MID-WILLAMETTE VALLEY HOMELESS ALLIANCE

COORDINATED ENTRY COMMITTEE and HMIS USERS WORKGROUP

November 9, 2021 Minutes

PRESENT:

Coordinated Entry Committee	Yes
Ashley Hamilton, MWVCAA/ACHES (Chair)	X
Kim Carbaugh, CHS	X
Andrew Rice, Easterseals Oregon	X
Doug Odell, Family Promise	X
Glenn Muna, MWVCAA/ARCHES	X
Michelle Artman, MWVCAA/De Muniz	
Tricia Frizzell, MWVCAA/HOME	X
Kimm McBeth, SHA	X
Hannah Paysinger, Sheltering Silverton	
Dominique Schoessler, Shangri-La	X
Anna Lookingbill-Steele, VA Healthcare	X
Jim Stackhouse, VetCare	X
Staff: Jan Calvin, MWVHA	X
Staff: Breezy Aguirre, ARCHES	X

HMIS Users Workgroup	Yes
Hunter Belgard, OHCS (Co-chair)	X
Jimmy Jones, MWVCAA (Co-chair)	X
Tara Stephen, CHS	
Natalie Doerfler, Easterseals Oregon	X
Kaela Lombardi, MWVCAA/ARCHES	X
Rachel Miller, MWVCAA/ARCHES	X
Tricia Frizzell, MWVCAA/HOME	X
Robin Winkle, Shangri-La	X
Hannah Paysinger, Sheltering Silverton	
Jill Tucker, St. Francis Shelter	X
Brenda Newey, UGM, Simonka Place	
Staff: Jan Calvin, MWVHA	X
Staff: Elliott Lapinel, ARCHES	X

Robert Marshall, MWVCAA/ARCHES	X	others	Carol Salter, Easterseals Oregon	X
Tim Weese, MWVCAA/ARCHES	X		Michael Livingston, CANDO	X
Raymond Powers, VetCare	X		Chris Barber, Curandi	X
Janet Scott, Oregon DHS	X		Lisa Trauernicht, MWVHA	X

WELCOME / BUSINESS ITEMS

Ashley Hamilton welcomed everyone and requested people enter their name and organization in the Chat.

Agenda – Robin moved approval of the agenda; Kimm seconded; approved unanimously
Minutes – Doug moved approval of the 10/26/21 minutes; Kimm seconded; approved unanimously

HMIS TOPICS

Regional Update – Hunter provided an update on the new HMIS instance, noting that OHCS will become the contract-holder with the HMIS vendor, rather than Portland Housing Bureau. Hunter also noted that, as of July 1, 2021, OHCS began covering the cost of all user licenses.

Our CoC is now part of the "Oregon Multi-CoC Governance Committee," along with Central Oregon, Jackson County, and the Rural Oregon Continuum of Care. The group has a nickname of the "Quad Squad," and our CoC Board-appointed representatives are Elliott Lapinel and Jan Calvin.

The new HMIS instance is scheduled to be live January 1, 2022. By early December, folks will have access to the new training site. Hunter will have "heavy duty" trainings on the ROI Module. People will see all the same screens, users, and clients – basically seamless to the user. Provider purge will happen in 2021.

HMIS Roles – Tim provided information on the roles and responsibilities of OHCS (the CoC's HMIS Lead), MWVCAA (the CoC's HMIS Coordinating Entity), and the CoC, which correspond to the HMIS section of the CoC's governance charter.

COORDINATED ENTRY TOPICS

Policies & Procedures – See attachment

CE System Evaluation Update – Jan noted that the workgroup has its first meeting this week and two more meetings scheduled later this month to work on the the 2021 CE System Evaluation.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, December 14
1:30-3:00 p.m.
by Zoom video & phone
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82342567683?pwd=QkJuNzdVclk0QWNUd3Z1UDZic2Ewdz09
Meeting ID: 823 4256 7683 Passcode: 701432
One tap mobile +12532158782,,82342567683#,,,,,,0#,,701432# US

CE Policy & Procedure Topics for Committee Review
11/9/21

CE PRIORITIZATION

Topic 1: Standardized Prioritization

Description/Rationale for Policy and Procedure:

Identify and describe all factors and assessment information that are used to prioritize persons for homeless assistance.

