

## **Minutes**

**Committee:** Equity Committee

**Date:** 06/09/2020

**Duration:** 12:00 – 1:30

Meeting Place: Zoom virtual meeting

## Attendance:

P = Present

TC = Attended via Dial in

A = Absent

	Equity Committee Members						
Р	Guen Brown	Р	Claire Burrus	Р	Junghee Cho	Α	Kellee Coleman
Р	Jesus Gonzales	Р	Kimberly Holiday	Α	Soleece Watson	Р	Sulipsa Luque
Р	Lori Neyland	Р	Esteban Olave	Α	Tiffany Hart		
			Co-C	hairs			
Р	Netanya Jamieson	Р	Summer Wright				
			Other Commu	nity	Members		
	Sam Whiteside						
	Lee Summers						
	Karem Castillo						
	ECHO Support Staff						
	Chris Davis						
	Other ECHO Staff						
	Alesandra Dominguez		Preston Petty				
	Meagan Biscamp						

	AGENDA		DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
l.	Welcome & Check-in	N. Jamieson and S. Wright		•
II.	Finalize Index Pilot Question Language	P. Petty & All	Note: From this document forward, the Austin Prioritization Index will be shortened to "Index" in agendas/minutes until a new name for the tool is chosen. See Agenda Item III below for reasoning.  Review  Clarify – pilot, so not used for point allocation, just to collect data, then will return to group to determine if and how Austin Prioritization Index is changing  Can keep two pilot questions on the Index already – have capacity  Vote – agreement to keep the two current pilot questions  Discussion of five new questions:  Pilot 1 – Agreement	

AGENDA	AGENDA DISCUSSION		ACTION	
		<ul> <li>Pilot 2 – question: should we keep the list of options? May be confusing to people to have both "correctional facility" and types of facilities; perspective from Preston – may reach more people who identify with one but not another; agreement on current language</li> <li>Pilot 3 – can add additional instructions to assessor to clarify a phrase like "moving frequently" in a uniform way (responsive to question about interpretation)</li> <li>Pilot 4 – recap language change from home -&gt; place</li> <li>Pilot 5 – recap language change: Do you use&gt; have you ever used &amp; negatively interferes with life/relationships</li> <li>Possible vote</li> <li>Vote – adopted officially as pilot questions</li> <li>Final pilot questions available here</li> </ul>		
III. Aging Affinity Group Request	C. Burrus & All	Discussion  O Question up for discussion is whether there is anyone in the household over the age of 65 (current) – person receives a point on the Index if so – change may be to lower to 50+ or two-point system for 50+ and 65+  This analysis looks at the impact on overall Index scores  Suggestion to move to 50+ and 65+ system to account for the fact that people have access to more supports once they reach age 65, so if someone is experiencing homelessness over age 65, they are particularly vulnerable (haven't/can't access traditional supports)  Community question: do other Index questions deal with race as well, or is this the question that deals with race? Answer: All questions on the Index are developed with an eye toward equity; aging affinity group presented this to the committee, so these results are the equity analysis of that suggestion  Community question: how do we know if we get this right? Answer: There's no clear best answer, so can't make a recommendation on a way forward  LN: Is there research that exists elsewhere that's touched on this question? Answer: not many communities have created their own assessment tools, so not a lot of info to compare to  SL: Hang-up is the possibility that younger, healthier people will be prioritized; but see such a large community between 50-65, so lowering threshold will provide access to people who aren't getting help right now; just because someone is younger doesn't mean they're healthier		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION	
	o Response to community question: This is not a proxy for health; there are		
	other questions on the Index that deal with health issues		
	o JC: This has potential to help people, but would it hurt people over 65?		
	Answer: This is why there's the 50+ and 65+ option, to account for this – it		
	does mean people in the 50-60 age range would score higher on the Index		
	than people 60+		
	o SW: ask to clarify point about the 50+ category – Black people have less access to other resources that people get access to at 65		
	o CB: Having the double point option might weight the system as a whole		
	toward older people at the expense of vulnerable younger folks		
	Voting – whether to drop age to 50+ rather than 65+: <b>unanimous approval</b>		
	o No need to pilot because age data already exists		
	o PP: These are the first steps toward an Index version 2; when ready, asking		
	committee to look at Index more broadly (retire some questions, etc.) to roll		
	out fully revised version/retrain assessors, etc.		
•	JC: Possible to change the name Austin Prioritization Index? Feels insensitive to use		
	something people relate to Asian and Pacific Islanders		
	o Can absolutely change the name; this was not a thought in the first iteration		
	o Broad thanks from committee members to Junghee for bringing this up		
	o Brainstorming new name will happen next meeting		
IV. Updates &	PLE Support Space	•	
Announcements	<ul> <li>Update: poll sent to everyone involved in governance with lived expertise to</li> </ul>		
	start connecting		
	Interest in subject matter presentations		
	o Presentations on governance, any other subjects related to homelessness are		
	available for committee members – contact Summer if you are interested in a		
	presentation like this		
	Workgroup Updates (N/A)		
	o Policies & Procedures Workgroup		
	o Tools Workgroup		
	o Trainings Workgroup		
	o Professional Development Workgroup		
	o PLE Support Space		
	o [Index] Development		
Adjournment	Next Meeting: 6/30/2022, 12:00PM – 1:30PM; Virtual meeting via Zoom		

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION