SYSTEM COORDINATION COMMITTEE AGENDA
1-08-2019

System Coordination Committee meetings are open to the public. Homeless and formerly homeless Alameda County residents are encouraged to attend. Public comment will be taken at the beginning of each meeting and is limited to 2 minutes per person.

Persons who are unable to attend the meeting may submit written comments. Comments should address an item on the agenda and be submitted prior to the meeting. Comments which include “For Public Distribution” in either the title and/or body of the email or letter will be brought to the attention of the SCC Committee and included in the public meeting notes. Written comments should be submitted to: jleadbetter@everyonehome.org or Julie Leadbetter, Director of System Coordination 101 Callan Ave, Ste 230, San Leandro, CA 94577

1. Public Comment (Julie) 2:00-2:10pm
a. Public comment
b. Reading of written comments submitted, if any

2. Director’s Report (Julie) 2:10-2:15pm
a. Happy New Year!
b. Coordinated Entry evaluation complete
c. Katharine Gale will present her findings and an action plan for CE Refresh in February
d. Housing Problem Solving training to take place at the end of January, after the training SCC will work to create/revise HPS policies as part of the CE Refresh
e. CoC/County/Oakland HHAP applications are underway, totaling nearly $40million for Alameda County over 5 years
f. Co-Chairs will present a 2020 SCC Workplan in February along with the CE Refresh action plan
g. CE Management Entity Recommendation to be reviewed January 21 by HUD CoC, if instructed to move forward, then staff will begin drafting an RFI
h. HMIS recommendations updates:
   i. For April 1, CE will move to project entry/exit model and Clarity will be programmed to auto exit people from CE at six months, according to the policy adopted by SCC. In April we can change the manual to reflect the new auto exit.
   ii. For housing info to be collected, SCC will need to determine the new workflow for CE and communicate to HMIS team about what should be designed after April 1.

3. Urgent Items (Julie) None
4. Discussion Items (Lara)
   a. Spending/outcomes of CESH and HEAP funds (Suzanne/Lara/C’Mone) 2:15-2:45pm
      i. County/CoC funds (Suzanne)
      ii. Large City/Oakland funds (Lara)
      iii. Youth set aside funds (C’Mone)
      iv. CE/System support funds (Suzanne)
      v. Questions/discussion
   b. Coordinated Entry Evaluation (Jessie) 2:45-3:45pm
      i. Presentation
      ii. Questions/discussion
      iii. Suggestions from Committee on what to prioritize for workplan/CE refresh
   c. Committee Membership (Suzanne) 3:45-4:00pm
      i. 4 open seats
      ii. Recruitment suggestions?

5. Action Items for Vote (Lara)
   a. None

6. Consent Items
   a. None
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Introduction and Highlights

The Oakland, Berkeley, Alameda County Continuum of Care fully launched its coordinated entry system in January 2018, implementing a standardized process that begins with access through 211 and street outreach; regional Housing Resource Centers (HRC) that administer screening, housing problem solving, and assessment; and continues with prioritization, matching and referral to regional resources such as rapid re-housing, housing navigation, transitional housing and emergency shelter at the HRC and prioritization, matching, and referral to system-wide resources such as permanent supportive housing at Home Stretch.

This document completes the first annual evaluation of the coordinated entry system in the Oakland, Berkeley, and Alameda County Continuum of Care in fulfillment of the requirements laid out in the Coordinated Entry Management and Data Guide published by HUD in October 2018. System Coordination Committee directed EveryOne Home to complete the evaluation in coordination with the Results Based Accountability Committee, but with no dedicated resources. Given the resource intensive requirement to collect and analyze input from coordinated entry providers and participants, System Coordination Committee and the CoC Board should dedicate resources to the annual evaluation of coordinated entry.

The evaluation includes four parts:

- The Summary of Key Themes from the Participant Focus Groups draws upon qualitative data collected through two focus groups and a set of interviews about the coordinated entry process.
with coordinated entry system participants. These opportunities for participant feedback took place October 23, 2019 in Berkeley, October 24, 2019 in Fremont, and October 25, 2019 in Oakland. In all, 25 people participated. 82% of participants were African American or Black, and 18% were white.

- A summary of key themes from the Providers Process Evaluation of Coordinated Entry reflects a large and small group discussion by coordinated entry service providers and funders of the coordinated entry process. This opportunity for provider feedback took place on October 15, 2019 at Oakland City Hall.

- An analysis of administrative data from HMIS and the By Name List Report provides insight into how the prioritization tool is working, including discussion of demographics, subpopulations, and matching. The Prioritization Analysis looks all households assessed from the launch on October 20, 2017 through June 30, 2019.

- The Coordinated Entry Self-Assessment is a standard form provided by HUD. A working group of the System Coordination Committee completed the self-assessment and presented it to System Coordination Committee for discussion. It was finalized by the System Coordination Committee in June 2019.

Together, the four parts of the evaluation illuminate where the coordinated entry system is working well and where it warrants improvement, as well as enhancements to be developed.

Areas of coordinated entry that are working well and should be expanded upon:

- With only a few exceptions, the Participant Focus Groups emphasized that staff are respectful, helpful, and trustworthy in the services they provide to people experiencing homelessness.

- The Providers Process Evaluation of Coordinated Entry highlighted the need to continue extensive investments in problem solving, flexible funds for homelessness and prevention, housing navigation, and tenancy sustaining resources.

- The Prioritization Analysis shows that the prioritization framework is working well to identify the most vulnerable households across household compositions, veterans, transition aged youth, seniors, race, and ethnicity.

- The Coordinated Entry System Self-Assessment showed many areas of growth and improvement in the past year, including increased language access, walk in hours and direct telephone access to housing resource centers, and more unified policies for rapid re-housing programs.

Improving coordinated entry involves:

- Cultivating trustworthy and knowledgeable front-line staff who can accompany a homeless household through the process is a significant need identified in the Participant Focus Groups.
This involves developing consistent messaging to be used across all providers, as well as enhancing training opportunities, expanding HMIS access and adoption, setting realistic caseloads and retaining staff to do this critical work.

- Assisting all people who are experiencing homelessness, not just the highest need households, was a primary theme from the Providers Process Evaluation of Coordinated Entry, including increasing staff capacity both in terms of training and caseload to support problem solving conversations. The Providers Process Evaluation of Coordinated Entry also raised the need to provide participants with inventory-based, real time information about their prioritization score, likelihood of being matched and referred to resources, as well as the crisis resources available at the time.

- Maintaining a by name list that is up to date with active households and ensuring that PSH and RRH resources are being matched and referred through a consistent coordinated entry process were two of the most important challenges raised in the Prioritization Analysis.

- Improving coordination with the domestic violence services system; developing HMIS to track inventory, matching and referrals; integrating prevention resources are key areas that the Coordinated Entry System Self-Assessment identified for improvement.

What needs to be developed:

- More deeply affordable housing. This was the resounding message communicated by the Participant Focus Groups. Without adequate permanent housing resources, coordinated entry does not make sense and cannot end homelessness.

