HRS Leadership Council Minutes

Committee: HRS Leadership Council

Duration: 12:00 – 3:00

Date: 11/15/2021

Meeting Place: VIRTUAL MEETINGS VIA ZOOM
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86532870646
Meeting ID: 865 3287 0646

Presiding:

Attendance:

P = Present

TC = Attended via Dial in
A = Absent
P/A = Partial Attendance

Leadership Council Members							
P	Cathy McClaugherty	P	Richard Johnson				
P	Dianna Grey	P	Summer Wright				
P	Dylan Shubitz	P	Whitney Thurman				
P	Emily Seales		Vacant				
P	Jason Philips		Vacant				
P/A	Quincy Dunlap		Vacant				
P	Rhie Azzam Morris						
Committee Chairs							
P	Brion Oaks						
P	Ruth Ahearn						
Attendees							
ECHO (CoC Lead)							
P	Maya Beit-Arie	P	Matt Mollica	P/A	Preston Petty		
P	Quiana Fisher	P	Kate Moore	P/A	Alessandra Dominguez		

AGENDA	TIME	PRESENTER	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
I. Welcome & Values	12:00 – 12:20	**B. Oaks**	**Welcome & Check-in** • Group Agreements & Values Check-in	
II. Austin Street Outreach Collaborative	12:20– 1:00	**M. Mollica, P. Petty, K. Moore, A. Dominguez**	**Background & Context** • Intended to fund organizations who have been doing the work for a long time but not been part of a formal funding structure within the HRS • Part of effort to ensure equitable access to programs funded/expanded by current funding surge in housing resources • Secured funding through St David's Foundation (SDF) with a number of conditions: ○ Funding secured for 2 years with ECHO as vehicle for funding (pass	

AGENDA			DISCUSSION	ACTION
			through); after the 2 years SDF will connect with funded orgs to continue to directly fund orgs (without passing through ECHO) 　　○ Work to connect funded orgs with ongoing funding opportunities 　• SDF total award = $31.M which includes an operating grant of $500K annually (so $1M total for the 2 years covered by the grant) + $1M annually (so $2M total) for ASOC + $100K to pay PLE in the system 　　○ ECHO has received admin grants from SDF annually for the last 6 years; last year, grant was for $875K, this year is $500K **Updates** 　• ECHO staff created draft questions for RFP ("outline summary"); need to figure out who will be the decision-making body on: 　　○ Finalizing RFP (questions & scoring) 　　○ Posting RFP & collecting applications 　　○ Scoring applications & recommending award allocations 　　○ Finalizing awards 　• Grant start date: 1/1/2022 　• Outcomes & metrics for grant need to be created by 2/1/2022 (need to know which orgs are funded in order to know what is being measured) **Discussion** 　• How to balance getting input from providers who are doing this work every day, with minimizing conflicts of interest 　　○ Could be a step in this process where members of interim Crisis Response working group provide meaningful input on RFP draft/outline summary and where newly seated voting members of the Crisis Response Committee are also provided same opportunity; then decision-making body can take that feedback in when finalizing RFP 　• How does the HMIS Expansion not getting funded through CoC NOFO impact ASOC? 　　○ The budget covered in the HMIS Expansion is already covered by ECHO through a combination of license fees collected from providers & from foundation grant money	==**Action:**== *Non-conflicted members of the interim Crisis Response group will provide feedback on the draft RFA (eligibility document, scoring rubric, wording of questions), ECHO staff will incorporate feedback into new draft and send recommended RFA to Leadership Council for final approval at January 10th Meeting.* ==**Action:**== *Leadership Council's ad hoc Funding Alignment Workgroup will put together scoring team of non-conflicted members to review & score applications and present funding recommendations to LC at either February 7th Meeting or an earlier Special Called Meeting. Funding Alignment Workgroup will invite members of the newly seated Crisis Response Committee to join scoring team.*

AGENDA			DISCUSSION	ACTION
III. **Opening Leadership Council Meetings**	1:00 -1:15	**B. Oaks & R. Ahearn**	**Opening Leadership Council Meetings** • Could start off with an open public comment period either at the beginning or the end of LC meetings • Could also ask for written public comment ahead of meetings (when agenda goes out) by posting a form for written feedback on ECHO website where agenda is posted • How to ensure invitations are being sent out equitably to smaller orgs? o Could ask folks to forward to their networks & then at beginning of meeting drop a form into the chat for folks to give their emails to be invited to future meetings	<mark>**Action:**</mark> *Open LC Meetings starting with December meeting; BO, RA , QF & MBA to create template for first open meeting.*

