



## SHS Advisory Committee Meeting

September 14, 2023 | 3:00-4:30 pm

**Attendance:** Jamar Summerfield, Jessica Mathis, Johnnie Shaver, Mitzie Pennet, Patrick Reynolds, Ria Tsinas, Sandra Comstock, Shannon Jones, Xenia Gonzalez, Cheryl Carter, Desiree' DuBoise

**STAFF:** Cristal Otero, Breanna Flores, Anna Johnson, Bill Boyd, Alyssa Plesser

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Decision/Action
Welcome Land and Labor Introductions SHS Updates	<p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● See slides for content</li> <li>● Does the committee want the SHS team to draft a plan for reporting back on spending recommendations and share with the committee? Or have the process be more organic as we go along?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We did not officially answer this question as a group</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Question:</b> How did these recommendations flow throughout JOHS as an organization?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Answer:</b> The recommendations were passed directly to JOHS leadership via email and the SHS team is working with leadership to collect their response.</li> <li>○ The recommendations process needs more detail and the SHS team would like to put more work into what would meet the committee's expectations.</li> <li>○ For now we will use the current process (to the degree that it has been developed).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Follow Up: SHS AC questions to JOHS leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What is the current strategic plan to address low recruitment and retention?</li> <li>● Some SHS providers sought additional FTE allocations last year that were declined. Why</li> </ul>	

was additional FTE not funded, and will the Joint Office add additional FTE this fiscal year?

**Notes:**

- The SHS team sent the pdf of a memo that answers these questions during the meeting.
- Can add a followup agenda item to our next session if needed in which committee members can provide more feedback.

**Feedback on the memo:**

- The response in the memo was frustrating.
- Agencies can't raise wages because we don't have consistent funding to raise them. An individual approach feels like instead of the county determining that there's a minimum they need to provide to fund retention and outreach for a service, they are saying what is the minimum we can provide per agency? This approach may pit agencies against each other.
- Second concern—Is JOHS just now creating a process to increase FTE?
- Don't like the way the cost of living is presented—4% is the typical cost of living adjustment, but it's 4% on a number that is already far behind.
- In the list of providers and FTE funds—would have liked to see how many FTE per allocation. (Other members agreed with that.)
- Aggregate amounts aren't particularly helpful when thinking about system-wide performance and retention.
- This isn't a market where nonprofits can compete for employees based on wages—if we don't take it seriously we won't see changes.
- Would have been helpful to review the information ahead of time and free up the time in the meeting for discussion.
- We can't respond properly in the meeting when we see materials in the meeting.
- Wage equity is really important—we need a living wage, transparency about different types of positions, and some minimums in place so there isn't competition, which drives up difficulties in retaining people.
- Capacity building dollars—will the dollars be opened to all qualified vendors or only those who have contracts currently? There should be

	<p>more vendors in the mix, especially those who serve underserved populations and culturally specific organizations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There should be systemic capacity building rather than individual capacity building.</li><li>• Also would like to request ratings on how well orgs are performing based on our standards. Organizations that are most effective and efficient should be funded.</li><li>• This committee should have some awareness around the performance of existing organizations. Some sort of rating doc? There should be more accountability with programs in general.</li><li>• What kind of criteria should be used in evaluating different programs? What happens if someone is evaluated and found lacking? Is there an evaluation tool that is more robust and focuses on the experiences of those in the system?</li><li>• There used to be a ranking for DV providers—was based on outcomes as you would enter in service point (how many served, housed at end of program, etc) Good info but not sure that's the info this committee needs?</li><li>• It's important to consider that many targeted communities don't have a lot of members in them—for instance, there won't be as many trans folks—but representation should be weighted. Shouldn't use data as simply a numbers game—not driving up numbers for the sake of it.</li><li>• There should be equity evaluations that evaluate how well orgs are serving our priority populations.</li><li>• Sometimes orgs are penalized by rankings because they're serving folks who have higher barriers and that comes across in the rankings.</li><li>• The HUD COC ranking is tied to federal government requirements and is only used to rank projects that are receiving HUD funding. The JOHS doesn't use that data or rankings to determine any other allocation in our office. The reasons for this are numerous—driven by HUD and not by JOHS. If we need to use it to apply for HUD funding we will, but we don't prefer to use it for SHS. It is also a very involved process and takes a lot of time for orgs to</li></ul>	
--	--	--

