MARICOPA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS
302 North 1st Avenue, Suite 300 ▲ Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Phone (602) 254-6300 ▲ FAX (602) 254-6490

May 3, 2016

TO: Members of the MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness

FROM: Mattie Lord, UMOM New Day Centers, Chair
Jacki Taylor, Save the Family Foundation of Arizona, Vice Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Meeting - 9:30 a.m.
Wednesday, May 11, 2016
MAG- 2nd floor Ironwood Room
302 N. 1st Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85003
(Parking is available from the garage below the building. Bring your parking ticket to the meeting for validation.)

The next MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness (CoC) meeting will be held at the time and place noted above. Members of the CoC may attend either in person or by phone. Supporting information is enclosed for your review.

The meeting agenda and resource materials are also available on the MAG website at www.azmag.gov. In addition to the existing website location, the agenda packet will be available via the File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site at: ftp://ftp.azmag.gov/ContinuumOfCareRegionalCommitteeonHomelessness.
This location is publicly accessible and does not require a password.

Please park in the garage underneath the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting, parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

In 1996, the Regional Council approved a simple majority quorum for all MAG advisory committees. If the Human Services Technical Committee does not meet the quorum requirement, members who have arrived at the meeting will be instructed a legal meeting cannot occur and subsequently be dismissed. Your attendance at the meeting is strongly encouraged.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

If you have any questions, please call the MAG office.

MAG CONTINUUM OF CARE REGIONAL COMMITTEE ON HOMELESSNESS (COC)
TENTATIVE AGENDA
May 11, 2016

	COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED
1. Call to Order	
2. Call to the Audience An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address CoC on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless CoC requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.	2. Information.
3. Approval of April 13, 2016 meeting minutes. The draft minutes for the April 13, 2016 meeting are posted with the meeting materials.	3. Approval of the April 13, 2016 Continuum of Care Committee meeting minutes.
4. CoC Conflict of Interest Policy The Committee will consider clarifying that the Conflict of Interest Policy in the Governance Charter applies to the CoC's Work Groups and Ad Hoc Groups. A draft Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form was distributed with the meeting materials.	4. Information, discussion, and possible action to adopt a CoC Conflict of Interest Policy.
5. Performance Improvement Plans and Processes Discussion regarding Performance Improvement Plans and Processes. Possible creation of flow chart and desired timeline.	5. Information, discussion and possible adoption of timeline and flow chart for Performance Improvement Plans and Processes.

6. Recovery Housing Criteria

The CoC Board adopted a policy endorsed by the CoC Committee to acknowledge the role of recovery housing as a valid intervention in the HUD CoC-funded programs. The Permanent Housing Work Group has adopted criteria by which to determine which projects will be considered recovery housing. A draft policy was distributed with the meeting materials.

6. Information, discussion, and possible action to adopt the PHWG recommendations on criteria for recovery housing.

7. Reports from Work Groups and Board

The following updates will be provided for information and discussion:
-Performance Standards and Data Quality (PSDQ)
-Coordinated Entry and Oversight Work Group (CEOWG)
-HMIS Committee
-ESG Collaborators
-CoC Board

7. Information and discussion only.

8. Systems Level Performance Measure Dashboard

Preview of a Systems Level Performance Measure Dashboard. CIR will present a draft Systems Level Performance Measure Dashboard report for Committee feedback.

8. Information and discussion only.

9. CoC Education Policy

Discussion and ideas for a CoC Education Coordination Policy.

9. Information and discussion only.

10. Tier 2 Funding Update

On May 2, 2016 HUD announced funding decisions for Tier 2 of the CoC funding. The Continuum was awarded two bonus projects and

10. Information and discussion only.

received an overall increase in CoC funding of approximately $500,000. However, eight projects were not renewed. The loss in funding to those projects will have a disproportionate impact on families experiencing homelessness. An overview of the funding announcement will be provided and the Committee will have an opportunity to discuss the impact of the funding decision.

11. Request for Future Agenda Items

Topics or issues of interest that the MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting will be requested.

11. Information and discussion of future agenda items.

12. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity will be provided for Continuum of Care Committee (CoC) members to present a brief summary of current events. CoC members are not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

12. Information.

Adjournment

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (MAG)
CONTINUUM OF CARE COMMITTEE
April 13, 2016
MAG Office Building, Chaparral Room

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing (ADOH)
David Bridge, Human Services Campus (HSC)
Erin Callinan, Arizona Coalition to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (ACESDV)
Kathy Di Nolfi, A New Leaf
Robert Ferraro, City of Tempe Law Enforcement
Joann Hatton, Arizona Healthcare Cost Containment System (AHCCCS)
#Vicki Helland, Community Bridges
Michelle Jameson, United States Veterans Initiative, U.S. VETS-Phoenix
Nicole Janich MSW, Arizona State University
*Jessa Johnson, Mercy Maricopa Integrated Care (MMIC)
*Stephanie Knox, Arizona Department of Economic Security
Mattie Lord, UMOM New Day Center
Alicia Kenney for Nancy Marion, House of Refuge East
*Suzie Martin, Homeward Bound
Kenneth McKinley, Tumbleweed
Linda Mushkatel, Lodestar Day Resource Center (LDRC)
Liz Morales for Dennis Newburn, City of Mesa
Lisa Eddings-Wilburn for Terros Safe Haven
#Rodrigo Olivares, Crisis Response Network
Stephen Sparks, Labor's Community Service Agency (LCSA)
Sara Sims, Phoenix Elementary School District
#Ursula Strephans, Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS)
Charles Sullivan, Arizona Behavioral Health Corporation (ABC)
Stephanie Smith, Native American Connections
*Jacki Taylor, Save The Family
*Michelle Thomas, Community Information & Referral
Keith A. Thompson, Phoenix Shanti Group
Dorian Townsend Phd, Sojourner Center
Ronald Lopes for John Wall, Arizona Housing Inc.

