

**Agenda for Meeting of the HCCSC's
Coordinated Entry System Committee**

February 25th, 2020

8:30 AM – 10:30 AM

Members Present:

Scott Schnyders
Natalie McCleskey
Joy Brubach
Lisa Waikem
Amy Dornack
Shirene Starn–Tapyrik
Lisa Snyder
Jennifer Keaton
Marcie Bragg
Teresa Ponchak
Diane Waite

Welcome and Introductions

Natalie McCleskey welcomed all the members present and called the meeting to order at 8:35 AM.

Approval of Minutes from October Meeting

Scott asked the committee to review the January 28th meeting minutes as distributed. Marcie Bragg moved to approve the January minutes. Jennifer Keaton seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.

CoC Board Updates

Marcie informed us that the CoC Board did approve of the updates to the HMIS Recipient and Approval forms that were submitted. Most of the changes were minor in nature and only involved changes in language. Marcie did also remind the group to make sure the agencies are using the most updated CE Privacy Form with clients. That form can be found on the website.

The next item Marcie shared was that the Stark County COC was going to begin sharing data with the Ohio Data Warehouse. A lawyer was consulted and approved the submission of Data to be shared with Ohio Data.

Lastly Marcie followed up on what the Homeless Prevention and Emergency Assistance task force had been working on. There was a meeting on February 11 where CoC Board

members and agency representatives convened to try to determine what the new focus for the Taskforce should be. It was clear through the meeting that both emergency assistance providers are willing to work with HMIS and will begin entering data into that system. This will hopefully allow us to track some things over time. It was also discussed how to engage the faith community to partner in this area.

Quality Assurance Updates

Jennifer updated the committee about an on going clarification about the 10 day out rule and how it applies if someone times out of shelter. After looking over the policies it was determined that the intent was to prevent the number of no call/no-shows at shelter. If someone reached a 90-day limit at one shelter that wouldn't prohibit someone from being referred by Homeless Navigation to another shelter.

Jennifer also informed the committee that the Shelter workgroup continued to discuss and work on a housing plan that could be implemented by all shelters and possibly be used through HMIS.

Lastly Jennifer followed up on the issue of familial status changes for couples in Rapid Rehousing. No policy changes were required and it was agreed that the highest scoring individual, as the qualifying participant, would receive the assistance. It was stated that we should monitor this and if it continues to be an issue that it could be revisited.

Chronic Homeless Strategic Plan Objective

Scott reviewed the plan that would flag individuals who have been homeless for 9-10 months, and were likely to become chronic, and prioritize them so that we didn't continue to have individuals become chronic. Scott asked what the benefit was to being able to "end chronic homelessness?" Marcie said that she didn't believe that there was a funding benefit but did believe it would be good PR for agencies and funders who partner with our system. Natalie advised that we make sure to look at policies from HUD to make sure it allows for it. After a robust discussion about benefits and drawbacks the group agreed to 3 action steps. Natalie was going to look at the HUD regulations and report back. Teresa was going to get information from HMIS to see how many chronic individuals were housed in 2019. Scott was going to try to get the policy that Las Vegas is currently using to work with a similar program.

Inactive vs. Active

Scott introduced a discussion about how to move forward with determining whether or not a client is active or inactive. This topic was brought up because we were seeing very long active list for both PSH and RR. Some providers expressed frustration around it taking a while to fill vacancies because clients were missing documentation. Also, some providers were occasionally getting clients who did not have a phone number or way to be contacted. It was agreed that the first step would be to make sure we are closely adhering to the policies that are currently in place regarding making a client inactive before we make any other changes.

Shirene suggested we explore a document ready list and explore what other communities are doing. Marcie has meetings scheduled with the Akron and Columbus CoC and was going to see what they were doing in regards to this issue. The discussion was tabled until the next meeting when we had more information from Marcie's visits.

Veterans

Diane followed up on a discussion that had happened the previous week and wanted to clarify some misinformation that had been shared. She did let the group know that Family and Community Services did receive funding from the VA for GPD beds in Stark County. It was indicated that these were emergency shelter beds. Diane clarified that these beds are actually transitional housing beds and NOT emergency shelter beds.

Diane also let the group know that she is working with HMIS to try to incorporate the HUD VASH vouchers into the CoC system from start to finish. She is working with VA representatives to create a process, in conjunction with Homeless Navigation, about how clients are referred for these beds.

Adjournment

Natalie adjourned the meeting at 10:26 AM.