Facilitator:	Lee Nelson Weber		
Meeting Attendees:	Lee Nelson Weber, John Wynbeek, Johanna Schulte, Rebecca Rynbrandt, Alonda Trammell, Veronica Arvizu, Jennifer Headrick, Mikyla Webb, Anya Ward, <u>Staff:</u> Courtney Myers-Keaton, Sierra Salaam, Brianne Czyzio		
Time Convened:	1:03	Time Adjourned:	2:35

Review of Approval		**May 16, 2019**	
Discussion	No Changes		
Approval of Minutes		**March 21, 2019**	
Motion by:	Mikyla Webb	Support from:	Johanna Schulte
Discussion	There is an incomplete action Item on bottom of page 3. In March, there were questions on how people were being counted and what category they were being placed in. Mikyla Webb clarified that Salvation Army uses the same definitions as MSHDA. The committee was also asking for process changes. How were changes made, who made the decisions, was there any evaluation after the changes? Mikyla can provide information from 2015 to 2018, including an interpretation of the definitions changed. There has been a change with shelter referrals. If someone calls and has no place to stay tonight, they are referred to shelter, instead of added to the shelter waitlist. This could impact numbers because as soon as an individual enters shelter, they are categorized as category 1. This process will continue to be discussed at the Coordinated Entry Committee and changes that need to be made to make sure the numbers are as accurate as possible. The goal of this committee is to get the definitions down so that the group can more accurately analyze the data.		
Amendments			
Conclusion	All in favor by acclamation with no dissent		
Approval of Minutes		**April 18, 2019**	
Motion by:	Rebecca Rynbrandt	Support from:	John Wynbeek
Discussion	There was conversation about how PIT count unsheltered numbers were tracked, not concern over how the numbers were collected. Has there ever been a local effort to do a PIT count in the warmer months? It has been discussed but never done. Outlying/rural areas in the county tend to see a spike in unsheltered numbers in the summer. In the winter, people tend to congregate in the metro area as this is where most services are offered. It is important to note that in Mark's presentation, he was grouping category 1 and category 2 numbers as the homeless population of the city. There is a full population of homeless, but there are cohorts within the full set of numbers. Often, people in the space talk about it with their own clarifiers and		

	definitions. To someone outside of the homeless data space, this may be misrepresented. Lee Nelson Weber can analyze the annual count numbers for category 1 and category 2. This will give the committee two data sets side by side. Lee will bring this to the June meeting. If a category 2 individual calls HAP, is this tracked with each call, or a waiting list they are put on? There is not a shelter waiting list anymore, but there is a resource waitlist. There is a resource waitlist (category 2) and a housing prioritization list (category 1). It is unlikely anyone is on both lists. When Sam Pennington from HAP presented to the full CoC, she shared that if a category 2 individual called when there was not a resource available, they were not tracked. If there are further questions around the definitions piece, please list them on basecamp. This can be tracked, and everyone can see the conversation.
Amendments	Change conversation around PIT Count to reflect discussion about how PIT count unsheltered numbers were tracked.
Conclusion	All in favor by acclamation with no dissent.

Annual Count Narrative	
Discussion	

Courtney Myers-Keaton presented a narrative developed around the annual count numbers and asked, 'What if the narrative was turned into annual report or state of homelessness for Kent County?' Perhaps all these numbers can be put on a one-pager with graphics specific to demographic breakdowns. The narrative would not need to be too in-depth. Other data points, like median income, could be added. Courtney will bring this narrative to Steering Council's meeting tomorrow and ask if the information can be added to the CoC's website. Other variables - length of time homeless, returns to homeless, and exits to permanent housing, should also be included. The goal is that this information is shared every general CoC meeting and posted on the website.

The annual percentage showed a large increase (about 20%) between 2017 and 2018. It seems that the data from both years has integrity, but there is not a full grasp on the data management. The 2017 and 2018 data are true, but likely were entered under different circumstances. What are the factors that have changed? These can be added in the footnotes. The changes at Salvation Army were and end of September/beginning of October 2018. The 20% increase has been the rate of increase throughout 2015 to 2018. The 20% increase from 2017 to 2018 is not out of line with the general trend. This reflects the realities of the community. Rebecca Rynbrandt shared that when the City of Wyoming is releasing information, maybe they do not include the info because then the media will contact you if they took the time to look into the data. This would allow CoC staff to then communicate the differences. On the other hand, fielding individual phone calls may lead to discrepancies in responses.

Often, data releases are held up by people wanting to add footnotes or wanted to develop a narrative. This annual count narrative data will be released by the Michigan Coalition Against Homelessness (MCAH). The group recommends that Courtney shares the draft with Steering Council to be released as soon as possible. An annual report can be worked on further and then released in the summer. Members suggested that the annual report format could be easily replicated. Mikyla Webb will supply the categorization information as soon as possible. Courtney noted that the same conversations are happening at CES as well. The draft shared with Steering Council should include three system performance measures (length of time homeless, returns to homelessness, and exits to permanent housing); the 2017 comparison (this adds context and understanding); and leave the door open for a footnote on methodology.

Johanna Schulte moves that a draft of this narrative data, including system performance measures (length of time homeless, returns to homelessness, and exits to permanent housing) and space for a methodology footnote, is brought to Steering Council. Jennifer Headrick seconded. All in favor by acclamation with no dissent.

Johanna was at a conference and talked to Gerry Leslie from MCAH. He mentioned that MCAH is planning to phase out the annual count reports in the future due to methodology issues.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Present annual count draft to Steering Council for review	Courtney Myers-Keaton	

MSHDA ESG Pay for Performance	
Discussion	

The Pay for Performance overview document was uploaded to Basecamp, as well as the measures broken down by provider. With MSHDA for Pay to Performance standards, the community must meet 5 of 7 measures and is currently meeting 5 of 7. This report will be submitted to MSHDA.

For the veterans specifically, this is not reflective of how providers are experiencing/providing services. The number does not look at verified as veterans, but instead looks at those who self-identify as a veteran. Measure 6 looks at how many people in emergency shelter receive assessment through the VI-SPDAT. Interestingly, the National Alliance to End Homelessness recommends administering the VI-SPDAT after 7-10 days in shelter because it gives the individual or family time to self-resolve. Veronica Arvizu noted that, in her experience, the VI-SPDAT number may be different after a few weeks. Families entering the system may be more likely to share information when they have built a relationship with staff. The VI-SPDAT is used as a gatekeeper for resources and is invasive. It makes sense that there would be a little time to develop that relationship. Is there a policy within our CoC when VI-SPDAT's should be given? Currently, MSHDA mandates shelter providers to administer the VI-SPDAT within a short timeframe. This could be an opportunity to advocate for change.

It was suggested the group look at providers who have high performance versus those who have low performance. Cheryl Schuch noted that the numbers for Family Promise may be artificially low

because families can be change from shelter to shelter. If families are moved to a different shelter, this would be tracked as an exit to homelessness. Members asked how much money Pay for Performance brings into the community. It is likely a low amount, around $100,000.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Look up resources (dollars) that Pay for Performance brings into the community.	CoC staff	

Coordinated Entry Report

Discussion

The Coordinated Entry report is developed quarterly by Salvation Army, this reports format is different because they no longer pay for Pictogram. Courtney asked the group discussed what this report means for the community and what pieces should be added.

All numbers dropped from last year. This quarter, 273 singles/families were added to the Housing Prioritization List (HPL). 25 of these were chronic individuals. 248 were non-chronic. The total number on the HPL is 422, 120 families and 302 singles.

There were questions around how chronic status is determined. Alonda Trammell shared that when Dwelling Place receives referrals, they determine chronic status not Salvation Army. An individual's SPDAT is the score given, but this alone does not determine whether they are chronic.

Is there a way to note how many were pulled off the list and referred to programs? No, Mikyla Webb shared that this number changes daily based on resource availability. Though the number changes daily, pulling the number on the HPL at the same time every quarter would allow for tracking.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline

Dashboard Examples

Discussion

Daniel Gore posted dashboards from across the country for consideration. Courtney Myers-Keaton ask the group to discuss the examples and decide if there is one framework that could be used for a dashboard for our community.

In the King County example, they break the numbers into families, single adults, youth with demographic, gender, and age data. They also look at average wait time to a resource after completing an assessment. This dashboard is easy to read but may take a while to build for our community. This dashboard looks at the performance of the system.

Chicago's dashboard has key system indicators including number of individuals, numbers exiting, number becoming inactive. Our community uses self-resolved, perhaps inactive is a better term. They also list the number of agencies working to end homelessness. This looks at the characteristics of the population. This dashboard would feed into the affordable housing conversation.

Snohomish County's dashboard lists goals and benchmarks. This dashboard is great for insiders and funders familiar with the language and performance measures of the system.

With each of these dashboards, there may be some custom HMIS reports that the communities are pulling. The group noted that a dashboard similar to the Chicago one is a starting point. The group will bring this example to Daniel and ask him to look into creating a draft and explain what data may be hard to get. Then, the group can work on a dashboard specific for insiders and funders. Johanna will bring demographic data as individuals move through the system to the next meeting. As a committee, discuss additional things that the committee would like to see. By the end of the June meeting, the group will have a draft dashboard to recommend to Steering Council.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Look into creating a draft dashboard and what data pieces may be hard to collect	Daniel Gore	June 20
Adjourn		