/16/2024 Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Scorecard Review/Update
3. Application Feedback
4. Attendance Policy for Committee
5. Slate of Officers for Committee
 - a. Chair (Funded): Lynn Rose
 - b. Chair (Non-Funded): John Trammel
6. Vice Chair: Tehani El-Ghussein
7. Secretary: Rachel Erpelding
7. Update on YHDP
8. Update on Healthcare and Housing
9. Public Comment
10. Other Business
11. Adjournment

2/16/2024 Minutes

Objectives/ Agenda	Owner/ Speaker	Action items/Results
Call to Order	HBG	Heather called the meeting to order at 9:03am and shared that both February meetings' minutes will be presented at the first March meeting.
Scorecard Review/Update	Shida	<p>GKCCEH HMIS staff have been meeting about possible score-card revisions. Shida presented their ideas. All recommended scorecard changes are meant to be useful to the program, to help guide it toward continuous improvement. The committee asked to delay discussing how to score the proposed revisions until after hearing all proposals.</p> <p>Add: Percent of grant left unspent at the end of the last completed grant cycle.</p> <p>Discussion: Overall agreement that this is worth reviewing and scoring, with the CoC having left >\$1 million left on the table. However, would like to see exceptions for first year awards which are protected per local procedures; for second year grants without an APR which are protected per local procedures;</p>

		<p>for first year expansion grants - only examine % of original grant left unspent, not the expansion portion. Also consider a tiered score based on % left unspent</p> <p>Change/Add: Reduce points in positive exits and place them in a new category: Returns to homelessness within 6 months after program exit to permanent housing.</p> <p>Discussion: Right now, only positive exits are looked at, not whether the person/HH returns to homelessness in the period immediately or shortly following exit. Overall, committee agrees with this change. Considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Data quality issues - Important to continue to define and train users in what constitutes positive exits (and how to ensure accuracy of those reports, e.g., having something in writing or a key to unit if moving in with family/friends permanently.) ● Establishing a threshold is important - 100% positive exits is not the expectation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Must consider the # of exits as well; if very few, then score could be dramatically skewed. Also impacted if have few exits. ○ Also don't want to disincentive move-on, based on concerns that client may or may not fall out of housing at some point, e.g., client exits to nursing home b/c truly needed, and are kicked out ● Establishing the point in time that homelessness is re-evaluated is important. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recommend within 6 months for RRH as this is the maximum timeframe a RRH program can provide aftercare assistance ○ System Perf measures look all the way to 24 months ○ Recognize the farther out from program exit, the less the likely the program interventions influence the outcome ● Using CW can simultaneous review use of emergency shelter and street outreach (new) ● TBD how VSPs could be evaluated against this measure <p>Add: Average number of days from project entry to Housing move-in date</p> <p>Discussion: Agreed this is important to review and measure. While the target is 30 days, most programs are closer to 60 days or longer. Also encourages data quality and timeliness b/c sometimes the move-in info is just missing. Can consider the housing market and how long it is taking for all grantees.</p> <p>Add: Number of days from project referral to project entry</p> <p>Discussion: Agreed; this evaluation point will help to enforce CES procedures. Timeliness of referrals is the responsibility of both the provider as well as GKCEEH.</p> <p>Add: Bed Utilization Rate (PSH only because RRH beds can vary)</p> <p>Discussion: Committee recommends only looking at this rate if PSH providers left any grant leasing \$ unspent. PSH providers shared that, similar to RRH, bed utilization may be down while unit utilization may be up. PSH and RRH</p>
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>providers shared that they had sought guidance from HUD Field Office about this and the differences between the application and the actual; HUD basically said not to worry about it, as long as taking referrals exclusively through CES. If agencies really wanted to make a change, they would be required to go through the HUD grant amendment process.</p> <p>Change: Max percent to exit to place not meant for human habitation (PNMH) to exits to all homelessness destinations</p> <p>Discussion: Agreed but also realize need some procedures around how, in real time, show who is in OR and in a CE program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● HMIS staff can add this to a monthly report ● HMIS staff to share this info not just with the program but with CE staff so it can be discussed at Housing Solutions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted - If exit/re-housed within 7 days, it's not counted as a return to homelessness (even if not housed) <p>Remove: Serves High Needs Population (chronicity, >2 disabilities, etc.)</p> <p>Discussion: Agreed. Programs do not have control over who is referred thru CES.</p> <p>Add (based on Committee's discussion): % of annual assessments completed when required.</p> <p>Discussion: Agreed upon. This is HUD required and is worth evaluating to help promote timeliness and completion by programs.</p> <p>Have made strides in the NOFO process, from not using any data to where we are now. Kudos.</p> <p>At next meeting, Committee asked Shida to present recommendations for thresholds, with how they tie with system performance measures and current projects' outcomes related to these measures.</p> <p>Marqueia reminded the Committee that it has discussed having a tier of programs which, based on scorecards, do not have to re-apply in the NOFO. Can we do that this year, based on new scorecard? Let's strongly consider this.</p>
Application Feedback	Marqueia	<p>Only one feedback message on the document Marqueia shared last week and it was about formatting.</p> <p>All content-related feedback due in Google Doc by 2/28.</p> <p>Leadership team will discuss at 3/6 leadership meeting.</p>
Attendance Policy for Committee	HBG, Tehani	<p>HBG reminding attendance policy in the charter is attendance at 80% of meetings. Tehani shared that 5 of the 12 members are below this acceptable rate for calendar year 2023.</p> <p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Committee agreed that we would start fresh with attendance now. ● Tehani to email each member's 2023 attendance rates individually for reference ● Attendance will be a part of the regular leadership team agenda going forward. ● Chair will be having conversations proactively with members if

		<p>attendance rates dip.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Each member is also accountable to assess their own capacity to serve on committee.
Slate of Officers	HBG	<p>Becky moved to accept the slate and Susila seconded. Discussion clarified that Lynn Rose as funded co-chair was a continuation (not a new term). The slate passed, effective 3/1/24:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Chair (Funded): Lynn Rose ● Chair (Non-Funded): John Trammel ● Vice Chair: Tehani El-Ghussein ● Secretary: Rachel Erpelding
YHDP Update	Amber, John, Ali	<p>Not much change since last week. Reiterated upcoming work and how impressive the youth and the work being done is. Youth are having honest, courageous conversations which can be used as a model in other parts of the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Insight shared around the payoff value of compensating people for their expertise. ● Amber has timeline and documents available for those interested in them. <p>It's been good to connect varied stakeholders.</p>
Update on Healthcare and Housing Workgroup	HBG	<p>Met yesterday for a productive working session. They will have ready in March a set of recommended best practices to propose this committee approves (and sends to the community for adoption.)</p> <p>Robbie will be joining. He and Rachel can act as liaisons with the Admin committee.</p> <p>As workgroup chair, Heather will send updates monthly to John for the committee.</p>
Public Comment		None
Other Business	HBG	<p>HBG and committee expressed thanks to one another. HBG reminded committee she is still available to support as needed, including John as he transitions into the Chair role.</p> <p>HBG will delete meeting requests from her calendar. This likely will cancel events for us so they will need to be sent out by John or his designee. This impacts full committee and leadership meetings.</p>
Adjournment	HBG	<p>Lynn moved to adjourn the meeting. Robbie seconded and the motion passed. The meeting concluded at 10:30am.</p>

Recorded and submitted by: Tehani El-Ghussein