

Governance Advisory Board Retreat Minutes

March 29 - 30, 2017

Members Present: Karia Basta (ADOH)
Carole Benedict (U.S. Vets, Yavapai County)
Valarie Donnelly (WACOG)
Eliza Louden (Catholic Charities, Yavapai County)
Suzanne Payan (CAHRA, Pinal County)
David Bridge (ADOH)
Joy Johnson (ADOH)
Glennifer Mosher (ADOH)
Michele Meyerkorth (ADOH)
Candee Stanton (Consultant)

Members Absent: Anita Baca (Housing Authority of Cochise County, Cochise County)
Chantel Padilla (Advocate, Navajo & Apache Counties)

Karia welcomed everyone and she reintroduced the newest team member, David Bridge. Karia discussed the future changes within the COC as David is the Continuum of Care Coordinator.

Governance Charter: (Attachment 1)

We reviewed the Governance Charter and made several changes, bringing the document into alignment with current situation. It was also decided to expand the Advisory Board from seven (7) to eleven (11) individuals. Motions were made and accepted to ask the following four (4) people to join the Advisory Board. They are:

- Karen Uhlich representing Cenpatico, the RBHA for southern Arizona;
- Barbara Mikkelsen representing Health Choice Integrated Care (HCIC), the RBHA for northern Arizona;
- Adriane Clarke, the ESG Specialist with Department of Economic Security (DES); and
- Lisa Fitzgerald, the Executive Director of Cornerstone Mission, representing the faith based sector, also an ESG sub-recipient.

The group is to review again separately and submit any changes to Karia. Voting on the final version will occur at the April meeting.

Action Item: Michele to make the changes to the Governance Charter and submit to the Board for separate review.

Action Item: Karia to send invite letters to proposed board members.

Action Item: David to draft job description to include and add to Charter.

Training: (Attachment 2)

AZCEH submitted a funding request for proposed training for rural outreach. ADOH will pay for the training. Carole asked about continuing education units for law enforcement. Eliza is a SPDAT trainer in the BOS and is underutilized. Eliza's feedback is rural outreach is not the challenge; we need "beyond outreach". Some suggested topics are:

- How to do a basic F-VI-TAY SPDAT in the field
- How to promote data sharing when the client is uncomfortable
- Trauma informed care
- Coordinated Entry Academy
- Motivational interviewing

As AZCEH does not always get a huge response, Valarie commented it might be time to take a different approach to marketing the training. It is difficult to get the people who need training to travel. There is also the concept of continuing to do things the way they have always been done. MOU's and referrals are also obstacles. Changing the name of the MOU to "cooperative agreement" might alleviate some concerns. Webinars are not very effective, as most people do not give one hundred percent (100%) to participating. SPDAT training is not conducive to a webinar. Training should be in person the first time with webinars as on-going and follow-up training. Could the Coordinated Entry Academy be one of the tracks at the AZCEH conference in the fall? Professional development credits should also be considered. After this discussion, the decision was made to not fund the proposed AZCEH training.

Action Item: Karia will ask AZCEH about continuing education units for law enforcement and a meeting will be held to discuss all the proposed topics. New proposal from AzCEH will be requested.

Support of Local Continuums:

Strategic Plans are needed for the NOFA. Valarie is having a meeting on May 2nd and the Strategic Plan is on the agenda. If you would like ADOH to present at any of your meetings, please contact Karia to coordinate.

System Performance Measures: (Attachment 3)

Glennifer reviewed different metrics (see attached) each agency need to be reviewing. She also noted data clean-up is needed. Communicating with ADOH is necessary. Agencies are not doing the Continuum a favor if they are not using HMIS correctly. Data needs to be readily available. Data also needs to be entered correctly; be sure to read and answer ALL questions. Expedience! ~ We need to ensure data is entered in a timely manner. Services need to be entered as well, including rent. Eventually, the expedience on the entry of services will be monitored by HUD. It is not written in the

contract yet but we should be proactive and start entering all data now. Data entry needs to be completed by someone who understands the information. This may not be the responsibility of a clerk. Owning the data for the agency is crucial. On negative exits, there is a box for a narrative. During the next contract round, completing this narrative will be a requirement. Please keep in mind we have twenty-four (24) hours to remove an individual from HMIS. Please let us know as soon as possible when a person leaves your agency.

Review of COC Scoring: (Attachment 4)

The BOSCOG was the highest scoring continuum in the state and we scored higher than the median score for all COCs! Even with our high score, we were not awarded any bonus projects. Having the narratives from the agencies was huge. Even though we did well, we still need to strive to do better.

PIT Count: (Attachment 5)

THIS IS PRELIMINARY DATA AND IS NOT TO BE SHARED! The count went down thirty percent (30%) from last year. We had 247 volunteers. SPDATs increased from ten percent (10%) completed to twenty-five percent (25%) completed. Valarie commented the numbers went down in her area because it took longer to complete the survey. More analysis is needed on the chronically homeless numbers.

