



## Administrative and Finance Committee

Current date: March 15, 2024

Next meeting: April 12, 2024

**Attendance:** Ali Hilton, Becky Poitras, John Tramel, Kevin Jean-Paul, KK Assmann, Lynn Rose, Rachel Erpelding, Robbie Phillips, Tehani El-Ghoussein

**Staff:** Marqueia Watson, Amber Bauer, McCormick

**Public:** Amy Copeland, Brandie Blair

### 3/15/24 Agenda

1. Review and approve minutes from 2/9/2024 and 2/16/2024
2. Discuss CoC collaborative application and DV bonus application feedback
3. Review and approve CoC Governance Committee Nominations
4. Review Program Standards
5. Share Update for YHDP
6. Share Update for Healthcare and Housing Committee
7. Public Comment

### 3/15/24 Minutes

Objectives/ Agenda	Owner/ Speaker	Action items/Results
Call to Order	John Tramel	Called to order at 9:03
Discuss Coc Collaborative	John Tramel	<b>J1d5 – RRH as reported on the HIC -0 out of 9</b>

<p>Application and DV Bonus Application Feedback</p>	<p>Shida said there are questions about RRH on HIC – only looks at families who have a move in date, not a bed count or unit count. Becky asked “were CoC’s being scored on increases over a specific time frame, year over year, or one year” Was reduction in COVID dollars being considered (loss of bed this Questions at conference last week. Norm said they are looking at year over year increases in total number of beds for RRH – They have a housing move in date in the year over year or they remain housed. They did take into account that there was a reduction in COVID dollars and there were partial points available. What amount are they looking to increase?</p> <p>Becky can look at MO BOS because they got 2 points, KS BOS got 0 points. They went from 316 to 350 from year to year. This is an 11% increase. There doesn’t seem to be logic into who got points.</p> <p>Marqueia reached out to field office - online debrief – tension around whether CoC’s could get a more detailed debrief. She doesn’t believe we will be able to get more information. 604 is heavy on PSH.</p> <p>There are several people who do not have a move-in date. This impacts the score. We’re not sure what this score actually says. Is this what RRH projects are serving now or what they said they would serve? Becky states this is counting an increase in the total number of people in RRH beds year over year.</p> <p><b>1e - Project Review, Ranking and Selection</b> – down 3 points. 21 out of 18 points. Lynn is not sure if we need to discuss. Did better than the year before.</p> <p><b>2a</b> all points</p> <p><b>2c1</b> – Reduction in the number of first time homeless. We have an increase in first-time homelessness. There were questions about how this was counted.</p> <p>Shida – stated this is counted in HMIS by the first time someone is entered into the HMIS system. There will be more training for front line staff on who should be entered into HMIS and training on diversion. Discussed adding a field for why a client is homeless for the first time.</p> <p>John – asked the question “how can we tell the story better”.</p> <p><b>2c2</b> – Length of time homeless – 5 out of 13. Last year we got 13 out of 13. Went down.</p>
--	--

		<p>Lynn - We decided we are going to score this measure this year and maybe this will help.</p> <p>Becky, is this total length of time homeless and not time from referral to move in. This is total amount of time</p> <p>Shida – training is needed in this area for people entering information so case managers understand what this means and how to enter this.</p> <p>Becky - Do we need to look at this on the CE Side? Can we look at referrals for people who are not necessarily higher acuity but a longer time homeless in CE process?</p> <p>CE group has wanted to revamp tool. If the length of time spent homeless was a bigger factor this should be a factor.</p> <p>Tehani – DV clients do not have the length of time homeless required. If we use only this information on CE tool, we need to have some other factors. Need to do a housing history on people taking assessment to be able to accurately answer questions. Info being collected is not consistent. Discussed masking questions. Shida stated masked questions don't get counted. Becky said we need a script.</p> <p><b>2c3 – Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations/ Retention of Permanent Housing</b></p> <p>Shida – looking at this monthly. Capturing exits and returns to homelessness monthly and they are going back to the agency to ask about the situation and fix the data before SPM is due and fixing information in real time.</p> <p><b>2c4 - Returns to homelessness</b> – 7 out of 8 –John this is pretty good.</p> <p><b>2c5 – Increase in Employment Cash/Income.</b> 7 out of 7. We went down in this score, got 7 out of 7 last year.</p> <p>Allison – is this specific to employment only?</p> <p>John – 2<sup>nd</sup> part is increase in non-employment income.</p> <p>Discussion about challenges: Becky – this is frustrating because if someone already has a disability, this isn't going to increase.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>John – for Youth, this is a massive fluctuation because they move jobs often.</p> <p>Discussion about annual assessments and can we do this early if a client gets income at the time of scoring and if it has to be plus or minus 30 days.</p> <p>How will this change if we move to a 2 year cycle?</p> <p><b>DV Bonus Feedback</b> – all of them scored well. We don't need to go through these unless anyone has feedback or wants to go through them.</p> <p>Becky said she heard at the conference that if if we would have scored higher on collaborative score, we would have received DV bonus dollars. The scores were weighted.</p> <p>Tehani discussed the CoC Collaboration with the Victim Service Provider Collaboration. She believes we are doing well in this area and how we might increase this score.</p> <p>Amber thinks that trainings and digging into the data more will help improve our Collaborative points. Maybe we should get RRH programs together.</p>
Review and approve CoC Governance Committee Nominations	John Tramel	Rachel & Becky said they would be open to this, and Allison and Kevin said they would like to participate. Rachel and Becky would be willing to step back since they are in other spaces. We moved forward Kevin and Allison. Becky moved, second by Lynn. Kevin and Allison were moved forward to this committee.
Review Program Standards	Amber Bauer	Amber said a small committee had delays, so they are not prepared to get these to the Admin committee. Goal is to get them to the committee by April 12 <sup>th</sup> . First meeting in April
Any Additional Updates on YHDP & Healthcare and Housing	John Tramel	<p>Might do these updates once per month.</p> <p>YHDP – had some smaller working groups meet this week. Working on governance structure and will be having a retreat True Colors with core YHDP team to set up governance structure in core Youth for Change team. Trying to make this process personal and KC Centric.</p> <p>Healthcare and Housing hasn't met again.</p>
Admin & Finance Committee	John Tramel	John's goal is to have an application from young adults by the next meeting. Lynn was checking in on Heartland Center for Jobs and Freedom to see if anyone from there would be interested in the

Member Openings		committee. Does this put us over our CoC funded members for YHDP. Charter says no more than 50% funded agencies on the committee.
Motion to End		Closing meeting Becky Piotras moved to close session, Allison Hilton 2 <sup>nd</sup> . Meeting Adjourned at 10:33am
Public Comment		No Public Comment

Next meeting: Scorecard standards, update on the potential youth member for this group from John, we were supposed to get a draft of program standards, application feedback for DV bonus applications, centralizing housing location services?

**Recorded and submitted by:**  
Rachel Erpelding