Results-Based Accountability Committee

Agenda

September 13, 2021
2:00 – 3:30 p.m.

Attendees: Julian Leiserson (Abode Services), Brittany Carnegie (City of Berkeley), Daphine (EBHO), Leslie Berkler (WDDC), Miguel Dwin (Alameda County Human Services Commission), Noah Brod (U.S. Department), Sharon Osterweil (Lifelong Medical), Melvin Cowan (Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency – BOSS)

EveryOne Home Attendees: Katie Haverly, Tirza White, Chelsea Andrews

Meeting Notes Approved By Committee Chair Julian Leiserson

1. Welcome and Introductions
   - RBA Committee is an open committee and welcomes participation from anyone committed to learning and implementing the RBA framework

2. Announcements
   - Meeting with HMIS committee to develop workplans concurrently
     i. Katie introduced the need to develop 2021-2022 workplan. Shared joint meeting between HMIS and RBA chairs, Katie, and Tirza.
     ii. Next meeting hoping to share more details after our second meeting.
   - CE evaluation waiver recommendation given to the other committees for review/approval
     i. Chelsea updated. Was on the SCC agenda, but meeting went over and this item was not raised in the full committee. Chairs agree on waiver. A formal discussion will be occur with the SCC in the next meeting.

3. NOFO Update
   - Upcoming NOFO meetings/mailing list
     i. Chelsea provided an update and introduced Homebase as TA and support for applicants. September 20 a session will be held for new projects. Application will be released later today. Chelsea invited questions and shared the two-week window for FAQs from 9/13 through 9/24.
     ii. Julian suggested a follow-up based upon the volume of information. Specifically, she suggested a TA session.
     iii. Turnout was larger and better than expected. We will reach out for feedback for opportunities for improvement for next year.
   - Importance of system performance measures, data completeness, data quality, feeds into CoC system performance measures. Good to think towards next year.
     i. Julian – system performance measures always weigh heavily into NOFO. Explains that is a part of why there’s an RBA Committee – to ensure quality data for system performance.
4. Practitioner Scorecard Updates for FFY 2021 Quarter 3
   • Presentation of Findings
     i. Katie shared where Scorecard is located on our website, how to interact with it, and that it is updated quarterly.
     ii. Indicators for CoC and for specific programs
     iii. Discussed key findings
     iv. Regarding trends related to rapid rehousing participants moving into permanent housing:
        1. Sharon said Rapid Rehousing was a resource to use as crisis worsened in the past few years, and perhaps they were unable to convert to a permanent setting once they moved into rapid rehousing.
        2. Julian shared if approximate length of time in rapid rehousing was on average 2 years, need to consider this when reviewing data.
     v. Discussion of Average Length of Homelessness
        1. Operation Comfort – Emergency Shelter hotels for those that may not have been homeless but living in crowded living situations that were at risk of COVID - could have contributed to the dip this quarter.
        2. Julian mentioned that when our system reaches out to those that have been homeless the longest due to prioritization, this could be causing the drop in average length of homelessness. Also, how important it is to exit folks from HMIS to have an accurate statistic here.
     vi. Maintaining or Increasing Income from Start to annual assessment or program exit.
        1. Sharon shared that they believe this is a data quality issue. For all entries and exits, it is so burdensome to ask participants to get proof of income each year and that practice is not trauma informed. Many times folks don’t have it, so last years number may be used. Increases from social security often aren’t counted if we are working off of old data. Wish a collaboration could work better with social security to get more accurate information.
           a. Julian shared access to the SHIE could maybe help support this, but this can bring up issues around privacy and accountability.
              i. Noah shared that the voucher program for HUD has some tools built in that do automatic income verification from social security. Data sharing agreements and efforts need to connect systems are not simple though.
           b. Sharon acknowledged the EOH one-page ROI was very helpful for her and their organization to get information from social services which has been really helpful in getting income information for those homeless moving into housing. This document is signed by the client and emailed and results come back in a couple of weeks.
     vii. % Individuals in emergency shelter programs that were enrolled in health insurance
        1. Julian shared that FEMA programs were rolled out in early 2020, thinking this could be a data entry issue. Hopefully specific programs would be running their own reports to notice drops like this. There are a lot of factors that could be affecting this indicator we can't see.
2. Sharon shared that many folks that moved into Project Roomkey may have had incomes too high to be eligible for MediCAL or other types of insurance.

viii. % of participants enrolled in mainstream benefits at annual/exit assessment

1. Can’t parse out those that are eligible or not eligible for certain benefits. Benefits included in this indicator are CALFresh (food stamps), TANF-related/other benefits (income support for families), and WIC (nutrition assistance for women, infants and children). Low percentages do not necessarily reflect individuals not being assessed or supported in signing up.

2. Brittany shared that some folks haven’t been connected to benefits so in some programs it may be a staff training issue.

3. Melvin wondered how representative the numbers are vs what’s actually happening in shelters. Julian mentioned oftentimes folks in shelters are not present in that program at annual assessment. Melvin shared that benefits may be captured in case notes but not correctly entered into the HMIS system and that training to help improve this could be beneficial.

ix. % of data entered into HMIS within 3 days (project entries and exits)

1. Melvin shared that it is an agency policy for data to be entered within 24 hours, it is another thing to get everyone up to speed. Also they have a lot of new staff and new programs that need to kick in HMIS. Even after staff are trained in HMIS it takes time for them to become certified and become HMIS users. They have had to use paper while they are on standby.

2. Julian shared that shifting to remote work may have caused some problems. But also, editable HMIS forms are not released she thinks. But curious what data looked like in previous years.

3. Sharon shared that data entry is difficult to do on a computer or tablet because outreach can often happen out in the field.

x. Julian shared that the new way to share data by pulling out key findings and reflecting on them as a group worked well.

1. Katie shared that it would be helpful to have a discussion in the future on how to better use our data reflections and help create actionable steps or other insights more often with other committees.

2. Katie is going to aggregate the comments related to scorecard findings and attempt to come up with next steps for improvement.

5. Presentation from Noah Brod (San Francisco HUD Community Planning and Development representative)

- He will demonstrate some of the new internal tools that HUD reps have at their disposal for analyzing CoC grant spending, which are sharable on a one-on-one basis with grantees."

  i. Field office perspective looking at grant portfolio for CoC: Looking at system performance, ensuring funding is getting out into the community in the ways the application intended to meet those needs

  ii. Also watching how grants get drawn down from our systems. Taking a straight dollars and sense viewpoint of grants. Not a replacement for looking at outcomes but it’s one element of looking at results of how CoC grants are performing.
iii. He modeled FOYA: HUD’s set of tools for looking at CoC grant portfolios on the spending side. Cannot go on HUD’s website to pull up dashboard but it is available if the CoC has a HUD grant and we can meet with the our rep to learn how they are looking at and evaluating Alameda CoC as a whole or even individual projects.

iv. Can drill down one-on-one with grantees regarding spending and can look at a timeline of spending for a grant.

v. What does financial health look like from a long-term perspective and what are the metrics we can look at to determine that? HUD considers it pacing – are funds drawn regularly or once a year.

vi. Opened for questions:
   1. Katie asked about how our CoC compares. He hasn’t built in the CoC to CoC comparison tool yet. He can do so manually at this point. Right now it’s an internal tool.
   2. For San Francisco field office, in aggregate terms, they are third in terms of recaptures being sent back to HUD. It’s one of the largest in the nation.
   3. Chelsea noted Julian’s question re: FMRs and will get back to her about an answer related to revising them.

6. Agenda Input for October meeting
   • Developing workplan for next year
     ○ Next meeting: October 4, 2:00-3:30