- A coordinated entry management entity to address operational needs such as:
  - Improving coordination and consistent communication within the homeless crisis response system and to participants as detailed in the Providers Process Evaluation of Coordinated Entry and Participant Focus Groups.
  - Developing grievance policies and procedures, notifying coordinated entry participants of their ability to file a nondiscrimination complaint, creating an ombudsman role as was discussed in the CE Self-Assessment and the Participant Focus Groups.
  - Standardizing access, assessment, matching processes as discussed in the CE Self-Assessment and Providers Process Evaluation of Coordinated Entry.
  - Homelessness prevention resources that are closely targeted to the people most likely to become homelessness was a priority from the CE Self-Assessment.
Key Themes from Participant Focus Groups and Interviews

To obtain feedback on the coordinated entry process, EveryOne Home worked with the three coordinated entry zone coordinators: City of Berkeley, City of Oakland, and Abode Services. Three opportunities for participant feedback took place in October 2019. A focus group in Berkeley brought together 5 homeless or formerly homeless participants in coordinated entry. Three of the five participants were African American or Black, and two were white. In Oakland, 18 currently or formerly homeless persons gathered for a focus group. Seventeen of the 18 participants were African American or Black, and one was white. In Berkeley and Oakland, Bay Area Community Services provided lunch and compensated participants with gift cards.

The service context in Fremont—a church where Abode’s mobile crisis van offers services and volunteers provide a warm meal—was less conducive to a formal focus group. Instead EveryOne Home staff conducted short interviews with 5 currently homeless persons. Two of the interviewees were African American or Black, and three were white.

The focus group and interviews explored the coordinated entry process—access, screening, assessment, prioritization, matching, and referral—with the aim of answering three central questions:

What aspects of coordinated entry are working well?

What aspects of coordinated entry aren’t working well?

What is not currently part of coordinated entry and should be developed?

The following summary themes emerged across the three feedback opportunities.

Coordinated Entry Process

The term, “coordinated entry” resonated for only a handful of participants as the name for the process of housing crisis response system access, screening, assessment, prioritization, matching and referral. More often participants described their experience of the coordinated entry process in terms of their relationship with the service provider and staff person(s) they work with most closely.

211 and street outreach were the most common ways participants reported accessing coordinated entry. Most participants reported having been assessed, although the assessment itself did not stand out. Participants remembered, “a series of questions, nothing out of the ordinary,” “a lot of questions,” and “filling out a lot of paper for a job and housing.”
Several participants expressed support for the values articulated in prioritization: “I agree with the idea of putting knowledge to work to help the most vulnerable,” “I appreciate the thoroughness, [the staff was] very courteous. Gave me a lot of hope that I was going to get housed.” Another participant offered that, “the assessment could be longer and more comprehensive to understand the people” and their needs.

Others struggled to reconcile the day to day hardships of homelessness with the slow pace and limited resources available through coordinated entry. “Homelessness,” reported a mother living in a car with her adult son, “it’s like working all day long,” to meet basic needs, attend appointments, and obtain paperwork. And for this household, coordinated entry offers no end in sight: “I don’t know what number we are, but by the time they get to us, it will be years from now. I don’t get it, I don’t understand.” This conversation distilled the hopelessness of needing help from a system that has insufficient resources.

Many participants described themselves and coordinated entry staff people as confronting a common problem: “Everyone we work with has been really awesome. It is more of an infrastructure thing. If there’s no infrastructure [of housing] then there’s not much they [the staff] can do.” And, “I’ve seen the politics behind gentrification and when people analyze it, there’s not much [the staff] can do about it.” Despite all the new construction in Alameda County, “it’s all condos and luxury that we can’t afford.” In sum: “the main issue is that we don’t have enough housing that is affordable,” and more specifically, that there is not enough housing that is deeply affordable.

The lack of affordability narrowly circumscribes the housing options available to people experiencing homelessness. Three interviewees described growing up in Fremont and wanting to continue living there, but not being able to afford housing in market where “low income is not even really low income.” Two of these households were resolved to remain homeless until they could find housing in the Fremont area. The third household was living in a car and working in Fremont but expressed resignation: “[the] car is not going to last. We will have to leave.” Similarly, in Oakland and Berkeley participants described being unable to afford the rent after the death of a relative or the onset of a serious health problem. Once homeless, participants described being referred to housing situations that they felt were unsustainable in the long term, undesirable, or, in a few instances, unsafe. Several people described feeling pressured to sign a lease despite knowing that they could not pay the rent without the temporary rapid re-housing subsidy. Others described shared housing situations that ranged from the challenges of living with roommates, “he’s a slob,” to renting rooms without doors or
locks, “I left out of there because we couldn’t put locks on the door. The first night I stayed there I had a man coming in to stand over me.” Threading through these stories is a sense of unfairness that in the current housing market, being housed means being displaced from the places where participants grew up or raised their families. For many, being housed also means having roommates into old age. And in some cases, participants described being presented with living situations that were not habitable or safe.

Sometimes participants expressed the feeling of unfairness through rumors of undeserving people who have been matched and referred to resources through coordinated entry. “I’ve heard so many stories,” one participant shared, “of people going in and out because they don’t want housing.” Others had heard from friends about resources going to undocumented immigrants or being spent on drugs and alcohol. The false rivalry described in these narratives, marked by conjecture, conveys the scarcity of help for people experiencing homelessness.

In the context of an unaffordable housing market and a homeless system with very few resources, the coordinated entry process—access, assessment, prioritization, matching and referral—is not particularly salient for the cross section of people experiencing homelessness who participated in these three feedback opportunities. Instead, the coordinated entry process became meaningful to participants through their relationships with organizations and people.

“Someone needs to take a personal interest.”

Across all the conversations, participants emphasized self-motivation: “Valuing yourself is bigger than what the housing counselor can do. You have to want it for yourself and be willing to take the steps to get it.” And, “you got to want to ask for help before they can help you. At the same time, participants pointed out that individual drive and perseverance is not enough. Equally important are trusting and cooperative relationships with staff, which participants cited as making the difference not only in their experience of homelessness but also their experience of themselves. One participant described:

Sometimes you do every step and it still doesn’t work. For me, I did everything I was supposed to do but it didn’t work. And then I met [my housing coordinator] and she did all the steps of the program. She’s efficient. She tells you what you need. She makes copies. She talks to the landlord, lets you know what the expectations are, everything rolls as it should.

Another recounted:

I was a mess. I was at my lowest. And when I say my lowest, I mean lowest. Those two [staff people] gave me hope. They tell me things to lift me up and bring me up. When I got to them,
everything turned around. Some people think [a service provider] will do everything for you. I beat the streets along with [them]. The trash is gone, and they left the roses. They gave me, me back.

Both participants highlight that their own initiative was ultimately successful when matched with a consistent, compassionate, and trustworthy staff person. These perspectives encapsulate a theme that resonated across all the focus groups and interviews: caring relationships between participants and compassionate staff members are critical. Connection between people grows hope, motivates, cheers, and restores a sense of humanity. A participant expressed the power of mutual connection simply and profoundly: “I realized she gave me the opportunity to value myself.” With this insight, participants make clear that assessment and prioritization, while important, are not an end in themselves. Instead, connection, mutuality, and problem solving are the substance.

Participant Recommendations for Supporting People Experiencing Homelessness

Participants offered a clear set of recommendations for how coordinated entry service providers can partner most supportively and effectively with people experiencing homelessness:

- **Deeply Affordable Housing is Urgently Needed**: In every conversation, participants assert the need for permanent housing that is affordable to people with Extremely Low Incomes (0-30% of AMI).

- **Increase Privacy**: The assessment collects personal information such as social security numbers and self-reported health conditions. Assessors must take steps to ensure the assessment interaction is private in order to build trusting relationships and safeguard participants information.

- **Improve the Coordination of Information**: As one participant stated, “I’m not sure if coordinated entry is a city or county or nonprofit, but if the purpose is that everyone has a shared system or database, then it’s not working.” Participants reported processes and expectations are described differently across organizations and people; telling their story multiple times or spending a lot of time obtaining and transporting documents between agencies and service providers; lost assessments that require multiple re-telling of a person’s story; and misplaced documents.