*Neither present nor represented by proxy.
#Attended by telephone conference call.
+Attended by video conference.

OTHERS PRESENT

Tricia Cano, CIR
Jennifer Dangremond, Native American Connections (NAC)
Shane Groen, Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness (ACEH)
Margaret Kilman, Maricopa County Human Services Department
Gilbert Lopez, City of Glendale
Denise Majors, Moves That Matter
Lisa Miller, UMOM
Trina Newell, Recovery Innovations International
Catherine Rea, Community Information and Referral (CIR)
#Ty Rosensteel, CASS
Barbara Sloan, The Salvation Army
Nicky Stevens, Save the Family
Stephanie Shaw, Area Agency on Aging
Steven Shivers, Homeless ID Project
Celina Brun, MAG
Anne Scott, MAG

1. Call to Order and Introductions
   Mattie Lord, UMOM New Day Center, Chair of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m. Introductions of the Committee and audience ensued. HAPPY one year anniversary

2. Call to the Audience
   Audience members were given an opportunity to address the Committee on items that were not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only.

3. Approval of the March 9, 2016 Meeting Minutes
   Chair Lord entertained a motion to approve the March 9, 2016, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Ursula Strephans, Central Arizona Shelter Services (CASS). The motion was seconded by Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing (ADOH). There were no comments. The motion passed.

4. Data Sharing Recommendations-Affinity Groups: Chair Lord noted that agenda items four and five were divided up and agenda item four is the recommendation that PSDQ will be making to the Board in April. Charles Sullivan, ABC Housing introduced the data sharing recommendation to the Committee. He discussed the following points.

   Mr. Sullivan: the PSDQ work group collaborated with the ad-hoc data sharing work group and HUD Technical Assistance (TA) to develop the recommendation of an established set of Affinity Groups that will be delivered to the Board for final approval. In coordination with HUD TA, the established Affinity Groups are defined as what was once known as a pocket share; a group of like-providers that are working together to complete some business goal. The goal is to limit the Affinity Groups because it can add extra administrative burden to the management of data shares within HMIS. The recommendation is to look at the groups in the community currently working together through CE and to mirror that process through Affinity Groups. The Universal Data Elements (UDEs) are currently shared globally; however the documents we share with data above and beyond UDEs are in reference to Affinity Groups and what those groups share. The Affinity Groups currently in place are:
   - Singles managed by HEART group
   - Families with children managed by Standing Strong for Families
   - Youth managed by Youth Advisory Council

   The Youth Advisory Council may not be a mutually exclusive group; however they have specific data elements they must track for Coordinated Entry of Youth. The Affinity Groups would allow for a process of a business need-to-know to share additional information between agencies that are working together in Coordinated Entry. They would not affect aggregate reporting for the community and the membership for those groups will be managed by the groups. The membership policy is to be approved by PSDQ. Currently the policy states that if a group of people wish to develop a new affinity group, that recommendation must be vetted and approved by PSDQ and then the Board. The group must be able to clearly explain the purpose of the new affinity group, and what data needs to be shared above and

beyond what is already shared in the established affinity groups. PSDQ will weigh the pros and cons of the proposal to determine management capacity within the existing system.

Ms. Strephans: inquired if PSDQ is responsible for approving members on a continuing basis or just the initial formation of the group.

Mr. Sullivan: the groups have their current members; however each Affinity Group would have their own process for adding members. The goal is to ensure that all members are participating meaningfully and working with those groups in Coordinated Entry. The Affinity Groups would have their own criteria for new members and that would be an ongoing PSDQ approval.

Chair Lord: stated that her understanding was that the Affinity Groups would be responsible for developing their policies and procedures on how they would determine membership and what data they would share and the policies and procedures would be approved by PSDQ. She added that she understood the process as PSDQ not being responsible for approving every member. Chair Lord sought clarification from Mr. Sullivan.

Anne Scott, MAG: clarified that Affinity Groups would be responsible for determining their membership. Membership would not go through PSDQ unless there was a grievance.

Chair Lord: sought confirmation on the statement that PSDQ would be responsible for approving any new affinity group. Furthermore once policies and procedures are developed and approved by PSDQ, then the existing Affinity Groups are on their own for membership management.

Ms. Scott and Mr. Sullivan: agreed and stated that Chair Lord's statement was correct.

Ms. Strephans: suggested a change in the policy being presented, stating that the policy currently states that PSDQ may approve additional membership without seeking Board approval, when it should say that the Affinity Groups are responsible for additional membership and management.

Mr. Sullivan: noted that PSDQ will revise the document to reflect the policies and procedures of the stakeholder groups.

Chair Lord: noted the importance of making sure that what is verbally stated, matches what is written on paper. Furthermore, she identified that throughout all of the documents the CoC Committee is listed as Maricopa Association of Governments Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness. She disagreed with the title, stating the title should begin with Maricopa County, not MAG.

Mr. Sullivan: clarified that the title of the CoC Committee as referenced in all of the documents was mirrored from the CoC Governance Charter which states Maricopa Association of Governments Regional Continuum of Care. He then suggested that the concern of the title be brought back to the Board for final determination.

