



## Results-based Accountability Committee Meeting Minutes

**January 10, 2022**  
**2:00 – 3:30 p.m.**

[\*\*Join Zoom Meeting\*\*](#)

**Phone:** 1 669 900 6833  
**Meeting ID:** 856 2878 9977  
**Passcode:** 544551

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. on Zoom by Julian Leiserson, Chair.

**Attendees:** Julian Leiserson, Chair (Abode Services), Kamesh Mamidipudi (Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department), Sharon Osterweil (Lifelong Medical), Deidre Wan (Berkley Youth Alternatives), Arlene Hipp (Community Member), Andy Duong (Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department), Miguel Dwin (Alameda County Human Services Commission), Kristin Clopton (invite by way of OHCC), Everett Morgan (Lifelong Medical), Fernando Esquivel (Bay Area Community Services), Suzanne Campillo (Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department), Brittany Carnegie (City of Berkeley)

**EveryOne Home Attendees:** Katie Haverly (Director of Research & Data Analytics), Tirza White (Senior Director of System Performance & Data Analytics)

*Notes approved by Chair Julian Leiserson.*

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

- Julian opened the meeting and welcomed attendees.
- Katie added agenda to the chat

### 2. Announcements

- **Minutes and Arlene's comments:** Katie added December 2021 meeting notes and asked for clarification. None offered. Arlene's comments from December's meeting were also shared.
  - What is length of time to moving into housing? Answer Katie provided – can derive it in HMIS. Arlene pointed out the timeframe for responding is too long to client needs and there are not good ways to follow a client through the system. Questions how collaboration works across multiple agencies (Veterans services, reentry, social services etc.) so that it moves effortlessly. When you're homeless you are in crisis and it seems this process takes too long.
    - Adjustment to mandatory LOS for emergency shelters was made 1-2 years ago – were able to keep people for longer than 90 days. Julian explained the reason for the extension – to provide more services and help better get them connected to services. When looking at this data, result was serving fewer people because they were able to let them stay longer but seeing better outcomes and fewer exits to homelessness. Julian shared the community queue

in HMIS allows for notes to provide more information on the client situation that others can review.

- Deidre: Intake and assessment forms. She asked if that's through HMIS. Julian said, yes. Deidre: asked if they need to go to HMIS agency when someone needs help. Katie shared that since not all programs use HMIS that work with individuals need housing, and it is important to think about how to we have these agencies and systems talk better to each other to better serve the client. Julian said to go to 211 because that has more comprehensive data on those that needs services. We are adding more 211 information to our dashboard.
- Arlene stressed collaboration and less siloing of systems. Katie mentioned looking at outside data sources could help with this and Julian mentioned the Community Health Record could also be helpful. Arlene shared why can't all of the agencies involved in serving the individual be better coordinated. For safety purposes and HIPAA certain information can't be released which she understands, but what about workforce development. How do we move people up the economic ladder from rapid rehousing solutions, for example. Katie shared the new CoC governance structure will draw from a wider group of stakeholders and providers to provide an opportunity for better coordination and communication.
- Miguel wants to understand who is responsible for the function of entering the data we are looking to analyze. Also, how will we track individuals who are dropping through the system that we don't know where they are. How are we going to collaborate to ensure this committee gets the information and data we need so we can share the data needed for the community's understanding. Arlene shared how do we get more funding to help with this.
- Addressing Arlene's question - Julian shared that we can look at data by cities and regions somewhat but it's tricky, and self reported and not consistent across the county. Miguel asked if we could put the specific providers under the program types so we know who is providing these services, also could help with the NOFO committee to know which programs the providers are funding. Katie shared that quite a few programs can be in each project type and we are able to see which programs are in each project type. Miguel thought it would be helpful to know program by program how they are faring. Tirza shared that the HMIS Oversight Committee meetings talk more about project and program monitoring and that folks are welcome to join.

- **Co-Chair:** Julian made a call for a co-chair and explained the time commitment and role of the co-chair. No members stepped forward with interest.
- **PIT Count – updates**
  - Provided an update on possible delayed PIT, the planning team next steps, and the upcoming HUD CoC emergency meeting and the work to build a different strategy for conducting PIT.
- **Present final scorecard indicators**
  - Shared proposed practitioner scorecard and next steps for the proposed scorecard
  - Will be working with HMIS OC to support HMIS data monitoring
  - New scorecard will go before Leadership Board
  - Includes data from 211, census data, and the Coordinated Entry system as well as disaggregating data by race and ethnicity

- Shared examples of how it might look moving forward – Returns to Homelessness by race and ethnicity. Used African Americans to show how the new scorecard will show disaggregated data.
- Everett shared that he was very happy to see disaggregated data
- Julian asked if census data can be another bar graph next to total enrollments and return to homelessness within 2 years
- Miguel asked if we can do a deep dive into the dynamics of the data and why it's happening. Katie answered that subsequent qualitative data collection efforts can answer some of the "why" questions about why these trends and inequities persist.