- **Knowledgeable of Programs, Processes, and Standards**: Participants rely on staff to communicate complete and accurate information about available programs, the steps that are required, and the specific forms of documentation that are needed.
• **Create Participant-Focused Materials:** from websites targeted to homeless people to checklists of required documents and step by step guidelines of processes, many participants want written documentation that would support direct communication between providers and participants. While these documents may not be useful for all participants, others were decisive that clear, consistent participant centered documents would ensure that “everyone [is] on the same page.”

• **Make the Homeless System Easier to Navigate for People with Disabilities:** “People who are disabled have the most difficult time. It’s ass backwards.” In each conversation, participants drew attention to the ways in which disabilities compound the communication, transportation, and information challenges of coordinated entry specifically and homelessness more generally.

• **Communicate the Grievance Process, Develop a “Negotiator” Role:** When participants experienced problems with coordinated entry, their recourse was often unclear: “I don’t know who to call if I have a problem, should be info on grievance, [like] call here if you’re having a housing problem, call this person.” Communicating the grievance process is an important starting place. As well, in cases of conflicts between participants and providers, homeless people describe a need for an impartial mediator or “negotiator, someone that can step outside the urgency [of the situation]” to find fair resolution.
Key Themes from Providers Process Evaluation of Coordinated Entry

These summary themes emerged from the meeting with providers on September 3, 2019 to evaluate the processes of Coordinated Entry focusing on three questions:

- What aspects of coordinated entry are working well and can be expanded upon?
- What parts of coordinated entry aren’t working well and can be changed?
- What is not currently part of coordinated entry and should be developed?

Assist the Whole Spectrum of People with A Housing Crisis

People with the highest needs are being assisted in exemplary, unprecedented ways in the housing crisis response system from emergency shelters to permanent supportive housing with tenancy supports, and we also need to attend better to all the other people (with less severe needs) with a housing crisis.

Provide Inventory-Based, Real-Time Answers at the First Contact

More real-time information is needed to honestly inform people at the time of access whether they are high priority and likely to get a resource in the very near term (60-90 days) or whether housing problem-solving and other resources are more appropriate and available. In addition, more resources are needed at first contact, especially for those not likely to be matched to a housing resource which could include greater use of problem solving, access to existing resources possibly without assessment (e.g. flex funds), and connection to mainstream resources. These would respond more humanely to people in crisis, mitigate gaps of time and losing people in current processes, and create accurate expectations and messaging for participants.

Launch Coordinated Entry 2.0

The Coordinated Entry System and its providers are ready for its next iteration that deprioritizes assessment, is more phased, amplifies problem solving, wisely embraces efficient case conferencing and collaboration, and is supported by HMIS and other technology. Essential features would be:

- A focus on meaningful and helpful conversation, not a wait list
- Access by survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault or trafficking
- Revisiting participant choice and “best match” to a resource
- Serving more people with problem solving and tracking the outcomes of that service
- Moving away from assessing everyone, possibly with a phased assessment and brief triage
- Real-time prioritization results linked to projected available inventory in 60-90 days
• Pool or other method of prioritized people for matching to housing resources that accounts for participants we are unable to contact and other appropriate factors
• Rapid Rehousing
• Grievance process and procedures.

Continue Extensive Investment with Simplified Reimbursement

The investments in housing problem solving, flex funds for homelessness and prevention, housing navigators, and tenancy sustaining services have served very well the housing crisis response system and people with a housing crisis. Continued investment should occur in tandem with a significant overhaul to simplify burdensome paperwork, billing, and invoicing.

Make HMIS Support Coordinated Entry and Provide Data

Continued, significant work is needed in HMIS to:
• Use it to better match people to available housing resources
• Capture problem solving activities and results
• Produce even basic reports about Coordinated Entry and persons served, problem solving efficacy, timeliness outcomes, and racial and economic equity indicators, and
• Reduce and eliminate workarounds in HMIS and with parallel data management.

Use Data to Understand Outcomes and Adjust CE Accordingly

There is a significant desire to use performance data to improve Coordinated Entry to improve the person experience, system design and policy, such as to reduce the time between key activities (first contact to problem solving, housing navigation enrollment to permanent housing), assure no side doors to resources, improve flow through housing navigation, and mitigate existing problem areas (people being matched to permanent supportive housing don’t have housing navigators/Housing Navigation case load has lower need people who don’t have access to a housing resource and the expectation of one).

Manage the System

Regional communication and collaboration has flourished among providers and even with other local departments like police and public works. The system of care for people with a housing crisis has advanced and some pieces are working very well since the launch of Coordinated Entry. Still, a Coordinated Entry
management entity is needed to manage the whole of the system and is a critical role to continuing advancement of the system in sophisticated ways. Other functions noted to complement the previously approved CE Management Functions and/or as imperative are:

- Increased integration with homelessness prevention
- Create connections to other systems, specifically other city-funded housing programs, behavioral health for substance use and mental health treatment, and Medi-Cal in other counties for more standardized ways to transfer Medi-Cal across county and possibly an associated MOU
- Provide coordination and consistent communication
- Assure appropriate level of documentation at the appropriate and respective points
- Funding the system with the most flexible funds
- Revamping the invoicing processes at every level to be less burdensome
- Consider investments and a campaign that could lead to functional zero with specific populations like families.

Support Staff Development Via Training

More training is needed for front line staff. Webinar trainings have been a helpful way of providing trainings recently. To be most beneficial to providers, trainings need to be available more readily or on demand to support onboarding new staff and retraining; webinar-based, on-line, or other virtual trainings that don’t require staff to travel are useful. Specific desired trainings include:

- Staff training about available resources and how to access them, particularly those outside the homeless system such as mainstream services and
- Domestic violence training to front line staff.
Prioritization Analysis: October 2017 through June 30, 2019

Alameda County’s housing crisis response system implemented a standard assessment process in October 2017. Since then, 8,548 households have been assessed. Once assessments are entered into the Homelessness Management Information System (HMIS), a weighted scoring framework prioritizes the highest need households for housing and support resources by quantifying housing barriers, household characteristics, history and length of homelessness, risk factors, and health vulnerabilities. The prioritized list is called the By-Name List (BNL).

Housing Status
Households on the BNL can have the status of active, inactive, or housed. Households marked “housed” have ended their homelessness by moving into permanent housing. Permanent housing includes subsidized or unsubsidized rentals, permanent supportive housing, family or friends. Households in rapid re-housing programs remain active on the by name list in order to retain eligibility for permanent supportive housing. Housing status becomes “inactive” when a household cannot be located or has not engaged with the housing crisis response system for six months or longer. Households can become active again by renewing contact with a coordinated entry access point.

For the time being, housing status must be manually changed on the household’s assessment. That this process is unconnected to other HMIS processes, like housing move in date, may inhibit the use of that field. For instance, the number of assessments marked “housed” is much lower than would be expected or can be corroborated: at the end of June 2019, 364 households had “housed” status on their assessment. As a counterpoint, the HUD system performance measure that tracks successful placement in permanent housing shows 1,214 persons obtained permanent housing between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019. On one hand, the system is struggling to manage the by name list to the extent that successes like moves into permanent housing are not being recorded. The reconfiguration of coordinated entry in Clarity presents an opportunity to structure the workflow so that changes in housing status are more integrated, and even automatic.