Chair Lord: reiterated that MAG does receive the planning funds on behalf of the CoC and MAG staffs the CoC (a very important partner), but MAG does not own the CoC. She added that she believes the title should be *Maricopa County Regional Continuum of Care.* She understands if the Boards would want to mirror the Governance Charter, however she feels that the title should be looked at more closely.

Ms. Strephans: supports Chair Lords's statement adding that MAG has made it very clear-by not adding insurance coverage for the CoC, that MAG does not recognize the Continuum as an official MAG committee. She then sought clarification from Ms. Scott on the matter.

Ms. Scott: stated that MAG does provide matching funds, space, and supplies. When this was first brought to MAG, it was her understanding that the CoC Committee was transferred from the City of Phoenix and that they wanted to be called the Maricopa Association of Governments Continuum of Care, so it's not that it cannot be revisited, but notes that by calling it Maricopa County Continuum of Care, it makes the committee sound like a county organization as well. Ms. Scott reiterated that this is a question for the Board, is the CoC Committee the *Maricopa Regional Continuum of Care* or something else. There are a few options available. MAG is providing a lot of support and she would like to acknowledge that MAG has been a good partner. MAG hosts at least one CoC meeting a day and at times three to four meetings a day, including the supply of most supporting documents. She then sought clarification on Ms. Strephans statement.

Mr. Sullivan: in previous conversations, the question of whether the CoC Committee fell under MAGs insurance came up. It was determined that the committee did not qualify for insurance coverage since it was not an official MAG committee, and that decision was made years ago so that the Continuum would not need to report up to the MAG Regional Council.

Ms. Scott: added that that was also a decision for the Board to make, however it would require every decision made at the CoC Committee level would need to go through the MAG Regional Council, so that is something to consider.

Linda Mushkatel, LDRC: it's always confusing when we are referencing something that is a Maricopa County wide project to separate that from Maricopa County Government. When the City of Phoenix facilitated the Continuum, it was not the City of Phoenix Continuum of Care. Believes that everyone is in agreement and just need to work on the semantics.

Chair Lord: this issue has come up periodically and it is all over the documents being presented today.

Mr. Sullivan: if the Board chooses to revisit this topic and define a different name then all documents will be revised to reflect the change.

Chair Lord: clarified that this issue is not to identify MAG as a bad partner, MAG is a good partner, UMOM is a good partner, there are many good partners in the Continuum.

Chair Lord: inquired about which document being presented will be presented to the Board.

Mr. Sullivan: all documents presented to the Committee will be presented to the Board at the end of April. The document with the table is just a background of the Affinity Groups. The policy document is for new Affinity Groups and new membership of Affinity Groups. The PSDQ work group is seeking feedback.

Chair Lord: steering back to the policy document, Chair Lord noted that this was the opportunity for Committee members to provide input to the document before it goes to the Board. If the Committee approves of the policy, the document would be recommended to the Board by PSDQ and the Committee. She read the document aloud to ensure all Committee members understood the content of the documents being presented.

Chair Lord: sought clarification on a part of the policy that read “three Affinity Groups have been approved” and then inquired if those Affinity Groups have already been approved by the Board.

Mr. Sullivan: With the current policy being approved, they would be approved. The policy is written with the intention that the three Affinity Groups would be approved.

Chair Lord: inquired if PSDQ is recommending three Affinity Groups.

Mr. Sullivan: yes, an Affinity Group for singles, families with children, and youth on their own.

Chair Lord: suggested revising the statement to read “three Affinity Groups will be recommend for approval”

Mr. Sullivan: we are recommending that this policy be put in place, and if it is approved by the Board as a policy, when read later, the groups will have already been established.

Chair Lord continued to read aloud. After reading, she opened the floor for comments. There were no further comments. She moved to discuss the matrix.

Ty Rosensteel, CASS: suggested removing the statement about the three Affinity Groups being approved by the Board and then changing the first word of the next sentence to “in order to form a new Affinity Group” because that would make the document more permanent-in the event that a fourth Affinity Group is established. He then suggested that the comment about approving the three Affinity Groups be put in the matrix.

Chair Lord: sought confirmation that the policy will become a part of the Governance Charter.

Ms. Scott: confirmed that that was correct.

Chair Lord: moved to the Matrix page and stated her concern about the matrix does not include the Family Hub’s Access database in the policies as a comparable database, only HMIS and Homelink.

Mr. Sullivan: stated that that was currently the case. He then suggested that PSDQ could list the programs or state “as applicable”.

Margaret Kilman, MCHSD: clarified that the discussion regards comparable databases and since the FHH Access database is not accessible outside the FHH it would not be considered comparable. She then suggested defining the Access database as a comparable database.

Chair Lord: suggested the following change; the data share plan would cover HMIS and HMIS comparable databases used for Coordinated Entry.

Ms. Kilman: stated that Chair Lord’s suggestion was correct because the Access database would not qualify for a comparable database since it is only being used for a singular purpose accessed only by the FHH.

Chair Lord: noted her concern and sough clarification because in the Matrix, it is written that despite the data elements that an Affinity Group may want, PSDQ will determine and approve the data elements.

Ms. Scott: there are elements of the system that must be considered, so PSDQ would want to weigh-in based on the group’s knowledge of the system and how it works and because there are things that are linked to assessments, so if you wanted to share one data element you couldn’t share that data element without sharing the entire assessment. She emphasized that the thought process behind this portion of the Matrix was to ensure the check and balances of data collection and reporting.