Required: "CoC's written CE policies and procedures must include the factors and assessment information with which prioritization decisions will be made for all homeless assistance." Source: HUD Coordinated Entry Notice: Section II.B.3

Sample CE Policy Text:

CoC will use data collected through the CE process to prioritize homeless persons within the CoC's geography.

Sample CE Procedure Text:

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH):
The prioritization for PSH is consistent with HUD's Prioritization/PSH Notice. Persons eligible for PSH will be prioritized for available units based on the following criteria (applying the definition of chronically homeless set by HUD in its December 2015 Final Rule):

1st Priority—Chronically homeless individuals and families with the longest history of homelessness and with the most severe service needs.
Determined by:
FUSE
VI-SPDAT score
Could look at certain questions, but those would have to be done aside from HMIS or a new way to pull from HMIS (disability, don't go for care…

How would providers classify someone with severe service needs?
Comorbidity (assessed in the VI; if tri-morbid, scores an additional point)
Type/severity of disability (permanent or temporary)
Ability to defend and protect self (physical, mental, emotional)
Circumstantial – pregnant, parenting
Age (posing greater vulnerability)

NOTE: Send Base Assessment and VI-SPDAT

PSH case conferencing is currently for chronically homeless individuals
2nd Priority—Chronically homeless individuals and families with the longest history of homelessness but without severe service needs.

3rd Priority—Chronically homeless individuals and families with the most severe service needs.

4th Priority—All other chronically homeless individuals and families not already included in priorities 1 through 3.

Committee Comments on PSH Prioritization:
See above

Transitional Housing (TH):
The prioritization for persons who are determined to be eligible for TH will be consistent with the CoC's scoring range for need and vulnerability associated with TH projects. The CoC will prioritize the following persons for TH:

1. Households fleeing or experiencing domestic violence as the primary cause of their current housing crisis.
2. Households consisting of unaccompanied youth.
3. Participants seeking treatment services for behavioral health conditions such as mental illness and/or substance use disorders.

Committee Comments on TH Prioritization:
TH funding establishes much of the prioritization

Rapid Re-Housing (RRH):
The prioritization for persons who are determined to be eligible for RRH will be consistent with the CoC's scoring range for need and vulnerability associated with RRH projects.

Additionally, the CoC has opted to prioritize the following persons for RRH:

1. Households with a single parent and 3 or more dependent children under the age of 6.
2. Households experiencing domestic violence.
3. Households consisting of unaccompanied youth.
4. Households with a previous episode of homelessness within the most recent 12 months.

Committee Comments on RRH Prioritization:

- Chronically homeless, but not able to be served in PSH

—Homeless individuals and families who are not chronically homeless but do have a disability and severe service needs.

—Homeless individuals and families who are not chronically homeless but do have a disability and a long period of continuous or episodic homelessness.

—Homeless individuals and families who are not chronically

homeless but do have a disability and are coming from places not meant for human habitation, Safe Havens, or emergency shelters.

—Homeless individuals and families who are not chronically homeless but have a disability and are coming from transitional housing.

Topic 2: Emergency Services

Description/Rationale for Policy and Procedure:

State which emergency services will not be part of the prioritization process.

Required: "[CoC's] written CE policies and procedures must clearly distinguish between the interventions that will not be prioritized based on severity of service need or vulnerability, such as entry to emergency shelter, allowing for an immediate crisis response, and those that will be prioritized, such as [permanent supportive housing]." Source: HUD Coordinated Entry Notice: Section II.B.7.a

Sample CE Policy Text:

Emergency services are a critical crisis response resource, and access to such services will not be prioritized.

Committee Comments:
ES providers can use the CE list, for example, to fill a duration shelter

On another note:
Need to address **policy** not to separate families in emergency services

REFERRAL

All CoC Program- and ESG Program-funded projects must accept referrals exclusively through the CoC's defined CE process as described below. All other CoC projects and services voluntarily participating in CE will consider the CE process the sole source for referrals.

Topic 1: Notification of Vacancies

Description/Rationale for Policy and Procedure:

Describe how projects participating in CE are expected to notify the CoC about anticipated housing or service slot vacancies.

Sample CE Policy Text:

All CE participating providers will enroll new participants only from the CoC's CE referral process. To facilitate prompt referrals and to reduce vacancy rates, participating providers must notify the CE coordinating entity of any known and anticipated upcoming vacancies.

