SYSTEM COORDINATION COMMITTEE AGENDA
4-10-2019

1. Director’s Report (Julie) 2:00-2:10pm
   a. CESH Round 1 and Round 2
   b. EOH public participation policies approved by HUD CoC
   c. HUD CoC approval of the Housing Crisis System Manual
   d. Recruitment announcement and application for DV seat was sent out, vote will take place next meeting
   e. HUD Technical Assistance

2. Action Items (Peter) 2:10-2:30pm
   a. CESH Use of Funds – Rounds 1 and 2 (Peter)
      i. Presentation by Linda Gardner, HCD
      ii. Discussion
      iii. Call to Vote
      iv. Vote, if called
   b. Election of new Chair/Vice-Chair (Julie) 2:30-2:50pm
      i. Thank you to Peter and Jamie
      ii. Presentation of Nominations to Date
      iii. Nominations
      iv. Accept/Decline Nominations
      v. Vote on Chair
      vi. Vote on Vice-Chair
   c. CE Evaluation Plan (Jessie) 2:50-3:05pm
      i. Presentation
      ii. Discussion
      iii. Vote
   d. Homelessness Prevention Guidelines (Jamie) 3:05-3:20pm
      i. Presentation
      ii. Discussion
      iii. Vote

3. Urgent Items (Peter) 3:20-3:35pm
   a. Reminder to send any urgent items to Director, Chair, Co-Chair in advance
   b. Document Readiness Preference for PSH Matching

4. Discussion Items (Peter) 3:35-3:45pm
   a. Housing Blitz Progress Report (Jamie)
   b. Rapid Rehousing Inventory (Vivian) 3:45-3:50pm
5. Plan of Action (Peter) 3:50-4:00pm
   a. Topics for Upcoming Work Groups

6. Consent Items
   a. None
HUD Requirements and Guidance on Coordinated Entry Evaluation

Coordinated Entry Implementation Entities and Responsibilities: As a system-level process, coordinated entry requires intensive coordination and communication among all the projects and agencies in the CoC and, ideally, all of those otherwise available in the community to serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness, including programs that can serve that population but may not be targeting it. A formal policy and management structure facilitates both.

To complete the work associated with coordinated entry requires:

- a *policy oversight* responsibility to establish and review policies and procedures
- a *management* responsibility to implement the day-to-day workflow of the process
- an *evaluation* responsibility to assess the performance of the system and create a feedback loop to the policy oversight entity

These responsibilities can be executed separately by different entities or combined and managed by a single entity or body identified by the CoC to carry out the corresponding tasks.

(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 1, Policy and Management Roles and Responsibilities)
**Evaluation Entity:** This activity may be undertaken by the policy oversight entity or another entity defined by the CoC, but must not be undertaken by the management entity. The CoC Board or Board Committee must authorize the evaluation entity to conduct the evaluation.

*(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 1.3, Evaluation Entity)*

**Coordinated Entry Evaluation:** In the context of coordinated entry, evaluation is the process of using participant and provider data to measure the functioning of the CE process.

**Core Questions:** The core questions to ask in evaluating the coordinated entry process are:

- Does the CoC’s implementation of coordinated entry efficiently and effectively assist persons to end their housing crisis?
- Are the housing and services interventions in the CoC more efficient and effective because of coordinated entry?

*(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 1.3, Evaluation Entity)*

**Evaluation Responsibilities:** The plan for conducting this evaluation should be developed early in the process of planning coordinated entry and then reviewed frequently throughout its implementation. CoCs must ensure that evaluation is on their implementation planning agenda from day one, even if the planned evaluation is relatively small in scope. In establishing an evaluation plan, the evaluation responsibilities should include the following:

- Determine which aspects of the effectiveness of its system will be measured.
- Determine which aspects of the process will be evaluated for fidelity to CE policies and procedures and HUD’s coordinated entry requirements.
- Determine how to gather data to track the selected measures, incorporating in the evaluation process the required stakeholders, at a minimum.
- Determine whether and how the CoC uses evaluation results to inform other aspects of system planning and monitoring, including evaluating whether the CoC has too much or too little of certain housing and supportive services resources overall and for specific subpopulations (e.g., youth, adults with children).
- Coordinate with partners (e.g., ESG recipients, SSVF recipients, etc.) so data are collected consistently across programs, to make sure evaluations are thorough and coordinated.

