# Continuum of Care Board Minutes

### 4/20/2023
### 11:00 AM - 1:00 PM

**Attendance:**

*Board Members:* Brandi Tuck, Drew Grabham, Ian Slingerland, Mark Morford, Cammisha Manley, Jessica Harper, Christina McGovney, Xenia Gonzalez, Elise Cordle Kennedy, Jamar Summerfield, Patrick Reynolds, Justin Barrieault, Hannah Studer, Stuart Zeltzer  [Absent – Laura Golino de Lavato, Lizzie Cisneros, Katie Cox, Sherelle Jackson, Amanda Esquive, Jennifer Chang]

*JOHS & County Staff:* Alyssa Plesser, Bill Boyd, Malka Geffen, Jenna Kivanc, Abigail Phillips, Jason Kyler-Yano, Lori Kelly

*Special Guests:* Matt Olsson and Patrick Wigmore (Homebase)

| Agenda Item | Discussion Points | Decision/Action |
|---|---|---|
| Opening | <ul><li>Land & Labor Acknowledgment</li><li>Review Community Agreements</li><li>Review Agenda</li></ul> | |
| Board vote on Data Quality Plan | The following JOHS staff were available to provide context and answer questions: Jenna Kivanc, Data Manager, Abigail Phillips, Data Quality Manager, and Jason Kyler-Yano, Research Evaluation Analyst<br><br>The CoC Lead presented the Board's questions about the Data Quality Plan.:<br>- What key stakeholders participated in the review: Transition Projects, Self-Enhancement Inc., Our Just Future, NAYA, NARA NW, JOIN, Central City Concern, El Programa Hispano Católico; DQ Plan was reviewed internally by JOHS Leadership, Equity, Program, Data, and Planning & Evaluation teams<br>- Is it possible to define the ongoing training in the plan?<br>The CoC Lead replied that JOHS is in the process of creating that strategic plan around HMIS training, which will include initial end-user training for providers, training around reports, and intermediate training as well. Once the data team has specifics on that they will come and share that, and we can incorporate that into the annual review cycle for this data quality plan.<br>- Other feedback was to spell out acronyms and that was completed.<br>The Data Manager thanked CoC Board members for their feedback | |

