



**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

November 6, 2017

3:00-4:30am

Facilitator:	Karen Tjapkes		
Meeting Attendees:	Wende Randall, Jesica Vail, Rebecca Rynbrandt, Matthew VanZetten, Jim Talen, Karen Tjapkes, Bree Butler, Kwan McEwen		
	Guests: Lauren VanKeulen		
Time Convened:	3:06 pm	Time Adjourned:	4:32 pm

Approval of Minutes		October 2, 2017	
Motion by:	Rebecca	Support from:	Matthew
Discussion	None		
Amendments	None		
Conclusion	Motion Passed		

Approval of Agenda		November 6, 2017	
Motion by:	Consensus	Support from:	Consensus
Discussion	None		
Amendments	None		
Conclusion	Motion Passed		

Public Comment	
Discussion	

Lauren VanKeulen attended to discuss concerns around the process of reallocation of funds from the Youth RRH project to a TH-RRH project, these concerns were not able to be discussed fully at the September Steering Council meeting due to a conflict of interest. She stated that after reviewing documents regarding the Coordinated Entry Evaluations, the Steering Committee should have a say in the evaluation process, especially since the RFP was submitted on behalf of the entire CoC. Since a system-wide evaluation is being conducted on the Coordinated Entry system, it seems that the evaluation should include a 360-degree evaluation, a revised RFP sent to additional contractors, and a vote from the Steering Council to choose the evaluator. Her care for this evaluation process comes from the way the youth project was funded and reallocated, without youth partners. She feels that that an unbiased evaluation to assess how we're working from the perspective of the consumer, community organizations, and the public as a whole, would be helpful. Our community has the opportunity and the ability to serve individuals who are experiencing homelessness with excellence through collaboration.

Review Draft CE Evaluation Contract		Jesica
Discussion		

A copy of the draft CE Evaluation Contract had been emailed to Executive members on Friday. The goal is to maximize what can be done with the grant money. Feedback has been received making sure the referral agencies and the partners, are able to give that information to CloudBurst. This includes confidential surveys and group feedback. The RFP 360 overview assessment process had been discussed previously and had been sent out to Steering Committee members after the October Steering Committee meeting. It may be helpful in the



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 6, 2017

3:00-4:30am

future to utilize a more transparent process. Some of the dissent may arise from the short procedural process involved in this decision; thereby creating a feeling of discomfort with the outcome amongst some. There was concern voiced that the RFP had not been circulated widely enough. The three key issues (brought to Executive members by unnamed person(s)) around the recent RFP process involve; confusion around who was invited to the RFP review group, a perceived lack of discussion at the last Coordinated Assessment meeting, and the absence of a call out for organizations to review the proposals or to put in a bid for the funding. Concern was also expressed regarding if a 360 of system processes is the best use of funds.

It is important to note that this RFP decision was fast process by need. It was discovered in September that there was additional funding available but needed to be dispersed quickly or it would be lost. The funding is from the CoC planning grant via United Way and comes from being under budget. The under-budget amount needs to be spent and dispersed by Nov. 30th or it will be lost. Therefore, it was imperative that this additional funding was matched to task that needed completion quickly. The RFP proposal had to be moved along quickly and had to be decided upon by a group that could gather quickly and was therefore small. This small group did reach out locally and nationally to find different system processes solutions. There were a few applications for the RFP and some didn't meet criteria or budget constraints.

There has been a lot of discussion about the lack of resources felt in our community and what the most effective model to use current funding would be. An evaluation of this kind would prove useful to show how well our Coordinated Entry system operates. There is a need for clarification around HUD regulations regarding spending the available twenty thousand. Referral agencies would like a voice in the process of RFP review. There is concern that if this proposal moves forward without involving the community, it could lead to animosity amongst some community members. Concern has been expressed regarding the nature of private comments that are brought forward unanimously through executive members and the precedent that behavior sets. Lauren set an example of how to appropriately express concerns by bringing them in person. Speaking directly with the CoC team regarding concerns is the best way to handle this kind of situation. There is a possibility to scratch the current RFP process and completely start over with essentially the same amount of money. Then relaunch with full community involvement. To address the situation of individuals in the community feeling left out, a vote is needed from the Executive or Steering Committee.

Conclusions

The next steps for moving forward include opening up the review committee and relaunching the process from the beginning and involving the community.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Redraft the RFP	Jesica Vail	

Policy Development **Matthew**

Discussion

Karen and Matthew met to discuss policy development. They talked about the resource needs infographic and how the information from Lansing hasn't been helpful. If a consensus can be reached within the CoC, then it may be best to pull in local lobbyists to ensure funding is fairly allotted to Kent County and to get behind a broader policy platform. Begin a template of our own infographic sheet,



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 6, 2017

3:00-4:30am

but keep in mind that any document will need to be approved by Steering and all necessary committees before released.	
Conclusions	
Sandra will email Jesica regarding policy platform development	
Strategic Planning: Next Steps	Jesica
Discussion	
<p>At the October CoC meeting, committee members were split in groups and asked groups to provide feedback regarding the old strategic plan. One group came up with the idea to take on-going task items out of the strategic plan and creating something else to put them into. Therefore the strategic plan pieces will be much more manageable. Jesica is compiling and working through feedback currently and will give feedback as needed. The next steps include having the Executive Committee, and anyone who would like to be a part of the planning work, start on creating a plan that goes through the next 3 years. The goal date to have the new 3-year strategic plan done is before May 2018. Consider possibly utilizing the graphic design staff from United Way and make a report that fits on an 11x14 sheet front and back.</p>	
Conclusions	
Ask for volunteers at Steering	
Updates	
Discussion	
<p>a. Committee Structure Update Group of nearly a dozen people and working on scheduling now.</p> <p>b. CSH Report Update Jesica and Jim are doing regular calls with the CSH representatives Amber and Nicole. Unit projections are currently being worked on. Amber and Nicole used a different process than the original representative. When Amber and Nicole were presented with HMIS annual data from MCAH they changed report format to more closely resemble the first representative's work, but it may be preferred not to go back to the first representative's system. Currently it is projected that the end product will be a report for Steering to use in funding discussions.</p> <p>c. HMIS Position Update Four interviews are set up for the position this week. The first-round team conducting the interviews include Wende Randall, Jesica Vail, Sue Rex, Karen Tjapkes, and Lee Weber. The second interview board will include Erin Banchoff. One interviewee has housing and systems experience, the others have systems experience. Hoping to have someone hired and in house by December.</p> <p>d. Basic Needs Index for K-Connect Meeting by December. ENTf is the underlying thread for K-Connect, involved in the meeting are all ENTf Governance and any who are helping with the work being done. At the next meeting they will review success measures that are in place and discuss what will be built in for K-Connect.</p>	
Additional Discussion	
Discussion	
Thank Lauren VanKeulen for coming and voicing her concerns in person. Jesica has been in contact to schedule a meeting with Lauren. We want to make sure her openness and honesty is appreciated and reinforced.	



GRAND RAPIDS AREA
COALITION TO END
HOMELESSNESS

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

November 6, 2017
3:00-4:30am

Adjourn	
Next Meeting: December 4, 2017	