

Implementation Group #4 Subcommittee Meeting Coordinated Assessment System

Megan Kurteff Schatz
December 17, 2014

www.focusstrategies.net



CA/CI REPORT FEEDBACK



FocusStrategies.net

Agenda Overview

- Present summary of comments on the CA-CI report, including:
 - Reviewers' overall impressions and opinions;
 - Suggestions about implementation;
 - Requests for clarification
- Group discussion of report and comments



FocusStrategies.net

Review of Feedback Process

- Providers received copies of the CA-CI report at the November CA-CI meeting
- Opportunity to provide written comments by December 15, 2014
- Comments received from 12 organizations



FocusStrategies.net

Main Topics Covered

1. Implementation Timing
2. Workgroups
3. Included/Excluded Programs
4. Right-Sizing
5. Focus on Literal Homelessness/Housing First
6. Program Barriers
7. Connections to other Systems



FocusStrategies.net

Main Topics Covered

8. Client Choice
9. Prevention/Diversion
10. Emergency Shelter
11. Permanent Supportive Housing
12. System Entry Points
13. Data/HMIS
14. Funding Needs



FocusStrategies.net

1. Timing

- Proposed timing is very ambitious!
- Re-shaping of programs will require major culture shift and funding shifts
- Completing rollout for PSH by March 2015 is too fast

Response: Yes, it is ambitious. PSH timeline will likely push out to July 2015. But also important to move forward with entire system as efficiently as feasible while also creating a system that works for OC.



FocusStrategies.net

2. Workgroups

- General support for idea of 4 workgroups
- Suggestions about using existing groups (e.g. Executive Committee = Policy Committee)
- Important for workgroups to be well coordinated.

Response: Identification of groups is in process, will be decided by C2eH.



FocusStrategies.net

3. Included/Excluded Programs

Questions about which programs will be required to be included in CA-CI and which can “opt out.”

Response: All CoC and ESG funded programs must participate. Local funders may require programs receiving private funding or other local public funding to participate.



FocusStrategies.net

4. Right Sizing

Many observations that the proposed CA-CI system will not function effectively until there is an available intervention for everyone who is homeless. Need more ES, RRH and PSH.

Response: Yes, the report recommends right sizing and expanding ES, RRH and PSH. The community should be working on the CA-CI in parallel with system right sizing efforts.



FocusStrategies.net

5. Focus on Literal Homelessness/ Housing First Approach

Concerns about system only serving literally homeless people. What about prevention, transitional housing that serve at-risk people?

Response: To end homelessness, homeless funding resources must be prioritized for people who are literally homeless. People who are in poverty and unstably housed can still be served, but with other resources.



FocusStrategies.net

5. Focus on Literal Homelessness/ Housing First Approach

Concerns about implications of housing high barrier/high need people in the community.

Response: Housing chronically homeless people and those with high barriers is very hard work. However, research strongly supports the effectiveness of Housing First strategies.



FocusStrategies.net

6. Program Barriers

- General comments about difficulty of removing barriers.
- Specific concerns about allowing people to use illegal substances while in programs

Response: Programs can remove sobriety requirements/drug testing as a condition of program entry but still prohibit use of substances on-site.



FocusStrategies.net

7. Other Systems

How do other publicly funded systems connect to CA-CI? Behavioral health is mentioned in the report but others are not.

Response: Excellent question and these details are to be worked out.



FocusStrategies.net

8. Client Choice

The report does not say much about client choice and self-determination. Will clients have to accept whatever referral they receive or will they have choices?

Response: Best practices suggest clients should have some choices, but also there must be some limits on numbers of referrals that can be declined.



FocusStrategies.net

9. Prevention/Diversion

How does the Prevention pilot fit in to CA-CI?

Response: The prevention group has just presented their proposals to C2eH this month. We are working on recommendations about how to align these two initiatives.



FocusStrategies.net

10. Emergency Shelter

Role of shelter is not discussed much in the report. How will existing “same day” shelter beds be handled in CA-CI?

Response: Ideally the CA-CI will include a system for same day shelter bed reservation and shelter beds would be prioritized to some degree for highest need households.



FocusStrategies.net

11. Permanent Supportive Housing

- Concerns about Housing First Approach (see # 5)
- Observation that report focuses mainly on OCHA’s tenant-based S+C and does not address other PSH, including site-based developments

Response: The report does focus on OCHA as main provider of PSH, but all CoC-funded PSH must be part of CA-CI and will be included in implementation planning.



FocusStrategies.net

11. Permanent Supportive Housing

Concerns about “graduating” PSH tenants to HCV. Will they lose needed services? Does HUD allow this?

Response: HUD has issued guidance specifically encouraging Housing Authorities to allow PSH residents who are stable and need only mainstream services to “move on” to the HCV program. These tenants would continue to receive the supports they need to remain housed.



FocusStrategies.net

11. Permanent Supportive Housing

Questions about prioritization based on vulnerability. What about programs that are required to serve people with specific disabilities? Do they have to accept highest need clients regardless of type of disability?

Response: HUD says PSH programs must comply with existing restrictions on targeted disabilities (i.e. if funded to serve people with mental illness they must continue to do so), and so CA-CI can only refer clients who meet those criteria.



FocusStrategies.net

12. System Entry Points

Some commenters advocated for “no wrong door” approach where all programs are entry points and can conduct assessment.

Response: Given the large number of existing entry points in Orange County and complexity of ensuring standardized use of a single tool/process, this likely would not be feasible.



FocusStrategies.net

13. Data/HMIS

Concerns about (1) open HMIS/data sharing and confidentiality issues; (2) burden on staff of real time data entry

Response: Most systems that are having success with CA-CI have found open HMIS and real time data entry are essential. Confidentiality can be handled through strong client privacy policies that are strictly enforced and monitored.



FocusStrategies.net

13. con't Data/HMIS

Concerns about using Adsystem. Existing implementation has been “patched” many times and is “creaky.” Should we consider a different vendor/system?

Response: Focus Strategies believes the Adsystem CAS module is well suited for the type of CA-CI approach Orange County is considering, and no system has a flawless track record .



FocusStrategies.net

13. Data/HMIS

Suggestion that data system decisions be tackled first, not at the end.

Response: We are evaluating the timing of the data system work and agree this should begin as quickly as possible.



FocusStrategies.net

14. Funding Needs

Observation that many key elements of CA-CI have no existing funding (e.g. diversion, landlord outreach, services for PSH tenants, HMIS data entry, training/TA for providers).

Response: 2-1-1OC is working with local funders to secure as much funding as possible, as quickly as possible.



FocusStrategies.net

Discussion



FocusStrategies.net