



Homeless Services Consortium Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2020 – 2:00PM – 4:00PM

Urban League of Greater Madison

2222 S Park St #227, Madison

Call to Order and Welcome 2:05

Attendance: Rev Dr. D. Jonathan Grieser, Melissa Mennig, Maggie Carden, Dana Stokes, Arree Macon, Torrie Kopp Mueller, Jani Koester, Jael Currie, Matthew Julian, Kim Kennedy, Liz Duffie, Natalie Deibel, Brad Hinkfuss, Lane Hanson

Guest(s): Sarah Lim

1. Introductions

2. Approval of Minutes from December 20, 2019

- a. Duffie moves to approve, Mennig 2nds the motion.
 - i. No discussion – All vote in favor, none opposed, no abstentions

3. Election of Board Officers

- a. President – Facilitate monthly board meeting, executive committee converses via email monthly and meets together quarterly or bi-monthly (set by president and can vary)
 - i. Floor opened for Nominations
 - 1. Stokes self nominates
- b. Vice President – assists president, helps with timing and reminding of guests – goal of helping to monitor some of the committee work.
 - i. Floor Opened for Nomination
 - 1. Mennig self nominates
- c. Secretary
 - i. Floor Opened for Nominations
 - 1. Julian self nominates
- d. Treasurer- (new position) works with Center for Fiscal Partnerships – monthly updates
 - i. Floor Opened for Nominations
 - 1. Hanson self nominates
- e. Koester agrees to mentor as we transition in

- i. Vote called for the 4 that self-nominated
 - 1. All vote in favor, none opposed, no abstentions

4. Review and Approval of 2020-2021 EHH application materials and allocation process (Sarah Lim):

- a. EHH is combination of the following 3
 - i. Emergency Solutions Grant, ESG
 - 1. Can fund: RRH, Prevention, Emergency shelter, Street Outreach, HMIS, Administration
 - ii. State Homeless Prevention Program, HPP
 - 1. RRH, Homeless Prevention
 - iii. State Housing Assistance Program, HAP
- b. Grant period July 1 – June 30, City of Madison as lead applicant and recipient
- c. Funds have varied from \$558-637k in the last 3 grant cycles
 - i. \$40k special allocation is competitive for state CoC's.
- d. Last year notified in February with deadline in March – short turn around
 - i. Board approves a review team made up of community stakeholders, city/county staff, and board members
 - 1. Review team comes up with a recommendation
 - a. Application score, performance score, consideration of community needs, states minimum and maximum, supplemental questions
 - 2. Presented to board, can make changes; and vote for
 - 3. People on funded agencies cannot sit on review team or vote
 - 4. Carden inquires the about the review process and expediting the process
 - a. Reviews typically end in similar results as the prior year
 - b. No direction by state of how the process goes other than prioritization
 - c. Clarification that we have annual audits and that agencies fulfill contracts
 - d. Lim is reviewing ways to simplify process for both new agencies and agencies that have been involved in the past
 - ii. Review of forms for 2020-2021 EHH application
 - 1. CoC Supplemental Questionnaire – added question #1, 2, and 3
 - a. Question 2, last 3 check boxes entered in error and will be removed.
 - b. Question 6, program description in each application
 - c. Duffie moves to approve, Deibel 2nds. Currie clarifies 6 & 7 may be modified by new projects. Voting on 1-5 as supplemental questionnaire, last 3 bullet points in question 2 will be removed. All vote in favor, none opposed or no abstentions.
 - 2. Scoring Criteria – general and program specific
 - a. Participation in CoC question taken off – in written standards that folks participate in Core and PIT
 - i. Current Committees Workgroup has been brainstorming participation expectations based on agency size.

- b. Reduced total points to be closer for performance evaluation to make them more equal in weighing decisions.
- 3. Scoring Guide
 - a. Main change was for the change in scoring for exit to permanent housing and retention of permanent housing section.
 - i. Shelter/Outreach vs Prevention/Permanent Housing
- 4. Lim proposes that we use the median score for the new project
 - a. Carden suggests that there is a review sheet that spells out how we review and are consistent
 - b. Hanson asks to clarify that if we have program participants provide satisfaction services be a part of scoring – Lim states we try to get folks with lived experience
- 5. Reviewed performance evaluation sheet
- 6. New Project Questions Recommendations
 - a. States asks for description, needs, population targeted
 - b. Experience in data collection and reporting
 - c. Non-scored – how did you hear about funding source
 - d. Question 1 from supplemental questions
 - e. Explain familiarity with written standards and application of them; considered communities expectations of standards
 - i. Can board provide coaching on expectations/accessing of funds
 - f. EHH projects are expected to attend these meetings – are you able to do that
 - g. What barriers/roadblocks do you expect to encounter and plans on how you would address that
 - h. What partnerships do you have
 - i. Housing First & Trauma Informed care

5. Update from Board Workgroup on Committees (Deibel):

- a. New goals/priorities set to provide guidance, but allow liberty to set specifics
- b. Trying to also place a spot for fundraising with the HSC
- c. Education & Advocacy - #3 is important, but the tie into the community systems would be beneficial. Specific to agencies that may be contributing to homelessness. Building awareness in the community/organizations. May include funding for city/county recommendations
- d. Core– Areas where are community is falling short for the CoC application and making workgroups to resolve issues – System improvement lands in that committee. Remove #2
- e. Funders – is going to take on mandatory HUD gaps analysis
- f. Committee to End Youth Homelessness – to interact with Youth Action Board
- g. Recommendations for Committee Service by Agency – made to solidify the objectivity of scoring and also as we move towards a membership model as an agency and what the expectations – not necessarily something we can hold against a funded agency.

- i. Larger agencies that agencies may have homeless service programs and other programs unrelated – and this count may be divided.
 - ii. Opportunity to get certain members at the HSC but get them active in this
 - 1. Auxiliary members to pull in
 - iii. Committee commitments do vary.
- h. Tabled to review next month – consider Governance and By-laws

6. Review and Approval of Compensation Policy (Duffie):

- a. Wrote an initial draft, discussed that we narrowed the definition for now until further fundraising can be established.
 - i. Funding is for lived experience that is not being compensating for their job.
 - ii. Includes Board meetings, funding review teams, and committee meetings
 - iii. Do note the limited funding – could also reference back pay
 - iv. This will be communicated to community chairs re: attendance
 - v. Suggest that backpay will be provided to eligible participants as funding becomes available.
 - vi. Discussed 2-week notice – how do we back pay – do we put a note of initial notice and then it is good until further notice.
 - 1. Consider simply informing folks that if we have money we will pay – and as money comes in they get paid.
 - vii. Suggested that we have a time sheet – and that committee chair can verify
 - 1. Person receiving compensation will email the treasurer and the chairs of the committees they attend.
- b. Historical – compensation came from a donation of \$1500 from GHC – and was converted to gift cards because we did not have
- c. Duffie will take the feedback to simplify on time reporting/treasurer

Motion to close 4:05