Mr. Sullivan: noted that there are certain data elements that are not shared, like *non-cash benefits, insurance, and disability.* When you begin to selectively share elements you begin to affect the work flow because you will need to create new assessments of answers and it can get really large really fast. The idea behind this is to work with the Affinity Groups to develop the best data share list. It is not PSDQ’s intention to require Affinity Groups to share data that they do not want to share, but that that conversation takes place and move forward.

Ms. Strephans: inquired if that is the appropriate role for PSDQ or should the conversation be between the Affinity Groups and the HMIS lead. She then sought clarification about the CIR seat on the PSDQ group, stating that it may not always be the case that there is a CIR seat on the PSDQ work group, so is the group setting themselves up for failure?

Mr. Sullivan: clarified that the CIR seat on PSDQ is a permanent seat for a non-voting CIR member. At this point, PSDQ has been established as the oversight group for the HMIS project and other data projects. He added that PSDQ would be the most appropriate place to have it go through the structure of the Continuum rather than directly to the HMIS lead.

Kenneth McKinley, Tumbleweed: stated that the youth providers created their own assessment to add more questions, and then inquired if the youth Coordinated Entry system would need to go through PSDQ to seek approval to add or subtract data elements.

Mr. Sullivan: no, of the program data elements in the system and community data elements in the system, there are a finite amount of those, and those are established by HUD and the community as a whole to track. For example; the highest level of education is still in the system, but you're looking at *income, non-cash benefits, disabilities, health insurance, domestic violence information, case notes, services,* and so-forth, all of those additional items that are in the system that would be shared and some those data elements are tied to other data elements. Furthermore, trying to share a tiered data set of assessments at different levels can get complicated very quickly. That is the type of conversation that needs to take place regarding the approval of data elements shared in different groups.

Ms. Scott: added that there is a question about assessments. PSDQ was formed from Technical Assistance (TA) on HMIS functioning. The group is looking at the HMIS action plan as the guiding document on how PSDQ functions. If there are more than three Affinity Groups and people are requesting a lot of custom assessments, the growing concern is how to manage that work flow. The group is working towards implementing that action plan of HMIS functioning recommended by the HUD TA.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Rosensteel: states his understanding that the Affinity Groups are in charge of determining the data elements they want to share and PSDQ would approve.

Chair Lord: disagreed with Mr. Rosensteel based on her interpretation of the written statement, stating that she feels the decision should be about feasibility, and not the content of the data elements. She then suggested softening the wording to accurately reflect what Mr. Rosensteel noted.

Ms. Mushkatel: agreed with Chair Lord and noted that the term "technical" should be added to feasibility for "technical feasibility".

Liz Morales, City of Mesa: stated that it is more of a check and balance situation because Affinity Groups have a narrow focus of what is in their interest and PSDQ is there to look at the larger picture. She then suggested that there should be an agreement between PSDQ and Affinity Groups on the direction that they are taking.

Discussion continued.

Ms. Mushkatel: suggested clarity on the verbiage of the policy.

Mr. Sullivan: part of it is the technical feasibility and then the larger picture of data system sharing. PSDQ will need to work on rewording the document for clarity and encompass the ideas presented.

Chair Lord: clarified that there is agreement from the group on the actual policy document, but some differences of opinion on the Matrix. We have the option to take action and support with our recommended changes to the policy.

Keith Thompson, Phoenix Shanti: motioned to recommend the policy as amended to the Board for approval.

Michelle Jameson, U.S. Vets: seconded the motion to recommend the policy as amended to the Board for approval.

Mr. Rosensteel: suggested that in the future there should be a policy on how the CoC maintains the Affinity Groups.

There were no further comments.

The Motion passed.

Chair Lord: we support PSDQ on the data share policy recommendation to the Board.

Mr. Sullivan: inquired about the Committee's thoughts on the Matrix for possible approval.

Chair Lord: stated that she was unsure how to approach the Matrix since it was not a policy document.

Ms. Scott: clarified that the Committee does not need to approve the Matrix for recommendation since the Matrix is a supporting document that will be amended based on feedback from the Committee before being presented to the Board. The Matrix is not binding, so PSDQ is going to recommend the list of Affinity Groups as recommended by Standing Strong for Families, the HEART, and the Youth Advisory Council to the Board. The policy for creating new groups and the Matrix would just be background.

There were no further comments.

5. Data Sharing Recommendations-Documents

Chair Lord: informed the Committee that there were two documents; a new Release of Information (ROI) and a Privacy Notice. She then inquired with Mr. Sullivan if PSDQ was seeking feedback.

Mr. Sullivan: PSDQ is presenting the documents for feedback. The intent of the ROI is to inform clients of what will be shared and with whom. The back of the document describes what items will be shared and references the additional items that will be shared within the affinity groups. There is an acknowledgement that the client received a copy of the Privacy Notice. The Privacy Notice will be available to all providers with an HMIS entry point. A client will not be denied service for refusal to disclose data. Client consent is not required to input data in the system; however client consent is required to share data. There is checkbox to denote that the client refuses to share the information. If that is the case, the record must be locked down so that it is not shared, but you must still enter the data in the system to be aggregately reported for APRs and other reports as applicable. There is a right to revoke this at any time. The Privacy Notice references obtaining client information and revoking it. There is a checkbox where the client can agree not to share. There are is a place to put family member information, children's names because they cannot consent, the form is asking for parents-if applicable-to sign the form.

Mr. McKinley: inquired about the reference to the list of data elements that will be shared by Affinity Groups.

Mr. Sullivan: once the Affinity Groups and their policies and procedures on data sharing have been approved by the Board, PSDQ will develop those details and include it in the Privacy Notice and ROI so that clients can see how being in that Affinity Group affects them.

