



## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

September 12, 2016

1:00-3:00PM

Facilitator:	Rebecca Rynbrandt		
Meeting Attendees:	Tom Cottrell, Vera Beech, Hattie Tinney, Julie Crossen (Guest, Steering Council), Jesica Vail (Staff), Tracie Coffman (ENTF Staff)		
Time Convened:	12:30 PM	Time Adjourned:	2:10 PM

<b>Approval of Minutes</b>		<b>August 8, 2016</b>	
Motion by:		Support from:	
Discussion	Minutes from August were not available.		
Amendments			
Conclusion			
<b>HUD Application Process</b>		<b>Jesica Vail</b>	
Discussion			
<p>a. A Self-Scoring Summary of the 2016 CoC Application was circulated for review. It was estimated that the local application would score 86%. In discussing the application, there were a several points that were significant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) On the question related to a decrease in the number of unsheltered households, there was actually an increase. This should be looked at to determine what we are doing to get those households housed. It should be determined what other factors may have contributed to this increase. It is thought it was not a capacity issue. This increase will result in a loss of 5 points.</li> <li>ii) A second question was related to youth homelessness. The weight on this question increased, however, we are not adjusting to the need. It is thought that Arbor Circle is following FYSB HMIS Guidelines (only Bridge entrees, not outreach). As such, we do have not collected the correct data. Measurements can only be taken from HMIS. Arbor Circle and HMIS staff are discussing to help secure accurate data in the future. Jesica is pulling additional data from specific projects. Vera noted that her numbers are quite large and questions if we should look deeper. Others added that the YWCA, Hope Community, and Family Promise also have numbers that would contribute to increased numbers.</li> <li>iii) Veteran homelessness needs to have more time spent on it. The PIT count number was used for the grant application. HUD desires to see a 75% drop in the numbers. The most significant work related to housing homeless veterans was done since the January's PIT count. Our current decrease in veteran homelessness is 20%. Also, HUD wanted applicants to reach as far back as the 2010 PIT count. This resulted in figures that were not the most flattering.</li> </ul> <p>b. Regarding <i>lessons learned</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Tracking and encouraging health care enrollment of participants in CoC programs. Suggested that we should stop relying on outside sources for numbers and that CoC programs should identify how many of their consumers are receiving mainstream services pre- and post-entry.</li> <li>ii) What do we count in the future to meet grant information needs? Perhaps this would be moved to a new committee or work group.</li> </ul>			

iii) Improve scorecard oversight through an existing committee. iv) Look at HUD’s directives and put into the Strategic Plan and make them the focus of a committee. These should be worked on throughout the year.		
Conclusions		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
<b>Family, Youth, and Chronic Homelessness Workgroups</b>	<b>Jesica Vail</b>	
Discussion		
<p>Currently, there is a workgroup for veteran’s homelessness. It was suggested that there should be workgroup focused on youth homelessness as well as other population groups. The workgroups would identify where we want to be and determine outcomes, outputs, milestones, etc. Our current committees are based on vehicles such as PSH, RRH, etc., not on population served.</p> <p>Data secured from the Coordinated Assessment, Data Analysis/CQI committees could be used to drill down and determine the strategies for each of these homeless groups. It is very important for population committees to work on ending homelessness for their specific homeless group. Discussion ensued related to the advantages/disadvantages of large or small workgroups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted, that when a very focused group is utilized, it tends to involve a smaller number of service providers and participants and the contributions of a larger participant pool is lost.</li> <li>• Additionally, when a larger group exists discussions become protracted and go beyond the initial focus resulting in loss of participants.</li> <li>• Suggestion was made to work in small groups initially and bring to larger group to share information and build on each other.</li> </ul> <p>To meet HUD targets and maximize grant scoring potential, we need to focus on data elements and system performance measures and utilize HUD priorities, community needs, and prior investment to design the strategies for the CoC.</p>		
Conclusions		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Staff will draft a proposal	Jesica	
<b>Youth Demonstration Project</b>	<b>Jesica Vail</b>	
Discussion		
A group of providers have come together to discuss the viability of a proposal for the community		
Conclusions		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
<b>Governance Charter</b>	<b>Rebecca Rynbrandt</b>	
Discussion		
a. According to the Governance Charter, the ENTF is the Supporting Organization for the Coalition to End Homelessness. Any changes in the relationship between the Coalition and the ENTF will be addressed with necessary changes to the Charter.		
It was suggested that a work group be formed to conduct a review (of changes in the relationship between the Coalition and ENTF) and present proposals (necessary changes in the Charter).		

Subsequent questions were posed related to the relationship with the ENTF:

- How do we strengthen the relationship with the ENTF?
- How do we work with the ENTF?
- CoC staff supervision is through the ENTF. Do we direct our concerns to the director of the ENTF?
- Is there clarity between the Charter, ENTF, and the CoC, and their connected purpose?
- If the Steering Council has these types of questions, we should address the questions.

b. Charter Update Considerations:

The original Charter was put together with the intention of periodic evaluation and make any necessary edits that may be required for clarification and/or operating purposes.

c. HMIS Data Quality Committee/Data Analysis Ad-Hoc Work Group:

It was discussed to change the name of the ad hoc work group so that it was less confusing as to what data group we are talking about. Data Quality is identified in the Charter and functions well. The suggestion was made to make the ad hoc group a committee, change its name, add it to the Charter, and identify its responsibilities in the Charter. Contact will be made by Jesica Vail to Denny Sturtevant the work group's chair.

d. Allowance of Email Voting:

This has been approved by other boards. This item will be brought to Steering.

Conclusions

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline

**Staffing Plan Ad-Hoc Committee Report** Vera Beech

Discussion

This will be presented in the October meeting.

Conclusions

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline

**CSH Report** Jesica Vail

Discussion

John Peterson sent a draft to Jesica with a promise for a final. The final has not been received to date.

Conclusions

**Meeting Schedule Updates**

Discussion

Next meeting will be held at Monday, October 10, 1:00pm at YWCA