



Performance Monitoring Committee Meeting Minutes

Duration: 2-3:30pm

Date: 4/24/25

Meeting Place: VIRTUAL MEETINGS

Meeting ID:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85158063485?pwd=Ei7bBnlcaYHKM41HbFfu5nFdE3YyAE.1>

P = Present
A = Absent

Committee Voting Members							
P	Candace McGary	A	Zoe Steensma	A	Lindsay Kocen		
P	Gary Pollack	A	Robert Kingham				
P	Gaby Libretti	A	Meagan Biscamp (ECHO)				
A	Kayla Grissett	P	Dylan Shubitz (LC)		8 voting members here		
P	Nirav Shah	P	Whitney Callari				
Committee Chairs							
P	Rachel Schuyler (Co-Chair)						
P	Cryss Murray (Co-Chair)						
Guest Attendees							
P	Micaela Villegas						
P	Preston Petty						
ECHO (CoC Lead)							
P	Perla Carranza	P	Kate Moore				
P	Dominique Peavey						
P	Joseph Montano						
P	Whitney Bright						
P	Kawther Albruaye						

AGENDA	PRESENTER	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
2pm: Welcome, Introductions, ice breaker	Rachel		
2:10pm – HRS Vendor Transition Updates	Whitney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process began in Fall of 2024 • Unanimous selection of Clarity • Key features: advance search, ROI done within Clarity (digital signature), “does math” = when client has income, it will populate total income, total score does the math for you, can locate specific service you’re looking for • Black out period for both Clarity and Wellsky • April-May: configuring Clarity, building projects (400) for current data to drop into • June: migration test, agency reviews, validate data (enrollment dates, AA, exit) • July-August: Data quality corrections, training in Clarity in person, migrate data, black out period, clarity go-live • Custom data moves over after initial migration • Question: Do we have a rough estimate from them on how long the CE By Name List and referral functionality might be additionally down? It won’t be “down” it just won’t be updated, we will have current data but we won’t have the CA data, 	
2:20pm: Scorecard Presentation	Joseph	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data from FY24 Q4 scorecards – CoC funded projects, several marked as PIP • 9 projects that didn’t need PIP based on old threshold, 7 scored below, • Lifeworks RRH – Collaborative project, score would be combined with Caritas • Function updates: Should formulas be one direction? Hard to determine because sample sizes are different • Sample size will cause strong variation in scores, • Option 1: define a reference value (ie white) and always calculate the difference of percentages in that way? (Joseph recommends) • Option 2: Create omnidirectional formulas that account for population weighing and variance. This will require new thresholds and additional time to apply this to all metrics comparing populations • Dylan asking what peer city research we did with scorecard work (Nirav states we looked at the Houston CoC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-Up: What are other CoC’s doing? Simple percent different or statistical formula? • Taking Josephs recommendation of using the white population as reference value (talk about it next time) <p>Questions that need answers from PMC (discussing at May PMC meeting)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Function updates: Should formulas be one direction? • Next question: Should negative differences be counted? • Income Growth Metric – Should metrics that measure income growth differ between PSH and RRH? • Should multiple negative exits be counted?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nirav mentions that he thinks they were not doing equity work in their scorecards • Gary states he will see what he could dig up on his end • Dylan suggests that we still vote – do what’s been recommended (white pop as reference value) • Next question: Should negative differences be counted? • Dylan’s thought – this is where equity is examined, negative numbers get treated as zero • Candance mentions that we need to be specific in grading the right thing • Joseph mentions that he hasn’t seen metrics like this been implemented • HUD gives ‘points’ to projects hitting the mark • HUD gives a lot of latitude to communities and how they implement their scorecards • Nirav mentions the objective is to move our HRS to where there’s no diff between how we serve white/BIPOC • Income Growth Metric – Should metrics that measure income growth differ between PSH and RRH? • Should multiple negative exits be counted? Providers had folks exit program and come back resulting in two negative exits for program • Should income growth be compared to the immediately preceding record? • Gary mentions this feels like program transfers: if people move to another program do you count that as a positive exit? • Threshold missing data: percentages we round, but not days • Metrics referencing previous metrics: clarifying verbiage • DQ-3 missing fields for validation: all 3 boxes need to be checked and not just one • Equity Metric 4 & 5: • Timeline: April 30 – scorecards distributed • Scorecards from all quarters by April 30 to the PIP workgroup to decide threshold 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should income growth be compared to the immediately preceding record? •
--	--	---	--

3pm – Group Brainstorm (CE Workgroup Focus)	Candace & Gabbi		Pushing this agenda item to the May PMC

Actions taken by [Performance Monitoring Committee] during the meeting on [4/24/25]

I.

Opening Statement: This committee works to ensure that diverse voices are included as facilitators, attendees, and guests in our meetings. We have a zero-tolerance policy for any form of discrimination or abusive behavior. We are committed to ensuring that all meetings are safe and respectful for all participants.