

Santa Clara County CoC
Coordinated Assessment Work Group
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2018

Attendees: Desaire Abeyta (BWC), Aurora Alivares (BWC), Alicia Anderson (BHSD)
Rachael Castro (Community Solutions), Conseulo Collard (CCSCC), Lori Collins (Life Moves), Michelle Covert (OSH), Susan Frazer (Institute on Aging), Aram Hauslaib (HomeBase), Elisha Heruty (OSH), Jessie Hewins (HomeBase), Linda Jones (HomeFirst), Valerie Kang (MidPen Housing), Liz Lucas (LifeMoves), Patrica Nanez (Next Door Solutions), Tringh Nguyen (AACI), Elizabeth Olvera (Family Supportive Housing), Jennifer Ong (BitFocus), Sonali Parnami (Health Trust), Edwin Patrick (LifeMoves), Leila Quieishi (OSH), Bea Ramos (HomeFirst), Nikka Rapkin (HomeBase), Aida Zaldivar (Community Solutions)

I. Welcome & Introduction

II. CoC Updates

- HUD CoC NOFA still expected to be released in May; programs have submitted APRs and program evaluation reports will be provided by email soon for review
- CAWG Participant asked: Will new agencies be allowed to apply?
 - HB's response: Yes, agencies that aren't currently receiving CoC funds are encouraged to apply. There will be a technical assistance workshop for applicants after the NOFA is released that will be announced on the listserv. Also recommended to talk to Kathryn or somebody else at OSH in advance to discuss the proposed program.

III. Coordinated Assessment System Updates

- Policies around ensuring DV survivors are safely connected to the system discussed during last working group meeting. Feedback is in progress and these will be presented at the next working group.

IV. Data Review

- **Participants reviewed data regarding:**
 - Acuity (number or proportion of households that scored in each VI-SPDAT range—no intervention, Rapid Rehousing or Permanent Supportive Housing) by:
 - Year
 - Gender
 - Veteran status
 - Residence prior to homelessness by SCC jurisdiction
 - Referrals by intervention range over time, and by assessment score
 - Time from first assessment to first referral by assessment score
- **CAWG Participant Feedback about the data**
 - "Would love to see the data by age"
 - OSH noted that those who received scores of 0-3 were largely direct referrals of veterans
 - OSH noted that many veterans in the county who are assessed are older; mostly in the 55-64 age range

V. Review of Tools to Help Providers Inform Clients about the Coordinated Assessment System

- Three FAQs were reviewed:
 1. **FAQ for Non-Access Point providers:** Purpose of FAQ is to help providers who do not work within the Coordinated Assessment System to understand how the system works and to be able to provide information to their clients free of misconceptions.
 2. **FAQ for Access Point providers:** Purpose of FAQ is to support providers who work in the Coordinated Assessment System to answer frequently asked questions from clients in order to reduce confusion and reinforce essential information.

3. **FAQ for individuals who took the VI-SPDAT:** Purpose of FAQ is to help clients understand the Coordinated Assessment system, ensure clients maintain updated contact information, and encourage re-assessment annually, or when there is a significant change in circumstances.
- **CAWG Participant Feedback: FAQ for Non-Access point providers**
 - This is great, glad it spells things out so clearly.
 - Are these ok to distribute now?
 - HomeBase responded that they just need to incorporate feedback from this meeting.
 - When will we find out if ok to use?
 - HomeBase responded that once finalized, it will be posted to the OSH website and the link will be distributed via the SPN and CoC listservs.
 - What languages will the one for consumers be available in? Can we translate for our own use?
 - OSH responded that they will find out.
 - **CAWG Participant Feedback: FAQ for Access Point providers**
 - Still hearing the Housing 1000 questions so should keep the answer.
 - With respect to FAQ answers with a current short answer and a longer proposed answer:
 - I love how the client form is all bullet points, so maybe we could pull out 3 to 4 main points for the proposed longer script answers, highlighting the key points.
 - Could we keep both answer types so people can choose which to use?
 - People in crisis will sometimes hear what they want to hear. In Question 2 of “Common Questions about the Process,” The line that says “if we have space available in a program that looks like a good fit for you” makes it sound more like a waiting list.
 - For Question 7 in “Common Questions about the Process,” should remove the second paragraph on private landlords.
 - When asked if clients are raising the issue of having to attend multiple appointments, no one recalled hearing that question from clients. One participant stated: I like it and think it should stay. Sometimes this might come up during intake.
 - HB let the group know that this issue came up during the focus group.
 - There should be a more specific document for VSPs that doesn’t include the HMIS graphic.
 - **CAWG Participant Feedback: FAQ for Individuals who have taken the VI-SPDAT**
 - When asked to consider what information would be good to include in case this document circulated widely and was given to a client who had never taken the VI-SPDAT before, it was suggested that the first question should be restated: What is it and why did I take that?
 - Probably shouldn’t say client is placed on a **list** or gets a **score** in “What happens next?”
 - Should change **list** to **pool**.
 - Change language to: “If a housing program has an opening that meets your needs, you will be connected...”
 - Add language to Call Out box to emphasize that a client can go to a shelter, or connect with an outreach team, for a new VI-SPDAT or to update contact info, so that it’s more concrete for clients knowing where to go.
 - Add to system map: the chart of outreach and shelter so that it is clear where clients can go for the VI-SPDAT.
 - Consider adding examples for “significant changes” in the client handout.
 - Need FAQ for VSP clients with no HMIS diagram.
 - **General CAWG Participant Feedback on all the FAQs**
 - Make branding more clear.
 - Specify on each document who it is for, make it clear, because otherwise confusing why there are three documents. Makes sense once you explain it.
 - The word “queue” isn’t familiar. Community pool is better.

- Queue sounds like a waiting list.
- Queue may not be known.
- Community queue is getting out there. Clients are referring to it as the Queue.
- Add information on immigration status. Make it clear that VI-SPDAT doesn't ask about immigration status and information is not released to immigration .
- Add statement to make clear that the VI-SPDAT is not meant to assess for parenting and information is not shared with Child Protective Services.
- Add statement around no disclosure of sexual orientation.
- Add language clarifying "significant changes" to the provider FAQs.

VI. Review of proposed language for "Significant Change in Circumstances" policy

- HomeBase explained the background of the change in circumstance discussion from the last CAWG.
- **Proposed Policy Presented**
The **blue** text would be added to Quality Assurance Standards Section J.V.F. (Updates to Assessments):
*"As long as individuals/families remain homeless, they should complete the VI-SPDAT annually to capture changes in their circumstances. In addition, individuals/ households may complete an update whenever they experience a **life event or change in circumstances that substantially impacts their vulnerability. This may include, but is not limited to, a significant change in:***
 - ***Amount of income or benefits,***
 - ***Health or disabling condition,***
 - ***Ability to care for oneself or dependents,***
 - ***Family composition, and/or***
 - ***Exposure to imminent danger or risk of severe physical harm."***
- **CAWG Participant Feedback on Proposed Policy**
 - I really like the draft, it includes a lot of the things I was thinking.
 - Clarify that disabling condition might mean both physical or mental. Define "disabling condition."
 - OSH responded that this may not be necessary because this is a policy document not meant for clients to see.
 - For me the policy is straight to the point and something I feel comfortable sharing with my staff doing the VI-SPDAT, I think it has plenty of examples.
 - Add language on "significant changes" to the provider FAQs.
 - Is there a way to define the percent of income?
 - OSH responded that this may not be necessary because the VI-SPDAT only assesses if someone has income and not the level of income

V. Check Out

- Next CAWG meeting is on July 12 1-3pm at the Health Trust