MDHI Board Meeting Minutes – August 9, 2018

Role	Board Member	Present	Absent
President	Shelley McKittrick	X	
Vice President	Benjamin Ryan	X	
Secretary/Treasurer	Claire Clurman	X (phone)	
Board Member	Bob Munroe		X
Board Member	Andrew Alsip	X	
Board Member	Brenton Huston	X	
Board Member	Melanie Lewis Dickerson	X	
Board Member	Daphne McCabe	X (phone)	
Board Member	Erik Soliván		X
Board Member	Jamie Rife	X	
Board Member	Lori Rosendahl	X (phone)	
Board Member	Patricia Hall	X	
Board Member	Stevi Gray	X	
Board Member	Cheryl Secorski	X	
Board Member	Alix Midgley	X	
Board Member	Eugene Wade	X	
Board Member	Ken Hayes	X	
Board Member	Elissa Hardy	X (phone)	
Board Member	Brian Arnold	X	

Staff Present: Will Connelly, Rebecca Mayer, Jackie Hernandez, Annie Jenkins, Bethany Maynard-Moody, Ian Fletcher (phone)

Guests: none

Welcome and Introductions

Shelley started the meeting with introductions and an ice breaker asking the group to: State your name and what you stand for. Shelley took a minute to acknowledge MDHI's growth. There were just 3 MDHI staff members in 2013. In 2016 the staff grew to 6. By July 2018 there were 10, and in September there will be 13 total MDHI staff members. She acknowledged the excitement and challenges and need for patience as the team grows and the CoC moves forward.

New staff introduction: Bethany Maynard-Moody, the new OneHome Program Manager, introduces herself and gives professional background. Welcome!

Consent agenda

Actions: Approval of Consent Agenda, Financial Policies, Conflict of Interest Policy

Melanie L.D.. Moves to approve consent Agenda, Eugene W. seconds
Motion carries. No discussion, No opposed, No abstentions

Shelley M. announces DOH contract for HMIS has been approved via e-mail vote: 16 ayes, 1 abstention (Cheryl S.). Andrew A. noted that he was going to vote "yes" but didn't hit send on his e-mail vote. Will C. is hopeful that the contract will be signed Monday.

Governance - Conflict of Interest Policy: (on page 39 of packet) Ben R. explained that this is a policy which applies to voting and non-voting members. The document is modeled after Detroit CoC's Conflict of Interest policy. He feels it contains good definitions of what it means to be "interested" and that the procedures outline a duty to disclose, and options for recusal if necessary (who and when should do this). Policy was discussed in Governance Committee, and includes "violations" where the Board has authority to take disciplinary action if policy is violated.

Eugene W. moves to approve conflict of interest policy as written, Melanie L.D. seconds

> Discussion:

- Melanie wanted clarification on "Independent Members" and if you are a member, in what circumstances would the non-voting piece apply. Ben explained Independent Members may not apply to us but is a way to collect information to report to IRS and that it is auxiliary to the policy. He also mentioned that voting members vs. non-voting members may be something that should get discussed more broadly. He further clarified that an agency can be a member, but then there should be a liaison to the CoC identified. He also went into detail about recusals and that there is an added wrinkle for council, committee, and board members. If you are in one of those 3 groups you must remove yourself from discussion.
- Shelley M. mentioned that it seems that we could lose a lot of important input if we don't hear from those with conflict because, often, they are the experts.
- Cheryl S. gave example of discussing the DOH contract at last board meeting. She was wondering if that was a conflict. Melanie kindly reminds her that the policy has not been approved, but that could be a good example of why we should review the policy.
- There was another example of the CoC NOFA, and that almost everyone at the committee level will have a conflict.
- Ben R. suggested stating affiliation with possible conflict to participate in discussion, and Ken H. agreed.
- Mel used RGC as example stating that there could be a time that there are only 5 people that can participate in discussion and the rest aren't sure what their role will be.
- Council members, committee members, and board members should recuse themselves from any voting decisions and disclose any potential conflict of interest when participating in discussion.
- Mel wanted to know about last sentence "All other voting members of the CoC should recuse themselves from any decision". Ben stated that the Board can be consulted, and it isn't legally binding one way or another.

Eugene W. amends motion to pass conflict of interest policy as edited from previous discussion, Cheryl Seconds

- Alix asked what the procedure will look like, now that members have to abide by conflict of interest policy? Ben explained it will be something renewed annually and a procedure will be posted. Rebecca added that right now only the agency liaison needs to sign the Conflict of Interest.
- Pat asked – who can be a member? Is it anyone who wants to participate? Ben mentioned that Detroit wrote their policy to say that a non-voting member of CoC is open to anyone, but to be a voting member there is an application process including a conflict of interest policy and a requirement that the member attended 2/3 of previous meetings. Rebecca added that HUD recommends certain entities to be members, and on the application we will ask their affiliation (social services, housing developer, etc.) and location.
- Ken asked if we know who the voting members are? Rebecca pointed out the "Governance Charter Implementation Plan" document that includes a timeline to get folks on board.
- Claire (from the phone) mentioned looking at financial policies and procedures and making sure that the conflict of interest policy stays consistent in both documents (Pg. 22 in packet) Ben agreed that the section of the financial policies about conflicts should be reflected in both documents.
- E-mail vote was discussed by group

Shelley motions to approve conflict of interest policy as presented, discussed, and amended;
No opposed, no abstentions Conflict of Interest policy passes with amendments.

