Reimagine CE Workgroup Meeting Notes – 3/8/24.

Agenda :
1. Welcome

2. Workgroup Timeline

3. PSH and RRH Prioritization Summary

4. Length of Homelessness

5. Chronic Homelessness Documentation

Attendees: Zach Stephen, Sarah Lim, Liz Duffie, Patrick Duffie, Chara Taylor, Alicia Spry, Allie Grant, Angela Jones, Jen Ripp, Jessica Oswald, Karen Andro, Maureen Quinlan, Rachel Litchman, Takisha Jordan, Brenda Konkel, Kristina Dux

Notes:

PSH and RRH Prioritization Summary :

At HSC Board Meeting this week (3/6/24) the PSH and RRH Prioritization was approved. Approved the 2-Tiered Approach. Changing to the 2-Tiered Approach terminology because the Prescreen and pre-assessment language was confusing for folks. 2-Tiered Approach going forward, the specific prioritization information is in the Reimagine CE Phase 2 slides.

Length of Homelessness:

Currently using VI-SPDAT score plus the number of years homeless (up to 3 years) to calculate the Dane CoC combined score. For example, someone with VI-SPDAT score 14 and 2.5 years of homelessness will get 16.5 points.

We are capturing the history of homelessness with a tier 1 assessment. (# of enrollments and length in homeless services).

The question becomes – Should we continue to use length of homelessness as a factor alongside the VI-SPDAT score for final prioritization? Or should we say, "We already looked at it in the tier 1 assessment so just use VI-SPDAT score going forward?" If so, how should we proceed?

Options:
A – Continue to consider length of homelessness along with VI-SPDAT score, using the self-reported answer to "approx. date this episode of homelessness started" (current method)
B – Continue to use length of homelessness at this stage, using the history of homelessness data from the tier 1 assessment.

C – Exclude the length of homelessness from further consideration as it was incorporated in the pre-assessment and solely use the VI-SPDAT score at this stage.

D – Use the tier 1 assessment history of homelessness data as a tie breaker for individuals with the same VI-SPDAT score.

- Several of these options use the tier 1 score, one or more of the history of homeless totals.

There's a want to move away from using option A because it is specifically not a good data point and tends to be fairly inaccurate, so Sarah suggested eliminating option A. No one in the group objects to eliminating option A from the group of options. Option A is eliminated by unanimous decision.

Talked a little bit about Predictive Risk Modeling and Patrick mentioned that we haven't actually done the risk modeling yet however a good start would be to begin using more third-party data like previously agreed.

Sarah explained that options B or D would count additional months homeless for folks who are utilizing multiple services within the same month such as using shelter, outreach, etc. in the same month. Having overlapping enrollments in the same months.

Patrick mentioned that looker will have some limitations as far as what we can do.

Liz brought up removing option C because if we solely use the VI-SPDAT score for prioritization, it will result in ties without any other tiebreaker. Suggested possibly using Tier 1 assessment score as the tiebreaker since we're already using that assessment and we would already have that information.

Chara does like removing option C but has concerns with a tiebreaker being too impactful. For example, would not want someone who scored a 15 to be brought up over someone who scored a 16 because of the potential tiebreaker bringing their score up that significantly.

Patrick mentioned that we want things to be simple for staff and for clients but doesn't necessarily mean that the reports need to be simple. The reporting and scoring process can be complicated if need be, as long as it doesn't break looker and remains easy for staff and participants to use.

Liz made a point that the current system does weight the tiebreaker as 3 points so there is certainly discomfort around that but the current process allows a 3 point jump for the tiebreaker. Liz is wondering if there's other information we think is important in our prioritization and not captured by the VI-SPDAT that needs to be captured and contribute to someone's overall score. If we don't end up weighting a tiebreaker more than 1 point, that's putting a lot of prioritization solely on the VI-SPDAT which we already agree is far from perfect.

Take up Liz's proposal to Eliminate Option C. No one in the group has any opposition to removing option C. Option C is removed.

