



September 7, 2021 (5:30 - 7:30 PM)

Microsoft Teams

BOARD MINUTES

Board Members:

Brendan Clark, Carla Respects Nothing, Elissa Hardy, John Feeney-Coyle, Jennifer Biess, Kelli Barker, Michael Malloy

MDHI Staff:

Kyla Moe, Jamie Rife, Julie Winkowski, Layla Said, Rebecca Mayer, Sierra Trujillo

Guests

Bill Charney, Tom Keyse

ADMINISTRATIVE

Each member of the group introduced themselves to Bill Charney, MDHI's Policy Governance Consultant. Mike told the group that we could be entering executive session, so that we might have to cut the meeting short.

Brendan started by reading the Land and Cultural Acknowledgement:

We acknowledge that our country was built on the territories of indigenous people on Cheyenne and Arapaho land, who are the original Stewards of this area. We also acknowledge all other Indigenous Tribes and Nations who call Colorado home, which include Apache, Shoshone, Ute, Pueblo, Pawnee, Comanche, Kiowa, Zuni, and Navajo/Dine. 48 Tribes have called this land home. It is also important to recognize that U.S. public policy has been used to displace Indigenous communities, erode Tribal Nation sovereignty, and forcibly assimilate Native individuals into U.S. society.

Not only was our country founded on stolen land, but also built by stolen people. We acknowledge the traumatic events of American Slavery and the harmful impact lasting stereotypes have had on Black American citizens, including racially charged violence, mass incarceration, and de facto segregation efforts.

We acknowledge that we are currently living in a global pandemic that has drastically changed our way of life. Impacting job security, access to basic needs, and alarming health disparities. Our condolences for anyone who has suffered a loss during this pandemic.

We share these acknowledgements to encourage all of us here to consider how our work in this space and in our daily lives can address these historic and contemporary atrocities perpetuated against marginalized communities. We invite everyone in this space to recognize their ancestors and the forces of history that brought you here, as well as the work you are engaged in to support collective liberation and the liberation of future generations.

CONSENT AGENDA

Michael asked if we could have a motion to approve the consent agenda.

Vote - John motioned to approve the consent agenda, Elissa seconded the motion, All in Favor

REPORT-OUT REMINDER

Mike reminded each committee to be prepared to report next month on who they've recruited for the Board. He said he is happy to say Jenna and John have brought in a few candidates and have scheduled interviews with them. John added that Jenna has set up interviews with 4 or 5 candidates over the next 2 weeks. At our next Governance meeting, the hope is that the committee will have recommendations for new Board members. The new Board members will start their term in January, but our hope is that they can attend the Board retreat in November.

Jennifer asked if there are any particular gaps that we are trying to fill right now so we can think about who we want to bring to our committee meetings. John said there aren't particular gaps; however, we have had a few conversations about diversity of profession, as well as diversity of racial, ethnic, and gender communities. He said certainly recruiting people of color and people from the LGBTQ community should be a priority. We aren't in a position to need anyone with a specific set of skills, such as a finance or accounting background. We also want candidates to be representative of geographic diversity, outside of Denver.

NOFA (Rebecca & Kyla)

Since we last met, the 2021 NOFA has come out. We will be submitting on or before November 16th. We will be very immersed in this process the next several weeks. The committee has met a couple of times in preparation for the NOFA coming out. This meeting, we are asking the Board to approve the Renewal Score Tool, as well as the New Project Scoring Tool. We wanted to review these today and talk about changes from 2 years ago. If people remember, HUD just funded our renewal projects last year and didn't accept new projects because of COVID-19. There are a couple of minor changes that have been recommended by our NOFA committee. We also made some edits to the process document based on the committee's recommendations as well. All changes are detailed in the memo (see board packet).

Rebecca started with the Policy document. We are pulling the scores on the annual performance report from a portal called SAGE. As we have new projects that don't have a full year of data, we thought we had to do something differently for those projects. The committee recommends that since we do not have a full year of data for these projects, to treat them like first year projects for the purpose of ranking. There was a project that transitioned from RRH to PSH. As we were going through the pre-NOFA process, HUD wasn't sure how they wanted us to report on that. There has been a lot of back and fourth about what to do with that program, but as we discussed further, it seems that it is really a new program. So the committee agreed that we treat transition year programs as new programs.

One good thing that came out of this year's NOFA is that we are getting enough funding to fully fund all of our renewal projects with Tier 1 dollars. We often have to put renewal projects in Tier 2 where they aren't safely funded, so this feels like a really good change for us. It takes a lot of pressure off to not have to defund renewal projects that are performing well. We included the document in the packet. Rebecca opened it up for questions from the group or comments from Kyla.

John asked if the programs that don't have a full year of data won't be ranked but will be in Tier 1? What impact does this have on their Tier status for next year? Rebecca said no, the following year they would be treated like everyone else since they have a full year of data.

Michael asked if we could have a vote to approve the policy for New Projects.

Vote – All in favor

Kyla shared her screen to do an overview of the renewal application. She said these metrics are similar to the NOFA process in previous years. The metrics are pulled from a SAGE APR. These are some of the metrics on how we are ranked as a CoC for HUD funding. The main categories: housing retention rates, percent of clients that exit to homelessness, housing utilization results, percentage of adults who increased income, percentage of adults who increased non-earned income, percentage of adults who increased non-cash benefits, data quality score, data timeliness, OneHome

participation, housing first, and grant expenditures. Rebecca added that we are also asking applicants to complete a racial equity assessment. Sierra added that we are going to share MDHI's internal DEI process with the grantees so that we can model how we are doing the exact same thing. We will also be sharing our assessment to model as well. Sierra will serve as support for the grantees as they go through this process. Rebecca added that the tone of the NOFA is great this year. HUD is again emphasizing the importance of racial equity.

