

Reimagine Coordinated Entry Workgroup

Meeting Notes

May 12, 2023

Attendees: Torrie Kopp Mueller, Sarah Lim, Patrick Duffie, Zach Stephen, Alicia Spry, Maureen Quinlan, Tim Bogosh, Takisha Jordan, Karen Andro, Melissa Mennig, Kayla Every, Johneisha Prescott, Michael Moody, Jodie Haas, Kayla Every, Brad Hinkfuss, Rachel Litchman, Brenda Konkel, Jessica Oswald, Chara Taylor, Erin Kollenbroich, Liz Duffie, Jennifer Pryor, Francesca Atkinson, Butch Andreas, John Adams

Notes are from conversation had during meeting. Underlined words are slide titles and below is highlights of conversation had.

Action items are in *italics>*.

Single Youth (age 18-24) Days Homeless 2019-2022

- Can we look back further than 2019?
 - 2018 is the first in Stella, but we could go back to 2012. It won't be in the Stella format though.
 - Seems to make sense to go back to 2018.
- Need to ensure we are coming back to CE for the basis of what we are talking about. There is a lot to learn from the data, but how does it related to CE.
- What can we learn from COVID programs that lessened/eliminated disparities? Think about how we can implement those things going forward.
- Our justice system plays a major role with disparities.

Exits to Permanent Destinations – FY22

Exits: Singles

- Many people captured in this data are using the overnight shelters. People may leave in the morning and never come back. They may not tell the staff that they have found housing. This leaves a lot of unknown data.
- In unknown data not considered or does it show up as a negative?
 - Counts as negative exit.

Discussion: Exit to Permanent Destinations

1. Where are the greatest inequities showing up?
 - Would like to look at the 61% (Families) vs. 19% (singles)? What is causing this? Is it data, different resources, etc? Is it a funding issue? Requires more thinking on this.
 - *Should look at how many families and how many singles experienced homelessness, what % accessed CE.....could be a disparity there.....then look at housing placement?*
 - We do have information about who is enrolled in programs and whether or not they are connected to CE.

- Look at how long it takes for someone to be connected with CE? Difference in amount of case management offered at different shelters. Do we need less hours of CE staff at one shelter and more hours at another?
 - Some of this conversation seems to focus on funding allocations rather than prioritization for CE.
2. Are there disparate experiences for different demographic groups in terms of Exit to Permanent Destinations?
- Outside of CE there are reasons that impact the experiences of different groups.
 - How long someone is in shelter has little to do with CE, what matters is how much case management there is or housing resources available
 - This information presented has all permanent destinations wrapped into one. That would be interesting to see if people are going to permanent destinations through CE or another way. Did someone score into a program? What % are getting housing through CE vs. self-resolve? Some of this can be seen by looking closer at Stella.
 - Data quality is a barrier in some of this.
 - Need to look at how few are actually getting housing through CE.
 - There just is not enough resources in our system so most people will need to self-resolve.
 - The system creates barriers to connecting with resources. Have to jump through so many hoops.
 - The largest disparity is in who is coming into homeless services. We don't see as large of disparities within the system. Need to figure out how to make the system as easy to navigate as possible.
 - Is CE adding additional hoops for people to go through? We can't change the requirements for PSH and RRH through the CE process.
 - Landlords won't rent to people unless they have some type of guarantee to subsidy. People feel like they need to have a program to find housing.
 - Also depends on who the person's case manager is that can have a huge impact on outcomes. Not sure how you get around that. The criteria that property owners have is shifting to make it more challenging for the people we serve to get in.....especially around criminal backgrounds.
 - Is it more challenging or is it more prejudiced? Sometimes what property owners are doing is illegal.
 - CE could be creating barriers by using length of time homeless (criminal justice system) and disability (lack of access to healthcare).
 - This is hard because we are mandated to use LOT and disabling condition, but they also cause disparities. Change needs to come from the top.
 - I am hearing that the CE system needs to be fixed, but that doesn't change landlord expectations. You can change the system, but if landlords aren't changing their criteria does it matter. This feels like a legislative issue. We need legislators to step in to make landlords think differently and house people.
 - What can we do with CE that will help people.
 - There are things we can't change – HUD definition of chronic homelessness, the number of people who exit to CE projects (this doesn't change the number of units available), we

can change who is getting into the program which gives people a better chance of finding housing

