



AGENDA	PRESENTER	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
<b>2pm: Welcome and introductions</b>	<b>Cryss</b>		
<b>2:10pm: Voting Member Nominations – Vote Lindsay Kocen</b>	<b>Cryss</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cryss shared a brief bio with Lindsay’s background information.</li> <li>• Lindsay not present, no vote was made.</li> </ul>	<b>Lindsay not present. Can’t vote as a voting member.</b>
<b>2:20pm – Co-Chair Nominations</b>	<b>Cryss</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lindsay Kocen &amp; Rachel Schuyler (already voting member)</li> <li>• Rachel gave brief introduction about why she’s interested in being a co-chair.</li> <li>• Rachel voted in.</li> </ul>	Rachel voted as co-chair.
<b>2:30pm: PIT Workgroup Updates</b>	<b>Angela</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided on staggered start times: central (3am-7am), suburban (4am-8am), rural (6am-9am)</li> <li>• PIT Survey: reframe question asking for HIV/Aids status “There are programs which support people with HIV/Aids, would you benefit from it” Instead of “If there was space available in a program that specifically assists people that live with HIV or AIDS, would that be of interest to you? “</li> <li>• Remove ‘outside of the US’ from “Where were you living when your homelessness started?”</li> <li>• Combine two questions (where were you when homelessness started &amp; were you in Austin when homelessness started)</li> <li>• For next meeting: any questions we should add?</li> <li>• Discussion: Whitney brings up, for clients that don’t have a social security number “client doesn’t know or client refused” include “unable to provide” as an option</li> <li>• Comment to put up fliers in different places so folks know (different community sites, psychiatric hospitals, CoC service providers, homeless hubs, etc)</li> <li>• Angela shared that there is an opportunity from the PIT workgroup to add a question surrounding diversion funding/intervention and what is needed in our CoC.</li> </ul>	Sent survey to committee members.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zoe stating that there is no question about psychiatric services – have you ever used in patient hospital as shelter? Understanding whether folks use psychiatric/in patient hospital as a form of shelter (folks are not high need for services but seek out shelter in this form) Andrew stating that this is captured in the CA collected.</li> <li>• Gaby mentions that she doesn't want to deny folks who are accessing crisis survey. "Shelter seeking" – she has seen it used to deny folks that are having a crisis</li> <li>• When thinking of data collection, what is the outcome? What is cost benefit analysis of these questions? (Whitney)</li> <li>• Angela: we are not collecting data if we aren't thinking about why is it important. Do we want to advocate for it? Are there programs that are underserved that are impacted by decisions?</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<b>2:40pm – Performance Improvement Plan Workgroup Updates</b>	<b>Alesandra</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First meeting scheduled for Wednesday, December 4, 12-1pm</li> <li>• About 4 different agencies represented (6 folks + 3 ECHO staff)</li> </ul>	
<b>2:45pm – Scorecard Presentation/Q&amp;A</b>	<b>Joseph</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please see attached slides.</li> <li>• Question: were there measures that were resulting in low scores across the board or is it all over the place?" Joseph mentions that he hasn't seen any metrics where folks score poorly. Mentions that he thinks racial equity metrics may not be met once it's all fixed. Everyone committed to getting bonus points so that'll assist in leveling scores.</li> <li>• Gaby asks where she can find the score</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	Send the scorecard template
<b>3:10pm - Adjourn</b>			

Actions taken by [Performance Monitoring Committee] during the meeting on [11/21/24]

- I. Voted in new Co-Chair (Rachel Schuyler)

# CoC Quarterly Performance Scorecards Update

Performance Monitoring Committee

11/21/24

## Current Known Issues

1. Performance Metric 3 is not awarding points to some projects meeting the required threshold
2. Racial Equity Metrics 2a & 3 for Rapid Re-Housing are currently awarding full points when it should not be
3. Collaborative scores have been scored separately
  1. Passages Project – SAFE & The Salvation Army
  2. YHDP Collaboration – Lifeworks, Caritas, SAFE
4. Maybe More!
  1. Expected to be resolved by Q1 2025, all quarters for 2024 and will be rerun and distributed with new year's scorecards

# Current Scores\*

	Q3	Q2
Integral Care - Fresh Start PSH	56%	54%
Caritas - MY HOME	78%	86%
SAFE Alliance - DV RRH	NA	NA
Front Steps - Front Steps Housing (10)	67%	69%
Salvation Army - Passages II RRH Collaborative	58%	62%
SAFE Alliance Transitional (HUD)	NA	NA
Lifeworks Rapid Re-Housing (HUD CoC)	65%	44%
HATC Upward - PSH	71%	70%
HACA Onward	77%	81%
Lifeworks PORT RRH (YHDP)	58%	40%
Lifeworks PORT TH (YHDP)	NA	NA
Lifeworks Diversion (YHDP)	NA	NA
Lifeworks RRH Plus (YHDP)	49%	52%
Caritas RRH Plus (YHDP)	56%	48%
SAFE Alliance - RRH Plus (YHDP)	NA	NA

\*Scores will change as code is fixed, these scores are not completely reflective of project performance

# Feedback from Providers

- For Racial Equity Measure 1, there has been concern expressed around the inability for providers to control what types of referrals they receive and the race/ethnicity of clients referred
- Providers are unsure of how their scores will be impacted by the PIP policy and NOFO ranking policies