*(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 4.1: Establishing a CE Evaluation Plan)*

**Performance Monitoring vs Evaluation:** A critical coordinated entry management function is monitoring of system and project level processes to ensure the CE is functioning as planned and system efficiency goals are achieved. There is a significant overlap between data collection and analysis related to monitoring and those related to evaluation. Although both performance monitoring and CE evaluation rely on the data collected by coordinated entry providers, these two activities serve different purposes.

- Monitoring is the responsibility of the management entity and should focus on the question of whether the CE is being implemented in the way it was designed, and whether individual
agencies are appropriately engaging with and participating in the system as established by the CoC. Performance monitoring, which focuses on system functioning, should happen at least quarterly.

- Evaluation is the responsibility of the evaluation entity and should focus on the question, is the system, as established by the CoC, the most efficient and effective system structure to move people quickly out of homelessness and prevent more homelessness?

(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 1.2, Management Entity and Chapter 4, Annual Coordinated Entry Evaluation)

Requirements for Coordinated Entry Evaluation:

- HUD requires CE evaluation to occur annually, focusing on the quality and effectiveness of the entire coordinated entry experience, including intake, assessment, and referral processes, for both participating projects and participants. Effectiveness is ensuring not only that the CE is compliant and operating as intended, but also that the CE is positively affecting the overall system performance. This evaluation creates an opportunity to modify CE operations to better achieve positive outcomes.
- CoCs should ensure that their coordinated entry design addresses each required element and that their written coordinated entry policies and procedures clearly describe the process or expectation for each element.
- Written policies and procedures must describe the frequency and method by which the evaluation will be conducted, including how project participants will be selected to provide feedback, and must describe a process by which the evaluation is used to implement updates to existing policies and procedures.
- The effectiveness and efficiency of the CE process, feedback about the ease of use from persons experiencing a housing crisis, and an assessment of referral outcomes should all inform the annual update to the CoC’s policies and procedures and regular updates to ESG written standards.
- The CoC must facilitate ongoing planning and stakeholder consultation concerning coordinated entry. Evaluation must solicit feedback at least annually from participating projects and from households that participated in coordinated entry during that time period. Solicitations must address the quality and effectiveness of the entire coordinated entry experience for both participating projects and households and must use the feedback to make necessary updates to the coordinated entry process written policies and procedures.
- Participating projects include CoC and ESG-funded shelter and housing projects that are required to participate in coordinated entry, as well as other publicly and privately funded shelter and housing projects serving people experiencing homelessness.
- The participants selected by the CoC to participate in the evaluation must include households, including individuals, families and unaccompanied children and youth, experiencing homelessness or who have been connected to housing resources through the CE process in the last year.
- CoC must ensure adequate privacy protections of all participant information collected in the course of the annual coordinated entry evaluation.

(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 4, Annual Coordinated Entry Evaluation, HUD Coordinated Entry Notice: Sections II.B.12 and II.B.15)
**Recommended Approaches to Evaluation:** HUD does not prescribe the scope or specific methods of the required annual CE evaluation, however they do provide guidance and recommendations on the use of basic approaches and methodologies:

- **Compliance Evaluation:** Compliance evaluation asks if the CE process as designed, documented in policies and procedures, and implemented through practice is compliant with HUD requirements and local requirements for Coordinated Entry.
  - The [Coordinated Entry Self-Assessment](#) provides a comprehensive assessment of HUD’s requirements for coordinated entry from the [Coordinated Entry Notice](#), the Prioritization Notice, the [Coordinated Entry Policy Brief](#), the [CoC Program interim rule](#), the [ESG interim rule](#), and the [HUD Equal Access rule](#).
  - Compliance evaluation should also assess that the CE process is compliant with locally established policies and procedures that go beyond HUD’s requirements.
  - A systematic review of the Access, Assessment, Prioritization, and Referral policies and practices including data from stakeholders, provides the qualitative data needed to assess compliance.

