



**Present:** Gai Lorenzen (HALO), Iraida Vazquez (ICA / Co-Chair), Matt Perz (LAW), Melissa Taggart (HALO), Scott Metzler (HOPES / Co-Chair), Teresa Reinders (COC Director)

**Apologies:** Holly Anderle (HALO)

## **Minutes of Meeting**

### **1. Welcome**

- 1.1. **Opening:** The meeting was opened with a welcome by Iraida at 11:05 a.m.
- 1.2. **Apologies:** Iraida noted apologies from Holly.
- 1.3. **New Member:** Iraida welcomed Matt to the System Performance Committee.

### **2. Approval of Minutes from February 2, 2024**

- 2.1. **Circulation and Corrections:** The minutes of meeting from 2.2.2024 were sent out prior to the meeting and no corrections were offered.
- 2.2. **Approval:** Melissa moved that the minutes be approved. Teresa seconded the motion and the minutes were adopted.

### **3. Context**

- 3.1. **Meeting in Context:** Scott explained that the committee is at the end of Step 1 of the Performance Analysis and Improvement Process: Analyze System Performance. He noted that we have mixed Steps 1 and Steps 2 a little, because we have already started to dig a little deeper into Quantitative Data in our process.
- 3.2. **Expected Outputs from Meeting:** Scott said that by the end of the meeting, we would prioritize several areas that were identified in the prior meeting and that we would carry those into Step 2: Identifying Contributing Factors.
- 3.3. **Next Meeting and Beyond:** He stated that as the committee moves forward into Step 2 of the Performance Analysis and Improvement Process, we will continue digging deeper into Quantitative Data, but also start gathering some qualitative data. This would likely be through tools like questionnaires, interviews and/or focus groups.

### **4. Review of Identified Areas of Interest**

- 4.1. **SPM and Areas Reviewed:** In Prior meetings, the committee had prioritized Length of Time Homeless and Returns to Homelessness as key SPM for Analysis and Improvement in association with data on the Number of People Experiencing Homelessness and related demographics and household data. The committee had identified 13 Areas of Interest for further investigation and prioritization.

**4.2. Notes on Reports and Pre-Meeting Review:** Iraida explained that she had run requested reports for the meeting and met with Scott beforehand to go over them. She indicated that during that preliminary review they had found that the areas of interest concerning prior living situation did not provide reliable and useful data and the committee agreed to eliminate them. She noted that the reports that had been produced were attached to the meeting invitation.

**4.3. Review of Areas of Interest:** Iraida led discussions on the various areas of interest using the reports that had generated and other data.

<b>System Performance Measure</b>	<b>Area of Interest</b>	<b>Updated Notes 3.1.2024</b>
<b>Length of Time Homeless</b>	<b>Adult Only Households using the Shelter-Only Pathway</b>	<b>This is the largest single sub-group of people experiencing homelessness. It's length of time homeless is lower than average, but still over 4 months.</b>
<b>Length of Time Homeless</b>	<b>Emergency Shelter to Rapid Rehousing Pathway</b>	<b>There has been decreased performance since 2018 in terms of LOTH in this pathway.</b>
<b>Length of Time Homeless</b>	<b>Adult Only 55 years+ Population</b>	<b>This appears to be an increasing population type with increasing LOTH</b>
<b>Length of Time Homeless</b>	<b>Adult Only Youth vs. Parenting Youth population types</b>	<b>This is a small portion of the overall population of people experiencing homelessness, but there is a notable difference between adult only and parenting youth households in LOTH.</b>
<b>Length of Time Homeless</b>	<b>Victims of Domestic Violence Population Type</b>	<b>WRC provided an aggregate report that showed lower lengths of time homeless for their shelter stays. It was unclear to what extent the difference between WRC and HALO /TLC is related to the population or to shelter policy on length of stay.</b>
<b>Length of Time Homeless</b>	<b>Disabled Household Member as a Population Type</b>	<b>There appears to be increase LOTH in this population</b>
<b>Returns to Homelessness</b>	<b>Housing Intervention Pathways vs. Non-Housing Intervention Pathways</b>	<b>Housing Pathways appeared to have lower rates of return than non-housing interventions.</b>
<b>Returns to Homelessness</b>	<b>Exit Destinations as a factor in Returns to Homelessness</b>	<b>Exits to family, permanent tenure had the highest rate of returns. 15 People who exited to rental with subsidy returned and this was a concern that might need more investigation to find out why. Matt said we might be able to look at official eviction records against returns to see if there is any helpful information.</b>
<b>Returns to Homelessness</b>	<b>Disability as a factor in Returns to Homelessness</b>	<b>Disability did not appear to be a factor in length of time homeless, to the surprise of the committee. One possible reason could be SSI income or access to other benefits based on disability, but this information was not immediately available. 1/3 of people returning to homelessness reported a mental illness.</b>

