Reimagine CE Workgroup
Phase I Recap
(Dec 2022- July 2023)



This meeting will be recorded.

This meeting/event will be recorded and will be posted on the HSC website.

By continuing to be in the meeting, you are consenting to being recorded and consenting to this record being released to public record requestors who may see you, your home and your family members in the recording. You have the option to turn off your camera and participate with audio only.

Agenda

- 1. What is Coordinated Entry (CE)?
- 2. Dane CoC's Current CE System
- 3. Why Reimagine CE Now?
- 4. Reimagine CE Workgroup Goal
- 5. Phase I Meeting Recap by Meeting Date
- 6. Phase I Data Review Highlights
- 7. Disparities Identified Families and Singles
- 8. Discussion Highlights on Prioritization
- 9. Phase II Meeting Plan
- 10. Key Discussion Points for Phase II

What is Coordinated Entry (CE)?

- Before the implementation of CE, referrals to housing programs were fragmented, requiring individuals experiencing homelessness to apply separately to each agency's program. Participant selection was left to the discretion of each agency, often seeking the right 'fit' for their program.
- CE is a **centralized or coordinated process** designed to coordinate program participant intake and assessment and provision of referrals within a defined area.
- There are four key components to CE: Access, Assessment, Prioritization and Referral.
- In many communities, homeless service housing resources are insufficient
 to assist all eligible households. CE prioritization enables housing and
 service providers to manage the high demand for limited housing resources
 based on the community- based standards instead of agency-specific
 policies.

Dane CoC's Current CE System

Don't dod't don't di dy'ttim				
	Access	Assessment	Prioritization	Referral
•	Emergency shelters Street Outreach	For households who have been literally homeless (residing in	 For RRH: non-chronically homeless by the highest score 	When openings become available at RRH, PSH, and other

- at unsheltered locations
- CE staff at the Beacon (call, walk-in, CE contact form on HSC website) and other strategic places
- emergency shelters or unsheltered locations) for 7 or more days
 - VI-SPDAT
 - Length of time homelessness (capped at 3 years)
- highest score, VI-SPDAT score plus years homeless (up to 3 years)
- PSH: chronically homeless by the highest score, VI-SPDAT score plus years homeless (up to 3 years)
- PH programs accepting participants through CE, the CE Manager uses HMIS to run the Single or Family Housing Priority List and refers the households ranked at the top of the list.

Why Reimagine CE Now?

- In Dane CoC, after implementing a CE system in 2016, referrals became coordinated, leading to people who were assessed to be highly vulnerable gaining access to housing programs. Like many CoCs nationwide, Dane CoC initially adopted VI-SPDAT as a prioritization tool.
- However, there has been local and national criticism of VI-SPDAT. Criticisms include:
 - Some questions are difficult to ask someone in a crisis because they are intrusive and potentially stigmatizing.
 - Some studies have suggested that racial disparities exist in VI-SPDAT scores, where whites tend to score higher than people of color.
- In response, HUD is encouraging CoCs to re-examine the CE process to align with local needs and priorities.
- 2020 Dane CoC CE evaluation recommended two key actions: 1) consensus building around prioritization strategies; 2) convene a conversation on race and equitable outcomes.

Reimagine CE Workgroup Goal

The Reimagine CE Workgroup is a workgroup of the HSC's Core Committee.

It has been charged with formulating recommendations for a revised approach to prioritize individuals and families for RRH and PSH openings. These recommendations are slated for presentation to the HSC Board of Directors by December 2023.

Phase I Meeting Recap by Meeting Date

- December 6: Overview of CE; Prioritization in Dane County;
 Workgroup goals
- January 13: Review of HUD rules; Review of VI-SPDAT
- **February 10**: HUD TA presentation on other community examples
- March 10: HUD TA meeting debrief; Dane CoC data highlights on race and ethnicity
- April 14: Outreach Plan; Dane CoC System Performance Data Review
 I (Days Homeless)
- May 12: Dane CoC System Performance Data Review II (Exit to PH, Return to Homeless)
- June 9: Dane CoC CE Specific Data Review

Phase I Data Review Highlights

- Racial Disparities in Dane County: In Dane County, a significant disparity in homelessness rates exists, particularly among people of color, especially Black households. Despite making up only 6% of the county's population and 8% of households in poverty, Black households accounted for 40% of individuals experiencing HUD category 1 literal homelessness (sheltered and unsheltered situations) and constituted 53% of CE enrollment.
- **Disparities within Dane CoC's Homeless Services System**: Upon reviewing the system performance outcomes CE specific data, the workgroup identified several areas where people of color experienced worse outcomes. (See the next slides.)
- Limited Impact of CE Housing Interventions: CE housing interventions had a relatively small impact on resolving homelessness episodes. In a one-year period, only 17% of referred families (41 out of 239) and 5% of referred singles (60 out of 1,172) who received CE assessments were able to secure housing through housing programs that accept referrals from Coordinated Entry.

