



DATA ANALYSIS MEETING MEETING MINUTES

May 13, 2021

2:00-3:30

Facilitator:	Lee Nelson Weber		
Meeting Attendees:	Lee Nelson Weber, Alyssa Anten, Cheryl Schuch, Erik Ryder, Francisco Calderon, Johanna Schulte, Jenn Headrick <u>Staff:</u> Courtney Myers-Keaton, Brianne Czyzio Robach, Daniel Gore		
Time Convened:	2:03	Time Adjourned:	

Review of Agenda			
Discussion	Coalition Vitals – Mission Matters will be attending the June meeting to present a framework of vital data points coming out of the strategic planning process		
Amendments	Move the Annual Count Preliminary Numbers to the first agenda item		
Approval of Minutes		April 15th, 2021	
Motion by:	Cheryl Schuch	Second:	Alyssa Anten
Discussion	None		
Amendments	Outstanding Action Items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request to MSHDA re: Data Quality – this has not been scheduled due to the strategic planning process, staff want to ensure all concerns/issues are brought in one singular meeting - Daniel posted the data analysis framework to basecamp 		
Conclusion	All in favor, motion passes.		
Approval of the Consent Agenda		May 13, 2021	
Motion by:	Cheryl Schuch	Second:	Johanna Schulte
Discussion			
Conclusion	All in favor, motion passes.		
Coordinated Entry Report: Q1 2021			
Discussion	<p>Alyssa shared the Coordinated Entry (CE) Report from Q1 2021. The data on this report is consistent with previous quarters. The number of families added to the Housing Priority List (HPL) (156 families) reflects the number of families who were prioritized for a resource. With the move to the Supportive Solutions process, it is difficult to track data. This number does not reflect the total number of families who have been referred to supportive solutions. Additional conversation is needed around how to incorporate by-name list (BNL) data with this report.</p> <p>There were 3384 total calls, 80% of which were call backs. This is likely because many folks were calling back to see if prevention resources were available. There were 147 program openings and 228 referrals. Some referrals include both prevention and RRH/PSH resources as some programs do both so entries into HMIS are labeled as rental assistance, but do not differentiate what is RRH and what is prevention. 175 households accepted referrals indicating that they have entered a program, not necessarily that they are leased up. It would be helpful to discuss and define what it means when a referral is accepted to ensure there is consistency across program data. Alyssa can share the number of referrals that were declined or cancelled in future reports</p>		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline	



DATA ANALYSIS MEETING MEETING MINUTES

May 13, 2021

2:00-3:30

Discuss how to incorporate BNL data with HPL data	Alyssa, Courtney, others as needed	
Include # of referrals declined/cancelled in future reports	Alyssa/TSA staff	
Annual Count		
Discussion		
<p>The Michigan Coalition Against Homelessness (MCAH) has announced that they are revamping the annual count, so this report pulled locally will not need to be approved by MCAH. Data has not yet been disaggregated by race and ethnicity. Though folks may have anticipated a total count that was steady or increase from 2019, the data shows a decrease. 2020 data may be anomaly due to the experience of the pandemic. There have been increases in length of time in projects which may be leading to less capacity in the system. In addition, eviction moratoria helped keep families in housing. The inability of landlords to evict tenants also likely slowed movement in the housing supply. The data universe is everyone who connected with CE and indicated homelessness as well as those who are entered into shelter. Unsheltered numbers would not necessarily be entered into this report if they did not contact HAP. Next steps: Compare raw data, including program data, to 2019 data.</p> <p><u>Family Promise Data</u> Their team put together a 12-month rolling average of length of stay (LOS). They have seen a large increase in LOS over the past year. The data shows that LOS correlates to the number of families exited. During times of high turnover, a greater number of households used shelter because more spaces were available. Recent data is reflecting limited shelter capacity and longer stays in shelter. The largest barrier to LOS is housing availability due to the tight market. Staff will connect with shelter providers for anecdotal evidence around LOS and DV provider to see if they have 2019 and 2020 data available to review. Cheryl shared that the single women count has dropped dramatically over the past year. Single men also decreased due to not wanting to stay in shelter.</p>		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Connect with shelter providers re: LOS	CoC staff	
PIT/HIC Review		
Discussion		
<p>Daniel presented PIT and HIC data. The housing inventory has been fairly stable with an increase in PSH beds for families. RRH beds did drop which may be because the HIC only includes occupied RRH beds and it has been difficult for families to get into housing. The HIC spreadsheet also compares to a total capacity number. The spreadsheet will be shared with the minutes.</p> <p>With the PIT, the unsheltered count was observation-based due to COVID. However, outreach teams were seeing an increase in encampments prior to the count. However, there was sweep of a large encampment just before the count which likely displaced folks. In addition, outreach did a count this past summer and could discuss another count this summer.</p> <p>Conversation around how quickly RRH vouchers are being used. Data could be used to identify system-wide gaps and to support need for additional resources. With annual count data, would be important to include narrative around increased LOT and limited capacity of the system.</p>		



DATA ANALYSIS MEETING MEETING MINUTES

May 13, 2021

2:00-3:30

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Collecting Disaggregated Data		
Discussion		
<p>Daniel had provided a research framework for analyze disaggregating data on Basecamp. Framework questions to guide the research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there a disparity between those triaged by HAP versus those assessed by HAP for housing needs? - Is there a disparity between those assessed & referred versus those assessed & not referred with a comparable prioritization status? - Is there a disparity between those referred & accepted versus those referred & rejected including the reasons for those rejections? - Is there a disparity between new client intakes into CoC projects referred by HAP versus new client intakes not referred by HAP if any exist? <p>Data sources could include HMIS and non-HMIS sources. Non-HMIS would be particularly helpful for new clients who are not coming through HAP.</p> <p>Daniel indicated that the group should be able to look at deidentified demographics for each of the groups identified. There may also be other ways to break this data down.</p> <p>Alyssa indicated that engagement and participation would be important from all agencies as this includes data that may not be housed in HAP. Currently, family data is being collected in Community Housing Connect which is not housed within the CE lead agency or CoC, so is not easily accessible. With the CE implementation, there has been conversation around. The data at Community Builders specific to program data is not exactly what this group is looking for but could be a starting point. CoC staff can take the above framework to the group discussing CE design and implementation so the framework can be included in conversations.</p>		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Bring framework to CE implementation group	CoC staff	
Next Steps		
Discussion		
<p>Last month, the committee decided to request that Steering Council commission resources for a report racial equity. Courtney indicated that this may have to wait until July, and also may be tabled for now based on what may come out of the strategic planning process.</p>		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Adjournment		