

COC Board Selection Process Discussion – Q&A

Q: Will provider candidates be identified by specialty area on the ballot?

A: Yes. Each homeless service provider candidate will have their relevant specialty area or system connection identified alongside their name to provide additional information for voters. These are not separate seat categories but descriptive identifiers.

Q: Are specialty areas (e.g., sober living, workforce development, specialty courts) separate board seats?

A: No. Under the current charter, candidates are considered homeless service providers. Specialty areas will be noted for voter information but do not constitute separate seat categories.

Q: If someone qualifies for multiple seat types (e.g., lived experience and elected official), can they apply for more than one seat?

A: No. Applicants may only apply for one seat type. The Selection Committee reviewed candidates based on the seat category they selected in their application and did not reassign applicants to other categories.

Q: Can an applicant submit a second application for another seat type if a different category remains open?

A: The Selection Committee indicated that applicants apply for a specific seat category and are evaluated only within that category. Multiple simultaneous applications for different seat types are not permitted.

Q: Were concerns raised about requiring candidates to fit into a single category?

A: Yes. Several participants expressed concerns that requiring applicants to choose a single category does not reflect the intersectional experiences many candidates bring, such as having both lived experience and professional service provider experience.

Q: Why were HUD specialty categories shown on the presentation slide without candidate names attached?

A: Staff explained that the slide was updated shortly before the meeting and did not include candidate-specific specialty information. The ballot and candidate forum materials will include those details.

Q: What concerns were raised about the current seat structure?

A: Participants expressed concerns that:

- The process may limit recognition of candidates with multiple forms of experience.
- Definitions of seat categories were not clearly explained.
- Previous board elections did not require applicants to select a specific seat category.
- The current process may effectively create seat allocations that are not explicitly outlined in the charter.

Q: What happens if a board member no longer meets the qualifications of the seat they represent?

A: Staff stated that under the current charter, a board member who no longer represents the category associated with their seat may be subject to board dismissal procedures outlined in the charter.

Q: Is there a mechanism in the charter to remove board members who no longer qualify for their seat?

A: Staff stated that board dismissal procedures are included in the charter and address situations where a member no longer fulfills the representation requirements of their seat.

Q: How many lived experience seats exist on the board?

A: There are multiple lived experience seats. For this election cycle, the Selection Committee proposed:

- 3 lived experience seats
- 3 homeless service provider seats
- 1 local funder seat

Additional seats reserved for elected officials and law enforcement/public safety representatives remain under consideration.

Q: Are these seat allocations permanent board requirements?

A: No. Staff clarified that these allocations apply to the current election cycle and available vacancies. They are not permanent seat allocations established across the entire board structure.

Q: Does the charter establish fixed numbers of seats by category?

A: Participants noted that the charter includes some minimum representation requirements but does not clearly specify fixed allocations for many seat categories. This contributed to confusion regarding how seat distributions were determined.

Q: Are the numbers being discussed minimums or maximums?

A: Discussion highlighted that:

- Certain representation categories are being used as minimum targets for this election cycle.
- The board also has an overall maximum size.
- Not all qualified candidates can be elected due to seat limitations and voting thresholds.

Q: Why is there confusion about seat allocations and representation requirements?

A: Staff acknowledged that the board is balancing:

- Existing charter requirements,
- New HUD expectations outlined in the recent NOFO,
- Current election procedures.

Participants noted that these requirements are not always clearly aligned, creating challenges in explaining the election process.

Q: Will these issues be addressed in future charter revisions?

A: Yes. Staff indicated that many of these concerns have already been discussed during charter revision work and that additional clarification will be included in future charter updates, election materials, and the candidate forum.

Q: Has HUD's recently released NOFO introduced new board representation expectations?

A: Yes. Staff confirmed that the recently released NOFO includes new expectations regarding board representation, which have influenced the current discussion and specialty representation considerations.

Charter Update Q&A

Kristina stated that the SPC Committee is concerned about the charter requirement that the committee be led by two COC Board members. She explained that this requirement has created challenges in maintaining leadership because one current leader is ready to step down and there are limited board members with the time, capacity, and interest to fill the role. The SPC Committee believes it would be more effective to follow the structure used by other committees, with one COC Board member and one COC member serving in leadership roles. Kristina also noted that the committee views the current requirement as an undue hardship and wanted its objection formally entered into the record.

Ruby confirmed that this concern was discussed during the Charter Revision Workgroup process and has been addressed in the finalized draft charter revisions that were distributed for review. She stated that the draft clarifies committee leadership requirements for all committees and includes amendments intended to resolve the concern raised by the SPC Committee. Ruby also noted that all committees had representation in the workgroup process and that committee feedback was incorporated into the revisions. She expressed confidence that the updated language should address the SPC Committee's concerns.

Coordinated Entry Assessment Discussion – Q&A

Q: Why is homelessness discussed later in the assessment instead of being prioritized earlier?

Question (Dorsol Plants):

Dorsol expressed concern that homelessness-related questions appeared later in the assessment, despite homelessness being central to the Continuum of Care's mission. Dorsol suggested that homelessness-related questions should be placed higher in the assessment process.

Answer (Tom Regan):

Tom clarified that homelessness is addressed early in the triage assessment and includes follow-up questions designed to gather more detailed information about a person's homelessness experience, including the duration and circumstances of homelessness. He acknowledged the feedback and indicated that the assessment's structure could be reviewed for clarity.

