# Performance Monitoring Committee Meeting Minutes

**Duration:** 2-3:30pm

**Date: 10/31/24**

**Meeting Place:** VIRTUAL MEETINGS

Meeting ID:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86412245649?pwd=6VQkEjnpo8LwXnPIM2N13GY6j1bPpj.1

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Committee Voting Members** | | | | | | | |
| P | Candace McGary | A | Zoe Steensma | A | Whitney Callari | | |
| P | Gary Pollack | P | Robert Kingham | | | | |
| P | Gaby Libretti | P | Meagan Biscamp (ECHO) | | | | |
| P | Kayla Grissett | P | Dylan Shubitz (LC) | | | | |
| P | Nirav Shah | A | Rachel Shuyler | | | | |
| **Committee Chairs** | | | | | | | |
| P | Liz Schoenfeld (Co-Chair) | | | | | | |
| P | Cryss Murray (Co-Chair) | | | | | | |
| **Guest Attendees** | | | | | | | |
| P | Andrew Willard | P | Micaela Villegas | P | Kayla Grissett | | |
| P | Robert Kingham | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| **ECHO (CoC Lead)** | | | | | | | |
| P | Alesandra Dominguez | P | Whitney Bright | | | | |
| P | Perla Carranza | | | | | | |
| P | Joseph Montano | | | | | | |
| P | Angela de Leon | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

