EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
February 2, 2018
2:30-3:00pm

Facilitator:	Lisa Cruden		
Meeting Attendees:	Lisa Cruden, Kenya Brown, Christina Soulard, Erin Banchoff, Jeffrey King Staff: Jesica Vail, Wende Randall, Angela Gillisse, Bree Butler		
Time Convened:	2:35pm	Time Adjourned:	4:12pm

Approval of Agenda		February 2, 2018	
Motion by:	Christina	Support from:	Jeffrey
Discussion			
Amendments	Add CE Evaluation Update on agenda as item number 7.		
Conclusion	Motion Passed		
Approval of Minutes		**December 4, 2018**	
Motion by:	Christina	Support from:	Kenya
Discussion	Motion to approve an email vote amongst the last Executive Committee members to approve minutes		
Amendments			
Conclusion	Approval will be voted on by previous Executive Committee members		
Public Comment			
Discussion			
None			
Expectations for the Year Ahead		**Jesica**	
Discussion			

Discussion started around how critical the Executive Committee is to have discussions that would be more difficult for larger groups. They also focus topics and lead discussions for the Steering Committee. It is critical that the Executive Committee be unified in decision making. The previous Executive Committee had most members from government entities with only one member from a service provider. They found their role in advocacy as well as reviewing and recommending policy. The current group is made up mainly by service provider representatives. Each Executive group is unique and bring unique talents to the table. Another key role the Executive Committee carries out is dealing with critical, time sensitive, issues. Recommending the Steering Council meeting agenda is a standing role as well as the CoC agenda. There are still some outstanding issues with how Lansing makes their funding choices that this group will have to look at. Kent County has been pretty involved in engaging with advocates and there will be plenty of room for advocacy going forward if this team decides to continue that issue. MCAH at state level is in touch with Jesica and more conversations like this can only help this group. It is important that everyone be aware of what discussions held between representatives and organizations are happening. Preparing an annual work plan and calendar is also included in important tasks for the Executive Committee. Strategic planning will be a big upcoming agenda item. For staff, it is important that the Executive Committee be available for immediate issues that will arise. Other thoughts are that it would be nice to see the Executive Committee be more proactive when it comes to the HUD score and find answers as to why the score

is the way it is, and how to improve our overall score. There was an adhoc HUD score group that met twice but it was suggested that a standing group should now be formed.

One question was if the CoC Staff has specific items from last year they can continue with the new Executive group.

Discussion then occurred around how this team should communicate with each and the existence of a "general dissenter or naysayer" it is important to note that the naysayer should not be the same person permanently. One group process rule is assuming good intentions on the part of everybody involved in the meeting. From there how are difficult conversations dealt with and how should members call out feelings of disrespect? Some suggestions included being direct, checking biases at the door, role awareness, and respecting the process it took to be an Executive member. Members are here as leaders of the CoC, which can be difficult for some to remember because members keep their agencies best interest at heart, as is expected. What are the repercussions if members of the Executive team are missing, i.e. quorum requirements? Members need to recognize that if two or more members start a discussion regarding topics that should be discussed in front of all Executive members, the conversation should be held until all are present.

The variety of backgrounds means that members can educate each other on items that other members might not have a background in. There was discussion about how we can expect each other to come with good intentions, be respectful, but also let each other know if we feel like comments made are not respectful.

Majority rule was suggested for this committee since this can aid in getting decisions made. Staff stated that after getting guidance from this group, it is expected that the full Executive group supports it. It's hard for the staff to present items if the whole group does not back it up.

During meetings, there may be agenda item carry over since some items take longer than anticipated. There may be times however when more discussion is needed and items are better to be carried over. If a contrary opinion is present, it is important for the "why" to be known.

It may be helpful for there to be discussion around HUD and other funding sources during Executive meetings. Another committee opportunity is to look at narrative building regarding advocacy.

Conclusion
This topic may be continued at the next Executive meeting.

Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project	Jesica

Discussion

The first Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project (YHDP) funding call started in 2016 just has the CoC HUD NOFA was wrapping up. In 2016, an adhoc committee to handle the process of applying for this funding was appointed. The lead agency voted in at that time was HQ. When this was brought forward to the Steering Committee, there was discussion around the issue of an adhoc group choosing the lead agency and a feeling that a decision of this magnitude should use conventional CoC processes.