Returns to Homelessness	Projects / Providers as a factor in Returns to Homelessness	The largest providers and programs had the most returns. The women and children’s shelter provider seemed to have higher returns in the 6-12 month period. It was unclear why.
No. of People Experiencing Homelessness (Demographics)	Under-representation of Hispanic/Latina/e/o households and individuals among people served by the Racine COC vs. the general population (Disparity).	Although we have made some hypotheses in the past, we are still not sure if the disparity can be explained because there are fewer people among this population experiencing Category 1 homelessness, or if our services are not sufficiently designed to service people from this population who may be eligible for services.

**5. NOFO Discussion**

**5.1. NOFO Score:** Teresa noted that the Racine COC had lost points in the most recent HUD/COC NOFO in areas related to SPM and that it was something that we should discuss. Iraida noted that HUD does not provide full information on where points were lost, but that she and Scott had looked at one of the main areas listed under SPMs: Exits to Permanent Housing.

**5.2. Exit Destination vs. Retention / Housing Stability:** Scott said that when they looked at the narrative for Exits to Permanent Housing, we had focused heavily on retention and housing stability. He said that this is a factor in rapid rehousing programs where there is an effort in keeping participants in their units and actively housed until they exit the program, but otherwise retention and stability are largely efforts to mitigate returns to homelessness. He said that exits from shelter to permanent housing are the majority of exits and that retention and housing stability is usually not a factor in those cases. He suggested that in the next NOFO we put more emphasis on identifying and pursuing as many permanent housing destination options as possible. Teresa said she would work on adjusting the narrative.

**6. Prioritization of Areas of Interest**

**6.1. Prioritization Exercise:** Scott had a “ballot” and asked each member to rank their top 5 areas of interest in order of importance. These were tabulated to give scores to each of the 11 areas of interest as follows:

Rank	SPM	Area of Interest	Score
1	Length of Time Homeless	Adult Only 55 years+ Population	18
2	Length of Time Homeless	Adult Only Households using the Shelter-Only Pathway	17
3	Length of Time Homeless	Emergency Shelter to Rapid Rehousing Pathway	13
4	Returns to Homelessness	Housing Intervention Pathways vs. Non-Housing Intervention Pathways	9
4	Returns to Homelessness	Exit Destinations as a factor in Returns to Homelessness	9
4	Returns to Homelessness	Disability as a factor in Returns to Homelessness	9
5	Length of Time Homeless	Disabled Household Member as a Population Type	7
6	Returns to Homelessness	Projects / Providers as a factor in Returns to Homelessness	6
7	Length of Time Homeless	Adult Only Youth vs. Parenting Youth population types	1
8	Length of Time Homeless	Victims of Domestic Violence Population Type	0
9	No. of People Experiencing Homelessness (Demographics)	Under-representation of Hispanic/Latina/e/o households and individuals among people served by the Racine COC vs. the general population (Disparity).	0

**6.2. Next Steps:** Scott said that at the next meeting the committee would go over the 4 top-ranked areas of interest and start planning the way forward into Step 2 of Performance Analysis and Improvement – Identifying Contributing Factors.

**7. Any Other Business:** There was no other business.

**8. Adjournment:** In the absence of any other business, Iraida adjourned the meeting at 1:05 p.m.