

**Santa Clara County Continuum of Care
Coordinated Entry Working Group Meeting Notes
July 14, 2022**

Coordinated Entry System Data Update

- Leila from OSH provided data on the Coordinated Entry System (CES) Assessment (VI-SPDAT) data from November 1, 2015 – June 30, 2022
 - 49,608 total VI-SPDATs (includes duplicates)
 - 31,401 unduplicated VI-SPDATs
 - 24,295 individual adults (78%)
 - 2,004 transition age youth (TAY 6%)
 - Note: TAY (18-24-year-olds) are also assessed with Single Adult or Family VI-SPDATs. Because of this, TAY actually make up about 13% of all assessments.
 - 5,040 families with children
 - 62 justice discharges
 - 1,085 VISPDATS are included from the Confidential Queue as of 6/30/2022
 - Roughly 40 per month
- Intervention score range data from November 1, 2015 – June 30, 2022
 - 37% score within Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) range
 - 3,563 referrals to PSH to date
 - 48% score within Rapid Rehousing (RRH) range
 - 8,120 referrals to RRH to date
 - 500 households were referred directly to rapid rehousing programs and not through the traditional VISDPAT route. These direct referrals are mainly through veteran and CALWORKS family programs.
 - 15% score within Minimal intervention range
- CEWG members had the following questions regarding the data presented:
 - A community member asked what the justice data signified
 - Leila responded that clients who have a criminal background receive this assessment, but noted that this number has remained constant.
 - Based on a request from the last meeting, a chart was displayed to disclose data regarding where people sleep most frequently, and included single adults, family and youth.
 - Outdoors: 44%
 - Car: 17%
 - Shelters: 16%
 - Other: 9%
 - Couch surfing: 7%
 - Transitional Housing: 5%
 - Safe Haven: 2%
 - Client doesn't know/Refused: 0%

- There was a question from a community member as to why those people who are struggling the most with the highest scores in the chart are not in rapid rehousing or quick rehousing?
 - Hilary answered RRH is a program design model. In both RRH and PSH, we are trying to get people housed as quickly as possible. RRH has a time-limited phase. Folks who receive higher acuity scores get connected to deeper level service subsidy.
- Hilary encouraged people to reach out to Hong Cao if they had questions about the community queue. There is a community queue, not a waiting list.
- A CEWG member inquired if there is there a plan to develop an "on the ground" secondary assessment for extreme cases that aren't reflected through the VI-SPDAT assessment?
 - Hilary said to wait for an update farther on during the meeting.
- A CEWG member asked what happens to people who are in RRH and can't afford rent?
 - Hilary suggested to bring this conversation to a future meeting.

Ad Hoc Meeting

- Hong Cao from OSH explained that this was in part a request to focus on questions that were put in the parking lot during earlier Prioritization Committee meetings. The purpose of this meeting is to answer questions about coordinated entry, clients who have been assessed but have not heard back, etc. The ad hoc meeting is July 18th and based on the lessons learned from how that meeting goes, OSH will host another ad hoc meeting open to the larger public to have their questions about coordinated entry answered.

Prioritization Committee

- Nikole and Carla from Homebase also provided an update with regard to the work that the Prioritization Committee has been leading.
 - Some members of this committee summarized what the group has talked about and the work that has been done to provide services for those who need it such as veteran's, children, families, and people with disabilities' needs.
 - The committee values were presented on a slide and are listed below:
 - Centering client choice regarding housing and services that will meet individual needs
 - Protecting people who may not be able to protect themselves (children, youth and young adults, pregnant persons, seniors)
 - Preventing physical harm (abuse, assault, hate crimes, intimate partner violence, sexual assault, trafficking) and prioritizing those who have experienced it
 - Honoring veterans
 - Helping people returning from incarceration to get a fresh start
 - Prioritizing chronically homeless persons (to prevent deterioration of physical and mental health and death)
 - Prioritizing racial/ethnic groups over-represented in the homeless population

- Protecting people who may not be able to take care of themselves (people unable to perform activities of daily living)
 - Prioritizing individuals who are unsheltered living outdoors
- Hilary emphasized that the timeline for this work is roughly two years and said that this process with the Prioritization Committee was the first piece that had to be done in order to start creating changes.
- A member asked how they are centering participant's choices for housing and services.
 - Nikole answered that the Prioritization Committee looked at another community's model where there is a section about client choice (e.g., would you accept the first housing that is offered to you, would you prefer PSH over RRH, are there certain neighborhoods that you can't move to, etc.) and then determined which questions felt of most importance to be asking clients regarding housing placement in SCC.
- Wendy Chen asked if the population that she works for was included in this prioritization work like people in the 290 and people with severe criminal backgrounds who face more challenges.
 - Nikole answered that there has been limited discussion regarding parsing out the nuances within subpopulations of those impacted by the criminal legal system but this is continuous work where and we will be hosting listening sessions to delve further into this.
- A community member asked a question about the value where it says people who may not be able to take care of themselves. He noted that some staff need to answer some questions for people who may have a mental illness who may not be able to help themselves.
 - Nikole answered that there was a subcommittee where this was discussed and one of the recommendations was to incorporate assessor observation and this will be rolling out shortly. This can be discussed in the Ad Hoc meeting further.
- There was a question about whether there has been any consideration for prioritizing based on length of time without housing.
 - Yes, the Prioritization Committee has discussed this and will be continuing to think through implications for prioritizing based on length of time.
- There was another question on whether families who are impacted by natural disasters were included in the purpose of this committee.
 - Hilary answered that might not be part of the scope but there is a staff member in the office who works for situations like this.
- Hilary mentioned that this committee will meet one more time for a retreat to work with the details of the prioritization. They will then present their final recommendations to the CoC Board. After this, there will be the implementation committee that will work on operationalizing the values defined by the Prioritization Committee.