System Performance Committee Meeting Minutes

Theory of Change

If we create a homelessness response system that centers people with lived experience of homelessness, then we will be able to respond to needs and eliminate inequities, in order to end homelessness for all.

Land Acknowledgment

The King County Continuum of Care Board acknowledges that we work on the unseated traditional lands of the Coast Salish peoples, especially the first peoples of Seattle, the Duwamish people. The original stewards of the land, past and present. We honor with gratitude the land itself and the Duwamish tribe. This acknowledgement only becomes meaningful when combined with accountable relationships and informed action and is the first step in honoring the land that we today sit on and their peoples.

Date & Time

November 10, 2026; 3:00 – 4:30 pm PT

Roll Call

Name	Present
Tamara Bauman	P
Sherry Tillman	P
Ruby Tuesday Romero	P
Marvin Futrell	Absent
Kristina Sawyckyj	Absent
Ben Vaagen	P

Mustafa Mohammed	P
Shawna McMahon	Absent
Becky Gilley	P
Ellen Waters	P

- Roll Call – 7 members present –3 absent
- Quorum Met – Yes

Meeting Minutes Review:

- Motion: Approve the October meeting minutes – Ben Vaagen
- Second: Mustafa Mohammed
- The motion was approved by voice vote

Public Comment: No public comments were made during the meeting or submitted in writing.

Amend Agenda:

- Motion: To amend the agenda to focus only on the HMIS Standard Operating Procedures in lieu of the full list of policies that was originally listed on the agenda – Tamara Bauman
- Second: Mustafa Mohammed
- The motion was approved by voice vote

Meeting Topic: Policy Review: HMIS Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) – Daniel Ramos III

A. Purpose of the Annual Policy Review

- The System Performance Committee (SPC) is responsible for reviewing and approving HMIS policies annually, as delegated by the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board.
- The HMIS Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) is a foundational document outlining the roles, responsibilities, and operating requirements of the HMIS system.
- The SOP was last updated in May, and an annual review is necessary to remain consistent with federal regulations and HUD guidance.

- Daniel acknowledged that the committee had a particularly busy year and recognized the challenges of assigning policy reviews to volunteer committee members. He expressed openness to resetting the review process and soliciting feedback on how to make future reviews more manageable and effective.

B. Proposed Updates to the HMIS Standard Operating Procedure

Daniel presented recommended updates to the SOP, primarily focused on clarifying existing requirements, updating outdated references, and aligning language with current practices and regulations.

Key proposed changes included:

- **Open HMIS System:** Clarify that HMIS is an open system in which authorized users at participating agencies can view client records across participating agencies, subject to client consent and applicable legal restrictions.
- **Annual Policy Review:** Update language to explicitly require annual review of HMIS policies.
- **HMIS Participation Requirements:** Expand participation language beyond CoC-funded agencies to include agencies required to participate by other funding sources, including the City of Seattle, King County, and the Washington State Department of Commerce.
- **Federal Regulatory References:** Remove references to the proposed 2011 HMIS rule, which was never finalized, and update references to the applicable 2004 HMIS Data and Technical Standards.
- **Organizational References:** Update references from King County to the King County Regional Homelessness Authority (KCRHA).
- **Data Terminology:** Replace outdated terminology such as "client refused" with "client prefers not to answer."
- **Policy Citations:** Update references to current policies, regulatory citations, and document versions.

C. Client Consent, Privacy, and De-Identification

The committee discussed the open HMIS model and the legal limitations surrounding the disclosure of sensitive client information.

- Certain information, including domestic violence, HIV/AIDS, and substance use treatment information, may be subject to additional privacy protections.

- Washington State law and applicable federal privacy requirements restrict the disclosure of personally identifying information for certain populations.
- Agencies are responsible for understanding and complying with their own legal obligations related to HIPAA, substance use treatment records, and other protected information.
- Daniel clarified that providers may use the consent-refused protocol when creating a new client record.
- Lauryn Searles clarified that when an existing client changes their consent status, the Bitfocus Help Desk team assists with de-identifying the existing record.