- **Effectiveness Evaluation:** Effectiveness evaluation asks how effective the CE process is in connecting people experiencing homelessness to appropriate referrals. In this type of evaluation, questions explore system need, time to referral, referral appropriateness, and referral outcomes.

- **Process Evaluation:** Process evaluation asks how the CE process has been implemented and whether it is currently operating in accordance with the CoC’s established policies and procedures.

- **Appropriate Feedback Methodologies:** CoCs may use any combination of these methods:
  - Surveys designed to reach either the entire population or a representative sample of participating providers and households;
  - Focus groups of five or more participants that approximate the diversity of the participating providers and households; and
  - Individual interviews with participating providers and enough participants to approximate the diversity of participating households.

*(from Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide: Chapter 4.3, 4.4, 4.5: Basic Approaches, HUD Coordinated Entry Notice: Section II.B.15)*
RECOMMENDATION: 2019 Coordinated Entry Annual Evaluation

DEVELOPED BY: EveryOne Home Staff

DATE: April 10, 2019

PURPOSE:
- Affirm the need for an annual evaluation of coordinated entry during calendar year 2019
- Acknowledge the constraints of a comprehensive evaluation
- Authorize the first annual evaluation of coordinated entry

BACKGROUND:
The Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide released in October 2018 describes HUD’s expectation for the annual evaluation of Coordinated Entry. The evaluation may be undertaken by the policy oversight entity or another entity defined by the CoC, but must not be undertaken by the management entity. The CoC Board or Board Committee must authorize the evaluation entity to conduct the evaluation.

Fulfilling this expectation in the Alameda County Continuum of Care for 2019 is complicated by the following factors:
- Resources have not been identified to support a comprehensive evaluation.
- The management entity has not yet been designated.
- Coordinated entry data collection is not fully built out in the HMIS.

RECOMMENDATION:
System Coordination Committee authorize EveryOne Home staff to undertake an initial, narrowly focused annual evaluation of coordinated entry. The evaluation plan will be developed through a System Coordination Committee Working Group including timeline, research questions, data collection, and how System Coordination Committee will use the results for system improvement.
RECOMMENDATION 1: Adopt Homelessness Prevention Guidelines for the Alameda County Housing Crisis Response System

RECOMMENDATION 2: Re-convene the SCC Homelessness Prevention Work Group

DEVELOPED BY: System Coordination Committee, SCC Homelessness Prevention Work Group

DATE RECOMMENDED: April 10, 2019

PURPOSE:

- Establish guidelines for targeting homelessness prevention resources in the Alameda County Housing Crisis Response System
- Use evidence-based best practices to design interventions that position homelessness prevention services as close to the ‘front door’ of homelessness as possible and to ensure that resources are targeted to households with the highest likelihood and immediacy of future homelessness.
- Re-convene the SCC Homelessness Prevention Work Group to develop standard homelessness prevention policies and procedures that:
  - Formalize the prioritization guidelines into standard policies and procedures for identified funding sources
  - Meet HUD Coordinated Entry requirements and ESG Standards

BACKGROUND:
The primary purpose of homelessness prevention (HP) is to reduce entries into homelessness and/or shorten stays in homelessness to the greatest extent feasible. According to a December 2018 Review of Best and Promising Practices in Homeless Prevention by Abt Associates, the strongest prevention programs are those with success in targeting and serving the “highest risk” households, meaning the households with the highest likelihood and immediacy of future homelessness. The reviews states that programs accomplish that goal first by locating the prevention intervention as close to the front door as possible and then by identifying households with the greatest and most entrenched barriers to housing. HP interventions that target people at the highest risk levels have been shown to make the biggest difference.

While the ability to predict a potential participant’s outcomes based on risk and protective factors is limited, the review of best and promising practices identifies evidence-based factors or attributes that increase the likelihood and immediacy of future homelessness. The single best predictor (the highest
risk factor) of becoming homeless is having been homeless previously. Other highly predictive factors include: Being doubled up and not being the lease holder, receiving public assistance and having high levels of rent arrears, or debt and sudden changes in income.

