Reimagine CE 10-16-24 Meeting Notes

Today is our 9th Phase 3 Meeting.

Topics :

Recap of Last Meeting :
1 – Transfer Process

2 – Backup Plan for Tier 2 List

3 – Transition Plan Build the RRH and PSH lists from scratch.

Topics :

Topic #1 – RRH History of Homelessness Lookback Period

Current scoring is :
1 – New Enrollment questions
2 – History of Homeless – utilization in past 12 months per HMIS

3 – New to homeless but unable to self-resolve – in 6th month of homelessness.

There is a contradiction between the goals of components 2& 3.

The proposal is to Change the service utilization lookback period to 6 months (180 days) for component #2 instead of using the previous 12 months.

Question : After the 6 month period do folks no longer qualify for RRH and instead qualify for PSH?

Answer : The thinking is that we are trying to catch folks earlier in their homelessness in order to get them into RRH to use a short term early intervention which RRH is. People who will have been homeless for longer that that 6 month period will not receive additional points and therefore would be lower on the list.

(Martha's Rules) Voting For Proposal as is : No one was uncertain or uncomfortable with proposal. Proposal passes.

Topic #2 : Evaluation (Quantitative Review)

1 – New CE Questions Analysis. Analyze responses to new CE questions by race/ethnicity, age, and gender. Need to think about some benchmarks, what would be statistically relevant.

2 – CE Referral and Housing Placement. Identify demographics of individuals referred to RRH and PSH and successfully housed through CE.

3 – Tier 1 & 2 Insights : Does method of calculating number of Tier 2 assessments needed produce enough households for housing openings?

4 – Time between referral and move-in for RRH : With RRH changes, is the time between referral and move-in shortened?

Discussion : Do the proposed measures above make sense? What other measures should be included?

For #2 – Should we also include "Who completes Tier 2 assessments?" just in case we have folks who don't complete them, we may have a very specific population that is completing them at a higher rate. That would be good evaluate in order to readjust.

If we prioritize folks using the shelter/family shelter, then they will move out faster and then that should hopefully make the flow of the shelter waitlist go faster.

Will be interested to see how the LIHTC units play into the flow of Coordinated Entry, knowing that they want to prioritize folks on the RRH portion of the list and that they will want a bigger pool of applicants. Knowing that there's more LIHTC units out there than CoC units, will that skew data?

Should we add Other Permanent Housing programs/projects if they are taking from Coordinated Entry?

May be difficult to evaluate things knowing that not all OPH programs enter into HMIS so some of that data will got lost, we won't necessarily know who got housed if it's not entered into HMIS.

Evaluation (Qualitative Review)

1 – Feedback from Households

2 – Staff Perspectives

3 – Community Stakeholders

Discussion : What Questions should be included in the interview/focus groups? (We will also review other community examples and draft a questionnaire.)

Discussion around making sure to add RRH staff and PSH staff from housing programs into those staff perspectives because they are the ones receiving referrals from Coordinated Entry in order to house folks within their programs.

Question around Community Stakeholders and whether or not that would include landlords and if we would include landlord engagement, etc.

Evaluation (Logistics)

Evaluation Schedule

Ongoing monitoring – quarterly?

Follow up evaluation – gets reported to HSC board.

6 months after implementation

Implementation and Evaluation Entity

Re-CE Implementation Team – What responsibilities? Who?
Re-CE Evaluation Team – What responsibilities? Who?

Should Implementation Team be separate from the Evaluation Team or should it be the same?
Idea for now I to keep teams separate as long as there’s two different sets of people.