



Minutes

Committee: Equity Committee

Date: 05/26/2022

Duration: 12:00 – 1:30

Meeting Place: Zoom virtual meeting

Attendance:

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

Equity Committee Members							
A	Guen Brown	P	Claire Burrus	A	Junghee Cho	A	Kellee Coleman
A	Jesus Gonzales	A	Kimberly Holiday	P	Soleece Watson	P	Sulipsa Luque
A	Lori Neyland	A	Esteban Olave	P	Tiffany Hart		
Co-Chairs							
A	Summer Wright	P	Netanya Jamieson				
Other Community Members							
	Ana Perez						
	Karem Castillo						
ECHO Support Staff							
P	Chris Davis						
Other ECHO Staff							
	Meagan Biscamp		Preston Petty				
	Mariane Elzy						

AGENDA		DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
I. Welcome & Check-in	N. Jamieson		•
II. Vulnerability Age Threshold	C. Burrus & All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Following up the presentation by Aging Affinity Group ○ Claire looked into data following meeting ○ One question on API asks if 65 or older – if yes, one point – aging affinity group wants to lower number to 50 because impact of aging on unhoused people starts earlier than 65 ○ Three options: keep 65+, new 50+, both 50+ and 65+ - all age thresholds mean Black and Latinx clients are scoring higher than white clients – there’s not a magic shift at 65+ - this is a green flag because it shows racial equity doesn’t change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add research presentation slides to Equity Committee folder • ALL MEMBERS review slides to

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 65+: Black clients score 0.6 points higher than white, Hispanic/Latinx are 0.3 points higher ○ 50+: Black clients still score 0.6 higher than white, Hispanic/Latinx score 0.1 points higher – important caveat: clients closer to 50 would be scoring higher than clients over 65 (if over 50 but not over 65, you score higher) ○ 50+ and 65+: get a point for each – difference between Black and white clients is smaller (0.5 points higher) ● Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A higher point score means the person is prioritized higher for housing ○ This would benefit the system overall by providing more benefits to people who are between 50-65 ○ Would the lower threshold mean fewer elderly people on the street? If all else is equal, yes, but if we get more units that also means there would be fewer people on the street – it’s all in flux ○ Without the age question, the API is already prioritizing Black and Latinx people, so that’s why we’d likely see people closer to 50 prioritized over people closer to 65 ○ Currently 269 clients age 65+ ○ Will not be able to have a vote at this meeting because we don’t have quorum ○ Decision to discuss again at next meeting with additional discussion/presentation to be prepared for a possible vote 	prepare for discussion at next meeting
<p>III. API Pilot Question Language</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Late addition to meeting, so not reflected on agenda ● P. Petty: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suggestions come from assessors ○ Tweaks, small updates, but didn’t feel right changing language without checking in with committee ○ All the questions are ready to go in API, these are just the final pieces ● Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agreement on changes to question 1; agreement to change on question 2 and use word “place” ○ On third question: If someone isn’t using that day but still struggles with substance use, “recently” might get a more accurate answer than “currently”; “have you ever..” feels less judgmental than “do you” – could capture more impacts; do we want to ask if it impacted past relationships, or is this question about current impacts? 	

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Suggestion that changing to historical impacts changes the nature of the question – how about “have you ever used.. if yes, does it currently interfere..?” – agreement on this change ○ Reminder that these are pilot questions and the committee will be able to review the results before anything is officially added to API ○ Rolling out pilot is a multi-step process – getting to work on this immediately – no rule for how long a question has to be in pilot – sometimes it’s a matter of days, sometimes it’s many months – depends on how obvious the results are ○ Question: Does question order matter? Answer: It can; these five pilots will be added at the end because it’s a completely optional – don’t want to communicate that people have to participate in pilot questions to receive services – when the new questions are added/questions are retired, want Equity Committee to look at the full API for order, etc. 	
<p>IV. Committee Work Check-in</p>	<p>N. Jamieson & All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Open discussion about how the Committee’s work is going, how members are engaging with the work, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Netanya: Would like to break out into workgroups and get started – want to see more diversity in leadership positions of agencies ○ Don’t need to have this entire conversation now – feel free to email thoughts to chairs and/or bring to next meeting ○ Would like to see more people with lived experience in leadership roles as well – what does this start to look like in our system? ○ 2021 Racial Disparities Report included composition of system staff – Leadership Council is interested in doing this survey annually to track changes ○ When we honor our time, people show up – efficiency matters to get more people to meetings – workgroups are the spaces where people can do this work and report back to the committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●
<p>Adjournment</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Next Meeting: 6/9/2022 12:00PM – 1:30PM; Virtual meeting via Zoom 	