Disparities Identified: Families

System Performance

- Black parenting youth experienced a longer period of homelessness.
- Black families had lower rate of exit to permanent destinations than White families.
- No substantial difference was observed in return to homelessness.

CE

- Latino families were less likely to be referred to PSH than white families*.
- Latino families were less likely to be housed through a PSH program than white families.
- Black families were less likely to be referred to RRH than white families.
- Black families were less likely to be housed through a RRH program than white families.

^{*}Latino and white families in the data are not mutually exclusive.

Disparities Identified: Singles

System Performance

- No substantial difference was observed in Days Homeless.
- No substantial difference was observed in Exits to Permanent Destinations.
- Black singles had a higher rate of returning to homelessness than White singles.
- Hispanic singles had a higher rate of returning to homelessness than non-Hispanic singles.
- Black single youth had a higher rate of returning to homelessness than White youth.

CE

- Black and Latino singles were less likely to be referred to PSH than white singles.
- Black and Latino singles were less likely to be housed through a PSH program than white singles.
- Black and Latino singles were less likely to be referred to RRH than white singles.
- No substantial differences were observed for singles in obtaining housing through RRH.

Discussion Highlights on Prioritization

- **Prioritizing Racial Equity:** While the new prioritization system won't end racism, we can take significant steps toward creating a more anti-racist homeless response system by placing a strong emphasis on racial equity.
- **Inclusive Decision-Making:** Ensuring that people with lived experience are actively engaged in the decision-making process is crucial. Their insights and perspectives are invaluable in shaping a more effective system.
- Enhancing User Experience: It's essential to consider how individuals experience the system. Engage with system users, and evaluate the process through a trauma-informed lens. Some questions in VI-SPDAT were overly intrusive, making people uncomfortable. We should be more thoughtful in developing questions to create a more respectful experience.
- **Continuous Improvement**: Recognize that the process itself is just as vital as the outcome, including the development of a new assessment tool. Regular review and adaptation are necessary to ensure the system remains responsive and effective.
- Tailoring Solutions Locally: One size doesn't fit all. Local decision-making is important to address unique community needs effectively.



Phase II Meeting Plan

- Goal: Develop recommendations by December, 2023.
- Meeting Schedule: Bi-monthly meetings on 2nd and 4th Fridays,
 10am-11:30am*. The next meeting is on Friday, September 8.
- An email with a <u>Google Survey Form</u> has been sent to assess your availability and commitment for Phase II meetings. If you cannot attend regularly, please recommend someone with similar expertise to participate in your place.

*The meeting schedule is subject to change. Please refer to calendar meeting invitations and emails.

Key Discussion Points for Phase II

Reimagining CE Prioritization:

- Define specific goals for the reimagined CE prioritization process.
- Identify indicators to measure the positive impact of the changes.
- Address observed disparities in the current system.

• Approach to Creating a New Assessment:

 Decide whether to make adjustments to the VI-SPDAT questionnaire or develop a new questionnaire from scratch

Data Sources:

 Consider whether to continue asking all questions directly to participants during CE assessments or utilize existing HMIS enrollment data and other third-party administrative sources to replace questionnaire data where possible.

Trauma-Informed Assessment:

Explore different approaches or modifications to make the assessment trauma-informed.

Pre-Screening:

 Consider whether to implement pre-screening to reduce the number of individuals undergoing a full assessment

Key Discussion Points for Phase II (cont.)

Timing of CE Assessment:

 Evaluate the timing of CE assessments, including whether to conduct assessments after seven days of homelessness or during a single enrollment session.

Length of Homelessness Data:

Consider adjustments to how length of homelessness data is utilized in prioritization.

PSH Enrollment Criteria:

 Revisit the criteria for referring individuals to Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) openings concerning chronic homeless documentation.

Special Considerations for Subpopulations:

• Determine if special considerations are needed for specific subpopulations (e.g., DV survivors, unsheltered individuals, youth, older adults, etc.).

Dynamic Prioritization:

 Discuss the potential for dynamic prioritization, starting with lower-intensity housing programs and re-evaluation for higher support levels.

• Implementation Approach:

Decide whether to make incremental changes over time or implement all changes at once.