Similarly, only 252 households have been marked “inactive” on the BNL. The staff who do matching at the HRCs reported reluctance to make households inactive on the BNL because the HMIS cannot substantiate the change in status by tracking failed outreach attempts, the presence or absence of 211 calls, or contact with Housing Resource Centers. Matchers reported erring on the side of keeping a household active because inactive status will mean that the household comes off the BNL and is not matched to resources until they re-engage. While all the Matchers want a list that is fresh, making a specific household inactive without documentation feels like foreclosing the possibility of permanent housing. This sensibility translates into a
prioritized list in which the majority of assessments are outdated: 8% (641/7,909) of active households on the by name list have assessments dated in 2017. Another 48% (3,759/7,909) of active households have assessments dated in 2018. Only 44% (3,509/7,909) of households have assessments that took place between January 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019. Retaining outdated assessments is a practice rooted in the belief that assessment is the avenue to ending homelessness.

The By Name List: Demographics
As of June 30, 2019, there are 7,909 active households on the BNL. Active households on the by name list have the following characteristics:

- 70% of households are composed of a single adult
- 16% of households have minor children
- 45% of households are headed by women and 54% are headed by men. Less than .5% of households are headed by someone who identifies as gender nonconforming or transgender.
- 58% of households identify as African American or Black, 26% as White, 7% as Multiple Races, 3% as American Indian or Alaska Native, 2% as Asian, 1% as Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and 3% refused to identify their race.
- 15% of households describe themselves as Hispanic or Latinx

Prioritization
The distribution of active households by prioritization score is nearly normal. Scores range from 3 at the lowest vulnerability, to 195 at the highest vulnerability. The average score is 98 and the median score is 96. There are no outliers. As a whole, the distribution shows that the assessment tool is sensitive to variations in vulnerability within the population and is working well to elevate highly vulnerable households.
Subpopulations

**Chronic Homelessness**

3,780 assessed households fit the criteria of chronic homelessness, making up 47% of assessed households. These households tend to score higher than non-chronically homeless households, with an average score of 120 and median score of 120. Chronically homeless households make up most of the highest scoring households: 84% of households in the top half of scores are chronically homeless, and 89% of households in the top quarter of scores are chronically homeless. Although chronically homeless households tend to be more vulnerable, the prioritization tool does not equate chronic homelessness with high vulnerability. Highly vulnerable households that do not fit the HUD definition of chronic homelessness can and do obtain high scores. In the graph to the right, orange represents chronically homeless households within the total distribution of all active prioritized households.

**Households with Minor Children**

As of June 30, 2019, 1,247 active households with minor children appear on the by name list, making up 16% of the total households. The distribution of scores is nearly normal, with a scores ranging from 3 to 195. The average score is 93 and the median score is 93, an increase from 91 and 90 the previous quarter. In general, households with minor children score as slightly less vulnerable than households with adults only. Forty-six percent of households with minor children are in the top half of all scores, and the average and median scores for adult-only households is 99 compared with 93 for households with minor children. Yet
some of the highest scoring households on the BNL have minor children. In the graph, the orange color represents the distribution of households with minor children within the distribution of all active prioritized households.

**Transition Aged Youth Headed Households**
Five hundred sixteen (516) of the active households are headed by Transition Aged Youth aged 18-24 years, making up 7% of active households on the BNL. Prioritization scores for this subpopulation range from 18 to 183 with an average and median score of 96. One hundred thirty-one (131) TAY heads of households are parenting minor children. Scores among parenting TAY headed households range from 36-174, with an
average score of 97 and a median score of 96. In the graph, the orange color represents TAY headed households within the distribution of all active prioritized households.

*Veteran Households*
A total of 707 active households are headed by veterans, making up 9% of all households on the BNL. Forty-four of those households include minor children. The distribution of veteran households is concentrated at the lower end of the distribution, with a long narrow tail of households with higher vulnerability to the right. 32% of veteran households score in the top 50% of all scores. Measures of center are lower among veterans than the prioritized population generally: the average score for a veteran is 79 and the median is 75 compared with 100 and 99, respectively, for non-veteran households. This may be the result of several years of targeted work on the veteran by name list by Operation Vets Home as well as the abundance of dedicated resources for veteran households. In the graph, the orange color represents veteran headed households within the distribution of all active households.

*Seniors (aged 50+)*
Forty-five percent all the active households on the by name list are headed by a person aged 50 or older, a total of 3,544 households. There are 690 active head of households aged 65 and older; 97 active head of households aged 75 and older. Scores range from 6 at the lowest vulnerability to 192 at highest vulnerability, with an average score of 100 and a median score of 99. Seniors tend to score slightly higher than prioritized households generally; 56% of senior headed households scored in the top half of all households. In the graph, senior headed households are shaded orange to show their distribution among all active households.
Racial and Ethnic Disparities

The assessed population shows similar racial disparity in the homeless population as in the homeless population: 58% of households identify as African American or Black, as compared with 47% of the Point In Time Count, and 11% of Alameda County’s general population. The BNL has a higher representation of households identifying as African American or Black, which could be descriptive of the homeless population, but may also reflect the way in which assessment has been implemented. Specifically, assessment is distributed across many nonprofit organizations in Oakland, where the Point in Time Count found 70% of the homeless population identifies as African American or Black. Fifteen percent of households identified as Hispanic or Latinx on the assessment, compared with 17% at the Point in Time Count. Again, it is useful to ask whether these data describe the homeless population, or the way in which assessment has been implemented.

Generally, the prioritization tool is working consistently across racial and ethnic groups to prioritize those with the highest need. The tool is designed to show similar patterns of vulnerability across racial and ethnic groups, and this pattern is shown in the distribution of scores by race and ethnicity, with very few households showing the highest degree of vulnerability, many households in a middle-range of vulnerability, tapering off to a very few households with the lowest degree of vulnerability.
The summary table below shows some variations, particularly when comparing measures of center such as the average and median. For example, Multi-Racial, White, and Native American households have the highest average and median scores, while Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and Asian households have the lowest average and median scores. In the middle, African American/Black households have average and median scores of 97 and 96, and Hispanic households have average and median scores of 98 and 99. In some cases the small sample size means the results may not be representative. For instance, on a list of nearly 8,000 households, only 112 households identify as Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and 194 as Asian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>AA/Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hawaiian/PI</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Multi-Racial</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-110</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-120</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-130</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131-140</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141-150</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-160</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161-170</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171-180</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181-190</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191-200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>4585</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>2052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 98 97 93 91 100 104 100
Median 99 96 91.5 88.5 99 102 102
The current coordinated entry configuration makes it challenging to explore patterns of racial or ethnic disparity in assessment responses. And, because understanding racial and ethnic disparities and striving toward equity is a system value, the coordinated entry restructure in HMIS presents an opportunity to develop a structure and reporting capabilities that are conducive to analyzing outcomes by race and ethnicity.

Regional Distribution
Assessment, case conferencing, and matching to shelter, transitional housing, and rapid re-housing have been taking place for adult only households (Adults) and households with minor children (Families) across five geographical regions: East County (Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore), Mid-County (City of Alameda, San Leandro, Hayward, and unincorporated areas Ashland, San Lorenzo, Castro Valley), North County Adults (Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville), North County Families (Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland), Oakland Adults, and South County (Fremont, Newark, Union City) as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Zone Assignments</th>
<th>Households Prioritized</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Lowest Score</th>
<th>Highest Score</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East County Adults</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Families</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-County Adults</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-County Families</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Adults</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Families</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Adults</td>
<td>4049</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Adults</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Families</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows some regional differences in scoring and rates of assessment. However, the meaning of this variation is lost at least in part because of geographically inconsistent assessment and case conferencing practices, where the by name list is managed in real time in conversation with service providers.