Diversity Goals: Governance committee is going to conduct interviews for new board members. Ben reminded the group of the Diversity Goals and that those that are interested can fill out application on website. Included in the packet is a document titled "why diversity and inclusion matter for non-profits" Shelley mentioned the non-profit evaluation tool on diversity.

Discussion:

- Stevi asked if MDHI has done any deep dive diversity training with an outside expert or anything like that in the past? Will stated that there are plans in place to have those types of trainings
- Shelly mentioned Equity Group has been discussing staffing models among other things
- 3 Board positions open now and 4 come January. Shelley reminded everyone to also keep regionality in mind.

Ending Homelessness: System Performance Measures – Will took the floor and mentioned that there are lots of HMIS and organizational health work going on at MDHI. We all need to shift conversations to be more housing-focused and about ending homelessness. He acknowledged that these conversations may be premature until we get HMIS fully implemented. Will presented the proposal of "homeless system performance report cards" for metro Denver. There also could be a CoC system dashboard posted publicly including total project entries, length of time homeless, exits to PH, returns to homelessness, etc. He mentioned the Board could provide direction regarding performance and publicizing data. Ian highlighted some of the language on the proposed report card. The plan would be to send them out to agencies but with a reference back to a website that is always up to date. He talked about making statewide data available to see how Colorado, as a whole, is performing. BitFocus is here this week and reminded the HMIS team that their role is to make sure the system functions, but that the Board enforces the requirements and can call out Lead Agency. Ian said that right now in our CoC we don't have site admins for HMIS. This will be a requirement moving forward and the HMIS team will ask every agency in HMIS to identify a person at that is responsible for moving their data in the right direction.

Discussion:

- Shelley mentioned that Santa Cruz operates in this way, and made the comment that it would be to not only get a sense of what is happening but also making sure HMIS is there to support.
- Ben asked what levers do we have besides NOFA? Does the board really need to be involved? Ian doesn't see that it must come from the Board, but because the Board represents different communities across the region, members can help be the enforcers. Ian mentioned that the challenge we have seen is that the only time people pay attention to their program data is during NOFA or APR time, but as CoC leads we want to know what's happening on a monthly basis.
- Brenton shared that he thinks it is a great idea and that backlog at HMIS Lead Agency has been a big complaint; therefore, having an agency liaison is a good idea. He also talked about accountability and Board's role. He feels MDHI is unique because they are a funder and convener. He liked the idea of data quality dashboards with organizations by name since these are public funds and we should be able to know.
- Will acknowledged that there are a lot of other people in the system (HMIS), and in order to make real progress all funders need to be aligned and be educated on what really works. Data quality could be the easiest first step, and once we are confident with data quality in our system, we can work on identifying other metrics to capture.
- Cheryl questioned if these points are aligned with what ends homelessness? Will clarified that they are aligned, and these are HUD's "big 4" system performance measures. Cheryl asked if there are performance benchmarks? Will stated that there are specific targets for each project type and something that we want to define as a CoC. Cheryl wants the data to move us forward and thinks the focus should be on what we are doing, not just finger pointing,

- Mel expressed love for the the idea and reminded us of being champions and rallying around shared goals and making sure that we take a positive spin. She pointed out a minor error in the document #2 and #3. Will noted.
- Ken H. asked what are we are doing to make sure that members are being held accountable and supporting them with that? Shelley chimed in recognizing one big thing: We are changing HMIS systems. She said that good data quality makes data more exciting and providers wanted to pull it and stop manipulating reports. Ian also talked about the Community Listening Sessions on Data and how providers said they want accountability and they feel that there is some unfairness. He said that we are not highlighting the superstars in our community and need them involved in culture change.
- Ben asked that if we are assuming data quality is great, how can we be proactive to provide support? Will talked about technical assistance and training. He gave the examples of RRH and how MDHI brought in consultants las fall for RRH learning collaboratives and CSH came in to provide even more training. He acknowledged that we could do it more consistently, and that there is a lot of turn-over in the field. Quarterly trainings on basic refreshers and deeper dives would be ideal but we need a budget for that. There was a flurry of trainings last year around this time and we need to make sure we are supporting all pieces of the system, not just data quality.
- Alix circles back to what Mel has said and encouraged the group to think about language. She felt that "report card" was punitive and suggested that as we build our systems and board accountability to think about incorporating monthly data reports/numbers into meeting.
- Brian A. closed the conversation by expressing the need to tell the story on what the data means to increase our funding pool beyond CoC dollars.