Sarah mentions that we could certainly decide how we want to weight the prioritization and decide if we want that 50% of your score is from the VI-SPDAT and 50% of your score comes from the Tier 1 Assessment.

Liz mentions that Option B is assigning the tier 1 score or other hix of homelessness info a score worth between 2-20 points. Option D would be weighting the tier-1 score or other hx of homelessness info a score of 1 (to tie-break)

Patrick mentions lots of options around potential tie-breakers, doesn't think they need to be decided today.

Takisha brought up taking family size into account, families with children vs couples or singles.

Patrick does question whether or not we're too heavily relying on the tier 1 assessment because if we end up weighting it 50% and the VI-SPDAT 50% then perhaps we don't need the VI-SPDAT after all. There's some overall caution about being too confident in the Tier 1 assessments ability to correctly prioritize folks. Liz also has hesitation about too heavily weighting the Tier 1 assessment for prioritization when we're not sure what it looks like yet.

Maureen mentions that the tier 1 assessment is supposed to be for folks who would be benefiting from services and wondering why we would then go back and pull that information again. Maureen also brings up whether or not ties are common? They aren't currently common due to tie-breakers however would be if we didn't have any in place. But lots of folks have the same VI-SPDAT scores.

Angie asked what is needed in the new assessment to have it replace the SPDAT if we don't like the SPDAT?

Liz mentions that we're looking to move away from self-report data and more towards third party data. The idea being that self-reported information will vary wildly depending on how the question is asked and who is asking the question. Third party data also benefits us because we're not having to ask more invasive questions to folks. We think a good replacement for the VI-SPDAT would require data sources that we just don't currently have access to. The current plan is to pair down the amount of folks who need to complete the VI-SPDAT without excluding folks who would normally be prioritized. Haven't figured out what the new VI-SPDAT replacement will look like yet.

Brenda asked about tiebreaker for option B. Not currently a tiebreaker for that option, thought being that Tier 1 assessment has an even bigger point range.

Zach mentioned that option B will give us more flexibility and that it feels weird to use a more data driven approach but then essentially use the VI-SPDAT specifically for PSH prioritization. Like the idea that option B allows us to give additional weight to Tier 1 assessment for priotization.

Patrick brings up the fact that Tier 1 assessment is largely based on homelessness and that PSH folks have a wide range of vulnerabilities that may not be captured in the tier 1 assessment. The VI-SPDAT does ask some questions about overall experience and does attempt to get at those vulnerabilities.

Group Voted to go with option B.

What to Consider in Tier 1 Assessment?

Options are 1) Use the whole tier 1 assessment score or 2) only use history of homelessness parts of it

Takisha asked if something like CCS would be captured. Liz mentioned that right now only enrollments in HMIS would be considered and since CCS isn't currently in HMIS that it would not be added at this time. Liz mentioned the hope would be in the future once that data is available it may be worth adding to prioritize people but at this time we cannot.

Patrick added that for PSH he believes we should use the entire Tier 1 score because we did come up with the Tier 1 assessment and asked those additional questions with some of this information in mind. As far as using it for RRH, it seems like we'd have a muddled message about where our priorities are. If we're looking to prioritize folks using shelter, perhaps we would not want to use history of homelessness because folks using shelter would only have the one enrollment but could have multiple outreach enrollments, etc.

Liz asked where the discussion had gone around assigning bonus points for shelter utilization and it was mentioned that further consideration would be given to those utilizing shelter however that specific point hasn't been fully fleshed out yet.

Liz likes a scenario where two people who otherwise have the same spdat score, extra point would be given to the person who is actively utilizing shelter.

Sarah mentioned for PSH using Tier 1 Assessment Score. For RRH using

Voting :

For PSH Prioritization – VI-SPDAT score plus Adjusted/Prorated Tier 1 Assessment Score

Vote passes, everyone can live with it. At next meeting we'll pick up and decide how many points that is.

Next Meeting :

RRH Prioritization

Implementation Plan Phase

Timeline Discussion