Minutes

Committee: Equity Committee

Duration: 12:00 – 1:30

Date: 04/14/2022

Meeting Place: Zoom virtual meeting

Attendance:

P = Present
TC = Attended via Dial in
A = Absent

Equity Committee Members							
A	Guen Brown	P	Claire Burrus	P	Junghee Cho	P	Kellee Coleman
P	Jesus Gonzales	P	Kimberly Holiday	A	Soleece Watson	A	Sulipsa Luque
A	Lori Neyland	P	Esteban Olave	A	Steven James Potter	A	Rachel Calhoun Schmidt
Co-Chairs							
P	Summer Wright	P	Netanya Jamieson				
Other Community Members							
P	Patricia Barrera	P	Dylan Lowery				
P	Karem Castillo	P	Lauren Dreyer				
P	Benjamin Elias						
ECHO Support Staff							
P	Chris Davis						
Other ECHO Staff							
P	Preston Petty	P	Alesandra Dominguez				
P	La Shandraia Dwyer						

AGENDA			DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
I.	**Welcome & Check-in**			●
II.	**Announcements**		● Co-chair vote 　○ Email vote was unanimous, Summer remains co-chair ● Targeted outreach 　○ Has been difficult to meet quorum (common across committees) 　○ Will be reaching out to folks who have had trouble attending – looks like more emails for now because don't have phone numbers 　○ This may be just the result of trying to seat a large body like this – the commitment won't work out for some ● Possible hybrid meeting 　○ Will try this next meeting (4/28/22)	**- Contact Netanya** if you'd like to attend the next meeting in person - Once you contact Netanya, she will provide the address

AGENDA		DISCUSSION	ACTION
		o **Action Item**: Contact Netanya with your picture/info so she can ensure it's safe – confidential space o May try having one of the two meetings per month in person moving forward	

III. **Austin Prioritization Index (API) Pilot Questions**		Presentation:
		 ● Full Austin Prioritization Index list of proposed pilot questions available here
		 ● Previously using VI-SPDAT; replaced with API developed by the previous iteration of this group (Equity Task Group)
		 ● Don't want to get into the same mistaken loop as VI-SPDAT (they didn't update, revise) – so we're piloting new questions to contribute to continual improvement
		 ● Capacity to pilot 6-10 questions (always voluntary after the full API is completed) at a time depending on how long they are – there are more possible pilot questions than this on the list, so need to pick some out
		 ● Two questions currently being actively piloted – only two because many of the first round were adopted into the API or thrown out quickly based on data – these two are middle of the road, not sure where the data will fall
		 ● Question posed to co-chairs: What is the practical way we go about selecting which questions to pilot?
		
		 Discussion
		 ● No data yet on the 19 Potential Pilot Questions listed in this doc because they are not currently being asked
		 ● Jesus question: Can we add an "if yes" option to one of the questions?
		    o A: yes, but that essentially means that's two questions instead of one (for purposes of length)
		 ● Pilot question 4:
		    o Summer: might not capture exactly what we're looking for because there might be men who say they've been discriminated against when seeking women's services; purpose of piloting these questions is to see how they would impact these groups without asking it directly
		    o Jesus: we need to ask because it gets at important data
		    o Claire: have to be careful about how we assign points – can't assign based on demographics; if chose to pilot this question, we'd get to look at who's answering yes to this question and the demographics of the people who are answering yes – can analyze whether it's capturing what it's intended to capture
		    o Esteban: Maybe combine sexual orientation and gender identity with race and ethnicity discrimination – gets at intersectionality
			● Complete this survey identifying your top pilot questions for further discussion