P = Present

A = Absent

| AGENDA | PRESENTER | DISCUSSION | ACTION ITEMS |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2pm: Welcome and introductions** | **Cryss** | | |
| **2:10pm: Co-Chair Nominations** | **Liz** | | |
| **2:15pm PIT workgroup composition** | **Angela** | <ul><li>PLE folks are able to give feedback how an approach may or may not be received</li><li>ECHO is able to pose questions regarding to how the shifts occur</li><li>Angela to set weekly meetings as a touch base for those conversations.</li><li>Angela owns meeting invite, get started as soon as possible.</li><li>Dylan S. suggested AHAC, who meets every two weeks, could be interested in this group</li><li>We don't have hard dates for PIT count training. Angela states that there are 6 trainings a week in January 2025</li></ul> | Send out inquiry to see who's interested in supporting this group. (Interest in PIT workgroup - LC person. dylans@hacanet.org) |
| **2:30pm: PIP policy draft discussion** | **Meagan** | <ul><li>Meagan gives update on revision of this policy. Earlier this year a group started organizing and discussing the policy. Decided that first step was for ECHO to draft first policy then the group would revise and discuss. Group would also develop new threshold for scorecards (old score was 60).</li><li>LC paused PIPs until the new policy approved. Group paused because of delays with scorecard and other staff changes. First draft has been started. We need to determine if workgroup wants to get started again.</li><li>Liz asks when the draft can be completed. She also mentions that subgroup could get the document in a better place. Liz suggests a general call to volunteers who want to work on this policy.</li><li>When would LC need the PIP policy finished? Aim for approval in February LC meeting. Intent is to have PIP policy completed by December.</li><li>Andrew: Wants to give projects more times to react to thresholds. Wants to wait until research is done to speak to threshold before the PIT workgroup meets.</li></ul> | Perla to circulate interest form for PIP policy workgroup.<br><br>Send out inquiry for PIP workgroup (include Permanent Housing Committee folks) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | • Liz mentions historical data was determined for previous policy and for this new scorecard it doesn't exist.<br>• Andrew: We don't want to wait for poor performance projects to get the support they need. Is the NOFO the only place where the PIP policy applies? Meagan states that it's a part of the regular monitoring that ECHO does.<br>• Andrew: PIP policies require participation from agency to participate in improvement.<br>• Joseph: By the time we get to January we would have 3 scorecards under our belt worth of data. A lot of the PIP process dictates to how we respond to low scorecards. Maybe not the best idea to get the PIP policy approved by the first quarter. By January 1 we will be able to look back at historical data and make a threshold determination.<br>• Liz: Is threshold determined by ECHO or more of a collaborative process? HUD recommends input of providers when it comes to accountability measures.<br>• Andrew: Mentions that ECHO could provide recommendations and bring it to the larger group for discussing or to 'poke holes'.<br>• Joseph explains we could bring back scorecard data to this group and explains it on a broader scale. Wants to do some more work on it with the workgroup before we bring it to the committee.<br>• Liz: ECHO does legwork of suggesting threshold and nonconflicting members of this committee.<br>• Joseph imagines steps: whole group drafts policy and threshold determined by smaller group.<br>• Alesandra mentions that the scorecard is new to the programs side of taking the PIP process so we're still figuring it out internally.<br>• Andrew interested in workgroup, Kaylee involved in scorecard (provider and scorecard), Cryss mentions interest for this committee during the permanent housing committee meeting~ | |
| **2:50pm: CE workgroup quick update** | **Andrew** | • Sent out survey gathering community input for four options being considered for RRH prioritization. Received 54 responses, of those 6 were anonymous. Sept 23-Oct 4 was how long it was open. Solicited from different committees, RRH providers, and workgroups. 3 emails distributed to folks soliciting input.<br>• 41% PLE, 30% other service providers, 11% RRH program managers.<br>• Heard from Lifeworks, The Other Ones Foundations, Family Eldercare, SAFE Alliance, and others.<br>• Overall, 68% believe RRH not working, 66% are RRH projects meeting needs for those referred? No.<br>• Looking at using subset analysis question as a way to prioritize individuals for PSH.<br>• Liz wants to know what the big take away, next steps and implications.<br>• Andrew states the CE workgroup has taken this info in and a data request to build on the information. Group has not made a decision whether they want to recommend any or | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | combination of the options. Group has struggled with weight of responsibility to make that decision. | |
| | | • Gaby wants to understand the system impact that choosing either options will have. What does the impact look like? Candace mentions they've struggled with reviewing data and the impact to the system. Must keep coming back to prioritization. | |
| | | • CE workgroup requested what is RRH to PSH flow historically look like among other requests. (3 week timeframe for ECHO to give data back to work group) | |
| | | • Gary mentions February 2025 deadline of RRH and Rapid to PSH policy recommendations, knowing that timeline is tight, throwing out idea to provide background of potential of recommendations and mention feasibility study and what it reviews. To let executive committee know that there's movement if it's necessary. Candace mentions that December they are set to give update on workgroup processes to the executive team. | |
| | | • Liz shares gratitude for the work that's happening in this group and appreciates the thought and care that's being put into this. | |
| **2:55pm: Update on status of HMIS** | **Whitney** | • Movement on the HMIS vendor search. Vendor selection committee has put out release for proposal on October 7, 2024. Q&A period closes on November 4. We've received a few questions from vendors so far. | |
| | | • RFP closes on November 21 (they will be due from vendor). Committee reviewing as group by December 5. Vendor will be selected by January 15, 2025. | |
| **3pm: Updates on new scorecard process** | **Joseph** | • Review where things have been in the past. Scorecards were set to be implemented quarter 1. Around January 2024 there was an issue with HMIS coding which prevented us from pulling scorecards. Fix took about 9 months (end of August 2024). | |
| | | • A couple of issues with new scorecard process: not able to incorporate SAFE data into scorecard. A couple of collaborative projects with other orgs. System is merging all of the projects together instead of individually. | |
| | | • Racial equity measure issue: currently system is giving everyone max points for first two questions. For things that are working we still want providers to receive info (scorecards still going out). Working on two large issues and work diligently to fix asap. | |
| | | • Onboarding more support which starts next week (Nov 4). | |
| | | • By January 1 2025 all items fixed for sure and states we will re-release quarters. We will share scores and ranking. Projects want to know what rankings are and 4 quarters will be places on spreadsheet. They will be able to see how they rank among other providers. | |
| **3:30pm: Adjourn** | | 2 meetings preferred for what's left of the year. Move them both up a week: 11/21 and 12/19. Liz mentions that she will miss 11/21 and will attend the first half of 12/19. | |

Actions taken by [Performance Monitoring Committee] during the meeting on [10/31/24]

I. []. **[Motion Passed]**