

CHIP
Coordinated Entry Workgroup Meeting #8
Thursday, December 1, 2016

- I. *Present:* Danielle Bagg (*CHIP*), John Dorgan (*HUD*), Nathan Ferreira (*Julian Center*), Jennie Fults (*City of Indianapolis*), Terri Garcia (*Southeast Community Services Center*), Brianna Gates (*HIP*), Zach Gross (*CHIP*), Chris Handberg (*DVN*), Chelsea Haring-Cozzi (*UWCI*), Mary Jones (*UWCI*), Kalisha Hayes (*HVAF*), Leslie Kelley (*Horizon House*), Michelle Kincaid (*HUD*), Kjirsten Kmetz-Morrison (*VA*), Nancy Lobdell (*VA*), Kaley Martin (*Community Solutions*), Cal Nelson (*Wheeler Mission*), Lisa Osterman (*Community Solutions*), Calli Pugh (*UWCI*), Cheryl Reed (*Anthem*), Rachel Sample (*CHIP*), Dena Simpson (*Salvation Army*), Nicole Spacey (*Anthem*), Caleb Sutton (*CHIP*), Kirk Taylor, Karin Thornburg (*Midtown*), Tom Tuttle (*HVAF*), Jenni White (*Coburn Place*), Kay Wiles (*HIP*), Alan Witchey (*CHIP*)

Representatives from the Technical Assistance Collaborative (TAC):

Lauren Knott, Gina Schaak, Liz Stewart

II. Overview of the Technical Assistance Collaborative (TAC)

- a. The representatives from TAC shared that they have been working with CHIP over the past few years in various capacities. They are currently helping draft the CoC Written Standards, with care a requirement for CoC and ESG funding. The Written Standards must include the prioritization criteria for providing housing assistance. This is a separate document from the CE Policies & Procedures. The Written Standards tie into CE because it's about prioritizing who will get the available spot in the housing assistance program. The CE process must align with the Written Standards developed by TAC (through consultation with CoC members and the CE Workgroup) and approved by the Blueprint Council.
- b. There are two other areas where the Written Standards align most strongly with the work of the CE Workgroup. The Written Standards should reflect both:
 - i. The lack of PSH funding available for chronically homeless people means that RRH could serve as a bridge for chronically homeless people to get housed while waiting for PSH. If this is the case, there must be some process within CE for transferring people to another project type and for fairly assessing those who are currently homeless and those in RRH who need PSH to determine who gets the opening.
 1. CE should be a system that looks at all the resources and funding sources that are available and all the different sub-populations in need.
 - ii. CE is how you determine if Housing First is taking place on the ground. If people are getting denied for housing, it is important to look at the reason for denial. That is how you can determine whether a program is Housing First.
- c. The Written Standards were reviewed/revised by the Blueprint Council yesterday and will be further revised based on today's conversation.

III. Community's Prioritization of PSH, RRH, and TH included in the Written Standards

- a. The Written Standards outline how individuals and families will be prioritized into PSH, RRH, and TH.

- i. PSH uses the HUD prioritization notice, which states the priority as “chronically homeless with the longest history of homelessness and most severe service needs.” This is taken to prioritize chronic homelessness first, the length of history of homelessness, and finally, highest service needs.
 - ii. RRH prioritizes chronic homelessness first, followed by length of history of homelessness, and then highest service needs.
 - b. The order of prioritization was done strategically to meet HUD’s notice for PSH and to allow RRH to serve as a bridge to PSH by having the same type of prioritization.
 - i. The community prioritization was initially proposed in an August 2016 draft of the written standards and was discussed at the previous day’s meetings on the Written Standards, with some push back. However, the importance of prioritization was noted as the community cannot solve all homelessness for everyone at once. For that reason, the group decided on this set of priorities that align with HUD’s. It will be up to the community to track the progress that is made with these priorities, what other resources are needed, and what funding is available to meet those needs.
 - c. The prioritization within CE should align with the community at large, as outlined in the Written Standards. This means that those entering CE would first be prioritized for housing openings within their appropriate programs based on their chronic homelessness, then the length of their homelessness, then by their level of service needs.
 - i. They would be organized into pools for housing programs based on their VI SPDAT scores. The level of service need would also be decided by their assessment score.

IV. Assessment Update

- a. It was decided at the last meeting that the VI SPDAT would be used as the common assessment tool that all those entering CE would complete.
- b. While there was discussion about using the full SPDAT as the next-level, more intensive assessment, the information provided about prioritization from the TAC representatives and additional feedback from workgroup members. For these reasons, the workgroup decided that the VI SPDAT would be the ONLY assessment completed.
 - i. The group agreed not to use the full SPDAT due to :
 - 1. Concerns about the amount of time it would require
 - 2. Questions about who would complete it and when
 - 3. A more in-depth, second-level assessment was deemed unnecessary given the changes in prioritization outlined in the Written Standards.
 - ii. While there were initial concerns that the 0-17 scoring of the VI SPDAT would be too broad to provide the detail needed to prioritize individuals, the information provided about the community prioritization included in the Written Standards changed that. Given that openings in programs would be determined primarily by chronically homelessness, then by the length of history of homelessness, then by level of need as

determined by assessment score, having a large variability in the assessment score is less important. Workgroup members agreed to start with using only the VI SPDAT. Once the process is up and running, if greater detail in scoring is required, they will revisit the issue.

- iii. It was clarified that if there are not enough chronically homeless individuals or families that meet the other requirements of the opening, you move down the list (based on the other prioritization criteria) to the next person/family who meets the other requirements.

V. Other Discussions

- a. Participants reviewed the current model for CE for individuals and families (included as Appendix).
- b. The bulk of the meeting was focused on information shared from the TAC representatives and how that impacts the CE prioritization and associated assessment. However, there were other questions and comments that arose without much follow-up discussion that are relevant to the workgroup and may be necessary to refer back to in the future.
 - i. Since the last meeting, Community Solutions reviewed the HMIS UDE data, the data collected through the VI SPDAT, and the data collected through the current PSH application determine what information relevant to program requirements should be collected. Those additional questions should be easy to add and will be collected along with the UDEs and VI SPDAT at Intake.
 - ii. One participant noted that case conferencing does not work well for RRH. If ESG funds are being used and there are openings for 12 families today, it doesn't make sense to wait another week to do case conferencing to get them housed. As a result, participants were reminded that case conferencing should be utilized when resources are limited or lacking. If the resources are available, they should be used.

VI. Next Steps

- a. Community Solutions will draft the CE Policies & Procedures Manual that incorporates the CE process that has been developed thus far. The Workgroup will discuss it at their next meeting, with a copy of the document sent at least a week in advance of the meeting.
- b. The December 19th meeting will be cancelled to be sure there is to develop the Manual.
- c. The next meeting will be in early January. Community Solutions will send a Doodle poll to identify the best date/time.

CE Model for Homeless Individuals & Families (11/2/16)

