

SHS Advisory Committee Meeting

February 8, 2024 | 3:00-4:30 pm

Attendance: Patrick, Jessica M., Jessica H., Cheryl, Julia, Desiree', Johnnie, Yvette, Sandra, Xenia

STAFF: Breanna Flores, Cristal Otero, Anna Johnson

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Decision/ Action
Welcome Land and Labor Introductions SHS Updates	 Metro/ Tri-County Request for Qualifications (RFQu) The tri-counties and Metro are running a Request for Qualifications to expand the pool of providers who can provide technical assistance. The application is planned to go live at the end of February/early March. The SHS team will make sure the committee receives the information. Metro is running the admin and outreach for the procurement. If you know of any orgs who should be on the list to receive information, please let the SHS team know. This is a good opportunity for culturally specific organizations or those with particular expertise to apply and be compensated to help other orgs. Providers who qualify will not automatically receive a contract but would enter the qualified pool. Coffee Chat scheduling Co-chairs are piloting a coffee chat event for committee members to: Create space for members to get to know one another and build relationships. Provide opportunities to ask questions and learn from one another in a smaller setting. Question: Would the coffee chat be virtual or in person? In person daytime meetings are difficult. Ideally it would be in person but we could be flexible and switch back and forth between 	

	virtual and in-person formats. After work,on a lunch break, or on the weekend. Other scheduling feedback: Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays are challenging. Next steps: In the followup email for this meeting the SHS team will send out a poll to collect more information about scheduling. Membership Update Shannon J. has resigned; current membership at 12 (quorum is now 8). The SHS team will be reaching out to schedule 1x1 meetings to hear from you and learn how we can best support. In the meantime, our virtual door is always open if you need any support with access needs.	
JOHS FY25 Budget Presentation	This item was postponed. We will hopefully have a budget presentation in the March meeting.	
Capacity Workgroup Recommendations	Committee members were given time to review the capacity building workgroup's list of recommendations and were then asked to provide feedback. • Question: Staff wages—what is the expectation specifically? Is it that they get paid a certain amount? • Response: The workgroup used the wage study to inform this recommendation. The intention is to ensure that data is gathered so we can understand what is going on. The wage study revealed that bigger organizations actually tend to compensate employees at lower amounts than smaller providers. • Feedback: Appreciated the mention of both systems-level and individual capacity. • Response: The workgroup was intentional in considering both of these things. • Feedback: It's good to see us reaching out to smaller organizations that focus on the people they serve.	

- Question: How will these organizations receive the information? Will it be on the website? Will it be easy to access?
 - Response: The workgroup's intent is for there to be a JOHS internal process accompanying these recommendations, i.e. the program team would take the lead on reaching out to culturally specific organizations to communicate the opportunities.
 - The committee could also choose to add a specific recommendation regarding communications strategy/distribution of information if desired.

Evaluation

- Feedback: Using SHS dollars to hire an outside evaluator may not actually help small orgs grow. A better approach may be Participatory Evaluation, which is based in the principles of Popular Education. In this approach an outside person doesn't come in; rather, the process is peer led by people at the organizations. Multnomah County's Health Department has one of the best popular education training programs in the nation. The county could use our in-house program to help design a participatory process that comes from frontline workers and those in service delivery—and ensure that the feedback is not filtered through those with most power in the organization.
- Comment: We should also have an objective sense of how well certain orgs are doing when looking at funding decisions, etc. Sometimes SHS will fund an org that isn't doing so well, and that may take dollars away from orgs doing well. Developing a process around this large amount of money is important not just for fiscal responsibility but also best practices in general. Evaluation can help us determine what those best practices are.
- **Feedback**: To be consistent across the document, we should mention both racial and gender equity (BIPOC and LGBTQIA2S+) whenever equity is mentioned..
- Feedback: No wrong door collaboration is important,

but Unite Us is a for-profit company, and our data is their product. This would not be a good use of public resources. There is already supposed to be a no wrong door policy in the continuum, so it may be better to understand why this is not happening in practice.

- Response: There are pre-established silos in our systems and some of them are designed to serve certain communities. To a certain extent they are clunky because they're assessing for different vulnerabilities. Maybe there could be increased data sharing, not through Unite Us, but from agency to agency some other way.
- Response: The feedback on Unite Us is well taken. There should be some way to foster communication so people don't have to apply multiple times, and resources that don't privilege the people who are always privileged.
 We need to think about how to do that.
- Feedback: Urban League started with 1.5 FTE and has grown to 120 employees working on homeless services. They have done a lot of capacity building over the years and have a lot of expertise to offer. However, this member was not able to participate in the workgroup because the meetings were at night.
- Comment: HMIS and Built for Zero data should not go into a black box that only provides completely anonymized information and is unable to provide useful data back to us. We need something that provides accessible, useful information. Our current systems don't allow us to use the information or coordinate across organizations. Systems-level data should not be too specific or too anonymized. There needs to be a middle ground. Knowing when and where a specific individual is accessing services would be too invasive, for example.
- Comment: Aside from the DV system, you can see everyone's info in HMIS. Why can't someone submit an application to short term assistance at one organization, and then hop to other orgs through HMIS? It's only being used one way currently, but could it be used differently?
 - Response: That isn't how HMIS functions for

every organization. For example, Urban League cannot see service level transactions even for their partners/subgrantees on the CHAT collaboration, even though they are the lead organization.