Funding was applied for, unfortunately the score was very low, and funding was not awarded. This experience did provide HUD technical assistance and a learning opportunity. HQ continues to be the lead agency with this work and with HUD feedback. There were issues around whether the adhoc group should continue to meet but due to personal desire from the partners, it did. For unknown reasons, partners were dropped off the invitation list to continue the work and meetings continued

without these partners. This is an unfortunate situation that needs to be rectified. Currently, there is another round of Youth NOFA opening and applying is relevant. This new NOFA drop provides an opportunity to create a group that reflects all community partners. It was suggested that an intent be utilized to find a new lead agency. 11 new applications with 5 being rural. It is critical to get started as quickly as possible. It was noted that CoCs who are serious about ending youth homelessness do youth counts. Collaboration was one sore point on the score sheet and a better plan needs to be put together to address this. Financial resources also received a low score. Data, evaluation capacity, and data quality isn't believed to be an issue. An issue might exist around pulling in youth data from other sources and monitoring youth providers, which there was none at the time because they are privately funded.

Jesica had a meeting yesterday with HQ and made them aware of today's meeting.

Lead agency role includes getting a planning grant, but that agency does not disperse the HUD funding award. Only the collaborative applicant can submit which is Jesica on behalf of United Way. It is believed that the planning grant gets subcontracted to lead agency from Jesica. The award is only allowed 30% up front (note: the lead agency would not get the full 30% for planning), this allows a 6-month time frame to plan a budget and community plan. Once that gets approved by HUD then the remaining 70% is granted. Projects added under this funding (if awarded) will be funded in perpetuity so it's a valuable way to add to annual HUD funding. The lead agency would shepherd the proposal process and submit the proposals, then the funding would go directly to the organization with the winning proposal. It is best practice to make sure the letter of intent/funding application process be as fair and equitable as possible and be sure that everyone who wants to do it can.

The question of the value behind the current youth group was brought up and where this process fell short. Some thresholds could be added including; does the lead agency have GAAP rules in place and financial backbone? Do they have experience with HUD policy and procedures? Diversity is important for project awards. In other successful applications, large organizations such as the CoC backed by HARA won funding. An independent body judging criteria is a suggestion as well. This came down to the question of using an adhoc committee. One comment included that while there might be positive sides of an adhoc committee, it may be best to appoint a permanent committee, but the lead agency should be able to write down the criteria. It was suggested there be clear outlines developed at the CoC level.

It was decided that instead of a letter of intent, an RFQ would be more useful and time sensitive.

It may be useful to think future forward and develop a transparent process that is clearly identified and organized. Questions around how to build a collaborative environment that utilizes shared experiences. These thoughts can be brought up at the next adhoc youth meeting, and if it is, the meeting needs to be open to all groups. NOFA spells out what a lead agency is. It is important to state in the RFQ that it is locally and nationally competitive and state that the lead agency will need to work with the CoC and Steering Committee clearly. The Youth Advisory board isn't being formed just for this NOFA, it should be formed across all organizations and it needs to be set up by Steering officially.

Conclusion
Official vote to have Jesica build the RFQ, then send out to all Executive Committee members for feedback, and set up agenda for the youth meeting and invite the full CoC Motion: Passed

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline

JV to send out drafts of RFQ and add agenda item to Youth Action meeting. Send out prior notice so all organizations can attend Youth Action meeting. Jesica to email out an RFQ to executive for comment	Jesica	
Decriminalizing Homelessness in MI - MCAH	**Jesica**	
Discussion		
MCAH is a state legislative body that works alongside MSHDA. They are currently doing research into decriminalizing homelessness. There are some questions around how they rolled out their approach to research. A survey was sent out via email with a webinar included detailing the questions they suggest asking the population experiencing homelessness. These questions made the Outreach team feel uncomfortable. It was brought up that Steering possibly vote on whether these questions be asked in Kent County. In the meantime, it is suggested to hold off. These questions are not required, and they are not impactful of any scores Kent County may receive. It is suggested that if questions are uncomfortable and invasive then they not even be utilized. It is important to support the decriminalization, but how is it best for us to aid in their research. We don't want to be seen as not being supportive, because we are.		
Conclusion		
It was discussed that Jesica maybe reach out to MCAH and ask of another way to support their research.		
CE Evaluation Update	**Jesica**	
Discussion		
Jesica just sent out three proposals and will be meeting next week. During the meeting, there will be discussions around picks. Executive members are to review their picks and be ready to discuss on Wednesday.		
Choose Executive Meeting Time and Place	**Jesica**	
Discussion		
Lisa or Jeff volunteered to host the monthly meeting. Bree will send out poll regarding the best time to schedule a recurrent meeting for everyone. Traffic patterns will be taken into consideration and Fridays will not be an option.		
Adjourn		
Motion to adjourn by Lisa, Seconded by Jeff, Motion Passed		