SMAC CES Committee Agenda

February 4th, 2021

9:00-10:30

**Attendance**: Peter Goldstein, Matt Lewis, Heather Duchscherer, Sheena Addis, Mica Whiteley, Rachel Bauer, Mark McNamer, Linda Hall, Jennifer Moore, Sue Rosendahl, Kelly Looby, Megan Joshi, Liz Moen, Bill Church, Michele Reid, Alyssa, Briana Rutscher, Chu Xiong, Dan Lauer-Schumacher, Kristen Brown, Rebekah Schneider, Pat Morley, Tasha (Hearth), Doreen Farrell, Suzie Misel, Abby Guilford

1. **Introductions** – (via chat) 5 minutes
2. **Chronic Youth and Families update** 10 minutes

SMAC Numbers (*as of 01/31/21*):

* How many families are entering homelessness vs. exiting homelessness?

In January, we had more exits than enters

* How many chronic single youth are entering homelessness vs exiting homelessness?

In January, more chronic single youth entered the PL than exited

* Total # of households experiencing chronic homelessness on PL:
  + Families - 15 (*14/15 have open, active referrals*)
  + Youth Singles - 8 (*7/8 have open, active referrals*)

(Review of folks who exited PL in the quarter, review of length of time on PL)

* Chronic households length of time on PL:

*(Review of folks who exited PL in the quarter, review of length of time on PL)*

* + Families – 163 days (*Not trending down in last qtr*)
  + Youth Singles – 114 days (*Trending down*)

1. **Centralized Access update** 5 minutes

Completed meetings with SMAC county staff & overall theme from these meetings/discussions was that Centralized Access seems like a great idea, what are the logistics? The identified questions incl., what mechanism will be used to fund Centralized Access work & what will the impact of implementation be on our current system workflow(s).

Formed small Centralized Access Workgroup that is comprised of mostly providers (*RRH CM, Outreach & Assessors*) & County staff. This group is tasked with figuring out what we need to know in order to flush this concept out further, what will work flow look like, ultimately getting to the point of being able to put together a proposal inclusive of the stakeholders & needs for this to function effectively.

If you have questions, please email Liz – [lizm@hearthconnection.org](about:blank)

Please note that we may be light on updates related to the work of this group for a few months as they work through their “fact-finding mission”

1. **Annual calendar check-in** 15 minutes

Review of CES Committee Annual Calendar 2021 (*incl. with meeting agenda*)

Wanted to ensure that we were all familiar with this document & whether additional items/tasks are needed to be added. In your review of this document, consider the reoccurring themes that you believe we need to keep checking in around.

Menti Questions:

* 1. “Access Monitoring Report” doesn’t exist as a singular report – what would you like us to compile?

Responses (from Menti):

* Who is getting turned away w/o an assessment & why?
* Where people aren’t getting access to assessments or CE in general
* How many people by population are entering our system monthly/quarterly?
* How many people show up in shelter/drop-in/outreach, etc.? How many people are assessed? Racially disaggregated data for all this
* Who is assessing? Who is being assessed (*population specific*)? Racial demographics of people being assessed & how it compares to the overall racial demographics in our system
* Where are the gaps?
* How long between their assessment & their first follow up?
* Turn-away data – why they were turned away but also what resources/numbers were recommended to them?
  1. What else would you like to see on a regular basis?

Responses (from Menti):

* Urgent needs? Identified that sometimes program has additional funds available & if they knew where to divert it, there may be opportunities to exceed the normal count of those receiving asst.
* Procedure Manual – Draft for CE Staff in the current iteration, but exploring the potential for provider manual
* Information about single adults
* During the assessor training or re-training – time to talk about challenges, questions clients ask – it would be good to hear how staff work through things & get your directions
* Comprehensive reference on CE processes
* Who is being denied? What conditions are leading to denials?
* Who is on the PL the longest? What factors are contributing to their lengthier periods of homelessness?
  1. Provider workshops in COVID – Do we need to create an online alternative? What would that be?
* Quarterly updates by housing type via zoom by CES Staff
* Getting assessors & housing providers together to collaborate on housing individuals
* Stress the importance of this meeting
* Chronic households that are referred but not yet housed consults
* Quarterly technical assistance opportunity for assessors, RRH providers, others… Is there something similar planned?
* Refreshers on the most important parts of the process like taking housing history
* I think it might be a good policy that a housing provider cannot decline a referral without connecting with the assessor first.

1. **Denials/Eligibility discussion** 50 minutes

Now that we have a better idea of what folks need who are active on PL, identifying tension in the system due to supply not meeting demand (*either in amount or requirements)*

What do we do as a community when program eligibility requirements are inhibiting households from getting referrals?

* Strategies to improve denial rate:
* At the point of referral - Increase the number of folks listed as a contact for the client (incl county contacts)
* Requiring documentation of contact attempts & contacts before accepting denials/returns to PL
* Consistency in practices for outreach efforts across CoC regions (is increased flexibility a benefit to us?)
* Involvement of Property Management entities – engaging tax-credit properties to be more involved in the partnership with providers to lower instances of denials &/or subsequent lease terminations
* Challenging the funders – demonstrating to program funders the impact of our current conditions & requesting opportunities to receive exemptions and/or waivers – what information would be necessary and/or helpful to present/maintain?

Break-Out Session:

State-funded programs (reqs. on top of the requirements mandated by the funder (*not CoC-funded*))

Site-based v. scattered-site programs -

What are next steps and who is responsible for each?

The role of the SMAC CES Committee was identified as including the identification of data & general info that can be provided to the Governing Board (GB) to better ensure that the experience of accessing our system & subsequent eligibility criterion for programs drawing referrals from the PL remains on their radar moving forward. The Governing board is identified as leading this effort from there.

1. **Review actions/next meeting** 5 minutes

Small group to review denials and turn those data findings into a displayable/digestible format that can be provided to GB – CE Committee will step away from eligibility after that

Secretary – Volunteer to take on this awesome role that will propel you into future planning capacities 😊