Attendees: Sarah Lim, Torrie Kopp Mueller, Patrick Duffie, Jen Ripp, Rachel Litchman, Karen Andro, Zach Stephen, MacKenzie Byer, Johneisha Prescott, Alicia Spry, Nicole Christen, Takisha Jordan, Sydney James, Brenda Konkel, Chara Taylor, Allie Grant, Francesca Atkinson, Brad Hinkfuss, Liz Duffie, Maureen Quinlan, Wendy Siewert, Kristina Dux

Sarah will send new meeting invites for the 2nd and 4th Fridays of the month. Goal is to have proposal for Board in December 2023.

Reviewed key discussion points for Phase 2. No decisions being made, just meant to get people thinking about these things.

There is a prep team that meets weekly to prepare materials for the meetings: Sarah, Chara, Torrie, Zach, and Patrick.

Review of Pre-Meeting Survey, 21 responses
- 57.1% - only attendees of meetings where the specific agenda was discussed can vote (real-time vote during the meeting)
- 66.7% - Use the HSC Board method to seek consensus
- 90.5% implement pre-screening to reduce the number of individuals undergoing a full assessment
- 71.4% make adjustments to VI-SDPAT
- 81% - Use existing HMIS data and other data
- 68.4% - complete assessment in one sitting instead of waiting 7 days.

Discussion: Decision Making Process

Q: What are the pros and cons of different approaches?
-There may be times when people have a lot of experience or information to inform a decision, who is regularly participant and won't be able to attend a certain meeting. We may want their opinion in the voting process.
-Want to include as many people as possible, but I know that hearing the conversation can change my mind. People do lose out on value of the discussion. You may not have all of the necessary information needed to inform your vote.
-Echo the statement above. Having the discussion does inform people's opinions. Get more and different information if you are present. Depends on if we are handling decisions one at a time or doing two topics over two meetings. Maybe avoid a certain decision being made at a certain meeting.
-can build in exceptions as needed, don't want people to make decisions based on emotions, it helps to be present for meetings to learn information, but don't want to exclude people who have been here a majority of the time
-Martha's rules vs voting would matter as well

-Another approach could be to base voting on a minimum number of meetings attended up until the vote akin to HSC Membership meetings

-Yes, although that is getting at what I was trying to - if each meeting is very specific to discussing a specific topic, than frequent attendees might not be informed in the same way about that particular topic that is what I was trying to get at!

-This is a whole process that we are working on and each part informs the next

-Need to have a definitive vote at the end.

-how long would we give people to make their vote who weren't at the meeting, we need to be able to move forward

-if we allow everyone to vote, we need to have a hard deadline, need to remember that some people may be missing more than one meeting, but participating in the vote- they are missing out on the conversation, people at the meeting have taken the time to be there, how do we decide who gets to vote….this person missed one meeting, but this person missed three – who gets to vote?

-Then we send more time giving an overview what happened and then it opens the discussion back again while taking time from the next topic

-We are deciding how to vote without everyone here, but the pre-survey said that it should be those at the meeting who vote

-If someone comes in with new thoughts or persuasive arguments, we should be able to consider that

-will we announce this decision to everyone, it may empower people to come to the meetings

-we do need to make decisions rather quickly, but it makes sense to have people vote at the meeting, but could have people who can't attend submit written comments

-at the end have everyone vote on final proposal

-majority feels that attendees of the meeting vote on the interim procedural votes, the final decisive vote before going to the Board may require us to reconsider the vote, will need to set clear agendas, highlighting decision points, if people can't come they can share thoughts with the share ahead of time, need to inform members as they go along

-appreciate the distinction of procedural vote versus final vote

-whatever is decided, we need to be clear on what is expected to be able to vote

-what is the time frame that is given for people to attend to be able to vote

-how long do people get for submitting a vote? Would likely be able to only give five days because the prep team will need the info to inform the next meeting

-maybe we need to do 3 days max, the meetings are biweekly so need the info quickly

-3 work days or 3 calendar days? I'd like to make sure its at least 2 work days.

-Martha's rules was majority on pre-survey

-we have been empowered by majority of voters on pre-survey to vote in the room and use Martha's rules

-Just a question: why did we vote and then open a discussion up about if we would accept the vote or not?

-there are times when I can attend part of a meeting and might leave early saying that this is how I would vote, but what if they aren't there for the motion

-we can always go back and make changes

-**Proposal** – Decisions about working assumptions are made along the way, in the room using, Martha's rules. By Liz, Sarah provided a second. Everyone in the room liked or can live with this proposal.

-Are people familiar with Martha's rules? Need to make sure people know how that process works.
-Can we do a quick vote right now? There are 22 people right now. But it leaves out people not in the room.
Discussion: Approach to Developing a new assessment
Q1: what are the pros and cons of different approaches?
Q2: Are there particular details or insights necessary to arrive at a well-informed final decision for each topic that the workgroup presentation team should address?

-We spent a lot of time looking at disparities in our current system, but we have not decided what our priorities are, other communities have had those in mind in the beginning to work towards those
-do we decide the priorities as we go through the VI-SPDAT or decide these in advance and then review the questions.
-Running low on time so can't go through all of these points. Also didn't plan to make decisions on these today. Let's go through the pre-survey results to help the prep team for future meetings.
-an overarching question that wasn't in the survey. Are we prioritizing PSH and RRH the same, but PSH is people who are higher? OR are we targeting two different populations for these interventions?
-What additional info is needed to make decisions:

      -Pre-screening vs. Full Assessment:

      We are not advertising Coordinated Entry and I was told this is due to capacity issues. We were going to put up a billboard with the CE number and was told capacity was an issue so not to do that. We need to work towards increasing CE capacity.

      This is more to do with access and referral. This is not something this group is going to do, but we can make recommendations to the Board.

      -Questionnaire Development: The prep team will present what other communities have done. Would be important to know what resources might be available to create a new assessment.

      -Data Sources: Need to know what's available in HMIS and what is available in the community. Important to know what info people would want to include and what the feasibility is

      -Timing of CE Assessment: Do we know the average length of time before someone gets their VI-SPDAT done? Or do we know how many people self-resolve in 7 days? Do not want to pre-screen for people that self-resolve. Could look to see how many people use shelter 7 days or less in a year? How many people have a VI-SPDAT and then disappear?

      -Can we do a pilot on some of these things and review at 60 or 90 days? Not sure what follow-up would look like.

      -it's an argument for the "prescreen" to use either HMIS data already part of the enrollment, or minimal additional data because then we aren't going to any trouble to do "prescreening" for everyone, regardless of what percentage of people "self-resolve" within 7 days

      -gets some feedback from people who go through the process

      -need to remember how few people actually are housed through the CE process, changing the prioritization won't change the number of people who actually get housing through CE, need to be clear on that with people

Decisions Made

- Votes will happen at the meeting with people in the room.
- Votes will happen in the same manner the HSC Board uses: [Standing Rules of Order](#)