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION

	▪ Claire: Can format this as a check-box – if any applies, it's a point; but wary of any question that requires assessor interpretation
	▪ Summer: An issue with this question is it would require a lot of emotional effort to go through explanation for someone rather than just yes or no
	● Pilot question 1:
	  ○ Summer: this is a really important question to ask in the context of Prop B and the statewide camping ban;
	● Suggest ranking questions in bottom or top half of questions to make eliminating easier (since we have to cut more than half)
	● Suggestions to combine some of the questions between 7-10 because they're similar
	  ○ Claire: If two similar questions, can just pick the one with better wording
	  ○ Summer + Kimberly suggest keeping questions 7 and 10 and removing 8, 9, 11
	  ○ Karem: I think questions 7-11 can better worded and can be combined
	  ○ Kimberly: Questions that ask how "poor" the neighborhood was – don't like this phrasing – a neighborhood might look poor from the outside, but it feels rich in other ways
	  ○ Claire: R&E developed the question and wanted to brainstorm alternatives to "poor" with the Equity Committee; original idea was to have a stand-in for impact of something like gentrification (which is hard to measure)
	  ○ Jesus: doesn't really matter what word is used because of the data it's trying to get at
	  ○ Kellee: Let's work our way back from what we're trying to learn; are we trying to determine whether the neighborhood someone comes from is gentrifying/gentrified or not?
	  ○ Claire: Current question about zip code (where grew up) doesn't necessarily capture what it's trying to in terms of gentrification because when people grew up there matters
	  ○ Kellee: People think unhoused people in Austin came from elsewhere; important to draw the connection to our local issues with a question like this
	  ○ Summer: What if we switch the "grew up" question to "last housed" question (pilot #13)? Might get at more of the recent gentrification; can we ask if the last place you were housed was in Austin?
	  ○ Netanya: Zip codes are important because there are a lot of people who grew up here who need help and we need to address this	

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION

	○ Claire: Data suggest Black people experiencing homelessness are more likely to be from Austin, but uncomfortable prioritizing Black people from Austin over Black people from somewhere else
	○ Kellee: Black people who come to Austin from anywhere are still going to have a tougher time because they're Black
	● Summer: In interest of time – suggest setting up a survey to gauge each voting member's top questions - **See action item**
	● Jesus: Clarify what kinds of data are being collected
	● Patricia: Wondering about safety questions – everyone on the street is likely facing some kind of violence (physical, emotional, or otherwise) – is this going to get at what we want?
	    ○ Summer: Trans people are 50% more likely to experience physical violence, so we need to be clear about the language
	    ○ Jesus: People make assumptions about people experiencing homelessness
	
	Possible vote
	● No vote held	

IV. **Aging Affinity Group**	Presentation on suggestion for Coordinated Entry (CE) ● Dylan Lowery (Family Eldercare) and Lauren Dreyer (Integral Care) presenting from the Aging Affinity Group ● Proposing age threshold for vulnerability be lowered to 50 rather than 65 for the older adult question on the CA; API is not capturing the true vulnerability of people who fall in this gap – 55 is the new 75 when you're living outside ● Proposed to APH in 2018 lowering threshold ● HEAL: No target age population served, but still seeing about a third of people contacted are age 50-64; 94% of clients Family Eldercare serves are over age 50, and 68% are 50-64 Discussion ● Older population tends to be whiter and more male than the general population of people experiencing homelessness; probably more people in 50-64 range who identify as people of color, but not being captured in current API ● Life expectancy for people experiencing homelessness is 47, compared to 77 for housed people; wear and tear on your body being homeless is real	● ECHO R&E provides data on aging affinity group request

AGENDA		DISCUSSION	ACTION
		- Before making changes, suggest that we pilot them and get more data; from looking at data regularly, can say with confidence that lowering age threshold would be more inclusive of people of color - Suggestion to add two thresholds – one at 50, and then over 65 or higher for especially vulnerable older adults - People do become eligible for a bigger safety net as they get older – retirement, Medicare - May be different age range seen at other organizations that don't have age target populations - Aging Affinity group is conducting a study with community partners – hypothesis is that the population of people experiencing homelessness is getting older and we need to be prepared to serve this population - Next step: ECHO Research & Evaluation begins analysis of what this possible change would mean for the system; Claire commits to bringing back this data in the next meeting for discussion and further analysis	
Adjournment		***Next Meeting: 4/28/22* 12:00PM – 1:30PM**; Hybrid meeting (Virtual via Zoom + in-person at Netanya's office for voting members only)	