RRH Standards: (Attachment 6)

ADOH is striving for standards of excellences for RRH. Candee asked us to review the “Current Standards and Practices Across Funding Sources” and provide her with comments, etc. Even though ADOH and the COC are listed in the same column, the requirements are different. During the last planning meeting, the general comment was there is a need for more eviction prevention. On the area/category that is “flexible”, we need to have a consensus and use the same practices across the board. Karia asked what the next step(s) should be. Carole suggested we use the least restrictive in each area/category as the standard. Candee will host a meeting in Phoenix and would like Karia and David to attend.

COC Operations: (Attachment 7)

Candee asked us to review the “Operations Handbook” and provide her with comments, etc. In order to be a local network/collaboration/etc., you must hold regular meetings, have agendas, keep minutes and enter into a contract with ADOH, all for the purpose of ending homelessness.

HUD Discussion:

We welcomed Noemi Ghirghi from HUD. It was explained that the Governance Advisory Board is set up to represent the geography of the State. We have eight (8) counties with local COC’s and a contract in place with a lead agency.

Noemi led a discussion around the principle areas of the COC, which are: coordinated entry, written standards, performance measurements, and strategic resource allocation. In addition to discussing

how the different areas have different challenges, lack of involvement from entitlement cities, and/or major stakeholders, the same concern everywhere is the lack of affordable housing. Transportation is also a factor.

Noemi asked, “when doing the PIT Count, what do you do when someone does not want to respond?” A visual assessment of ethnicity and gender is completed. Suzanne stated, “more people are reluctant to complete the SPDAT due to the number of questions.”

Noemi inquired if we were ready for the next round of funding. Karia replied the BOSCOG needs to discuss expanding evaluation procedures. With HUD not having a budget or a budget that may be severely cut, it is expected that the percentage for projects in Tier 2 will be increased.

Action Item: A discussion on the criteria for Tier 1 and Tier 2 is needed.

We discussed entitlement funding. Carole shared how Flagstaff requires their agencies to use Coordinated Entry to receive funding. Noemi would like to share this with other entitlements. Eliza feels excluded from the CDBG process, as the funds are not used for ending homelessness. A suggestion was made for her to attend the public meetings and to submit comments. The lack of affordable housing is an issue for Valarie. She noted in La Paz there is no PHA so could entitlement funding possibly help in La Paz’s effort to get a PHA.

Sage is the new reporting software that we need to start using effective April 1st. This system came on-line to coincide with the new HMIS reporting. Noemi reviewed some of the requirements. David asked about the strategic plan and if it was separate for each area or is it one (1) for the State. Each area has a strategic plan but there is only one (1) used for the State.

Follow-up:

How do we want to evaluate programs for the next funding? We can further review data quality. What impact would occur if a program were not funded? Please let Karia know your questions/comments on the evaluation form she will distribute. Is there was a way to cut a percentage across the board. We will have to wait for the NOFA announcement.

Action Item: Karia will distribute the evaluation form used to determine what projects are in Tier 1 and what projects are in Tier 2.

Action Item: Karia will invite the new board members and have them present at the April meeting.

ADOH Leadership:

Change is hard. ADOH is looking to a standard of excellence. Andrew discussed AMS/Lean Management and the standards of work. Funding will be going into rapid re-housing and the

Landlord Mitigation Fund, which Catholic Charities will administer. That fund will cover rents not paid or damage to apartments. This fund might also be used for increased security deposits. The Housing Locator function for the BOS is in the infancy stage. This function will be huge in locating affordable housing. ADOH appreciates what you are doing.

We started the discussion on the criteria needed for Tier 1 and Tier 2. How are we going to accomplish a standard of work when we interact with federal programs like SSVF? We need to use the minimum that everyone can do. Regardless of the funding source, we should be providing the same level of service. The client should not be able to “shop” programs. Standards will assist everyone. The partners need to engage and be part of the system. Eliza asked why do we have to divide between RRH and veteran RRH? It would be so much better if we could just say RRH and provide the services based on their program’s guidelines.

We reviewed the evaluation form from the last NOFA. Is there any narrative that we need to improve? We have improved significantly but there is still room for improvement. The local entities having and utilizing a strategic plan will be a key component. Performance measures are what they will be; we cannot change these numbers. Having a peer review, especially with those agencies that do not get COC funding, will benefit the COC. What do we need to add to differentiate the programs to determine what goes into Tier 2. Do we use half (½) points? Valarie suggested the questions: What would you do if you were not funded? What would you do if you were partially funded? How would you perform? It was asked if we could prioritize the categories or put a benchmark on performance measures (i.e. return to homelessness) to be the tiebreaker. Weighing the performance measures by entity would be tiebreaker. Carole suggested using Coordinated Entry performance in HMIS.