- From the chat: There are definitely benefits to scoring into a PSH program or receiving a RRH subsidy (including tax credit units). It doesn't change the landlords requirements, but it makes the renter more appealing to have the support. So, we would want to make sure that the subsidies go to the people with the highest need - but those people have scoring barriers.
- In order to make recommendation for prioritization, need to look at who isn't being served. We need to work on making the system we have control over more equitable.
- Chat: don't people who are enrolled with a service provider who is also a landlord have an unfair advantage at getting housing quickly or do the service providers not rent to clients?
- We recognize that criminal background is a barrier, do we want to prioritize people based on criminal background? What equitable outcome are we looking for? What is the end goal? How do we know if we are successful?
- Chat: Random thought based on what Patrick was saying about how few people get housed through CE - I wish there was a pre-vispdat and only those who pass a certain threshold get the VISPDAT and opportunities for PSH and RRH - It would cut down on a bunch of work and trauma with the questions. And then the rest of the folks would focus on private market/other affordable housing solutions
- Chat: Another thought - Fair Chance housing programs are coming to hopefully help with housing for individuals with justice involvement
- Need to think about PSH/RRH prioritization differently as they are very different programs.
- We need to be more thoughtful about where people go. Feels like there are placements that don't make sense to me.
- Chat: Brenda, to your point - "pre-screening" could potentially just be based on info in HMIS so as to not actually do any assessment with anyone
- Chat: If someone scores a 5 on the VISPDAT, we need to tell them that they need to focus on other housing and not count on CE
- Need to look at who is asking the question to whom
- Chat: if there are disparities in spdat scores across groups, how do we know if that is about the questions vs. the administration of the tool vs. the person's situation (agree with John that administrative makes a huge difference)
- Chat: We also need a process to change VISPDAT scores if a case manager looks at the WISPDAT and after getting to know the person things they would answer differently
- I do that as well with the VISPDAT, always make sure they understand that they don't have to give any details, and that nothing they say will prevent them from getting housing.
- Worry when we talk about tiering and who decides which person gets access to a housing opportunity
- Chat: we need more supportive PSH
- Chat: I think more options and more ability to move between options is what we need

- Chat: yes it's tough for us with our programs when we get a higher scoring individual in an RRH program with not a lot of CM \$\$ available
- Chat: right, but that is not a problem of not placing them in housing - that we need housing that is well suited for more high-needs folks
- Chat: Yes, we need housing options that is better designed to different types of needs. Much of this we can predict with some accuracy.
- Worked with a household who we couldn't get their score higher, could tell they had high needs, LOT was low because they sometimes stayed in hotels and couldn't get a disability diagnosed so couldn't get the housing they need
- Chat: there are tons of people out there especially with the high inflation rates, high rent rates, and food insecurity
- Getting stuck on VI-SPDAT when it plays a small part. Should we give bonus points for being from a zip code or based on criminal background
- *I think we have seen disparities, but not sure CE is causing the disparity. Do we want to use CE to try to correct some of the outcomes that people experience? Are we working to make CE equitable or make systemic issues equitable?*
- Chat: I think we need to do that 2nd. first we need to understand what disparities do or do not exist in our current system
- Maybe need to look at all the issues and figure out which can be switched by CE
- Chat: agreed - we do need to understand where disparities exist, but we also need to decide which disparities are most important to us, which I guess requires identifying them first, and then, as Brenda is saying, identify whether it's something CE could potentially correct