IV. **Community Conversation on NOFO Process**	1:30-3:00	**B. Oaks & R. Ahearn**	**Community Conversation on NOFO Process**
			• Process for determining designation of Critical to CoC Infrastructure:
			    o In previous years, that was done prior to applications being received; that not happening this year likely contributed to the confusion
			    o Issue with determining prior to applications, could result in projects not putting much effort into application bc they know they'll be ranked non-competitively
			    o Important to at least define what "critical" means or what parameters are considered in designation
			    o Need to define what critical to the infrastructure means prior to competition opening
			    o Need to have a deeper conversation about whether we want to even have the designation of critical to the infrastructure; if a project is really critical, shouldn't it always be scored towards the top by the IRT and prioritized?
			        ▪ Designation can be a great way to be flexible, but can also be used to circumvent the process & make it political
			• Changing the way it's normally done in such a critical year may have also contributed to the challenges folks experienced (e.g., shift in IRT & scoring process, new questions on local application) and didn't feel adequately communicated out
			• Should be more than 2 reviewers per application
			• New questions added to local application were really exciting (e.g. focus	

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	on racial equity, paying sustainable living wages)	
	• Local application process was very lengthy; may be less burdensome as a 2-part process (first local application questions prior to NOFO coming out, then move into the HUD-specific questions in a second round)	
	○ 2-part application process could allow for more support to smaller organizations & orgs applying for the first time	
	○ If splitting out local questions from HUD-specific questions, ECHO could provide training & TA on local application	
	• Support to smaller/new orgs isn't limited to just applying; managing a HUD grant for the first time is layered and administratively burdensome; need to ensure that we're supporting smaller orgs not just in applying but also in the admin portion of managing a HUD grant	
	○ Could build partnerships between established orgs that have managed HUD grants & new applicants (smaller orgs) to provide mentorship & admin support	
	• Appeals process had not changed this year; so using the critical infrastructure as a means instead of the appeals process for HMIS Expansion didn't feel like how we've done things before; need for clarity on what is the appeals process & when/how to use each process	
	• Requesting clarity on critical to the infrastructure designation was not an appeal on the HMIS expansion application; ECHO stated in the application that they were seeking critical designation but didn't have any other means since no process was outlined so asked NOFO inbox what the process would be	
	• Issue is not ECHO as an applicant having a question about process; issue is ECHO as Collaborative Applicant sending an email ostensibly speaking on behalf of LC; no other applicant or organization in this system would have had the proximity to be able to do something like that	
	• We need to figure out how to move forward in a way that gives fair access to all NOFO applicants	
	• Moving forward, when the Collaborative Applicant speaks publicly on behalf of LC, LC must be aware of it	
	• IRT attempted to incorporate people with lived experience much more this year than in the past; if LC had designated critical infrastructure then effectively its making the scores less relevant which would run counter to intent as council to center the voices of those with lived experience	
	• If LC were to communicate out prior to competition opening next year,	

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	ACTION

	whether or not will be considering critical to the infrastructure, would that alleviate concerns?
	   o Need to define what critical to the infrastructure means prior to competition opening
	   o Formal feedback process for workgroups and committees in advance of NOFO opening; where group look at pieces that impact their work & sent their thoughts in advance on ranking process or other core needs to try to inform prioritization & critical infrastructure
	• The email that went out did not only ask applicants to argue for their projects to be considered critical to the infrastructure, also asked for budget amendments; this read poorly, as if ECHO was asking providers to make room
	• The email that went out felt directed at the community, not as a request for clarification from LC that was shared with community for transparency
	• ECHO will continue to debrief this process (internally with ECHO staff, with IRT, and with any interested applicants) and will send out feedback survey to applicants
	• Why was the review process changed to having only 2 reviewers per application? This seemed to cause big discrepancies between reviewers in some cases
	   o Chair of IRT requested additional reviewers be added per application; recruitment of IRT members was difficult & there was a sense of urgency
	   o Intention was to reduce burden per IRT member
	   o Intention to create standing IRT-style group for future reviews
	   o Scoring was not a smooth scale; so difference between 6 and 10, for example, is 1 step not 4 points
	   o Intention behind the scoring matrix was that highest score (10 or 15 points depending on question) represented exceptional answer that exceeds expectations whereas the mid-range score (6 or 8 points depending on question) represented meeting expectations and answering fully
	   o This change should have been communicated better, and scoring should have been communicated better
	• As a community, can advocate to HUD to remove HMIS from the NOFO
		Action: *Q. Fisher will continue to debrief this process (internally with ECHO staff, with IRT, and with any interested applicants) and will send out feedback survey to applicants.*
		
		Action: *R. Azzam-Morris will send out information on how other communities have dealt with HMIS expansions*

AGENDA			DISCUSSION	ACTION
			competition for funding (make it a separate process) since it is HUD mandated and critical to the infrastructure of the CoC • Can also continue this conversation in the NOFO workgroup; will ensure intentional invitations to those on this call	
Adjournment	3:00		**FUTURE AND ONGOING AGENDA ITEMS** • MOU – CoC & Collaborative Applicant • Alignment of program standards across COA & ECHO Funding (balancing consistency & barrier to new programs) • Charter revisions (Committees, attendance, etc.) ==Next Meeting: December 6th, 12:00PM – 3:00PM==	

"For the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. They may allow us to temporarily beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change. Racism and homophobia are real conditions of all our lives in this place and time. I urge each one of us here to reach down into that deep place of knowledge inside herself and touch that terror and loathing of any difference that lives here. See whose face it wears. Then the personal as the political can begin to illuminate all our choices."

— Audre Lorde