	provide the qualitative survey.	
Wage Study Presentation/ Q&A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● See slides for content</li> </ul> <p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Reflection: One idea is to have funded orgs implement requirements like mandatory 1 week vacations, because based on the study it seems like overwork is an issue.</li> <li>● Feedback from committee member: Don't know if having mandatory breaks are beneficial. The greater issue is not that agencies aren't allowing staff to go on break—it's more about caseload.</li> <li>● JOHS relies on the integrity and commitment and passion of folks doing direct service so if someone is faced with the option of not getting paid overtime, taking time off and having their phone flooded with messages when they return from people who needed help—that is a lot emotionally to put on a person.</li> <li>● Not until we bring caseloads down to something reasonable will we fix the problem. High caseloads make it difficult to have someone cover for you as well.</li> <li>● It would also help with situations where folks with lived experience are saying no one is answering the phone because everyone is maxed out.</li> <li>● Comes down to pay and quality of life. The govt. shouldn't be funding poverty wages.</li> <li>● How can the government pay people to do work that keeps them eligible for the same services we're providing?</li> <li>● <b>Question:</b> There is an interesting difference in the study between smaller and larger organizations—why are larger orgs paying lower wages and smaller orgs paying higher? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Answer:</b> Didn't delve into it in the study so it's an outstanding question. We could dig into it through the followup sessions and ongoing interactions with the JOHS workforce development team.</li> <li>○ Educated guess: Bigger orgs typically have multiple funding sources and multiple contracts, and are more likely to have funding to support multiple staff through those sources. They have</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<p>to bump up wages funding source by funding source, which is difficult because larger orgs have more funding streams. Smaller orgs may be more agile in that regard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Reflection: Is there a higher chance of getting funded with a lower wage level?</li> <li>● Everything we've discussed today are long term investments to get the system updated.</li> <li>● JOHS should continue to update wages to increase retention, showing people we care about them. If we continue to listen to feedback and recommendations, things will get better. If things don't change, a lot of the smaller orgs will burn out. The nonprofits depend on this funding.</li> <li>● Fighting for higher wages and getting engagement and more retention is important.</li> <li>● Have heard it repeated in a lot of committees—there needs to be more of a push for policy changes and getting the money into the hands of people who are unhoused. As well as a focus on keeping them housed. That takes peer support specialists, financial literacy, IDs, health insurances, job preparation, etc. We need programs that are going to do all that rather than transitional housing.</li> <li>● Proven lack of success with transitional housing because of higher barriers and folks are not able to follow through as much.</li> <li>● As a person with lived experience there's no way they would have been able to get into the programs for transitional housing.</li> <li>● Put the money into the hands of the people who are living on the streets. Brainstorm more about finding and developing organizations that are geared toward vulnerable groups.</li> <li>● JOHS: Agree that there should be more transparency in how we evaluate requests for FTE and other things in the JOHS.</li> <li>● JOHS contract evaluation process: if an org says they can serve a very high number of people per dollar, that would be a red flag. We are looking for quality service, not just the highest number of people served.</li> </ul>	
<p>SHS Q4 Report Highlights/</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● See slides for content</li> <li>● Did not have time for this section.</li> </ul>	

Q&A		
Retreat Brainstorming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What topics would the committee like to discuss at our day retreat this fall?</li> <li>• Did not have time for this section.</li> </ul>	

**Accessibility:** To help ensure equal access to services and activities, the Joint Office of Homeless Services will reasonably modify policies/procedures and provide auxiliary aids/services to persons with disabilities. Call 3 days in advance to request ADA assistance and 2 days in advance for translation services: 503-988-2520, TTY, 503-823-6868. Reimbursement for travel and childcare costs are available. Please contact SHS Admin Analyst Anna Johnson by email at [anna.johnson@multco.us](mailto:anna.johnson@multco.us)

**From the Chat:**

From Xenia Schez to All Panelists 03:05 PM

- Yup

From Cheryl Carter to All Panelists 03:06 PM

- Yup

From Johnnie Shaver (he/him); Equi Institute to All Panelists 03:13 PM

- heck yeah

From Cheryl Carter to All Panelists 03:13 PM

- Luv the fun fact

From Jessica Mathis (She/They) to All Panelists 03:18 PM

- Down with the summer, may it not RIP!

From Anna Johnson (she/her) SHS Team to All Panelists 03:21 PM

- Sandra and Patrick haven't gone yet either :)
- Oops sorry!

From Claudia S. (she/her) to All Panelists 03:26 PM

- Hi Anna, I'm about to join the meeting on my computer. Just FYI

Me to Claudia S. (she/her) (Direct Message) 03:32 PM

- Hi Claudia, apologies for running a little long. Are you okay with starting a little later?