| | and questions and provided information on the development of the plan. The team looked at data quality planning guidance from HUD and reviewed 15 plans from other CoCs. They also reviewed the original plan from 2018, to make it more robust. It sets benchmarks to have data entered within ten calendar days, and that is maintained. Another maintained benchmark is to have 90% completion across the universal data elements. The goal is to complete the data quality plan now, as we head into HMIS implementation and will review every year, bringing any substantive changes to the CoC Board for approval.<br><br>    - Are license monitoring reports spent on a specific timeframe? We have a regular process and an ad-hoc process. We want to maintain a number of inactive licenses to accommodate new users. Whenever we dip below that number, we will do an ad hoc monitoring and that's what we're in the process of doing right now. A frequent monitoring also happens I believe every other month (will get back to you about the exact timeframe).<br><br>    - Were there a lot of issues about people not logging in and having to be re-enrolled?<br>We reach out to individuals (or agency administrators) before sunsetting their license.<br><br>    - CoC Lead read question in chat: I have a question about service transactions and how they're being used for which project types. Do they match how other CoC implementations use service transactions? Also, is there a way to mark shelter types in order to understand outcomes based on certain shelter types?<br>There are different project types in Service Point (emergency shelter, transitional shelter, PSH, Rapid Rehousing, etc), and we have that more detailed shelter data captured in our reporting. I'll have to get back to you about service transactions, as to what is the standard around tracking services outside our CoC, and will follow up.<br><br>    - We aren't currently capturing supportive housing services, just the shelter system, and it would be great to do that without it being too time burdensome on our contracted providers. It would be great to capture what it takes in totality in the system to create the outcome of an intervention.<br>That conversation is happening in the FUSE space, in the context of scope, and the systems data task force that meets with the Chair and folks from the City, as well as a representative from HealthShare. These conversations look at how we can leverage all of the data outside of the homeless services system; there are a lot of issues around data sharing and privacy that need to be worked out.<br><br>    - Conversations like this are an opportunity to engage the provider community. In this instance there were a total of 10% of providers contacted. Is there a way for JOHS staff to get more provider feedback?<br>This is an iterative plan with additions and changes to come. There are monthly administrator and key user HMIS meetings where we talk | |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | about the data quality plan and where we solicited reviews. Hearing that this is not enough, we can figure out a more comprehensive way of  reaching out to  providers in the future, when JOHS will be HMIS Lead (taking over for PHB).<br>    - I recommend more communication with other CoCs and the State to better understand how each of these HMIS implementations can more cohesively talk with one another, especially in regard to what's being asked in the emergency order.<br>Jenna listed existing meetings and collaborations, including a standing monthly meeting around measurement and another around implementation. We're the first entity to revisit our data quality plan in the past five years,, and this (first) review will serve as template for other CoCs DQP reviews.<br>    - It might be worth connecting on what's happening with the Balance of State, too.<br>The CoC Lead presented a question about the connection between Built for Zero and HMIS. BfZ project manager, Abigail Phillips, answered re: client data. BfZ pulls info from HMIS to create the quality by-name list (which is a bigger and more comprehensive picture of who is experiencing homelessness). The quality by-names list includes those only receiving services and not necessarily staying in shelter.<br>The Planning & Evaluation Manager added that the only anonymous data we look at in any depth is the PIT count, and HMIS has always been a by-name list, while BfZ is broader and more rigorous.<br><br>Patrick called for a fist of five to approve the Data Quality Plan; votes entered in chat (all 5s and three 4s). The DQP with the acknowledgement page removed was approved. | |
| Homebase "Action Planning" continued | Matt & Patrick shared the action planning presentation to receive feedback from the Board.<br><br>Action steps in green are ones Homebase have enough clarity to move forward with, ones in red are broader and need clarification, and ones in blue have draft ideas ready.<br><br>Goal #4<br>    ● Seems to fall under purview of CAC and might be helpful in guiding their work<br>        ○ goals/timelines to be approved by full Board<br>    ● Need to ensure alignment between project performance and systemic success for the purposes of the national competition - needs to take into account both local and national priorities.<br><br>Goal #6<br>    ● Selecting people from this community to lead this would be good. | |

● Would love to see some requirement regarding people with lived experience inclusion on committees, leadership groups, etc.
  ○ CA Lead said JOHS LEAC will coordinate with this and other committees, but there are a lot of items on the LE committee's plate already and it hasn't even started.
  ○ Need to make sure - both for this priority and others - that we're not duplicating efforts already happening elsewhere (e.g., SHS).
    ■ Opportunity to look at priorities across the two groups? Staff who are supporting the groups compare action plans; groups should also have autonomy.
    ■ Justin can give SHS updates to the CoC Board.

Goal #7
● CoC Lead asked whether this priority should be reframed so that it is about incorporating equity analyses already underway into Board decision-making?
● Get ongoing information about existing analyses and look at where CoC Board resources can address equity gaps.
● This approach/description is seconded by multiple Board members.

Goal #2
● Getting a thumbnail or training of other funding sources would help. Board members discuss what training looks like, and CoC Lead will arrange JOHS staff to provide.
● CoC Lead said one of our goals was to find overlap between priorities to get them down to 5, and asked whether this can be rolled into goal #7? and goals 4 and 6 can be similarly combined.
● People voiced approval for combining.

Goal #1
● Came from our interest in CoC taking high-level positions on local government decisions re: homeless sector.
● White Paper on CoC's views on priority needs and direction could be helpful. Also, we should be able to be responsive.
  ○ Could just have a couple slides that state a CoC position on policy priorities.
  ○ Create a vision workgroup to develop talking points.
● Have space in CoC meetings to discuss emerging issues.

Reach out directly to Homebase with any further feedback; CoC Lead will hold an additional meeting for fleshing out the last two points.