MDHI Financial Policies and Procedures: Will mentioned at the last meeting we approved an e-mail vote and that we maybe need to go back for the conflict of interest policy. Mel confirmed that there is no expiration date on the motion.

Discussion:

- Ben made a comment on the document and the lines of authority in the bank account open/close section. He was wondering if it was intentional that the Board is the first and second approver. It was confirmed that it only needs first approver on that one.
- Mel suggested that the first approver could be the Executive committee and second goes to Secretary/Treasurer
- Brenton suggested including Finance Committee as an approver
- Claire made a comment that it would be a good idea to keep Secretary/Treasurer as an approver until the Finance committee is figured out and the group agreed.

CoC NOFA Update:

- Will called for Board volunteers to help write/edit parts of CoC NOFA Narrative to HUD and directed the group to a spreadsheet of all projects applying this year (renewals and new). He mentioned that we are working through the step-by-step community process. The total Annual Renewal Demand is a little over 25 million. MDHI received letters of intent for new projects. Will mentioned that there are some priority areas (geographical considerations, scaling up RRH, DV). The new projects alone added up to about 3.8 million in requests and the maximum MDHI could get for new projects is 1.4 million in new projects. Some tough decisions need to be made. Will encouraged DV projects to get together and collaborate to put in one application versus 3 separate applications. He warned that it is possible that we could still see some consolidation or drop offs. Will updated the group that MDHI will send HUD a list of projects that we want to fund. Then, we complete a narrative section of the application to review our narrative responses. We can send out to everyone, but 1st draft comes from MDHI staff.
- Volunteered to draft: Ken, Stevi, Cheryl,
- Volunteered to edit: Jaime, Shelley, Alix, Mel, Cheryl, Ben, Eugene, Claire

- Alix asks about timeline and Rebecca clarified September 6 is the date to post a draft for public comment asked for the Board to provide draft language and editing by August 27

HMIS Transition Schedule – Ian gave an update on Advanced Implementation. He stated the BitFocus kick-off celebration party was a success, and there are several face-to-face meetings with BitFocus scheduled throughout August. Ian and the team are in the process of configuring project set up and deciding how to migrate, what can we migrate, etc. He mentioned August being a month of discovery which will help the team understand the full scope of data issues, see what it looks like, and figure out how it is going to convert over (Adsystech creates Csv file). Then, the team will decide on a go-live date. Ian is hopeful for a 2018 launch. The HMIS team will be fully staffed as of Labor Day weekend. Help desk software has been identified, and MDHI is officially taking over on August 20th. The team is learning Adsystech as quickly as they can. They are in the process of communicating with MDHI agencies to work on fixing/cleaning up data and identify what needs to be fixed to move forward with migration. Will mentioned John P. at CCH signed everything that he needs to sign for HMIS funds to get transferred, and we will be ready to draw down on time. There are no public timelines as of yet. Ian mentioned that one of the issues is that same project types are set up differently and want to help align how the programs are set up. The MDHI HMIS team is going to have meetings by project-type to discuss how each one should/could look. Mel asked if there will be an opportunity for for those that should be in HMIS but don't want to be. Ian said that group will need to be convinced and see evidence, and it may have to look a little different at first. Ken asked if he could see the new HMIS as a user. Ian thought that MDHI could set up a webinar and walk through for those that were interested. The HMIS team has a system administrator training at the end of this month, and they can make something available after that. Shelley took a moment to acknowledge the successful HMIS journey and the group applauded.

Open Forum For Stakeholder Comments and Community Announcements

Brian A. announced that his has resigned from Aurora Warms the Night and that he is taking to new position at Ready to Work Aurora on Sept. 4th. His program will have 50 beds (modeled after Boulder Ready to Work) in Aurora and is a social enterprise through parks and rec with City of Aurora.

Ben R. mentioned that Governance Committee looked over implementation plan that Rebecca prepared and reported back that they gave seal of approval.

Shelley M. updated the group on the Second Chance Center. They received a 9% tax credit through PSH toolkit and trying to work their way through city process to start construction. They need variance on parking requirements and got 100% denial at the planning and zoning commission level. It didn't appear to have anything with parking but rather it was an issue with the perceived target population. The PSH project is approved for 49 units with 100% of referrals coming from OneHome. She shared that this is an ADA issue and not a re-entry issue. They will be appealing and going straight to City Council. Will agreed to attend the meeting and talk about the need for PSH in our community. Lori told Shelley to give her a call about how to deal with the zoning issue in aurora, since she has gone through something similar.

Wrap up: Confirming commitments and Actions before next board meeting

- Financial policies will be updated to match broader conflict of interest and take into consideration other comments
- Volunteers for NOFA draft/edits will be contacted with assignments