D. Alignment of SPC Responsibilities: SOP vs. Committee Charter

Daniel identified inconsistencies between the SPC responsibilities outlined in the SOP and those identified in the committee charter.

Areas discussed included:

- **Data Sharing Requests:** SOP currently states that the committee reviews data-sharing outcomes quarterly, while the charter indicates that the committee approves data-sharing requests.
- **System Performance Metrics and Federal Reports:** These responsibilities appear in the charter but are not clearly reflected in the SOP.
- **CoC Competition Rating and Ranking:** The committee's responsibility for reviewing and making recommendations on the annual CoC competition is included in the charter but missing from the SOP.
- **Appeals, User Access, and Grievances:** These responsibilities are outlined in the SOP but are not reflected in the charter.

The committee discussed whether data-sharing requests should require prior SPC approval or whether KCRHA should continue handling operational approvals and report outcomes to the committee.

Members expressed support for maintaining an efficient approval process to avoid unnecessary delays for agencies seeking HMIS access. However, members also emphasized the importance of transparency and committee oversight.

E. Data-Sharing Oversight and Reporting

- Members generally supported allowing KCRHA to continue processing routine data-sharing requests rather than requiring committee approval for every request.
- Ben Vaagen noted that requiring committee approval could create unnecessary administrative delays.
- Ruby Romero supported reporting data-sharing decisions to the committee rather than requiring prior approval.
- Becky Gilley requested additional transparency regarding the criteria used to approve or deny requests.
- Members suggested monthly reporting as a potential alternative to the current quarterly reporting process.
- The possibility of distributing data-sharing updates electronically or through automated reporting was also discussed.
- Daniel agreed to compile information about the volume of requests, approvals, and denials to help the committee determine the appropriate oversight process.

F. Federal Reporting and Program Performance Oversight

Daniel reviewed the federal reporting requirements and discussed whether the committee should review individual Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

- KCRHA submits approximately 100 CoC-funded program APRs annually.
- These reports provide program-level information, including client demographics, enrollment and exit outcomes, services delivered, and data quality.
- Aggregate information from these reports is incorporated into broader federal reporting, including the CoC APR, Longitudinal Systems Analysis (LSA), and other system performance reports.
- Daniel recommended maintaining the committee's primary focus on system-level federal reports rather than reviewing every individual APR.

Committee members discussed the value of reviewing individual program performance while recognizing the time and staff capacity required.

Suggestions included:

- Providing the committee with an example APR template to better understand the information collected.
- Developing an automated dashboard to summarize program performance.
- Identifying performance anomalies or programs that may require additional review.
- Allowing the committee to request more detailed program-level information when concerns or questions arise.

The committee generally supported reviewing system-level information while retaining the ability to conduct deeper program-level reviews when warranted.

G. Feedback on the Policy Review Process

Daniel invited feedback on the meeting format and the overall policy review process.

Discussion included:

- Providing committee members with policy documents and proposed revisions in advance.
- Sharing redlined versions to make proposed changes easier to identify.
- Ensuring members have adequate time to review documents before meetings.
- Considering a more manageable approach to assigning policy reviews, recognizing committee members' volunteer capacity and competing responsibilities.

Results and Outcomes

The following outcomes and areas of general agreement emerged from the discussion:

1. **SOP Updates:** The committee reviewed the proposed changes and provided feedback but did not formally approve the revised SOP.

2. **Open HMIS System:** Members received clarification regarding the open-system model, client consent, and legal restrictions on sharing protected information.

3. **Data-Sharing Requests:** There was general support for KCRHA maintaining operational authority to process routine data-sharing requests, with increased transparency and regular reporting to the SPC.

4. **Reporting Frequency:** Monthly reporting was suggested as a potential improvement over quarterly updates. Additional information is needed before the committee determines the final approach.