For example, households with minor children in the North County have an average score of 91 and median of 90, while families in Mid-County have an average score of 85 and median score of 81. How can we explain this variation? Does it describe regional differences in the vulnerability of households experiencing homelessness? Or, regional differences in assessment practices? Or, something else entirely?

It is also notable that families with minor children comprise such a large proportion of households. Looking at the households served in a comparable group of projects in HMIS shows 6% have minor children, while the
BNL shows 17% of households assessed in East County have minor children, 22% in Mid-County, 23% in South County, and 9% in Oakland/North County. Again, without consistency in the implementation of coordinated entry, it is impossible to know if these numbers describe differences in the homeless population, differences in rates or modes of assessment, or other differences all together.

Matching
Matching and referral describe the way households are connected to housing and services according to vulnerability score and the eligibility criteria of the resource. As mentioned earlier, coordinated entry is not fully integrated into the HMIS, but matching is not captured in a standard electronic form at all. As a result, it is difficult to know very much about housing and services matches, refusal and acceptance rates, or client outcomes such as permanent housing exits or returns to homelessness.

As a system, the continuum of care seeks to use coordinated entry to fill all vacancies in permanent supportive housing by prioritizing the highest need people to this, the most intensive of available interventions. Currently Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) is matched by Home Stretch at the system level, rather than regionally, with the goal of housing the most vulnerable on the by name list. What follows is a preliminary attempt to understand matching to permanent supportive housing by cross referencing permanent supportive housing enrollments beginning September 1, 2018, when Home Stretch retired their previous prioritization list and began using the BNL, through June 30, 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritization</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of all move ins</th>
<th>% of scored move ins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Quartile/bottom 25%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quartile/26-50%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile/51-75%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quartile/Top 25%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Score</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After cleaning the HMIS data, it appears that 213 households were newly enrolled into PSH projects during the time period. Many of those households are very vulnerable, with 44% of all move ins prioritized to the highest quarter of scores. However, a significant number were less vulnerable with 10% in the upper middle range, and 13% in the bottom half of vulnerability scores. Additionally, 71 move ins (33%) had no coordinated entry assessment prior to project enrollment.
In discussion with the matchers and Home Stretch, there emerged some reasons that households with low or no score may have moved into PSH:

- PSH units and/or services are CoC funded, and therefore should be filled through coordinated entry, but Home Stretch was not notified of the vacancy.
- Sites with existing wait lists are exhausting those before filling vacancies through coordinated entry.
- The PSH match and referral took place through Home Stretch before September 1, 2018 but the enrollment was recorded at move in, which was after September 1, 2018.
- Referral process through coordinated entry and Home Stretch was too long and the site filled their vacancy on their own.
- Eligibility criteria including but not limited to HIV status, shared housing stock, age, or domestic violence, forced Home Stretch to look further down on the prioritized list for an eligible household.
- The highest need households are not always document ready, which leads to enrolling lower priority households in PSH.
- Some PSH are not filled through coordinated entry but through a related system of care, such as those serving the re-entry population and Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing.

Clearly when HMIS is restructured to better support coordinated entry, more will be known with greater certainty about matching and referral across all types of resources. Until then, this glimpse into PSH matching suggests that much can be done outside of assessment to better coordinate with housing partners and with homeless households in order to realize the system’s value of prioritizing the highest need households gain access to PSH.
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## Coordinated Entry Process Self-Assessment (Ver. 1.1)

**Version 1.1**

This document is Version 1.1, which replaces the original version dated on the HUD Exchange on January 23, 2018. This Version 1.1 reflects the following changes:

1. **Section A. Planning**, item 81 has been updated to correct the data that CoC’s are expected to achieve full compliance with CoC’s Coordinated Entry requirement established by the Notice. The correct date is January 23, 2018.
2. **Section C. Assessment**, item 89 has been updated to correct an earlier error in citation. The privacy protection noted in the requirement are from HUD’s Coordinated Entry Notice: Section 1.1.12
3. **Section E. Referral**, item 82, “Referrals to Participating Projects,” has been restructured from Required to Recommended.

### A. PLANNING

#### Core Requirements since 2012.


#### Core Requirements

1. CoC’s Coordinated Entry policy and procedures used to prioritize homeless persons within the CoC’s geographic area for referral to housing and services must be made publicly available and must be applied

| Deadline for Compliance | Please elaborate on the reason for the indicated answer. How can we
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CoC establishes an updated coordinated entry process in full compliance with HUD requirements by 1/23/2018.</td>
<td>CoC Program inference rule: 24 CFR 578.7[i][ii], HUD Coordinated Entry Notice: Section 1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Core Requirements since 2012.

1. CoC’s Coordinated Entry policy and procedures used to prioritize homeless persons within the CoC’s geographic area for referral to housing and services must be made publicly available and must be applied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CoC establishes an updated coordinated entry process in full compliance with HUD requirements by 1/23/2018.</td>
<td>CoC Program inference rule: 24 CFR 578.7[i][ii], HUD Coordinated Entry Notice: Section 1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CoC covers the entire geographic area claimed by the CoC.</td>
<td>Currently accessible through website, street outreach, limited drop-in hours, and 24 hour 2-1-1. In general, CoC is responsible for ensuring that its service area is defined in a way that is consistent with the client demographics served and the CoC’s ability to meet the needs of that population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CoC’s Coordinated Entry process meets the requirements (below) established by the CoC Program.</td>
<td>CoC Program inference rule: 24 CFR 578.3 &amp; 24 CFR 578.7[i][ii]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CoC has well-advertised.</td>
<td>Currently accessible through website, street outreach, limited drop-in hours, and 24 hour 2-1-1. In general, CoC is responsible for ensuring that its service area is defined in a way that is consistent with the client demographics served and the CoC’s ability to meet the needs of that population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CoC includes a comprehensive and standardized agreement template(s).</td>
<td>Currently accessible through website, street outreach, limited drop-in hours, and 24 hour 2-1-1. In general, CoC is responsible for ensuring that its service area is defined in a way that is consistent with the client demographics served and the CoC’s ability to meet the needs of that population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CoC provides an initial, comprehensive assessment of individual and families for housing and responsibilities.</td>
<td>Currently accessible through website, street outreach, limited drop-in hours, and 24 hour 2-1-1. In general, CoC is responsible for ensuring that its service area is defined in a way that is consistent with the client demographics served and the CoC’s ability to meet the needs of that population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CoC includes specific policy to guide the operation of the centralized coordinated assessment system to address the needs of individual and families who are homeless, are fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, but who are seeking shelter or services from non-violent specific providers.</td>
<td>Currently accessible through website, street outreach, limited drop-in hours, and 24 hour 2-1-1. In general, CoC is responsible for ensuring that its service area is defined in a way that is consistent with the client demographics served and the CoC’s ability to meet the needs of that population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Core Requirements

1. CoC in consultation with recipients of Emergency Solutions Grant program funds within the geographic area, has established and consistently follows written standards for providing Continuum of Care assistance which can guide the development of standardized policies and procedures for the
1. Written standards provide guidance for evaluating individuals' and families' eligibility for assistance under 24 CFR Part 570.

2. Written standards provide guidance for determining and prioritizing which eligible individuals and families will receive transitional housing assistance.

3. Written standards provide guidance for determining and prioritizing which eligible individuals and families will receive rapid rehousing assistance.

4. Written standards provide guidance for determining what percentage or amount of rent each program participant must pay while receiving rapid rehousing assistance.