### 3. Discussion of Coordinated Entry Evaluation

- Julian explained Coordinated Entry Evaluation
  - May suggest having a working group
  - Listed Coordinated Entry requirements (annually, participant and provider feedback, and three components – compliance, effectiveness, and process)
  - System Coordination Committee (SCC) will decide if subcommittee will be gathered
- Julian covered the previous Coordinated Entry evaluation published in January 2020
  - *Two Participant focus groups and interviews* – 25 participants at three regional locations (Oakland, Berkeley and Hayward)
  - *Provider process evaluation* – Large and small group in person discussion with coordinated entry providers and funders
  - *Analysis of HMIS prioritization data* – demographics, subpopulations and matching
  - *Coordinated Entry Self Assessment* – Required by HUD, completed by SCC Committee
- 2022 Coordinated Entry Evaluation Considerations – shared with attendees that we have these three components available:
  1. Have self-assessment completed by HCSA (Completes compliance portion)
  2. Have Focus Strategies (quantitative evaluation of Coordinated Entry Assessment tool)
  3. There are HMIS reports on the Coordinated Entry system to look at components.

Miguel asked for clarification on who uses Coordinated Entry. Katie answered: Public Housing Authorities, specific providers, 211. But not all provides are access points for the system. Miguel's follow up -- "Does all info in Coordinated Entry go into HMIS?" Katie: Yes.

Julian asked the group for feedback on:

- Who should conduct the evaluation?
- Key elements to include in the evaluation?
- Proposed timeline for evaluation?

- Goal: want to give this feedback to SCC committee
- Coordinated Entry suggested Evaluation Plan to be presented to HUD CoC Committee in February

- Brittany said many are still learning the new system. Would be interesting to see what the county is doing in researching the scoring for the current quantitative analysis.
- Sharon asked if this is something we can get Homebase to do, the Coordinated Entry Evaluation. Katie explained the evaluation is based on what aspects of Coordinated Entry are meaningful to the CoC. Sharon explained that they're not matching to resources yet that

way, especially for the crisis queue. Doesn't know if there's a way to evaluate the crisis queue if we haven't as a system started to match that way, should consider this in the evaluation. Sharon said there is a lack of transparency on how matching happens. Fernando said you need a special agency manager license to match and that it is important to go back to the providers to better understand how the system is working.

- Sharon thinks it will be a challenge because it's hard to evaluate when it's not working as intended and we don't have enough reliable data to explore those data and that process measures may be more important to pursue for this evaluation than outcomes due to the current nebulousness of the system. System needs to be more resilient and improved. It's worth looking at how the rollout occurred. Mentioned one key person left and the rollout of the new system was delayed and had many problems because our system is not resilient enough to weather that.
- Andy talked about Patrick's recommendations and that they were not accepted as a part of the Coordinated Entry upgrade. As a result of ignoring his technical advice, Andy noted, our system is less than optimal in how it operates.
- Julian contextualized that HUD told communities to build a coordinated entry system and we had to jump to it. Only recently was a manual released to help support evaluating the system.
- Deidre reinforced and agreed with Andy's assessment of the front end and backend issues with transitioning to Coordinated Entry/HMIS integration. Andy said coordination between front and backend is necessary instead of using two distinct groups. Sharon said that focusing on the bigger picture system can be helpful when frustrated, especially when this country and this government do not see housing as a human right, so there are very few resources to provide and the people who are affected. The people she works with are doing the absolute best they can with the insane lack of resources.
- Miguel: Recommendation coming out of this committee that the evaluation should really be based around training and development for individuals who are doing these functions, especially with a lack of collaboration between the front and back end.
- Arlene is curious how information will be collected from users of the system to better design the system and emphasized the importance of succession planning when these changes occur. Miguel shared that it is more important to understand how do you ensure individuals retain information from a training, not just the information presented in the training. Are there polls after the training to assess this?

Overall Key Recommendations from RBA Committee for Coordinated Entry Evaluation:

- Focus on process measures/process evaluation instead of outcome measures/outcome evaluation due to limited/unreliable data and the limited amount of time the system and trainings have been live for the community
- Focus on how effective the training is for users, gather feedback from providers on their understanding and use of the system after receiving the training and where improvements could be made
- Include the results, if possible, from the quantitative scoring evaluation currently being conducted by Focus Strategies
- Include the self assessment that was recently completed

**4. Agenda Input for February 14<sup>th</sup> meeting**

- Coordinated Entry Evaluation Plan
- Presentation of new scorecard data
- Turn the Curve - Race/equity data monitoring

Katie concluded the meeting at 3:35 pm

