SMAC CES Committee Agenda

April 1st, 2021

9:00-10:30

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89587097398

+1 312 626 6799, Meeting ID: 895 8709 7398

1. Introductions – (via chat) 5 minutes
	1. See bottom of agenda
2. Update on HSS pilot 5 minutes

1. CE Policy Changes Review 10 minutes
	* 1. **Information**: See attached CE Policy Manual with comments/notations
		2. **Conversation**:
			1. + Length of Homeless (Youth was the only one changed in the prioritization criteria from 2019);
			2. pg. 11: Point 8 CE Staff Responsibility to analyze trends is a vague statement.
				1. Does this include racial equity lens?

Yes, CE Staff brings this data to the board for analysis and direction

Also language later in the report that is more specific to address racial equity lens, leaving this specific point broad allows us to be flexible as to what we are asking CES staff to do with data.

What is a racial equity lens? Do we want to spell out how we use this lens in policy or procedure manual?

**Follow-Up:** Send a proposed definition for what the racial equity lens is/looks like to Liz.

**Follow-Up**: At some point in time for the NOFA process this group with the Directors Council and the Governing Board will need to figure out how we evaluate...not necessarily the job performance of our CES staff but the effectiveness of our CES grant since it is HUD CoC funded. At that point we may need to get more specific with staff responsibilities in a measurable way so it is good thing to be thinking about!

* + 1. **Follow-Up**: We will come back to this document briefly at the May meeting before this is sent in during May
1. Single Adults Pool maintenance discussion 55 minutes
	1. Overview – where we’ve been
		1. **Information:**
			1. 2018 CE began using HMIS with the goal of understanding the Who/What/Where of homelessness and to get everyone assessed.
				1. 66% denial rate (1/3 due to unreachable)
				2. Avg. 362 days on list
			2. 2019: working with data quality issues (Attempting cleanup and 90 day rule)
				1. HUD's recommendation is that your entire list turn over in 90 days or it isn't effective. Obviously that may be unrealistic but we tried to get closer to that best practice with the shift
			3. 2020:
				1. 33% denial rate
				2. Avg. 195 days on list
		2. **Discussion:**
			1. Menti Questions about peoples history with CE and experiences during the 2018/19 changes
2. **Information:**
	1. Singles 25+ are still growing
	2. Average time in pool is growing 215 days due to singles getting stuck where they are
	3. Chronic numbers are growing for the first time since 2018
		1. Assessments are getting out of date so many people are showing up Chronic due to HMIS list assuming they are chronic
3. **Discussion:**
	1. Reviewing HMIS Data for people labeled chronic that may not be:
		1. Are assessors entering data properly? Do they have what they need? Are they staying current on their trainings?
		2. Single referrals are coming from shelter with more COVID shelters but there is still a stall on the list
			1. There are so few opening for single adults in CES
		3. Housing single adults is so difficult, so little affordable housing
			1. Even push-back from site based and property managers on criteria to house
	2. Data Review – where we’re at
		1. **Information:**
			1. Single Adults are 3/4ths of the 91+ days on the list
			2. ½ of people needing an update have been on the list longer than 8 months; over a quarter longer than a year
			3. We will be getting a report from ICA on specifically on how long they have been.
	3. Short-term/immediate plan
		1. Automatic removal of folks who have not been updated in… 180 days? 120 days?
		2. **Discussion:**
			1. Decreasing number of people entering priority pool
				1. Seems like kicking the can down the road, these people will show up in other ways as this doesn’t resolve the issue
			2. Enhancing and expanding the 90 day update report
				1. Keeping information updated is all of our responsibility and crucial to solving this problem
			3. Directors Council Discussion-Where the DC is at:
				1. We need to have a functioning CE system-it’s difficult for everyone when it doesn’t work
				2. AND we need to also be client centered (if assessors don’t have the capacity to reach out at 90 days then we are removing people before contacting them-this is overwhelmingly considered the worst case situation)

How can we create a process where people are being contacted? Balancing the responsibility of Assessors, Client, and Housing Provider

* + - 1. We have de-prioritized single adults as our focus for PSH, etc… and focus needs to be on addressing the lack of crisis as well
		1. **Follow-Up:**
			1. What information do you need to be able to make a decision about removal from the list?
			2. Liz will follow-up with Directors to get recommendations/guidance based on our feedback.
				1. We need to try something to see if it works and if it doesn’t we will try a new thing
			3. May’s meeting may be difficult. We may have some difficult decisions to make – Please get in contact if you have ideas/information
1. Review actions/next meeting 5 minutes
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