

## Reimagine CE Workgroup Notes – July 14, 2023

Attendees: Sarah Lim, Torrie Kopp Mueller, Patrick Duffie, Karen Andro, MacKenzie Byer, Johnneisha Prescott, Melissa Mennig, Francesca Atkinson, Zach Stephen, Maureen Quinlan, Erin Kollenbroich, Takisha Jordan, Liz Duffie, Allie Grant, Brad Hinkfuss, Alicia Spry, Jodie Haas, Aurey Leslie, Rachel Litchman, CFC, Brenda Konkel, Michael Moody, John Adams, Jessica Oswald, Jen Ripp, Tim Bogosh, Kristina Dux

Review of slides.

Notes below are from discussions.

What are your takeaways from the Reimagine CE phase 1 meetings? What should we remember as we go into the next phase?

- Our system has some specific disparities that trend to worse outcomes for people of color. Do we add a question to help fix that disparity, but hard to know what the impact will be. More complicated than if we found a universal disparity.
- So few households get housing through CE process.
- Our system puts a lot of resources to CE even though not many people are housed that way. Is that a good use of resources?
- Thinking about trauma informed questions/processes.
- Can we whittle down the group that is prioritized for housing. May be able to identify those we can self-resolve, then do a more in-depth assessment for those who may be able to get an intervention.
  - Consider what waitlists people are on for other housing opportunities such as subsidized housing
- We currently refer everyone to complete the VI-SDPAT even though they may never get housing
- YHDP conversation around CE has a similar process where folks have a phase 1 type of assessment
- Seems like too much reliance on CE. Do we need to work on other options? We can make changes to the system, but won't make a difference in the number of people who get housed. Do we focus on interventions for people who will not be served through CE?
- We don't want to lose objective tools/policies as disparities improved when we moved to more objective processes
- System performance includes people who resolve on their own, CE data looks at the people who get housed through programs that use the list
- Would be helpful to see what other communities have done to change CE process
- Even if we successful in creating an equitable system, we still aren't serving many people through CE. Is the issue more about capacity? Is the same issue that we are reading about in large communities, that there is a large need but finite resources? Need to determine what we should be advocating for.
- Chat: Yes. We don't have enough units. Obviously Seattle is a much bigger community. However, the agency I used to work for there has been opening a new building with approximately 150 units of PSH each year for the last several years.

- Capacity is an issue both in the number of units and nonprofits to provide the services and hire/retain people
- A lot of housing is being built here and some affordable, but not many units that are truly affordable, not many units that are truly PSH, tools that we have to build affordable housing are inadequate
- We do have PSH and RRH in our community and do need to focus on the task at hand which is who do we prioritize for these units.
- Do we assess less people.....focusing on those who will get a housing intervention? Maybe we assess everyone, but different interventions based on outcome of assessment?
- Communities of color are scoring lower so need to determine what the assessment tool will be
- *Did we ever look at specific questions and how different races score on those questions?* No, can be done, but don't have the resources to do this right now. Something to consider if we decide to use the VI-SPDAT as a starting point.
- Can we find proxy data that doesn't require an interview to determine who the less vulnerable people are? Identify a different process for who completes the full assessment.
- Chat: I wish we had access to cross system utilization data
- Chat: I hope the intrusive questions get resolved
- There are already informal things happening around who is connected to CE. About a 1/3 of people in men's shelter is connected. Could be due to staff resources, people not wanting to connect, having another resource, etc?
  - Chat: I think we need to identify that informal process and put it in writing and all do it the same.
- Property owners are determining who gets housed. There are many factors to who gets a resolution through CE.
- Returns to homelessness are probably based on treatment from property owners.....there is bias that happens there.
- Chat: Very true Melissa. We are really struggling with getting families approved for housing in scattered site programs right now. 2022 and 2023 housing search is taking so long and having some exits where folks are enrolled but then don't find housing for 5 months
- Are there measures we can pick that will impact CE outcomes?

### Next Steps

What other topics should be covered in Phase 2?

- Reviewed slide of topics to discuss in phase 2
- In the chat, comments about liking dynamic prioritization and wanting to have a simple assessment
- Chat: Implement The Changes That's Causing The Prevention
- Prioritization for DV survivors – those meeting Category 4 definition
- **Are there subpopulations we should have special considerations for (e.g. DV, unsheltered, youth and young adults, older adults, etc.)?**

- People who are in and out of jail frequently. Many people in the top 50 who may have chronic documentation in place, but find themselves in jail.
  - Chat: If they are housed it will definitely cut down on the in and out of custody issue!
  - . . . criminalization of homelessness!
- E-mail Sarah if you think of other important questions: [slim@cityofmadison.com](mailto:slim@cityofmadison.com).

#### Future meeting logistics

- Proposal to have meeting twice a month for 1 ½ hours.
- There is a lot going on in our community right now. Is it realistic to increase the number of meetings?