From Claudia S. (she/her) to Me (Direct Message) 03:32 PM

- Sure, that's totally fine

Me to Claudia S. (she/her) (Direct Message) 03:32 PM

- Thank you! We appreciate you being here.

From Xenia Schez to All Panelists 03:50 PM

- I can't hear
- Nvm fixed it

From Johnnie Shaver (he/him); Equi Institute to All Panelists 03:51 PM

- A real lack of transparency, for sure, definitely agree

From Johnnie Shaver (he/him); Equi Institute to All Panelists 03:59 PM

- So sorry!

From Cristal (She/her) to Everyone 03:59 PM

- We will need to wrap up for the wage study briefing

From Johnnie Shaver (he/him); Equi Institute to All Panelists 03:59 PM

- Definitely

From Patrick Reynolds to All Panelists 04:05 PM

- In the context of \$107.1M of SHS funding compared to \$30M in CoC funding, it would seem that a 20page qualitative survey is reasonable for monitoring and improving our community's spending

From Sandra Comstock to All Panelists 04:06 PM

- Patrick and SHS staff: Is it possible to share the evaluation survey and rubric with our group?

From Cristal (She/her) to All Panelists 04:07 PM

- I agree with Patrick that evaluation is important, and since SHS funding is a local source and therefore flexible - this work can create a set of priorities for evaluation

From Jessica Mathis (She/They) to All Panelists 04:12 PM

- Your screen isn't sharing anymore, just an FYI.

From Patrick Reynolds to All Panelists 04:13 PM

- @Sandra, I can share the survey with the group via email

From Sandra Comstock to All Panelists 04:14 PM

- Ty Patrick

From Jessica Mathis (She/They) to All Panelists 04:17 PM

- When we're done could we go back to the slide we missed. I think you read a lot of interesting data I would like to review.

From Sandra Comstock to All Panelists 04:20 PM

- Could you describe the range of jobs included in associate level jobs?

From Claudia S. (she/her) to All Panelists 04:23 PM

- \$21.50/hr

From Cheryl Carter to All Panelists 04:24 PM

- Absolutely correct Mz J

From Cristal (She/her) to Everyone 04:25 PM

- Responding to Sandra's question - see page 21 of the study for a breakdown of roles - <https://live-johs.pantheonsite.io/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/REVISED-JOHS-CCB-Study-August-2023.pdf>

From Jessica Mathis (She/They) to All Panelists 04:25 PM

- I was thinking wage might skew higher in larger orgs, but that would be mean, not median.  
\*ED wage

From Claudia S. (she/her) to All Panelists 04:26 PM

- Thanks Cristal

From Jessica Mathis (She/They) to All Panelists 04:26 PM

- Thank you for the reminder!
- I was thinking ED wage might skew higher in smaller orgs, but that would be mean, not median.
- There is definitely more risk to the smaller orgs when they aren't funded and so much time and effort is spent on fundraising instead of program development.
- I hear that can happen even within the same funder, but between different contracts, especially between older and newer ones.

From Xenia Sanchez to All Panelists 04:38 PM

- Hope yall have good weekend

From riat to All Panelists 04:38 PM

- thanks yall

## **Q&A**

Anna Kurnizki (she/her), CW 03:31 PM

- I have a question about underspent dollars from SHS and the allocation as voted on by the county board. Can organizations that are qualified for SHS funding but not in a current contract with JOHS apply for/receive funding through the \$10m budget for capacity-building grants? Context for this question - Community Warehouse is interested in pursuing a contract with JOHS for next fiscal year (and have support from numerous stakeholders to do so), but first we need capacity-building funding to be able to expand and execute on the contract. If JOHS only

considers organizations that are currently contracted, this would miss the opportunity to fill gaps in the system and bring in new agencies to be able to contract, spend down SHS funds as designated by taxpayers, and provide needed/relevant services.

Anna Johnson (she/her) SHS Team 03:36 PM

- Hi Anna, thank you for this question! I will ask Cristal to address this once she is done presenting.

Breanna Flores (she/they) MultCo (You) 04:02 PM

- Hi Anna, here is my email address: [breanna.flores@multco.us](mailto:breanna.flores@multco.us). I want to make sure we can connect around this.

Alyssa Plesser (She/her) 04:06 PM

- Folks can feel free to reach out to me, Alyssa Plesser CoC Lead for the Joint Office - [alyssa.plesser@multco.us](mailto:alyssa.plesser@multco.us)

Anna Kurnizki (she/her), CW 04:07 PM

Thank you!