



## Youth Committee Meeting Summary

**Date:** 7/28/20

**Location:** Zoom

**Time:** 3:30 – 5:00

### Items Discussed

1. Present: Cole Giannone, Kelly O’Sullivan, Charlie Winkler, Alyson Zikmund, Randy Scott, Amanda Slater, Amy Wilkerson, Barbara Andrews, Brain Crozier, Cathy Batista, Constance Barry, Davia Steely, Elizabeth Garcia, Karim Lewis, Lauren Magee, Laurie Berarducci, Maddox Guerilla, Nachell Simmons, Sam Miller, Robert Yancy
2. Announcements: discussed new assessment form for youth and Covenant House vacancies
3. CoC steering committee updates:
  - a. Reviewed CoC Steering Committee action plan, evaluation tool, racial equity, and committee updates
  - b. DSS – doing analysis of disparities by race. CoC has formed work group which met for the first time 7/27/20. HUD has tool that breaks down racial disparities by CoC.
4. Race Equity in Youth Projects (Cole)
  - a. CoC review of data to examine racial disparities in housing and homeless system. DSS as CoC lead agency will conduct the analysis. Our committee should help inform set of data elements for consideration in youth specific projects.
  - b. HMIS data elements from youth projects to review:
    - i. Total % of youth by race in youth projects
    - ii. Breakdown of which settings youth are coming from by race
    - iii. Breakdown of where youth move out from TH by race
    - iv. In RRH projects → length of time it takes youth to find an apartment broken down by race (HMIS data element – PH move in date, so admission date to PH move in date)
    - v. Obtaining benefits by race (other income)
    - vi. Increases in earned income by race
    - vii. Referrals to programs and acceptance into those programs by race
    - viii. Youth with immigration issues (pending more info from Cathy)
    - ix. HPD Where We Live report –
      1. Full draft report: <https://wherewelive.cityofnewyork.us/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Where-We-Live-NYC-Draft-Plan.pdf>
      2. Executive summary: [https://wherewelive.cityofnewyork.us/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/WWL\\_ExecutiveSummary.pdf](https://wherewelive.cityofnewyork.us/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/WWL_ExecutiveSummary.pdf)



3. Video:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?reload=9&v=lmW9Q0mK0iM&feature=emb\\_title](https://www.youtube.com/watch?reload=9&v=lmW9Q0mK0iM&feature=emb_title)

x. Categories of discharges by race

5. CoC Youth Project Landscape (Cole)

TH providers	#	RRH providers	#	Youth PSH providers	#
Ali Forney Center	30	Covenant House	40 (10 parent)	NCS – Louis 9	46
Covenant House	20	Sheltering Arms	36	The Door – The Lee	
Good Shepherd Svs	32	Bailey House/Housing Works	30	Lantern – Jasper House	
		Jericho Project	115		
		GMHC	31		

6. Overview of performance evaluation committee meeting (Kelly)

7. Discussion from questions sent around (Kelly)

- a. As a youth specific program, what is one feature of your program model that you should be graded on through the annual CoC Evaluation? Why?
- b. Are there specific TH, TH-RRH, or RRH outcomes that should be altered for youth specific programs? Why?
- c. What question do you score most poorly on in the annual CoC evaluation? Why?
  - i. Multiple: Income and benefits question – high threshold for points, very hard. Immigration issues, or have a job and don’t qualify. Those who do well in earned income don’t do as well in benefits. For those who do well in benefits don’t do as well in earned income. These questions pin each other against the other. Why couldn’t it be overall an income question?
  - ii. Charlie: Performance mgmt. committee is looking at earned income and benefits question MAY be merged into a single question. Have clients increased or gained earned/other income? Average score on other income is 70% which gets you 8 out of 9 points. Earned income is 18% which gets you 3 out of 9 points. We plan on merging them. It’ll be an 18 point question but you should be able to do okay. If there are rules or laws from actually qualifying or being eligible for a benefit and that prevents you from scoring well on the question, please let us know. Send us this info now, we may be able to grant an exemption. It’s too late to hear about this in an appeal.
  - iii. Elizabeth: Problem is that there is 1 evaluation system that applies uniformly to everyone, but we all have different projects. We have to do the prework to be exempted from a system. Instead of creating a system that works for many populations. Seniors are on fixed income. They’re not going to increase employment or earned income. Instead of having to submit an exemption, the evaluation should commit to that change. This has persisted for ages in NYC.



- iv. Alyson: We can do what we want in NYC, but we base it on the APR. But, ultimately this info goes to HUD with the way the APR asks its questions. We need to balance it, but if we are going to use these evaluations to look at performance and at ways for CoC to do better, it doesn't help us to change the metrics so that projects do better on evaluation. Across the board, on the income questions so many projects do poorly. For youth especially, we should address the chronicity for example. For HPD projects, we get a memo from HRA that says there are NO eligible chronically homeless youth for this project. CoC has flip flopped on this, ages ago we exempted youth projects wholesale from chronicity. Then we went to appeals, but then CoC rejected all of them. That's something we could recommend.
- v. Robert: Every year its a bit different, and our scores vary because of the way the CoC grades certain things.
- vi. Nachell: Increase in benefits/income at LNH. A large % of the youth at Louis 9 are engaged in educational/vocational programs and not necessarily employed and earning income.
- vii. Charlie: Evaluation was based off the PSH model, and we included TH because we had so few. We instituted a new HMIS tool that you can run in AWARDS or from whatever database you use. That was an advancement. ... we are open. There will be a new RRH eval this year. Your points have been heard over the past few years. For literal homeless question we are making an accommodation.
- viii. Alyson: If you're being told to do something by another government agency and this hurts you in your evaluation, let us know so we can review it.
- ix. Charlie: Sent the tool to AWARDS to be able to build a template for providers to be able to pull a report. Can take into account for 2022 any additions/change.

8. Suggestions for evaluation rubric (Kelly)

- a. Question 3: Admitting youth who are couch-surfing (for example, Category 3 definition) this may need to be approved for the ENTIRE CoC or maybe it could be approved for a subpopulation such as young adults.
- b. Question 7 + 8: on merging non-cash benefits & health insurance. Most participants have health insurance. We shouldn't expect that in a program of 40 where 10 are eligible for noncash benefits, if 7 or the 10 have it, they should get the points for those who are eligible.
- c. NEW Q for RRH time to move in → for a new RRH tool, we would suggest these wouldn't be scored this year. This would be more for information gathering, adjusting question or coming up with scoring that makes sense. We may need 2 years of not being graded. (An example was given about a young person with a record of eviction from when he was a minor and how that young person needed much more time to get an apartment because of that.) This may help us see if we need a Housing Search group in the CoC.
- d. NEW Q for Returns to Homelessness → Cole said may not be good to grade providers on this, but more so that the system should be examining these findings and making systematic changes. Often this return would not be the "fault" or the provider and it shouldn't be something the provider is evaluated on individually.

9. Suggestions for survey questions 11, 12, 15 (Kelly)

- a. Charlie: For the survey questions, we would use this to capture non-HMIS data and things that are important for the CoC. We will have some pandemic specific questions on the survey this year
- b. Need YAB's ideas on this too!
- c. Some ideas for extra points for RRH & youth providers: Do you have a Housing Specialist on your team? Do you have a Peer Mentor on your staff?
- d. We can ask about the Youth Count as an area to get 1 more point.



**Action Items**

1. Committee to review; Kelly to submit recs to Performance Mgmt group/Charlie
  - a. Need survey edits by early to mid August. For the RRH HMIS tool, get that to Charlie ASAP.
2. Cole to send ideas for Racial Disparities workgroup to Melissa Stevenson