Ms. Mushkatel: inquired about lowering the grade level of the content.

Discussion continued.

Ms. Strephans: inquired if the document was vetted through a legal review.

Ms. Scott: the Privacy Notice and ROI were reviewed by the HUD TA and legal counsel.

Mr. Sullivan: The reading level of the content was considered, however, the group concluded that in order to capture every detail the community voiced concern about, PSDQ concluded that in order the capture the legal content, the content was presented as is.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Sullivan: added that there is also an understanding that providers will be talking through the document with each client to ensure understanding.

Ms. Jameson: inquired if a client could be selective of the data they wish to choose.

Mr. Sullivan: noted that HMIS does not have a way to lock some data elements from a record and not others.

Mr. McKinley: noted that clients have the right to not answer a question.

Joann Hatton, AHCCCS: in reference to the earlier discussion about the CoC name, suggested that it is important to have one name for the CoC on all of the documents. One name will help agencies that work with all three Arizona Continuums to discuss with their clients the differences.

Chair Lord: suggested the following revisions,

- Underline and bold where it talks about data elements to be shared and then bulleting the data elements to be shared. This change would help with “white space” and “readability” and is very important to stand out.
- Attaching the list of data elements in a consistent manner.
- Eliminating the reference to the website since it is unreasonable to expect the client to be able to reach the internet.

Mr. Sullivan: noted that employees should also be going through the document in detail to ensure the client understands.

Discussion continued.

Ms. Jameson: suggested adding checkboxes or lines asking the client if they understand data elements that are being shared.

Mr. Sullivan: that was discussed, and the group determined that consensus at the bottom was preferred while also building upon the process with the case worker/manager.

Chair Lord: pointed to the back of the document and inquired about what was meant by “in addition by signing this form”. She stated that she did not understand what was meant by “in addition” when the document could simply say “by signing this form”.

Mr. Sullivan: noted that change.

Chair Lord: also suggested changing the negative phrasing to positive phrasing regarding the fact that a client will still be provided services even if they choose not to share. Furthermore, she stated her concern on the practicality of a client revoking their data share agreement by filling out a form on the internet.

Mr. Sullivan: the form is not complete yet and PSDQ is still working on the revoking policy and process.

Chair Lord: stated her concern that the Privacy Policy and ROI are complicated-even for her, so she could not imagine a client-under duress-being able to understand the forms. She then suggested that the documents be revised for convenient readability and understanding.

Karia Basta, Arizona Department of Housing (ADOH): suggested two boxes: I agree to share; I do not agree to share.

Mr. Sullivan: that suggestion was also discussed and the concern was that the client could check both boxes.

Ms. Basta: supported her statement by adding that there should be a case manager present to ensure that does not happen.

Ronald Lopes, Arizona Housing Inc: whoever runs through the document with the client MUST walk through all items. He then asked how it is ensured that the information is locked if client chooses not to share.

Mr. Sullivan: it is the responsibility of HMIS to lock down the record and HMIS conducts monthly monitoring to detect for private records being shared. Agencies must communicate to HMIS that a record must be locked.

Discussion continued

Erin Callinan, ACESDV: a staff initial and signature ensures that staff overlooked the document and provides accountability to the client and staff.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Sullivan: took the suggestions under consideration and stated that PSDQ would update the witness signature line to the staff signature line to clarify and ensure that the appropriate person signs as witness.

Chair Lord: noted that in the Privacy Notice where it states that the client has the right to "opt out of sharing data with other participating services and still receive services" that that language could be mirrored in the ROI so that there is parody. There should be correlation between both documents.

Ms. Strephans: stated her concern in the ROI about the revocation piece and if that was confirmed with CIR. She added that her understanding of what PSDQ has written in the ROI regarding revocation cannot be accomplished in the system.

Mr. Sullivan: That is explained more in the privacy notice. For example, if a client share data and then decides not to, the data that has already been shared stays in the data share and any new data does not get shared. That is referenced in the Privacy Notice. Mr. Sullivan refereed to Tricia Cano, CIR for more information.

Ms. Cano: if CIR locks the record, all data is locked. If an agency does not have permission to view the record-not even the name will be disclosed. If a client revokes, then CIR would lock the record completely.

Mr. Rosensteel: if there were five agencies previously serving that person and then the client requested to lock the record, my understanding is that if that record was locked, the original five agencies would still have access but future agencies would not. New data entered would still be seen by the five agencies. The revocation would apply only to new agencies.

Mr. Sullivan: noted that PSDQ will reword that portion to clarify that revoking sharing rights does not retroactively remove data sharing.

Chair Lord: inquired that a client can revoke data sharing for any future data sharing.

Ms. Scott: clarified that there is a difference between a data share agreement and a client list.

Chair Lord: provided the following example; "If UMOM has a client, named Suzie Q, and UMOM is in the Affinity Group, so all the family providers in the same Affinity Group can see Suzie Qs' information, then Suzie Q decides to revoke rights her data sharing permission by contacting CIR-who then locks Suzie Q's information, does that mean that UMOM can still see Suzie Q's information but the rest of the Affinity Group cannot see any of her information?

Mr. Rosensteel: inquired for clarification if in Chair Lord's example, Suzie Q was receiving services from more than one agency.

Chair Lord: requested to keep the example simple to ensure a clear understanding.

Ms. Cano: if Suzie Q revokes her sharing right that means that the providers she is currently seeking services from is the only provider who can see her information. All other family services providers in the Affinity Group are blocked from seeing Suzie Q's information.

Chair Lord: revised her example, stating that now Suzie Q is currently at UMOM but working with another family provider on Rapid Rehousing (RRH) and then revokes her right to share her data, now what?