5. Written standards provide guidance for determining and prioritizing which eligible individuals and families will receive permanent supportive housing assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Program interim rule: 24 CFR 578.7(a)(1)</th>
<th>ESG interim rule: 24 CFR 578.7(a)(1) ESG interim rule: 24 CFR 578.408(i) and (j)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Full Coverage:

1. If multiple CoCs have joined together to use the same regional coordinated entry process, written policies and procedures describe the following:

   - The relationship of the CoC(s) geographic area(s) to the geographic area(s) covered by the coordinated entry process(es); and
   - How the requirements of ensuring access, standardizing assessments, and implementing uniform referral processes occur, including where the CoC geographic boundaries and the geographic boundaries of the coordinated entry process are different.

   **HDD Coordinated Entry Policy: Section H.D.4**

Marketing:

1. CoCs affirmatively market housing and supportive services to eligible persons regardless of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, familial status, disability, or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status.

   **HDD Coordinated Entry Policy: Section H.D.5 HDD Equal Access Rule: 24 CFR 5.108(e) and (f) and 24 CFR 5.108(g) and (j)**

Nondiscrimination:

1. CoC has developed and operates a coordinated entry that permits receipt of Federal and State funds to comply with applicable civil rights and fair housing laws and requirements. Recipients and sub-recipients of CoC Program and ESG Program funds are subject to the nondiscrimination and equal opportunity provisions of Federal civil rights law, including the following:

   - Fair Housing Act prohibits discriminatory housing practices based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, or familial status.
   - Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.
   - Title VI of the Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

24
B. ACCESS

Access Models.

1. CoC offers the same assessment approach at all access points and access points are usable by all people who may be experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness. If more access points are identified to meet the needs of one of the five populations allowable by HUD CoC Coordinated Entry Notice, initial screening at each access point allows for immediate linkage to the appropriate subpopulation access point (e.g., unaccompanied youth who access CES at the access point defined for adults without children are immediately connected to the youth-specific access point).

   Improvements in coordination around familiar, don't have another sub population access points. Assessment approach is the same. Strategy for access points may differ across regions.

Accessibility.

2. CoC ensures that households who are included in more than one of the populations for which an access point is dedicated (for example, an unaccompanied youth who is housing insecure in a domestic violence shelter) can be served at all of the access points for which they qualify or target population.

3. CoC provides the same assessment approach, including standardized decision-making, at all access points.

   JL - This was identified as any area of compliance concern by HUD CoC Committee when the manual was adopted.

Policy is that victims can decide which system they want to use. This is formalized in the access packet. Some individual programs may have preference that conflict, and we will work with DV providers in the coming year to address this (possible) issue.

Emergency Services.

4. CoC emergency services allow emergency services, including all domestic violence and emergency services hotlines, drop-in service programs, and emergency shelters, including domestic violence shelters and other short-term crisis residential programs, to operate with a focus on entry or access. People are able to access emergency services, such as emergency shelter, independent of the operating hours of the system's intake and assessment process.

   Doing this in bits and pieces, each zone has different processes. Shelter standards are aligned to reinforce CES. We don’t have it, need to improve.

Prevention Services.

5. CoC's access points must be easily accessed by individual and families seeking homeless or homeless Prevention services.

   We're not doing this, need improvement. 211 does some prevention work. SOP passed a resolution to target prevention or close to the door of homeless services as possible.

6. CoC works to ensure that assessment processes, including all domestic violence and emergency services hotlines, drop-in service programs, and emergency shelters, including domestic violence shelters and other short-term crisis residential programs, to operate with a focus on entry or access. People are able to access emergency services, such as emergency shelter, independent of the operating hours of the system's intake and assessment process.

   Doing this in bits and pieces, each zone has different processes. Shelter standards are aligned to reinforce CES. We don’t have it, need to improve.
8. CoC's written CE policy and procedure document describes a process for persons seeking access to
hamo learners prevention services funded with ESG program funds through the coordinated entry
process. If the CoC defines separate access points for hamo learners prevention services, written policy
and procedure must describe the process by which persons are prioritized for referrals to hamo learners
prevention services. To the extent to which other (i.e., non-ESG-funded) hamo learners prevention
services participate in coordinated entry processes, the policy and procedure must also describe the
process by which persons will be prioritized for referrals to those programs.

Full Coverage

9. CoC's access points cover and are accessible throughout the entirety of the geographic area of the

Marketing

10. CoC's written coordinated entry policy and procedure document describes steps taken to ensure access
paints, if physical locations, are accessible to individuals with disabilities, including accessible physical
locations for individuals who use wheelchairs, as well as people in the CoC who are least likely to access
hamo learners assistance.

Marketing flyer documents ADA locations, street outreach design is meant to make the system
accessible to people who are least likely to access hamo learners assistance. Could do better with
language access.

11. CE policy and procedure document states steps taken to ensure effective communication with individuals
with disabilities. Receivers of Federal funds and CoC must provide appropriate auxiliary aids and
services necessary to ensure effective communication (e.g., Braille, audio, large type, assistive listening
devices, and sign language interpreters).

JL: Marketing flyer does not document ADA locations, EOH never received that info.

2-1-1: Ensure the access points have resources in this area, HRGs and outreach need additional
support in this area.

12. Access point(s) take reasonable steps to offer CE program materials and participant instructions in
multiple languages to meet the needs of minority, ethnic, and groups with Limited English Proficiency

Safety Planning

13. CoC has a written CE policy and procedure to address the needs of individuals and families
who are fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, but
who are seeking shelter or services from non-victim service providers. At a minimum, people fleeing or
attempting to flee domestic violence and victims of trafficking have safe and confidential access to the
coordinated entry process and victim services, including access to the comparable process used by
victim service providers, or applicable, and immediate access to emergency services such as domestic
violence hotline and shelter.

Street Outreach

14. Street outreach efforts funded under ESG or the CoC program are linked to the coordinated entry
process. Written policy and procedure describe the process by which all participating street outreach
staff, regardless of funding source, ensure that persons encountered by street outreach workers are
offered the same standardized process or persons who access coordinated entry through site-based
access points.

Accessibility

15. Access points, if physical locations, are in proximity to public transportation and other services
to facilitate participant access. A CoC or recipient of Federal funds may be required to offer non-
transportation to the process, e.g., different access points, or reasonable accommodation for persons
with disabilities. For example, a person with a mobility impairment may request a reasonable accommodation
in order to complete the coordinated entry process at a different location.

CoC and access points provide connections to mainstream and community-based emergency assistance
services such as supplemental food assistance programs and applications for income assistance.
Access Models.

17. Access points provide virtual entry where individuals and families experiencing a housing crisis may present for initial assessment and screening (e.g., a 211 or other hotline system that screens and directly connects callers to appropriate crisis housing and service providers in the area).

18. CaO has multiple access points, each assigned to a specific sub-region within the CaO.

19. CaO has partnered with neighboring CaOs to create a single access point covering the multi-CaO region.

20. The CaO has multiple access points to facilitate access, coordinate entry processes, and improve the quality of information gathered for the following sub-populations:
   - Adults without children;
   - Adults accompanied by children;
   - Unaccompanied youth;
   - Households fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence;
   - Persons at risk of homelessness.

21. CaO has a "harvesting" approach in which a homeless family or individual can present at any homeless housing and service provider in the geographic area.

Prevention Services.

22. CE process includes separate access point(s) for homeless prevention services so that people at risk of homelessness can receive urgent services when and where they are needed. Separate access point(s) for homeless prevention services exists in the CaO, written CE policies and procedures describe the process by which persons will be prioritized for referral to homeless prevention services.

Safety Planning.

23. Victim service provider funded by CaO and ESF program funds are not required to use the CaO coordinated entry process, but CaO- and ESF-funded victim service provider are allowed to do so. Or, victim service provider may use an alternative coordinated entry process for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual trafficking, that alternative process must meet HUD minimum coordinated entry.