John asked for the rationale for the expenditure changes. Rebecca said last year we had folks that had multi-million dollar grants that didn't spend a few thousand dollars. The committee felt it seemed punitive to take points away for that, so they lowered the expenditure amount to 95% to be more realistic.

Kelli asked if the housing first question was qualitative or quantitative. Kyla said the application in e-snaps has a question about housing first and this metric is based off of that question. Elissa asked what they are looking for in the housing first piece. Rebecca said they are using the same assessment that HUD is using.

Michael asked if we could have a vote to approve the Renewal Scoring Tool.

Vote – All in favor

Kyla shared the New Project Scoring Tool. The categories it looks at are experience, design of housing and supportive services, timeliness, and budget. Rebecca added that after the scoring has been completed, the Board will receive the final score and ranking for approval in October. She also added that 5 points were removed from the scoring sheet for pledging to use Coordinated Entry, since it's a requirement and was added to the threshold score.

Brendan said that the questions for the New Projects seem more subjective. He asked if there was underlying criteria that the scorers use when reviewing new projects. Is this designed in a way that can be scored objectively? Rebecca said the HUD application is largely narrative, and we also use that information to compare applications. We certainly don't want to be in a position where the best grant writer wins. The committee does preliminary scoring and then meets together. They share notes and bring up what they noticed as strengths and concerns, so we have a good rationale behind every decision.

Kelli asked if new projects are always in Tier 2. How could a new project score higher than a renewal? Rebecca said that wouldn't happen unless there is a renewal project that isn't performing or if we are reallocating because they did not spend down. We don't want to defund a renewal project that is performing well for a new project, because then we aren't improving the housing continuum. Kelli asked if new was always at the bottom of Tier 2? Rebecca said yes, we won't have enough funding to put our new projects in Tier 1. Kyla added that new projects are always ranked below renewals, even in Tier 2.

Michael asked if we could have a vote to approve the New Scoring Tool.

Vote – All in favor

ESG SIGNATORY AUTHORITY

Elissa read the following motion: I move that the MDHI Board of Directors names Rebecca Mayer as the person with full signatory authority in regard to all contracts and corresponding documents associated with agreements entered into by Metro Denver Homeless Initiative and the Colorado Division of Housing. Furthermore, this statement certifies and hereafter delegates Rebecca Mayer Interim Executive Director, an agent of Metro Denver Homeless Initiative for the purpose of authorizing and signing: Payment Requests, Quarterly Financial Status Reports, Quarterly Project Performance Reports, and Monitoring Documents.

Vote – Elissa motioned to approve the Signatory Authority, Mike seconded, All in favor

AUDIT UPDATE (Brendan)

Brendan said that recently an independent auditor conducted an audit for MDHI (2018 and 2019). It is in the Board Packet to read in detail. This is the first single year audit that was performed for MDHI. The summary of findings is in the Board Packet as well. The auditors said there were no suggested changes to the MDHI financials. They did not identify any issues in internal controls. There were no issues found with our major programs or our compliance for these programs. He said he doesn't really need to go in more detail than that. He told the group to reach out to him or Julie if they had any questions. He said we can move along unless anyone has any questions.

POLICY GOVERNANCE UPDATE (Bill Charney)

Bill Charney began his presentation on Policy Governance. He introduced himself and Tom Keyse. He added that Charney and Associates has worked with over 150 organizations, 95% nonprofits, to do the reorganizing policy governance work they are about to do with MDHI. By the end of their work, Bill expects the Board to have a clearer and more unified understanding of MDHI's mission, the Board's collective and individual responsibility, the parameters of authority between the Staff and the Board, ED performance evaluation criteria and monitoring systems, Board officer and committee job descriptions, updated bylaws, and systems to provide appropriate levels of assurance about internal operations without needing to engage with them.

Bill then reviewed the timeline for getting there. It begins with interviews with the ED and Board Chair (July/August). The Board will then complete an online Board Assessment of Structural Effectiveness (BASE) Survey in late September/early October. Charney Associates (CA) will then review survey responses and Board documents and prepare customized policy discussion templates for the November 5-6 retreat in mid-late October. At the initial on-site meeting during November 5-6, they will start with a review and discussion of the BASE Survey responses and more in-depth policy discussions. The second part of the meeting will facilitate the development of governing policies addressing Board Processes, Management Parameters, and Board-Management Delegation. CA will then prepare suggested revisions to the Bylaws in mid-late November. The date of the second on-site meeting will be determined once there is a new ED in place. At this meeting, the group reviews draft Bylaws and an initial draft of governing policies. They also engage in a Purpose and Vision Expander workshop, which is a highly interactive brainstorming session. After this, they will prepare the final wrap-up package for the Board within 2 weeks of the second on-site meeting. For 6 months after the last meeting, Bill and Tom will be available as tech support to assist with any remaining questions and general operations.

Jennifer added that our Board wears 2 hats: the MDHI CoC hat and the MDHI nonprofit hat. She asked what their experience CA has working with organizations like ours. Bill responded that he has not worked directly with a CoC like MDHI, but he has worked with parallel nonprofits that serve as the pass-through funder for other agencies. Tom added that he has been provided with the CoC Governance Charter and will combine that with the Bylaws in their analysis. Brendan asked about the Survey. Bill added that they are aiming to conduct the Survey during the last week of September. It is a 20-25 minute survey with about a 10-12 day completion window. Elissa said she didn't have any questions and she is still processing everything. She thanked everyone for pulling this all together. She thinks the timing for this is perfect as we look for a new ED and she looks forward to this work.

Mike encouraged everyone to review the contract again before we really get into this work.

Executive Session

The group moved into Executive Session. The executive hiring committee has narrowed down the job description and needs to finalize a few details.