- Comment: HMIS has a lot of individualized info, but doesn't have systemic info, and that skews our perspective. We need to see high level patterns.
 - HMIS doesn't translate well between systems either (adult, DV, etc)
 - Current systems are making the individual the problem when so much is systemic.
 - We need a platform or process that allows us to see which orgs are meeting metrics successfully.
- Action: The committee is in agreement to not recommend UniteUs as a specific platform. However the committee still emphasizes the importance of improving the intake, assessment, and referral process, and suggests the JOHS develop a specific recommendation to address this. We will circle back to the intake/referral recommendation at the March meeting and discuss the committee's expectations about how the JOHS moves this forward.
- Feedback: (On recommendations review process) It's important to talk about the details, but broadly the recommendations make sense the way they are written now, and we don't need granular details down to who JOHS should hire on every item. The committee gives guidance, and the staff that will operationalize the work can decide how best to do that. Higher level guidance makes sense based on how I think about the role of this advisory body, and I would not be comfortable with identifying specific vendors because of a lack of familiarity and because that may not be the role of this body.

Next meeting:

 We will continue the conversation about the capacity workgroup recommendations, specifically about the collaboration section. If there are other areas members would like to Action: Revisit intake and referral recommen dation in March

Action: SHS team will send out scheduling poll for

focus on next time, please let us know.

When the committee approves the workgroup's recommendations, we will use the recommendations process that the committee recently finalized. JOHS executive leadership will receive the recommendations, and they will also be published on the website. We will also engage in conversations with other teams at the JOHS, tri-counties, Metro, etc on next steps. coffee chat in followup email

 We will also hopefully have a brief presentation from the finance team in March.

ZOOM Chat:

From Breanna Flores (she/they) MultCo to All Panelists 03:04 PM Breanna.flores@multco.us

From Johnnie Shaver (he/him) to All Panelists 03:11 PM Yeah, Sorry y'all Johnnie, he/him

From SHS Advisory Committee Member to All Panelists 03:17 PM

Ello Mz Sandra if you don't mind could please send me your email address I have a few questions about BHRC

Just in case you don't know who I am I'll send you my email address. I appreciate you taking time and get back to me.

Thank You

Mz Cheryl

From Johnnie Shaver (he/him) to All Panelists 03:24 PM Weekends would be better for me for something like that, for me anyway. And agreed, Yvette

From Desiree' (She/They) to All Panelists 03:24 PM I think we could offer both options, switch off bimonthly From Jessica Mathis to All Panelists 03:25 PM I'll be back in a few minutes.

From SHS Advisory Committee Member to All Panelists 03:25 PM What location are you thinking of

From Desiree' (She/They) to All Panelists 03:26 PM
That could change around too
From Johnnie Shaver (he/him) to All Panelists 03:27 PM
East Portland/East county is better for me, but I drive so I'm flexible

Thursdays are rough for my schedule

From Jessica Harper to All Panelists 03:28 PM I think a poll for those interested could be the best way to handle scheduling

From SHS Advisory Committee Member to All Panelists 03:28 PM Tuesday are out for me

From Julia Delgado to All Panelists 03:30 PM

I am a solo parent to 3 kids who I really like to spend time with so I'm not available outside of working hours like probably 6pm is the latest. For me this is work \odot

From Me to All Panelists 03:52 PM

Starting with section 1: Introduction and Strategic Expansion. Discussion questions:

- -- Any areas of concern?
- --Points of confusion to clarify?
- -- Does this accurately represent the committee's priorities?

From Desiree' (She/They) to All Panelists 03:56 PM

I really love the focus on systems-level considerations

Oh yeah, I think the more we can tell decision makers that they need to consider the systems, the better.

From SHS Advisory Committee Member to All Panelists 04:04 PM



From Patrick Reynolds to All Panelists 04:04 PM What does participatory evaluation entail?

From Jessica Mathis to All Panelists 04:05 PM

Thank you for saying that. I was never for a third party entity, but I didn't have a better recommendation.

From Jessica Mathis to All Panelists 04:14 PM

Yes, I wasn't suggesting that HMIS is being optimized, more that it is clearly capable.

And sort of why are we not.

From Jessica Harper to All Panelists 04:15 PM

I think we can remove the recommendation of specific companies or providers from the document and still make meaningful recommendations.

From Jessica Mathis to All Panelists 04:17 PM

I agree.

I think going down this rabbit whole could be a job in and of itself and we could just list what we'd like to see in a platform.

From Julia Maria Delgado to All Panelists 04:24 PM thoughtful way