Reimagine CE Workgroup Phase 2
September 22ⁿᵈ, 2023.

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Reimagine CE Workgroup Goal
3. Additional Data Points
   a. Review of To-Do's identified at last meeting. Recap slides available.
   b. After reviewing that data we asked what else do we need to look at before we get into discussion?
   c. Last pieces of data review are Length of time at emergency shelters and VI-SPDAT score average. Data we want but may not be able to get are # of people who complete VI-SPDAT assessment but have no successful CE follow up contact. Other data source availability and feasibility. UW Institute for Research on Poverty can be contacted if we're interested in that data (would be historical not real-time data). Dane County members attending the meeting will let us know more about that information as well as what's available.
4. Length of Time at Emergency Shelters –
   a. Families may have trouble resolving within 1-7 days because of the shelter waitlist.
   b. 27% of Singles actually did stay between 1-7 days in emergency shelter from 9/1/22 to 8/31/23.
5. Dane CoC Average VI-SPDAT Scores –
   a. All Households the average score was 8.54. White households scored higher at 9.13. Black Households scored lower at 8.01. This would confirm the thinking that the VI-SPDAT scores are skewed, and that people of color tend to score lower on the VI-SPDAT.
6. Defining the Objectives for Change
7. Other Community Examples
   a. Austin/Travis County
      i. Started with the VI-SPDAT. Developed and tested new prioritization questions that spoke specifically to members of marginalized groups in Austin. Added questions considering where people were born, zip codes, previously having been in foster care, having spent time incarcerated, and what grade level of education you've completed.
   b. Pittsburgh/Allegheny County
      i. Saw flaws in the VI-SPDAT that it was not locally validated by any research. They wanted to know if they were allocating PSH resources to the right people meaning 1) people who will experience harm from unstable housing or 2) risk of chronic homelessness in the future. They found that the VI-SPDAT was a poor predictor in their county. They use Predictive Risk Modeling (PRM) and found it was better at predicting those vulnerabilities than the VI-SPDAT.
   c. State of Utah

       i. Also using Predictive Risk Modeling, however, doesn't have a data warehouse available to them. They're using the VI-SPDAT and HMIS data. Asking similar questions about whether or not they're allocating housing resources to the right people. Developing a system which would predict who will become chronically homeless. Utah is still using the VI-SPDAT however they changed the weights of the VI-SPDAT. The questions remain the same, however the answers have been weighted differently based on their objectives.

    d. Metro Denver

       i. Looked at prioritizing households more at risk of becoming homeless or having more difficulties in obtaining and maintaining housing. They stopped using the VI-SPDAT and built a new assessment from scratch. They gathered information from providers about what made households more at risk. Tested 30 different ways to do prioritization. Narrowed it down to two ways to do prioritization and they chose one of those two.

8. Discussion

    a. Poll: What should be the Dane CoC's primary objective for changing the CE Prioritization system?

Initial Poll Results:

Pre-Discussion Survey: Primary Objective

Poll | 1 question | 17 of 19 (89%) participated

1. What should be the Dane CoC's primary objective for changing the CE prioritization system? Please select your top choice from the following options. (Multiple Choice) *

17/17 (100%) answered

Enhance Equity in Assessment: Create a system where th... (7/17) 41%

Reduce Harm from Homelessness: Prioritize individuals l... (6/17) 35%

Prevent Chronic Homelessness: Prioritize those at risk of... (2/17) 12%

Address Housing Barriers: Prioritize those likely to face ... (4/17) 24%

Enhanced Equity Discussion:

1 – Discussion around the importance of who is giving the assessment and that a standardized assessment given by white case managers may continue to disadvantage people of color and lead to lower scores.

2 – Looking at the demographics is something we need to do regardless of what option we pick. Remember that depending on what option is picked we have to realize that it very well may affect the population of who gets PSH. Example, if we decided to focus on unsheltered homelessness our population of unsheltered homeless skew very white so if we specifically chose to focus on unsheltered homelessness then the housing referrals would skew white because of that.

3 – Discussion around what we mean when we say equity and there's not a strict standard definition of what equity is when we talk about it. It may mean different things to different people and needs to be considered when we're talking about it.

4- Talk around WHEN to complete an assessment. Some people felt completing an assessment with someone immediately was not helpful. That a large population of people of color are disenfranchised by our system and our assessments. Specifically, that people of color make up a very small population of our County but make up a majority of its homeless folks.

5 – Discussion around what equity looks like through the CE lens. Is it trying to achieve the same ratio of population of folks experiencing homeless and having those mirror housing placements? Is it trying to match populations of folks in dane county versus housing placements? What does it look like?

Reduce Harm From Homelessness Discussion:

1 – Think this is what we currently try to do but don't do a very good job of it. Pittsburgh's tool attempted to do this and was also able to address some equity concerns as well so by going with this approach it seems they were also able to fix other issues within the system.

2 – Some thought about it feels hard to pick one objective because they all feel so connected, however by choosing one objective we can think about how to more directly impact that one specific objective.

3 – Some people struggled to conceptualize what this meant exactly. Questions around the harm being cumulative with being homeless and may need to be unpacked a little more to see at how we would actually measure this. Thoughts that the VI-SPDAT is also trying to measure harm but we've established that it doesn't necessarily do a good job of getting at what we want CE to look like.

4 – Acknowledgement that there's not a perfect system that exists that could measure all the cumulative harm that an individual may or may not experience.

5- Considering High Utilization of emergency services, etc and that this would be an easily measurable outcome that could be found. We know that who is utilizing services may also be skewed as well.

6 – The idea of the VI-SPDAT does attempt to get as some good things and that it does measure harm but we agree that the way it asks is a problem. Problems with who the interviewer is, what questions are asked, bias, etc.

Address Housing Barriers :

1 – Some felt that this option most encompassed the things we've been talking about and discussing the most through this discussion.
2 – Housing provider spoke about housing individuals as a PSH provider and that each person has complex issues and that our system needs to anticipate and recognize those needs better. To what degree are people being placed into programs ready for being housed. A dimension of the conversation that is often missing is what happens to folks when they are placed into housing and then continue to struggle. Do we need to be looking at those negative experiences and see what is impacting those experiences as well.
3 – People felt the objective was to make homelessness brief, rare, and non-recurring so for them prioritizing barriers to get in and maintain housing seemed most relevant.

Prevent Chronic Homelessness :

1 – Some felt that this is really hard to define and that ideally we would be able to prevent chronic homelessness but that it is difficult with limited resources in our community.
2 – Some folks felt that some of this would also be alleviated by other objectives as well, as mentioned not all options are mutually exclusive.

Will Complete the Post-Discussion Poll and decide on an objective next meeting.

Post Discussion Poll :

Post-Discussion Survey: Primary Objective

1. What should be the Dane CoC's primary objective for changing the CE prioritization system? Please select your top choice from the following options. (Multiple Choice) *

Enhance Equity in Assessment: Create a system where the dem...   13%

Reduce Harm from Homelessness: Prioritize individuals likely t...   38%

Prevent Chronic Homelessness: Prioritize those at risk of longer...   6%

Address Housing Barriers: Prioritize those likely to face barrier...   31%

Focus on utilization of services   6%

Simply the CE process for the purpose of freeing up staff and ...   19%

Your answer: Focus on utilization of services

Close

Zach

To: Ev

Type me