



Reimagine CE Workgroup Phase II #5

November 10, 2023



Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Reimagine CE Workgroup Goal
3. Last Meeting Recap
4. Clarification regarding 3rd Party Data
5. Discussion
 - a. 3rd party data or self-reporting
 - b. Interim approach
 - c. Pre-screen
 - d. Assessment validation



Reimagine CE Workgroup Goal

The Reimagine CE Workgroup is a workgroup of the HSC's Core Committee.

It has been charged with formulating recommendations for a revised approach to prioritize individuals and families for RRH and PSH openings. These recommendations are slated for presentation to the HSC Board of Directors by **December 2023**.



Last Meeting Recap: Primary Data Source

Option A

Self Report Questionnaire

Example:

VI-SPDAT

Option B

3rd Party Data

Example:

Allegheny County Housing
Assessment

Dane County Familiar Faces Project
Pilot



Pros and Cons

Self Report Questionnaire

Pros:

1. **Flexibility:** Can ask about anything, not limited by what data are available.
2. **Easy Implementation:** No need for complex data processes.
3. **Client Involvement:** Allows individuals to share their own experiences, which could improve service delivery.

Cons:

1. **Reliability Challenges:** Information may vary based on the person's willingness and/or ability to accurately report.
2. **Emotional Impact:** Having to tell their stories, especially vulnerabilities, can be emotionally burdensome and re-traumatizing.
3. **Time Consumption:** Requires significant time and effort to complete an assessment for both the assessor and the person being assessed.

3rd Party Data

Pros:

1. **Objectivity:** Provides an unbiased record of actual events.
2. **Consistent Assessment:** Ensures uniform data collection for fairness.
3. **Reduced Burden:** Does not emotionally burden the individuals being assessed.

Cons:

1. **Data Limitations:** Data availability may restrict the capture of certain experiences of harm, leading to incomplete assessments of an individual's circumstances.
2. **Resource Needs:** Requires resources and processes for data matching.



Last Meeting Discussion

- Concern about disparities on who is and who is not using the services if we are looking at service utilization - involuntary services, using weight
- Question about client choice in 3rd party data collection - Release of information can be used; Sarah reached out to Allegheny County
- Concern about limited data such as lack of DAIS shelter data

Poll: For CE assessment, should we rely more on **self report** or **3rd party data**?

- 5 Voted for Self-Report
- 13 voted for 3rd Party Data



Clarification: 3rd party data availability

Dane County currently does not have a data warehouse.

- 3rd party data such as jail or behavioral health system utilization is not available real-time at this point. Some information (e.g. shelter utilization recorded on HMIS) may be available real-time now.
- The Dane County Familiar Faces pilot project plans to look at the previous six months' data to compile a list of individuals who have frequently used the system. These data points may not be available to homeless services.
- Whether we decide to try to predict future harm (Predictive Risk Modeling) or simply look at who used the various system the most, it will take time and resources to set it up.



Discussion #1 : 3rd party data or self-reporting

Given the probable delay and uncertainty in accessing 3rd party data, **should we continue to explore the utilization of more 3rd party data and decrease reliance on self-report questionnaires as a general strategy**, with the understanding that this is a long-term goal?



Discussion #2 : interim approach

Should we opt for an interim solution that primarily relies on self-report questionnaire?



Discussion #3: pre-screen

Should we implement a pre-screen to reduce the number of individuals assessed for CE?



Discussion #4: assessment validation

Should we pursue an option of utilizing a validated model (Predictive Risk Modeling)?