The following inventory of prevention programs was conducted by Everyone Home on September 4, 2018:

- Keep Oakland House
- Catholic Charities
- Seasons of Sharing (SSA)
- BHCS (HCSA)
- HRCs (HCSA/HCD)
- VA/SSVF
- City funding (specifics unknown, came from county presentation ppt in 2017)
- County funding (specifics unknown, came from county presentation ppt in 2017)

The programs are funded through a combination of funding sources including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOCP SSVF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFHP SSVF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP SSVF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charities (incl FEMA, excl. SOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons of Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC Contracts: Boomerang (Abode)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC Contracts: Boomerang (Oakland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC Contract: Boomerang (Berkeley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other FEMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Oakland Housed (Private Funding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While a couple of prevention programs in Alameda County—namely those funded by VA’s SSVF and ESG—operate using best practices of targeting, criteria, and standard tools designed to reach households with the greatest risk of homelessness, most prevention programs are using criteria, tools, and administrative processes not specifically designed to reach households with the greatest likelihood of homelessness. In some cases, program models can actually screen out these households through
eligibility requirements such as the requirement to hold a lease. Below are a list of other criteria and eligibility used in prevention programs in Alameda County:

- Must be 55 years of age or older
- Must have legal notice (3 day notice, unlawful detainer)
- Must hold a lease
- Must be at 30-50% AMI
- Must demonstrate ability to sustain rent after intervention
- Must complete budget demonstrating ability to pay
- Must have proof of income
- Intervention must be a ‘one time’ intervention

RECOMMENDATION 1:

In order to reduce entries into homelessness and/or shorten stays in homelessness and to effectively use federal, state, and local homelessness prevention funds, the following Homelessness Prevention Guidelines are proposed:

1. Homelessness prevention is a critical component of the Housing Crisis Response System and the primary purpose shall be to reduce entries into homelessness and/or shorten stays in homelessness to the greatest extent feasible.

2. Programs with the greatest impact on reducing entries or stays in homelessness, include the following core components:
   a. Efficient targeting: Identification of evidence-based risk factors that increase the likelihood and immediacy of future homelessness through the use of an empirically-based screening tool;
   b. Effective program models: Delivery of program models proven to be effective and situated within the Housing Crisis Response System closest to the “front door” of homelessness.

3. Homeless prevention resources shall be targeted to households who are at the highest and most imminent risk of homelessness using the following factors:
   a. Previous experience(s) of homelessness;
   b. Being doubled up and not being the lease holder;
   c. Receiving public assistance (including being housed in affordable/subsidized housing/PSH) and having high levels of rent arrears or debt;
   d. Sudden changes in income.

4. Homelessness prevention programs shall use evidence-based models such as:
a. Standardized, empirically-based screening criteria and tools that identify and target resources to households at greatest risk of homelessness (Example: SSVF Homelessness Prevention Screening Tool);
b. Referral to or provision of services/resources which are proven to effectively prevent homelessness for those at greatest risk (Examples: Community-based outreach and intensive services, permanent housing subsidies, flexible temporary financial assistance, critical time intervention for people leaving institutions).

5. These guidelines shall be considered for all funding and policy decisions related to homelessness prevention within the Alameda County Housing Crisis Response System.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

Re-convene the SCC Homelessness Prevention Work Group to develop standard homelessness prevention policies and procedures that:
- Formalize the prioritization guidelines into standard policies and procedures for identified funding sources;
- Meet HUD Coordinated Entry requirements and ESG Standards;
## 2019 System Coordination Committee Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Manual Published, HUD CoC/SCC Joint Session on CE Management Entity with HUD TA</td>
<td>Review SCC Workplan, Debrief CE Mgmt Entity Session, Review EOH public participation policy</td>
<td>Recruit DV Representative, Vote on Chair/Co-Chair, Review changes in seats</td>
<td>Approve DV Representative, Review Manual</td>
<td>Vote on Rec for CE Mgmt Entity</td>
<td>SCC Annual Membership, Vote Chairs/Co-Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prioritization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data &amp; Privacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universal Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Building/Resources/Funding for HCRS/CE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CE Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>