Mid-Willamette Valley Homeless Alliance

Performance and Evaluation Committee

Tuesday, August 2, 2022
MEETING MINUTES

ATTENDANCE		
Member	**Organization**	**Attended**
Chair: Josie Silverman-Mendez	PacificSource	Yes
Chris Berg	Oregon Housing and Community Services	Yes
Julie Conn-Johnson	24J McKinney Vento Program	Yes
Dede Hazzard	UGM Simonka Place	No
Christine House	PacificSource	Yes
Michael Livingston	CANDO Neighborhood Association	Yes
Margie Lowe	Marion-Polk Early Learning HUB	Yes
Alisa Parker	Catholic Community Services	Yes
Aryn Walker	Marion County Health and Human Services	Yes
Guests	Jan Calvin, MWVHA Consultant	
	Janet Carlson, MWVHA Consultant	
	Tim Weese, Mid-Willamette Valley Community Action Agency	

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
   Josie Silverman-Mendez called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm.

2. **Committee Administration – Josie Silverman-Mendez**
   Approval of 7/12 Minutes: Michael Livingston moved approval of the minutes. Christine House seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

   Data Dashboard: Chris Berg summarized the recent meeting of the workgroup. Discussion included System Performance Measures (SPMs) and how data needs to be culled. Chris said he is not too concerned about format at this juncture and has drafted different ways to pull data from HMIS. Michael pointed out that originally the data dashboard was envisioned as an interactive, user-friendly display of SPMs with linked data. However, the process has proved unwieldy in the short term. We will begin by displaying aggregate data for three SPMs:

   - The length of time a person remains homeless;
   - The extent to which persons who exit homelessness to permanent housing destinations return to homelessness; and
   - The number of successful housing placements.

   Data will be updated at regular intervals, and we will work from there to build a learning base, tracking trends and changes. Chris noted that the workgroup will bring a mock-up to the September committee meeting.

   Performance Monitoring document: Josie introduced the discussion by noting that the document serves as a roadmap for the committee, breaking down the responsibilities that then feed into an annual work plan. She believes the workgroup meetings and committee

discussions have been productive review sessions and asked for comments by committee members.

Alisa affirmed that the language helps with understanding. Margie added that the descriptions are aspirational, what we will do when fully functional. Michael said that the intent was to make the document useable and clear. He expressed appreciation for the time and attention of those who worked on it.

The committee members then walked through the proposed edits to the document. Janet explained the change to language about the number of Review & Ranking Subcommittee members. The staff proposal had been three members, but the Executive Committee recommended keeping five members, but expanding the pool of members to include both the P&E Committee and the Alliance Board of Directors. Michael read new language for the System Performance Measures paragraphs. The discussion then turned to the committee's role vis a vis site visits.

Margie stated that reviewing funded programs is important in making determinations about future investments. Janet cited information from HUD documents about HUD's expectation that CoC program reviews incorporate both quantitative and qualitative data. Josie raised the issue about how to structure site visits and whether interviews were sufficient? Margie described "fidelity checks" conducted by the Marion & Polk Early Learning Hub, where she found site visits valuable in comparing what was included in the plan and how services were being delivered day-to-day. Margie proposed developing a standard tool; not everyone needs to visit every program; the tool can be used to report back to the committee as a whole on areas of strength and needs for improvement.

Michael expressed concerns about our purpose being focused inquiry and expressed reluctance to commit to site visits in the abstract. Margie replied that the site visits were not like restaurant inspections. Rather, they are a chance to see who the clients are; what is the recordkeeping system. Julie commented that most of the grant applicants have clients with sensitive situations and cautioned that the committee needs to be aware of confidentiality issues. Michael added that time spent on site visits means time not available for other committee work and that he would prefer a subgroup undertake the visits. We need to keep in mind our organizational capacity. Janet added that a small group of volunteers could get together to develop a template or tool to use for program reviews. Margie volunteered to participate in the small group.

Janet then reviewed revisions to language about the committee's role with Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) projects. She explained that the YHDP projects do not even have contracts yet from HUD and that conversations about the Youth Action Board role are still taking place. She recommended deferring recommendations on YHDP project reviews. With regard to Michael's proposal to change the committee name, Janet asked if the idea could be tabled, given the reduced capacity of the CoC currently. Michael agreed. Josie concluded the discussion by saying there will be more to come at the September committee meeting.

3. Scoring Tools – Janet Carlson

Janet summarized changes to the scoring tools from the tools used for the FY 2021 Notice of Funding Opportunity. She discussed the rationale for increasing the number of total points and breaking down items so that more elements from the application responses received individual scores to improve variability and make it easier for the reviewers to crosswalk application responses and the scoring rubrics. She walked the committee through one of the funding tools posted on the CoC website and reviewed the revised timeline. Julie noted that she will not be able to participate on the Review & Ranking Subcommittee, as she will be out of the country on September 12 and 13, which are the dates scheduled for subcommittee work. The subcommittee process was discussed, including the plan for scoring outcomes compared with how outcomes were scored in the previous competition.

MOTION: Margie moved approval, in concept, of the timeline and scoring tools and recommended them to the Alliance Board of Directors. Michael seconded the motion and thanked the consultants for their work. The motion passed unanimously with Margie, Michael, Josie, Julie, and Aryn voting in favor. (Other members of the committee had left the meeting.)

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 pm.