Sample CE Procedure Text:

When a TH, RRH, or PSH vacancy occurs or is expected to occur in the immediate future, the provider agency with the vacancy must alert the CE Coordinator via email within X business days of the vacancy. The notification must include specific details of the vacancy, including the project name, unit size, location, and any

funder-defined eligibility requirements. The CE Coordinator will provide vacancy information to the CE Governing Committee, which will work to identify a prioritized household to fill the vacancy during the next regularly scheduled housing referral coordination meeting.

Committee Comments:
New APR for CE will require a particular procedure, related to HMIS. Procedure will come back to committee, likely in January. The new CE APR is outcomes driven.

Topic 3: Provider-Declined Referrals

Description/Rationale for Policy and Procedure:

Identify allowable reasons and the process for handling situations when agencies decline a referral from CE.

Sample CE Policy Text:

There may be instances when agencies does not accept a referral from the CE system. When a provider agency declines to accept a referred prioritized household into its project, the agency must notify the CE Coordinator of the denial and the reason for the denial.

Sample CE Procedure Text:

Refusals by projects are acceptable only in certain situations, including these:

- The person does not meet the project's eligibility criteria. [easy]
- The person would be a danger to self or others if allowed to stay at this particular project.
  Determined in what ways?
- The services available through the project are not sufficient to address the intensity and scope of participant need.
  Specifically….
- The project is at capacity and is not available to accept referrals at this time. [easy]
- Other justifications as specified by the "referred to" project. The agency must communicate the refusal to the CE Coordinator within X business days of making the refusal. The agency must notify the CE Coordinator why the referral was rejected, how the referred participant was informed, what alternative resources were made available to the participant, and whether the project staff foresee additional, similar refusals occurring in the future. This information will then be shared by the CE Coordinator with the CE Committee, which will discuss and decide on the most appropriate next steps for both the project and the participant.

Committee Comments:
Identify the documentation and process required to support the refusal. Convene discussion with providers.

EVALUATION

Topic 1: Evaluation of CE System

Description/Rationale for Policy and Procedure:

Describe the local process for evaluating your CE.

Required: CoC must ensure through written CE policies and procedures the "frequency and method by which the [CE system] evaluation will be conducted, including how project participants will be selected to provide feedback, and must describe a process by which the evaluation is used to implement updates to existing policies and procedures." Source: HUD Coordinated Entry Notice: Section II.B.15.c

Sample CE Policy Text:

Regular and ongoing evaluation of the CE system will be conducted to ensure that improvement opportunities are identified, that results are shared and understood, and that the CE system is held accountable.

Annual evaluation, using HUD self-assessment tool

Sample CE Procedure #1 Text:

The CE will be evaluated using HMIS data on a quarterly basis. Results will be published on the public CE System website, after they have been reviewed by the CE Committee. The CE Committee has selected the following as key outcomes for CE:
1. Reduction in the length of time homeless (system and project level).
2. Reduction in the number of persons experiencing first-time homelessness (system and project level).
3. Increase in the number of placements into permanent housing (system and project level).

Sample CE Procedure #2 Text:

The CoC will evaluate the effectiveness of its CE System using participant feedback gathered via a web-based survey that each CE project must request participants complete at the time of entry and exit from the project. Indicators measured via the participant feedback survey will include:
1. appropriateness of questions asked on assessment;
2. effectiveness of process to find and secure referrals; and
3. satisfaction with placement.

Committee Comments:

- Annual CE System evaluation
- CE client survey
- CE agency survey/feedback tool

Engage feedback of youth through YAB
Engage feedback through a DEI lens (DEI Subcommittee, Farmworker Outreach Team, etc.)
Community feedback on marketing, well-known system

Topic 2: Role of Participating Agencies in CE Evaluation

Description/Rationale for Policy and Procedure:

Identify the key tasks and roles of participating agencies in the evaluation of CE.

Sample CE Policy Text:

Participating agencies play a crucial role in the evaluation of CE. Participating agencies will collect accurate and meaningful data on persons served by CE. In addition, participating agencies will review evaluation results and offer insights about potential improvements to CE processes and operations.

Sample CE Procedure Text:

At least one representative from each participating agency will be sent the draft results of the CE System evaluation, prior to its distribution to the CE Committee. Representatives will have X business days to review and provide feedback on the results. While reviewing the data, agency representatives are encouraged to communicate directly with the CE coordinating entity about any concerns or questions that they have, and to be detailed in their suggestions to the CE coordinating entity about how best to interpret and use the evaluation results.

Committee Comments:

See above