Ms. Cano: two things would happen; either Suzie Q would move into the RRH program and the RRH provider would need to open a new profile and duplicate Suzie Q's information due to the revocation,

or since the it is known that Suzie Q locked her profile, Sue Q can send a letter to CIR specifying that she would like her information shared specifically with UMOM and the RRH program.

Chair Lord: inquired if the options Ms. Cano discussed were also written in the Privacy Notice.

Ms. Cano: clarified that the discussed options were a part of CIR's protocols on data sharing and special requests for selective data sharing or revoking.

Discussion continued on the clarity of revoking data sharing and CIR protocols.

Mr. Rosensteel: inquired, based on Chair Lord's example what the exact data sharing protocols would be for co-occurring data sharing that involves revocation.

Ms. Cano: such examples would need to go through CIR because CIR has the ability to go into Suzie Q's profile to see if the client is in multiple programs. Ms. Cano noted that it is a limitation of the software that CIR cannot stop sharing with agencies that the client originally agreed to share with.

Mr. Rosensteel: for clarification, inquired if Suzie Q joined a new agency after signing a revocation form, can the original agencies that were serving Suzie Q still see her information?

Ms. Cano: the original agencies could still see Suzie Q's information, which is a limitation of the system.

Chair Lord: for clarity, inquired, if the client does the revocation form and the form stated in this case "my information will only be available to the providers currently providing services to me and my family.", if that would be accurate.

Ms. Cano: currently historical providers would also be able to see the data and cannot be locked out of the system because they need it for reporting.

Ms. Scott: for clarification, she added that the revocation in question was for agencies that have not yet served the client. Furthermore, for any agency that has previously provided services to that client, they will need access to the data in order to run their Annual Performance Reports (APR).

Chair Lord: for the purpose of time, suggested to the group to move to the next document but noted that the revocation portion of the document in question will require some revisions in order to simplify the importance of the information to the client.

David Bridge, HSC: noted that there are policies and there are procedures, the policies should reflect what the community wants to happen-so if the community wants the option to revoke then the policy should reflect that. The procedures and technical pieces of how that happens should be left to the technical working groups. He added that the CoC Committee should not turn into the editorial board of the Continuum of Care and the technicalities of the policy decision should be left to the most appropriate group.

Discussion continued on suggestions for the revocation portion of the document.

Chair Lord: moved onto the next document and then inquired about who is responsible for authorizing data for research.

Mr. Sullivan: noted that an agency conducting research on its own data would not need to run a request through CIR. He added that the information provided is based on the baseline privacy notice HUD made available in 2004. The baseline Privacy Notice identifies the baseline standards of what HUD believes should be in a community Privacy Notice. PSDQ took HUD's baseline and compared it to the needs of the community.

Ms. Scott: that determination is covered in the HMIS policies and procedures and PSDQ policies and procedures. Moreover, PSDQ would be authorizing any research requests.

Ms. Basta: concerned how a client will be able to understand the content of the Privacy Notice.

Mr. Sullivan: PSDQ did discuss Ms. Basta's concern, however, in order to capture all of the community's needs; more than one page was needed. PSDQ is open to ideas on how to compress all the information without compromising anything.

Ms. Strephans: suggested the Pima County Privacy Notice as an example, stating that the Privacy Notice is very simple, but references the more in-depth Privacy Notice plan.

Mr. Sullivan: will take that under consideration.

There were no further comments.

No action was taken. Committee prefers revisiting the document after revisions.

6. Recovery Housing Recommendation- Mr. Thompson took the floor to discuss the Recovery Housing Recommendation. Mr. Thompson briefed the Committee and audience on the history and timeline of the Recovery Housing recommendation. The discussion ensued.

Mr. Thompson: seeking questions and input on the recommendation being presented, followed by a recommendation to the Board.

Chair Lord: concerned that the Board would want to know why they should approve Recovery Housing.

Mr. Thompson: the first portion of the document is the recommendation, and the remaining portion is supplemental to the implementation of the recommendation.

Chair Lord: concerned about strict guidelines on who would qualify as recovery housing, since HUD's criteria are pretty loose.

Mr. Thompson: there would be an inventory of Recovery Housing providers that would develop in the next 2-3 months. Then there would need to be a process where providers would check the qualifications for Recovery Housing and determine if they fit. The finished list would then be brought to the Committee for review. He added that an ad-hoc count identified about only five percent of projects may be Recovery Housing.

Chair Lord: inquired about who conducted the ad-hoc count and what criteria were used to determine the five percent and then stated her concern about Housing First being a priority

for some time, noting that there would be some exceptions to that priority and feels it is important to determine the exact criteria of such a determination.

Mr. Sullivan: identified the page where HUD lists the requirements for recovery housing-as determined by HUD.

Mr. Bridge: clarified that Recovery Housing should adopt standards. He then suggested the revision of changing “might” to “will”, noting that there should not be a lot of wiggle room.

Mr. Sullivan: noted that the community does not have monitoring for Housing First providers, so if the community recommended and approved Recovery Housing it would be co-developed with Housing First.

Discussion continued on the suggestion for the recommendation to require standards rather than have an option for standards.

Chair Lord: explained that she was ok with #1 which was the recommendation, and that the #2 should clearly define the criteria for identifying and qualifying a Recovery Housing project. She then suggested that the document be reworded for #2 before being recommended.

Mr. Sullivan: noted that the Recovery Housing discussion was initially brought to the Committee and then sent back to the work groups for revisions and feedback.