C. ASSESSMENT

Click on the checkbox to indicate that the item is fulfilled. Please elaborate on the reasons for the indicated answer. How can we

Assessment Process:

1. CaO consistently apply one or more standardized assessment tool(s), applying a consistent process throughout the CaO in order to achieve fair, equitable, and equal access to services within the

2. Written policies and procedures describe the standardized assessment process, including assessment information, factors, and documentation of the criteria used for uniform decision-making across access

3. CaO maintain written policies and procedures that prohibit the coordinated entry process from screening people out of the coordinated entry process due to perceived barriers to housing or services, including, but not limited to, tax liens or arrears, active or history of substance abuse, domestic violence history, resistance to receiving services, the type or extent of a disability-related services or support that are needed, history of evictions or poor credit, lease violations or history of not being a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Coordinator Entry Requisite: Section II.D. 1.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor Training.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CoC provider training opportunities at least once annually to organizations and staff persons at organizations that serve or access points or administer assessments. CoC-updater and distributor training protocols at least annually. The purpose of the training is to provide all staff administering assessments with access to materials that clearly describe the methods by which assessments are to be conducted with fidelity to the CoC's coordinated entry written policy and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor training has been provided quarterly by the CoC. Plan to provide training by webinar during calendar year 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CoC Coordinator Entry Requisite: Section II.D. 1.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CoC's coordinated entry pre-assessment training curricula include the following topics for staff conducting assessments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of CoC's written OE policy and procedure, including any adaptations or modifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Requirements for use of assessment information to determine prioritization; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Criteria for uniform decision-making and referrals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CoC Coordinator Entry Requisite: Section II.D. 1.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Client-Centered.

6. Participants must be informed of the ability to file a nondiscrimination complaint. |

**CoC Coordinator Entry Requisite: Section II.D. 12.c**

*Hoping to check this box with grievance procedure, which is contingent on management entity. Work to be done to be compliant.*

### Participant Autonomy.

1. CoC coordinator is aware that participants are frequently asked to decide what information they provide during the assessment process, to refuse to answer assessment questions and to refuse housing and service options without attribution or limiting their access to other forms of assistance. Written policies and procedures specify the conditions for participants to maintain their place in the coordinated entry process. |

**CoC Coordinator Entry Requisite: Section II.D. 1.4**

*Assessment training emphasizes gathering self-reported information from the client, recognizing a client's decision to provide or not provide information. Incomplete assessment records are to be accurate and can be updated over time.*

### Privacy Protections.

9. CoC has established written policies and procedures concerning the protection of all data collected through the OE assessment process. |

**CoC Coordinator Entry Requisite: Section II.D. 12**

10. CoC uses locally specific assessment approaches and tools that reflect the characteristics and needs of the OE and CoC participants. |

**CoC Coordinator Entry Requisite: Section II.D. 12**

11. CoC uses valid, reliable, and data-driven assessment processes which gather only enough participant information to determine the severity of need and eligibility for housing and related services. |

**CoC Coordinator Entry Requisite: Section II.D. 12**

12. CoC uses a phased approach to assessment which progressively collects only enough participant information to prioritize and refer participants to available CoC housing and related services. |

**CoC Coordinator Entry Requisite: Section II.D. 12**

13. CoC employs a phased approach to assessment which aggregates the collection of participant information into the following categories: |

- Initial Triage — revealing the immediate housing crisis: identification of the CoC crisis response system or the appropriate system to address the potential participant's immediate needs. |
- Disposition for Prevention Screening — determining if the CoC and participant can resolve the problem and options that could be used to avoid entering the homeless system of care. |
- Crisis Services Intake — information necessary to enroll the participant in a crisis response project such as emergency shelter or other homeless assistance project. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Initial Assessment</strong></th>
<th>Information to identify a participant's housing and service needs with the intent to resolve a participant's immediate housing crisis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Information necessary to refine, clarify, and verify a participant's housing and homeless history, barriers, goals, and preferences. Assessment information supports the evaluation of a participant's vulnerability and prioritization for assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Steps/Follow-Up Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Information revealed after an initial assessment is conducted when new information may suggest a revised referral strategy or re-evaluating a participant who has been stably housed for some time but who may be ready for less intensive housing assistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Case management tools contain a set of assessment processes which focus on rapidly housing a participant without preconditions.

**Assessor Training.**
15. All staff administering assessments are culturally and linguistically competent practitioners, including:
- Case manager cultural and linguistic competency training to increase the required annual training protocols for participating agency staff members;
- Assessments are culturally and linguistically competent for all persons that reduce cultural or linguistic barriers to housing and services for special populations.

16. All assessment staff are trained on how to conduct a trauma-informed assessment of participants. Special consideration and application of trauma-informed assessment techniques are afforded to victims of domestic violence who are at risk of re-traumatization.

17. All assessment staff are trained in safety planning and other protocols to prevent safety issues from being identified in the process of participant assessment.

**Client-Centered.**
18. Physical assessment areas are made safe and confidential to allow for individuals to identify sensitive information and safety issues in a private and secure setting.

19. Assessment questions are adjusted according to specific sub-populations (i.e., youth, individuals, families, and chronically homeless) and responses to questions. For example, if a participant is under the age of 16, questions related to violence, intoxication, and experience with the armed forces can be skipped.

20. Assessment questions and instructions reflect the developmental capacity of participants being assessed.

21. Case management processes incorporate a trauma-informed approach, including the following:
- Assessments are based on a participant's strengths, goals, risks, and protective factors.
- Tasks and assessment processes are clearly understood by participants.
- Assessments are sensitive to participants' lived experience.
- Participants are offered choices in decisions about location and type of housing.
- Participants are able to easily understand the program they are being referred to, whether they consent to the program, and evidence of the program's effectiveness.

**Incorporating Mainstream Services.**
22. Case management processes involve mainstream service providers in the following activities:
- Identifying people at risk of homelessness;
- Facilitating referrals to and from the coordinated entry process;
- Aligning prioritization criteria where applicable;
- Coordinating services and assistance; and
- Conducting activities related to continual process improvement.

23. Case management also involves the development of policies and procedures describing how each participating mainstream housing and service provider will participate, including the process by which referrals will be handled.
## D. PRIORITIZATION

**Core Requirements.**

1. CoC uses the coordinated entry process to prioritize homeless persons within the CoC's geographic area.
   - Prioritization is based on a specific and determinable set of criteria that are documented, made publicly available, and applied consistently throughout the CoC for all populations.
   - CoC's written policies and procedures include the factors and assessment information with which prioritization decisions are made.
   - CoC's written policies and procedures are consistent with CoC and ESG written standards under 24 CFR 576.10(f).
   - Note: Refer to HUD's Prioritization Notice (HCS-2015-1) for detailed guidance on prioritization process.

   **HDD Coordinated Entry Notice: Section 11.3.3**

2. CoC's written policies and procedures include the factors and assessment information with which prioritization decisions are made for all homeless assistance.

   **HDD Coordinated Entry Notice: Section 11.3.3**

**Emergency Services.**

3. CoC's written policies and procedures clearly distinguish between the interventions that will not be prioritized based on severity of service need or vulnerability, such as entry to emergency shelter, allowing for an immediate critical response, and those that will be prioritized, such as permanent.

   **HDD Coordinated Entry Notice: Section 11.3.7**

   Updated P&P address which resources are prioritized and which are not.

**Non-discrimination.**

4. CoC does not use data collected from the assessment process to discriminate or prioritize households for housing and services on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, familial status, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity or marital status. CoC's written policies and procedures for CE document how determining eligibility is different from prioritization.