Q: Does the assessment screen people out of Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) if they have high medical or support needs?

Question (Dorsol Plants):

Dorsol raised concerns about language indicating that some individuals may be "beyond the scope" of Permanent Supportive Housing and questioned whether people with significant medical or behavioral health needs could be excluded from housing opportunities.

Answer (Tom Regan):

Tom stated that the assessment is not intended to screen people out of housing or determine eligibility. Instead, the purpose is to identify individuals who may require additional medical, caregiving, or specialized supports alongside housing. He emphasized that PSH providers are not skilled nursing facilities or adult family homes, and some individuals may require both housing and higher levels of care. Tom acknowledged that the wording created confusion and committed to revising the language to better reflect the intent.

Q: Is the proposed assessment easier and less burdensome than the current Coordinated Entry process?

Question (Elizabeth Maupin):

Elizabeth noted concerns she had heard from case managers about the length and complexity of the current Coordinated Entry process and asked whether the proposed assessment would be more streamlined.

Answer (Tom Regan):

Tom explained that a pilot phase is planned following approval of the assessment. The pilot will evaluate:

- The time required to complete the assessment.
- Whether the tool is safe and practical for use.
- Whether the results accurately reflect participant vulnerability and support prioritization decisions.

He acknowledged the need to balance thoroughness with efficiency and stated that the workgroup intentionally reduced the number of questions while still collecting enough information to support fair prioritization.

Q: Are there concerns that the assessment may be discriminatory toward people with disabilities?

Question/Comment (Kristina Sawyckyj):

Kristina expressed strong concerns that portions of the draft assessment could be interpreted as

discriminatory toward people with disabilities and those requiring higher levels of care. She questioned whether the assessment had undergone legal review and raised concerns about compliance with disability rights laws, including ADA protections. She also requested stronger language regarding privacy protections and domestic violence survivor protections.

Answer (Tom Regan):

Tom thanked Kristina for the feedback and confirmed that the assessment remains in draft form. He stated that legal and risk management review would occur as part of the approval process to ensure compliance with federal, state, and local laws. He also clarified that:

- The assessment includes informed consent and privacy requirements.
- Assessors must confirm consent for information sharing through HMIS.
- Survivors of domestic violence are identified early in the assessment process and their records are de-identified to protect confidentiality.

Tom welcomed additional feedback on strengthening these protections.

Q: How frequently are individuals denied Permanent Supportive Housing because providers believe their needs exceed available supports?

Question (Elizabeth Maupin):

Elizabeth asked how often people are unable to access PSH due to the severity of their needs and what system changes may be necessary to address those gaps.

Answer (Tom Regan):

Tom stated that he did not have data available during the meeting regarding the number of PSH denials based on level-of-care concerns. However, he acknowledged the importance of the issue and emphasized that improving assessment practices is one step toward better identifying and serving highly vulnerable households. He also stressed the importance of continuous quality improvement and ongoing review of assessment outcomes.

Q: How will the assessment be evaluated and improved over time?

Question (Discussion):

Members asked how the assessment would be monitored after implementation.

Answer (Tom Regan):

Tom proposed an ongoing quality improvement process that would:

- Continue collaboration with the workgroup and community partners.
- Review assessment data on a regular basis.

- Evaluate whether questions effectively identify vulnerability and service needs.
- Make revisions as necessary based on data and community feedback.

He emphasized that the assessment should remain adaptable and responsive to system needs rather than becoming a static tool.

Q: What is the difference between a Regional Access Point and a Community Assessor?

Question (Ruby Tuesday Romero):

Ruby asked whether Regional Access Points and Community Assessors perform the same role and why the distinction matters in the assessment.

Answer (Tom Regan):

Tom explained that both administer the same Coordinated Entry assessment. The distinction is primarily for tracking purposes:

- Regional Access Points are dedicated locations where people can receive Coordinated Entry assessments.
- Community Access Points include shelters, outreach teams, and day centers that have assessment staff embedded within their programs.

The assessment process itself is the same regardless of location.

Q: Will the assessment help collect more detailed information about people's experiences of homelessness?

Question (Ruby Tuesday Romero):

Ruby asked whether the assessment could help transform qualitative experiences of homelessness into measurable data that could improve understanding of participant needs.

Answer (Tom Regan):

Tom agreed that one goal of the assessment is to better capture nuanced experiences and vulnerabilities in a structured way. He noted that additional follow-up questions are included throughout the assessment to gather richer information than is currently collected through the existing prioritization process.

Q: Is credit score considered in the assessment process?

Question (Ruby Tuesday Romero):

Ruby asked whether credit history or credit score was considered for inclusion, given that poor credit can be a barrier to housing placement.

Answer (Tom Regan):

Tom explained that credit score was initially considered by the workgroup but was ultimately removed to:

- Keep the assessment shorter and less burdensome.
- Avoid creating the perception that credit history could impact eligibility or prioritization.

The workgroup determined that discussions about credit history are more appropriate after assessment, during housing navigation and case management conversations when participants are actively seeking housing opportunities.

Key Points from Discussion

- Importance of prioritizing homelessness-related information within the assessment.
- Concerns about language suggesting limitations on access to Permanent Supportive Housing.
- Need for strong disability rights, ADA, privacy, and domestic violence protections.
- Balancing assessment thoroughness with ease of use.
- Interest in ongoing evaluation and continuous improvement of assessment tools.
- Desire for more robust data collection to better understand participant needs and housing barriers.