5. **SPC Charter Alignment:** The committee acknowledged inconsistencies between the SOP and charter. Updating the charter was identified as a future work item, potentially following finalization of the CoC charter.

6. **Federal Reporting:** The committee expressed interest in seeing an example APR and exploring a system-level dashboard to support oversight without creating an excessive administrative burden.

7. **No Formal Vote:** The committee agreed to postpone the SOP approval vote until members receive the revised draft and additional requested information.

Next Steps and Action Items

Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeline
Distribute the revised HMIS SOP draft, including proposed changes/redlines.	Daniel Ramos	Before next meeting
Provide committee members with the updated SOP and supporting materials in advance of future reviews.	Daniel Ramos	Before next meeting
Compile data-sharing request information, including the number of requests approved and denied.	Daniel Ramos / KCRHA Team	Before next meeting
Explore options for monthly data-sharing reports and potential automation of reporting.	Daniel Ramos / KCRHA Team	For future discussion
Provide an example CoC Annual Performance Report (APR) template and explanatory materials.	Daniel Ramos	Before next meeting
Explore developing or updating a dashboard to provide regular program-level performance information.	Daniel Ramos / KCRHA Team	For future discussion
Consider updates to the SPC Charter to align responsibilities with the SOP, including appeals, data sharing, and reporting responsibilities.	SPC / KCRHA	Future work plan; potentially January
Review the revised SOP and provide additional feedback before the approval vote.	SPC Members	Before next meeting
Schedule a formal vote to approve the revised HMIS SOP.	SPC	Next meeting or January

Incorporate committee feedback into the future policy review process and improve advance distribution of materials.	Daniel Ramos	Ongoing

The committee did not vote on the revised SOP. Daniel will distribute the updated draft and additional supporting information so members can review the proposed changes before a formal approval vote at the next SPC meeting.

Meeting Topic: Co-Chair Recruitment

The committee discussed the ongoing recruitment efforts for the System Performance Committee co-chair positions, noting that there are currently no co-chairs in place. Recruitment efforts are continuing, with a particular focus on identifying a representative from the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board to fill a co-chair position. Daniel Ramos noted that committee members attending the next CoC Board meeting may help identify or solicit potential candidates. Members were invited to share comments or suggestions regarding recruitment; however, no additional comments or updates were provided.

Results:

- No co-chair appointments or new recruitment updates were reported.
- Recruitment efforts will continue, with the goal of identifying an appropriate candidate from the CoC Board.

Next Steps:

- Continue soliciting potential co-chair candidates, particularly from the CoC Board.
- Leverage upcoming CoC Board meetings to identify interested and qualified individuals.
- Provide an update on recruitment progress at a future System Performance Committee meeting.

Meeting Topic: December 16 Meeting Discussion

The committee discussed whether to hold the regularly scheduled December 16 SPC meeting, recognizing that the holiday season may impact member availability and the ability to achieve quorum. Tamara Bauman recommended postponing the December meeting, as the committee has experienced challenges with quorum in the past, and suggested using the additional time to

reflect on priorities and prepare for the committee's 2027 work. She also encouraged consideration of opportunities to streamline committee operations, including potentially consolidating the Continuum of Care (CoC), System Performance Committee (SPC), and Coordinated Entry Committee (CEC) charters to reduce duplication and improve efficiency. Sherry Tillman supported postponing the meeting and reconvening after the holidays.

Results: Tamara Bauman made a motion to postpone the December SPC meeting until the regularly scheduled meeting, **January 20, 2027.** Ben Vaagen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, with no opposition.

Next Steps: The December 16 meeting will be canceled, and the committee will reconvene in January. Members will have additional time to consider priorities for the 2027 work plan and potential opportunities to streamline committee structures and governance documents.

Next Regular Meeting

January 20, 2027; 2:00 – 4:00 pm PT