   Note: In certain circumstances, a project may use disability status or other protected class information to limit enrollment, but only if Federal statutes explicitly allow the limitation (e.g., AIRS for transportation assistance, special education, etc.).

   **HDD Coordinated Entry Notice: Sections 1.9 and 11.3.2.g(2)**

5. CoC's written policies and procedures document processes for participants to file a non-discrimination complaint.

   **HDD Coordinated Entry Notice: Section 11.3.4.9**

6. CoC's written policies and procedures document conditions under which participants maintain their place in coordinated entry prioritization lists when the participant requests referral options.

   **HDD Coordinated Entry Notice: Section 11.3.3**

**Prioritization List.**
If the CoC manager prioritization order using a "Prioritization List," CoC extends the same HMIS data privacy and security protections prescribed by HUD for HMIS practices in the HMIS Data and Technical

**Prevention Services.**

1. If the program service area contains a community-wide list of all known homeless persons who are facing or may need CoC housing and services to resolve their housing crisis, the community-wide list generated during the prioritization process, is regularly referred to as "By Name List." The use of this list provides an effective way to manage an accountable and transparent prioritization process.

**Recommended Prioritization Factors.**

11. CoC uses any combination of the following factors to prioritize homeless persons:

- **Significant personal or functional impairments:** including physical, mental, developmental, or behavioral health challenges, which require significant level of support in order to maintain permanent housing.
- **High utilization of crisis or emergency services to meet basic needs:**
- **Extent to which persons, especially youth and children, are unsheltered:**
- **Vulnerability to violence:** including physical assault, trafficking, sexual abuse.

**Prioritization Process.**

1. CoC identifies a prioritization entity, agency, or other decision-making entity empowered by the CoC to manage the process of determining and updating participation prioritization for available CoC housing.

2. In cases where the assessment tool does not produce the entire body of information necessary to determine household prioritization, other sources of the nature of self-reporting, withheld information, or circumstances outside the scope of assessment questions, the CoC allows care workers and others working with households to provide additional information through care conferencing.

3. CoC maintains a prioritization list that prioritizes households using a referral to housing service. If the CoC cannot offer a housing service to every prioritized household experiencing homelessness within 60 days, then the CoC does not prioritize households in order to more precisely determine and identify resources for those households with the most need. The

4. In the event that two or more homeless households within the same geographic area are prioritized for the same available unit, and each household is also eligible for that unit, the CoC selects the household that first presents for assistance in the determination of which household receives a

**Optimize Prioritization Process.**

15. CoC establishes criteria that translate the participant's current living situation and barriers impacting the participant's ability to obtain and maintain housing into a numerical score that can be used to inform the referral process.

**Referrals to Participating Projects.**

1. CoC's CE process includes uniform, coordinated referral process for all beds, units, and services available at participating projects within the CoC's geographic area. For referral to housing and services.

**E. REFERRAL**

Please elaborate on the reasons for the indicated answer. How can we improve the needs in HMIS to track resource inventory and match to inventories.
2. CeC and project participating in the coordinated entry process do not screen potential project participants out for assistance based on perceived barriers related to housing services.

3. CeC and ESG program recipients and subrecipients use the coordinated entry process established by the CeC as the only referral source from which to consider filling vacancies in housing and related services.

**Roadmap:** CeC Coordinated Entry: Section II.B.3

**Roadmap:** CeC Coordinated Entry: Section I.D

**Roadmap:** CeC Coordinated Entry: Section I.B and II.B.3

**Roadmap:** CeC Coordinated Entry: Sections I.B and II.B.3

**Roadmap:** CeC Coordinated Entry: Section I.D and II.B.3

**Roadmap:** CeC Coordinated Entry: Sections I.B and II.B.3

### Referrals to Participating Projects

6. CeC maintains and annually updates a list of all resources that may be accessed through referrals from the coordinated entry process.

7. Each CeC project establishes and makes publicly available the specific eligibility criteria the project uses to make enrollment determinations.

8. Non-HUD-funded CeC agencies participating in the coordinated entry process fill project vacancies only through referrals from the referring agency/entity.

9. CeC’s written operating policies and procedures include standardized criteria by which a participating project may justify rejecting a referral.

10. CeC’s written operating policies and procedures document uniform processes for managing non instances of referral rejection, as well as the protocol the coordinated entry process must follow to connect the rejected household with a new project.

11. Upon referral, CeC participants receive clear information about the project they are referred to, what participants can expect from the project, and expectations of the project.

12. CeC identifies a referral entity, agency, CeC subcommittee, or other decision-making entity empowered by the CeC to manage the process of referring participants to available CeC housing and related services.

13. If a CeC participant is prioritized for permanent supportive housing (PSH) but no PSH resource is available, that participant is offered any other CeC resource available in the CeC’s geographic area.

14. CeC establishes a minimum set of participant information associated with a referral and which will be shared by a referring agency/entity with the project receiving the referral.

15. CeC establishes alternate processes to identify suitable options when project rejects a participant and when participants reject a project.

16. CeC employs a ‘Housing Navigator’ function to ensure efficient and effective enrollment, and subsequent movement from one CeC project to another. While specific ‘Housing Navigator’ functions will vary from CeC to CeC, typical duties include the following:

   a. Work closely with referral agency regarding eligibility determination.
   b. Develop a Housing Stability Plan.
   c. Complete housing applications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. DATA MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Requirements:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. When using an HMIS or any other data system to manage coordinated entry data, CoC ensures adequate privacy protection of all participant information and the HMIS Data and Technical Standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Privacy Protections:**

2. CoC’s written CE policies and procedures include protocols for obtaining participant consent to share.

3. CoC prohibits denying services to participants if the participant refuses to allow their data to be used for research purposes.

4. If a HMIS to manage coordinated entry functions, CoC ensures all users of HMIS are informed and understand the privacy rules associated with collection, management, and reporting of client data.

**HMIS Use:**

5. CoC uses HMIS as part of its coordinated entry process, collecting, storing, sharing, and reporting participant data associated with the coordinated entry process.

**Privacy Protections:**

6. CoC only share participant information and documents when the participant has provided written

**Data Systems Management:**

7. CoC imports and exports data to support collaboration between homeless service providers and mainstream resource providers (Medicaid, criminal justice, re-entry programs, healthcare services).

8. CoC integrates data between multiple data systems to reduce duplicative efforts and increase care coordination across providers and funding streams.
6. EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Requirements.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CoC consults with each participating project and project participants at least annually to evaluate the intake, assessment, and referral processes associated with coordinated entry. Solicitation for feedback must address the quality and effectiveness of the entire coordinated entry experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Methods.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. CoC ensures that written OE policies and procedures include the frequency and method by which the OE 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privacy Protections.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. CoC ensures adequate privacy protections of all participant information collected in the course of the annual coordinated entry evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Methods.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. CoC incorporates system performance measures or other evaluation criteria into their required annual coordinated entry evaluation plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. CoC ensures that evaluation is part of the implementation planning processes from the inception of OE:  
  + Determine which aspects of the effectiveness of the system will be measured.  
  + Determine which aspects of the process will be evaluated for fidelity to the policies and procedures.  
  + Determine how to gather data to track the selected measures.  
  + Determine whether and how the evaluation results will inform other aspects of the system planning and monitoring.  |  |
| |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Consultation.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6. CoC employs multiple feedback methodologies to ensure participating projects and households have frequent and meaningful opportunities for feedback. Feedback methodologies include the following:  
  + 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. |  |
| |  |