**Reimagine CE Workgroup Meeting Minutes – 10/27/23**

## 1. Indicators of Success

The prep team has reviewed the last meeting discussion and prepared updated indicators. We will discuss and finalize them.

- Most referrals to PSH and RRH are drawn from the top ____ percentile of the housing priority list.
- The number of households who are on the CE housing priority list and receive follow-ups but do not get referred to permanent housing programs is reduced.
- The percentage of people placed on the CE housing priority list reflects the racial and ethnic composition of the households eligible for permanent housing programs.
- The percentage of referrals to permanent housing for specific racial and ethnic groups is not significantly different from their representation among households placed on the CE housing priority list.

Discussion on Proposed Updates:

Liz asked would we feel comfortable if the percentage of specific racial and ethnic group referrals overall weren't significantly different among households eligible for CE, but they WERE significantly different for either RRH or PSH.

Do we leave the last point as it is, or do we break it up by specific housing intervention (RRH and PSH)?

Indicator of Success #1 Discussion - For the first point – discussion around whether or not we need to put a specific percentile number on it? Sarah mentioned the idea around that proposal was to make it a measurable indicator of success. Patrick mentioned that this specific piece tends to have more to do with folks who are completing documentation for clients and less about the housing providers themselves. Brad brought up the idea to remove "Most" from the indicator of success specifically if we're hoping to make it measurable, the worst most remains too fungible.

General agreement around the 1st point on taking out the word "Most" and coming up with the specific percentile amount of those taken from the top of the housing priority list.

Indicator of Success #2 – Doesn't exist yet.

Indicator of Success #3 Discussion (# of households who are on CE list who receive follow-ups, etc)

Sarah mentioned we could lower the amount of people we're completing the entire CE assessment for, especially if we believe those people are highly unlikely to receive a housing intervention from CE.

Brad thought it could be problematic to reduce the number of people who get referred to the list. But wasn't sure if was limited to the very scope of CE or not, Chara confirmed that it would be limited to the scope of CE.

Maureen asked about the follow-ups and Zach mentioned that right now lots of staff time is being used on completing follow-ups with folks who may be very unlikely to ever have a housing intervention through CE.

Melissa and Liz both mentioned that it will likely depend on the assessment we choose – because if we decide to pull our assessment strictly from data that we may be missing some folks if we choose to pull data a specific way.

Indicator of Success #4 Discussion (Race/Ethnicity)

No objections.

**Working Draft for Indicators of Success**

- **___ percentage of the referrals to PSH and RRH are drawn from the top ___ percentile of the housing priority list.**
- **The number of households who are on the CE housing priority list and receive follow-ups but do not get referred to permanent housing programs is reduced.**
- **The percentage of people placed on the CE housing priority list reflects the racial and ethnic composition of the households eligible for permanent housing programs.**
- **The percentage of referrals to permanent housing for specific racial and ethnic groups is not significantly different from their representation among households placed on the CE housing priority list.**

## 2. Data Sources for Assessment : Self-Report or 3rd Party Data Discussion

Liz explained the pilot project currently being worked on based around services you might use because your needs are not being met. Goal to identify who these folks are – in order to see what their characteristics look like and to work towards helping some of those individual people on the list. Currently have a 6 month window of utilization data from the first half of 2023.

Case Examples –

Pro/Con Discussion – How do these systems account for accessibility to these services?

Liz mentioned that as far as the data points that were chosen are specifically involuntary services that go towards the idea of if a crisis has risen to the level of involuntary services being needed that would be related to significant harm.

Should we rely on Self Report or 3rd Party Data and Why?

The demographics of those utilizing these services may be one-sided. There could be people who are certainly avoidant of using services.

Rachel mentioned that she worries there could be huge demographic disparities between who is and is not using services and that data could be one sided towards those demographics.

Chara mentioned for her that is the point because you're hopefully capturing those people who may historically not have been interested in using services. If we see they're using involuntary services but not other services. Rachel mentioned there could be a huge racial disparity there. Liz mentioned that if we continue to value proportionality and weight questions that would result in equitable outcomes that we could do the same using 3rd party data sources. Liz does mention that data is limited but it is accurate and it can be pulled without needing to retraumatize the person.

Brenda asked a question about how client choice factors into all of this if we go towards a 3rd party data option? Patrick added that often times there would be a release of information that facilitates the data sharing agreement, so a client could decline to participate in services at that time. Patrick mentions that a lot of these details are yet to be ironed out but that it would have to be considered. Sarah mentioned that for Allegheny county she believes there is a point where you get someone's consent to put them on the list in order to receive a score and you could do client choice/consent at that point but that she will follow up and find out.

Patrick states that we could also phrase it as existing data versus 3rd party data. Patrick reminds people that we already have a lot of data in HMIS that we could also use as a data source such as length of time homeless, etc. Liz asked if that data was based on self-reports and Patrick clarified that you could measure it in ways that were not reliant on self-reports such as shelter stays, etc.

Jessica had a question about shelter stays specifically around like DAIS shelter where that information would need to be confirmed or self-reported due to confidentiality concerns.

Patrick mentions that we would never have access to DAIS shelter information so Jessica is correct in that but that their could be an approach that accounts for that. Mentioned that Allegheny county did not prioritize survivors because they did have a specific set of housing programs set aside specifically for survivors so they felt okay in not addressing that in their assessment.


Next Step would be to vote on Self Report or 3rd Party Data

Poll Results – 5 Voted for Self-Report, 13 voted for 3rd Party Data


Pick up discussion in two weeks on November 10th.