Chair Lord: opened the floor for suggestions on how to reword number two.

Ms. Basta: suggested eliminating “should” and “perhaps”.

Chair Lord: read aloud the suggested revised version of the recommendation, “Our Maricopa County CoC should adopt the Recovery Housing Model as defined by HUD as a valid intervention. She then suggested that the Committee only take the revised recommendation and the list of criteria by HUD to the Board. She noted that the rest of the document still needed to be flushed out, but at least the Committee would have a policy recommendation to present to the Board.

Mr. Bridge: motioned to approve the revised Recovery Housing policy recommendation as stated below, in addition to the list of HUD’s criteria for recommendation to the Board.
“Our Maricopa County CoC should adopt the Recovery Housing Model as defined by HUD as a valid intervention”

Ms. Basta: seconded the motion to approve the revised Recovery Housing policy recommendation as stated below, in addition to the list of HUD’s criteria for recommendation to the Board.
“Our Maricopa County CoC should adopt the Recovery Housing Model as defined by HUD as a valid intervention”

There were no further comments.
The motion passed.

Chair Lord: suggested tabling agenda items 7, 8, 11, and 13, and moving to agenda items 9, 10, and 12.

7. CoC Conflict of Interest Policy
Tabled for May

8. Performance Improvement Plans and Processes
Tabled for May

9. Letter in Sanctioning Homeless ID Project- Chair Lord discussed the letter she proposed and wrote to a representative in California regarding the Homeless ID Project. She noted that if the Continuum sanctions Homeless ID services then the Continuum can get discounted California birth certificates.

   Ms. Basta: motioned to send the recommended letter to California in order to get sanctioned services for reduced cost ID's out of the State of California.

   Mr. Bridge: seconded the motion to send the recommended letter to California in order to get sanctioned services for reduced cost ID's out of the State of California.

   There were no further comments.
   The motion passed.

10. Reports from Work Groups and Board- Chair Lord moved to agenda item four, stating that standing verbal updates would be provided by the groups listed below. The reports are for information and discussion by the representatives from the groups listed below.

    Performance Standards and Data Quality (PSDQ): Mr. Sullivan provided the updates listed below.

    - The Program Performance Report has been given to Bowman to develop all the proper queries. The initial response from Bowman is June as to when we will have the report back and ready to test.
    - Chair Lord: sought clarification that the report in question is the report that will enable providers to run at the touch of a button.

    Coordinated Entry and Oversight Work Group (CEOWG): There were no updates to report.

    HMIS Committee: There were no updates to report.

    ESG collaborators: Ms. Scott provided the updates listed below.

    - The group met March 10, 2016.
    - Reviewing the ESG report that has also been sent to Bowman.
    - Awaiting word on when Bowman will be ready with the ESG report.
    - Standardizing the ESG programs and taking on recommendations from the Rapid Rehousing conference.

CoC Board: Ms. Scott provided the updates listed below.

- Met March 28, 2016.
- Discussed Coordinated Entry and coordination within the system.
- Looked at the Coordinated Entry timeline focusing on the Welcome Center and FHH.
- Appointed new members of PSDQ.
- Reviewed HMIS MOU but delayed action until the MOU was finalized based on the recommendations made at the Board meeting.
- Had a Housing Trust Fund presentation.
- Meeting again on April 25, 2016.

11. Systems Level Performance Measure Dashboard
Tabled for May

12. Discussion of HUD Technical Assistance for Projects that Received Low Scores in NOFA Review
Chair Lord noted that HUD TA would be coming out to assist stakeholders with Transitional Housing and this meeting was an opportunity to provide feedback to Ms. Scott on specific focuses stakeholders would like to look into. The recommendations are listed below.

Ms. Jameson: requested input on changing a housing programs' status to low barrier and the implications of that process.

Ms. Townsend: requested input on DV providers and TH.
There were no further comments.

13. CoC Education Policy
Tabled for May

14. Request for Future Agenda Items
Topics or issues of interest that the MAG Continuum of Care Regional Committee on Homelessness would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting will be requested.
    - Flowchart around Program Improvement Process.
    - CoC Education Policy.
    - CoC Conflict of Interest Policy.

15. Comments from the Committee
Chair Lord opened the floor for comments.
Ms. Jameson: U.S. VETS is partnering with Mercy Maricopa a two-day ASIST Training which an applied suicide intervention skills is training. The training is open to community with 8 spots left and free with complimentary breakfast and lunch. There were no further comments. April 27-28, 2016.

Mr. Sullivan: inquired if additional trainings will be scheduled.

Ms. Jameson: probably not. It was an undertaking of six months just to schedule the current training.

Ms. Townsend: announced that Sojourner Center will host their inaugural research symposium on April 14, 2016, in partnership with the ASU School of Social work, the University of California,

Schools of Social Work and Nursing, the Coalition to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, and other organizations.

Adjourn

Chair Lord adjourned the meeting at 11:25a.m. The next meeting will occur on May 11, 2016.

Maricopa Association of Governments
Regional Continuum of Care

CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

INTRODUCTION

The Continuum of Care (CoC) relies upon the input and participation of many segments of the community in its decision making. The breadth, depth and diversity of background and experience of the CoC Board, CoC Committee, and the work groups contribute to the Continuum's ongoing ability to successfully address critical community needs and, in turn, demonstrate accountability for allocation of federal resources. This breadth, depth and diversity may also cause, from time to time, conflicting and competing interests to exist within the context of the CoC's decision making process.

