



Coordinated Entry Workgroup MEETING MINUTES

May 7, 2019

1:00-2:30

Facilitator:	Courtney Myers-Keaton		
Meeting Attendees:	Tom Cottrell, Cathy LaPorte, Sherri Vainavicz, Sam Pennington, Gayle Witham, Laura St. Louis, Victoria Sluga, Johanna Schulte, Adrienne Goodstal, Pilar Dunning, Laura St. Louis, Anna Solomon, Cheryl Schuch, Kelsey Kruis, Brittani Barkley, Jameela Maun, Kari Sherman Staff: Courtney Myers-Keaton, Brianne Czyzio		
Time Convened:	1:05	Time Adjourned:	2:13

Introductions		
Name, Organization, what is bringing you to the coordinated entry space?		
Review of Agenda		
Discussion		
Review of Minutes		From April 2, 2019
Discussion		
Roster and Nominations		
Discussion		
<p>The roster was sent out. There are some people who would like to receive updates, but not be included on the roster. A roster will be sent out and CoC staff will receive nominations for chair, vice chair, and secretary throughout the month of May. Elections will happen in June. The <i>Committee Reporting Process Document</i> will also be sent out describing leadership roles. Committee leadership is responsible for ensuring that minutes are taken, and updates are provided to Steering Council on a regular basis.</p>		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Committee Purpose Statement		
Discussion		
<p>The group reviewed the draft purpose statement: Implement a Continuous Quality Improvement Process of the coordinated entry system. There was recognition that this group is not there yet. There is a lot of learning to do around Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) and around how our system works. Does this draft purpose statement accurately reflect the committee's goals? Johanna S. shared that she researched purpose statements of other communities. She suggested that the statement be expanded to include what the committee could/should be doing on a regular basis. This includes operationalizing the policies and procedures that the community has put into place. Cheryl suggested that the statement includes the core elements of the coordinated entry system (CES). Tom suggested that the statement should be straightforward so that anyone can understand It is important to keep the CQI piece in the purpose statement. Another piece to consider is values. The values piece may be separate from the purpose but should be kept at the forefront of discussion. Perhaps this is a separate meeting to decide values and how they could be operationalized. The group wordsmithed different purpose statements.</p>		



Coordinated Entry Workgroup MEETING MINUTES

May 7, 2019

1:00-2:30

Purpose Statement: To ensure our community experiences equitable access to housing resources, the committee will develop, evaluate and continually improve our coordinated entry system.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline

Committee Structure: Workgroups

Discussion

Are there things that need to be talked about before the group can effectively split into workgroups.

Thinking through some of the urgent next steps. The CoC is mandated by HUD to have an evaluation of our coordinated entry system annually. The Cloudburst evaluation was presented last year, but it looked at the system as it was a few years ago. However, the evaluation did include a framework for future evaluations. HUD mandates that an evaluation includes consumer feedback. What are urgent needs moving forward to check the boxes on program application? The coordinated entry committee would be responsible for doing this year's evaluation. Cheryl noted that last year's evaluation looked at what the policies and procedures said and how practices differed from the goals. There may be a question on the program application around process for evaluation of coordinated entry system.

A subgroup could work on drafting an evaluation by looking at the cloudburst report and self-evaluation tool. Courtney and Tom have attended HUD TA sessions, but these did not look at evaluation. It is important to note that there are two levels of evaluation, one is looking at whether we are meeting all the HUD requirements. A consumer feedback process should be developed so this can be submitted to HUD. The second piece is an evaluation of how the system is working for our community. For this, the group would want a more robust evaluation looking at whether all the pieces are in place. Cathy, Cheryl, Johanna, Laura will work to develop a draft/recommendation framework for HUD evaluation before the next meeting to bring framework ideas to the next meeting. Workgroups could flow out of the results of an evaluation. From there, perhaps an entire meeting could be dedicated to which workgroups should be created.

A future meeting may be dedicated to what each of the 4 points of the system look like – access, assessment, prioritization, referral. A KConnect group just went through this exercise, Courtney can connect with Cheryl to get the some of the feedback/results. Cheryl suggested that the next steps following that meeting would be to look at what is currently happening versus what should be happening. Then, the policies and procedures can be updates with these suggestions in mind.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline

Timeline for Activities

Discussion

For now, this committee will focus on a HUD evaluation and a reviewing how the system works. From there, workgroups will be developed.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline

Urgent Matters Related to Coordinated Entry



Coordinated Entry Workgroup MEETING MINUTES

May 7, 2019

1:00-2:30

Discussion

VI-SPDAT – Adriene wanted to bring this topic to the group. Mel Trotter has been mandated by ESP funding to make sure VI-SPDATs are being done in a timely manner. These completed assessments are not necessarily able to be seen at HAP. Changes to the process would have to go through HMIS. This needs to be a quick hitting change that should be addressed. The system needs to work together to ensure VI-SPDATs are being done in a timely manner.

Recommendations made in the cloudburst evaluation, were not completed. This committee had been dormant for some period of time when this report out was released. The report-out did not include best practices. As we are moving through evaluation phase, it will likely become apparent that there is a need for updated policies and procedures. Perhaps the CES policies and procedures should be broken down and addressed separately, instead of as a whole. The policies and procedures cannot change to meet the community’s needs in real time. Looking forward, there should be a way to hold ourselves accountable to what we decide to put in our policies and procedures. Cheryl suggested that policies and procedures should not include direct process steps as this leads to less flexibility but should include guidelines that the group can ensure are being followed.

As a community, we say we have a centralized intake system, but we are closer to a coordinated entry system at this point. We need to navigate this. Immediate need is to address this change in our policies and procedures. There needs to be a process to look at how to we want to have the system changes so that the system can change. Johanna noted that it seems there was not accountability built into the past policies and procedures. This committee needs to build this structure into new policies and procedures. In addition, data and real-world information should inform policies and procedures.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline

Next Steps

Discussion

Subgroup meeting to talk about framework for evaluation. Courtney double check on whether Cloudburst framework is what is recommended from HUD and post the requirements of an evaluation per HUD.

Next meeting:

- Discuss system as it currently is regarding the four elements.
- Discuss frameworks and how to move forward for the HUD evaluation.
- Nominations and elections.

Adjourn