



Performance Monitoring Committee Meeting Minutes

Duration: 2-3:30pm

Date: 5/29/25

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	P	Meagan Biscamp (ECHO)				
P	Kayla Grissett	P	Dylan Shubitz (LC)				
A	Nirav Shah	A	Whitney Callari				
Committee Chairs							
P	Rachel Schuyler (Co-Chair)						
P	Cryss Murray (Co-Chair)						
Guest Attendees							
P	Andrew Willard	P	Diana Garcia (SAFE)	P	Preston Petty	P	Rachel Astorga – McCain (Caritas)
P	Micaella Villegas	P	Petra Kirlew (Front Steps)	P	Jen Pinkley	P	Ana
P	Holly Winge	P	Veronica Villareal	P	Vedia Sherman (SHP)	P	Terica Haney (Caritas)
	Chloe Rocha	P	Kellie Wylie (Integral Care)	P	Linda	P	Jasmin Bonnett (Front Steps)
P	Karem Castillo (SAFE)	P	Judit Madrigal	P	Illiana Serrano	P	Linda Perez
P	EB Price						
ECHO (CoC Lead)							
P	Perla Carranza	P	Jenelle Adetunji	P	Shan Robertson		
P	Dominique Peavey	P	Quiana Fisher	P	Alessandra Dominguez		
P	Joseph Montano	P	Nina Gutierrez	P	Sara Fuetter		
P	Helen Eisert	P	Sharon Kao	P	Jordan Hulin		

AGENDA	PRESENTER	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
2:05pm: Welcome, ice breaker	Rachel		
2:10pm – Performance Improvement Policy Workgroup Update	Perla	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kali Holyfield presented at the May 5 Leadership Council meeting • No objections 	
2:15pm – New governance manager introduction	Cryss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shan Robertson, Ethics presentation in the near future 	
2:20pm – RRH Implementation Plan Presentation	Dominique	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How we got here (background) • What Leadership Council asked of the workgroup • Austin/Travis County RRH analysis (trends, changes, etc) • Findings of research (RRH serving chronically MORE than non-chronic, items measured HH income at exit/HH insurance at exit) <p>May 5, 2025 – Formal vote, new process -system recommendation → 10 or below, or 11+ with less than 12 months, further develop dynamic prioritization to be data informed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acronyms/definitions (RRH, referrals, dynamic prioritization, pull, sort) • Currently: dynamic prioritization orders households with the highest APAT score, HH that meet criteria for subpop, highest length of time homeless, HH with earlier APAT/assessment date (RRH pulling is according to above criteria) • NEW policy: only these criteria will be used: 10 below on APAT OR 11+ with less than 12 months of homelessness of CURRENT episode <p>Historical practice VS new practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why filter by special populations? Many different agencies that serve specific target populations (veteran specific, by age, etc) • General population list exists as well as the subpopulation list as well • Subpops will be filled first before general referrals (most specific population to least as well as cross referencing) • Days homeless calculates time: what’s being reported by individual and continues to count 	<p>rehousingsupport@austinecho.org – CE & HRS Support team</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New policy will mean day of assessment subtracted by days homeless~ <p>Jenelle shared screen to demonstrate a mock pull</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What happens in the classic pull? Historically, team would take a look at income plan, how the income is coming in, according to stipulations of program <p>New prioritization rules</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals that scored above 11 sorted by how many days folks have been homeless (365 days) • A lot of folks being skipped over due to time homeless • About 11,000 folks on the RRH list • Holly mentions clarity is necessary with assessors and communicating the reality • Quiana mentions that folks are assumed to be in the community until they are confirmed to not be in the community, self resolved, or deceased • Veterans do not use housing income plan • Until implementation is completed, the income plan is not a determinant <p>Implementation plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General email regarding policy change has been sent out • Population specific conversations will happen at staffings • Referrals will be pulled via the new RRH policy for the second pull in June • Workgroup assigned to adjust dynamic prioritization policy for community (Leadership Council determining the workgroup) • TA & Program support will be revising the CA assessor script 	
<p>2:50pm – Continuing Scorecard Conversation</p>	<p>Joseph</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joseph mentioned doing some research on what other CoC’s are doing regarding scorecards and not much available (no responses) • Reviewed materials from original group reviewing the scorecards • Still some questions that this group needs to answer before moving forward • This presentation will also be given to the PIP workgroup to determine threshold 	<p>Questions that need answers from PMC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Function updates: Should formulas be one direction? Option 1 (R&E suggestion) • Next question: Should negative differences be counted? No they will not.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Income Growth Metric – Should metrics that measure income growth differ between PSH and RRH? Leave as is • Should multiple negative exits be counted? Answer unclear. • Should income growth be compared to the immediately preceding record? Leave as is
3:30pm	Adjourn		

Actions taken by [Performance Monitoring Committee] during the meeting on [5/29/25]
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.