To continue to ensure the integrity of this process and to continue to call upon and receive the benefits of involving all segments of the community, it is imperative that decisions made by the CoC Board, CoC Committee, and work groups be free of any undue influence, conflicts of interest, or appearances of impropriety by all participants in the decision making process, at any level.

With that in mind, the CoC Board has adopted the following policy in order to identify and publicly disclose any conflicts of interest in order to avoid any appearance of impropriety.

APPLICABILITY AND SCOPE

This policy applies to all who participate in or influence the CoC Board's decision making, including, but not limited to, CoC Board members, Committee members, members of the CoC work groups, and CoC staff.

Members and staff must avoid conflicts of interest with respect to their fiduciary responsibility.

1. *There must be no self-dealing or any conduct of private business or personal services between any member/staff and the organization, to assure openness, competitive opportunity and equal access to inside information.*
2. *When the CoC Board is to decide upon an issue about which a member has an unavoidable conflict of interest, the member shall absent herself or himself from not only the vote, but also from the deliberation, on the issue.*
3. *Members/staff will annually disclose their involvement with other organizations, with vendors, orany other associations that might produce a conflict.*

DISCLOSURE

It is the responsibility of the CoC Board members to inform all who participate in or influence CoC Board decision making of this policy.

It is then the responsibility of the individual participating in or influencing CoC Board decision making to identify conflicts in interest as they arise from time to time and to thereafter comply with the letter and spirit of this policy. Such disclosure should occur at the earliest possible time and if possible, prior to the discussion of any such issue.

It is the collective responsibility of the committee or group in which such issues arises to ensure that this policy is carried out. Concerns regarding conflicts of interest should be directed to the Board Chair, who should resolve them within the context of both the letter and spirit of this policy.

Annual written disclosure statements in the form attached to this policy will be obtained by the CoC Board members in order that perceived or actual conflicts can be identified and then disclosed.
Individuals should promptly notify the CoC Board and update their disclosure statements as necessary.

IMPACT OF DISCLOSURE OR NONDISCLOSURE

Having disclosed the existence of an actual or perceived conflict of interest, an individual may nonetheless participate in the discussion of a given issue, but must abstain from voting upon that particular issue. That abstention should be reflected in the written minutes of that meeting.

If a conflict of interest is later thought or found to have existed, but was not previously disclosed, inadvertently or otherwise, that information should be brought to the attention of the CoC Board Chair. That person will then proceed to review such matter with the affected individual and proceed to resolve the issue in a manner consistent with this policy.

Continuum of Care Board

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

INSTRUCTIONS
Please complete this form for yourself and for all members of your agency for whom it would be appropriate.

NAME: _____

I. CURRENT CONTINUUM OF CARE AFFILIATIONS Please list all current CoC affiliations.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT
POSITION/TITLE: _____

EMPLOYER: _____

CURRENT BOARD MEMBERSHIPS
Please list all the boards of any voluntary organizations on which you are currently a member. Include both those affiliated with CoC Board and those that are unaffiliated.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

CURRENT VOLUNTEER SERVICES WITH CONTINUUM OF CARE AGENCIES
Please list all current volunteer services in which you are currently involved with CoC affiliated agencies or CoC-funded programs.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

BUSINESS OR PROFESSIONAL INTERESTS

Are you an officer, director, member or majority owner of a for-profit organization that directly or indirectly furnishes goods, services or facilities to the CoC? If so, please list.

Please list any organizations in which you are employed or have any financial interests, direct or indirect, that currently conduct business with the CoC.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

POSITION/TITLE: _____

EMPLOYER: _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

By signing this document I am affirming that I have been given the CoC Board Conflict of Interest Policy and am familiar with its contents. I am also affirming that the information contained in this disclosure statement is accurate to the best of my knowledge. I agree that as my circumstances change, I will promptly notify the CoC Board Chair and update this disclosure statement.

*SIGNATURE:*_____*DATE:* _____

Note: this information will be kept on file by the CoC Collaborative Applicant - Maricopa Association of Governments. Access by other committee chairs or volunteers will be determined by the CoC Board Chair on an as needed basis.

Please return your complete form to:

Anne Scott
Human Services Planner
302 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 300
Phoenix, AZ 85003
ascott@azmag.gov
(602) 254-6300

Housing First	Recovery Housing
Affordable and supportive housing options and models are available to maximize housing choice among people experiencing homelessness.	Residents have expressed a preference for living in a housing setting targeted to people in recovery with an **abstinence** focus.
Admission/tenant screening and selection practices promote the acceptance of applicants regardless of their sobriety or use of substances.	Projects may be **alcohol and drug free** to support the continued sobriety of their participants. However, lengthy periods of sobriety are not required for program entry.
Services are informed by a harm reduction philosophy that recognizes that drug and alcohol use and addiction are a part of tenants' lives, where tenants are engaged in non-judgmental communication regarding drug and alcohol use, and where tenants are offered education regarding how to avoid risky behaviors and engage in safer practices.	Programs provide services that align with participants' choice and prioritization of personal goals of sustained recovery and **abstinence from substance use.**
Use of alcohol or drugs in and of itself (without other lease violations) is not considered a reason for eviction	The program includes relapse support that does not automatically evict or discharge a program participant from the program for **temporary** relapse.
Housing First does not consider alcohol or drug use in and of itself to be lease violations, unless such use results in disturbances to neighbors or is associated with illegal activity (e.g. selling illegal substances.)	Discharge from transitional housing or eviction from permanent supportive housing should only occur when a participant's behavior substantially disrupts or **impacts the welfare of the recovery community** in which the participant resides.

This content is taken directly from HUD Guidance or ISICH Housing First documents.