

December 2021 DAC Meeting Minutes

12/8/2021

Members present: Kim Sanders, Thomas Montaglione, Courtney LaCaria, Megan Coffey, Anisse Puryear, Joann Markley, Melissa Corzine, Vickie Craighead-Davis, Hannah Stutts, Shamika Agbeviade, Mary Ann Priester

Guests present: Branden Lewis, Erin Nixon, Carole McKernon, Tim Williams

Members absent: Anna London, Maya Marshall, Justin Lane

Quorum established.

The committee reviewed the October and November meeting minutes; motion to approve by Shamika and second by Melissa. No objections. Minutes approved.

HMIS Sub-Committee Report

There was no update this month as the previous meeting was cancelled due to the Thanksgiving holiday.

Safe Alliance Data

Mary Ann introduced this segment by stating that we want to include DV data in our conversations; due to restrictions in the VAWA, domestic violence providers are prohibited from inputting data into the HMIS system. The alternative database used by Safe Alliance is run by Bell Data. Time presented on the shelter outputs for the most recent quarter, including the number served and their length of stay. Safe Alliance also tracks the number of advocacy sessions and psycho-educational sessions that clients and their children participate in. Joann asked about barriers to permanent housing; Tim and Anisse responded that these often include the cycle of abuse (victim returning to abuser), lack of income, lack of ID and/or social security card, and criminal background.

Anisse also presented on their transitional housing (the OVW project) which is a 24 month housing project. Their outcomes include the percent who exited to a positive destination, the percent who return to shelter, and the percent who complete the Safety Related Empowerment survey (a survey conducted 4+ weeks after entry). Erin asked how returns to shelter other than Safe Alliance are obtained; Anisse responded that it is a combination of self-report and information gained when providing follow-up services. Anisse also noted that openings for spots in this project are currently done by referral through partner agencies; they may open up the referral process to the entire community at some point, but given the funding the pool of available slots is not very large at present.

System Performance Measures

Kim went over the draft SPMs for 2021-2022. We are still seeing an increase in the number of first time homeless (defined by HUD as within the last 2 years) after years of decline. Erin asked what approach we should take if we want to decrease the number of first time homeless; do we need additional resources to keep people with family members or in hotels? Joann wondered about the reasons behind losing housing when living with family or friends; is it a lack of rent, or possibly behavioral issues? Could prevention dollars help here?

Another area of note is returns from permanent housing; we are still seeing a 25% return rate, though TH return rates are low. Does TH help retain housing better in some ways, or is it artificially high due to the selection process of the projects (some require fewer barriers to housing for entry)?

Regarding changes to income for stayers and leavers, Joann noted that income data is not the best data that we have. Tom agreed that it is harder to track, and also may be one of the least updated questions at assessment. He also pointed out that changes in income is basically a snapshot of data as someone could have been receiving income for 11 months but lost a job a few days before discharge. Erin wondered if we could tie increases to non-employment income to SOAR workers?

NOFO and CoC/NCHDDS Funding

The group discussed whether the same performance measures should be used going forward. Joann noted that the income at annual assessment for RRH projects may not include a lot of people so the universe of people could be low. Mary Ann suggested the question #2 (income at annual assessment) be changed to only apply to PSH projects, as it is expected that people in those projects will remain for years at a time. Question #3 (income at exit) would remain in effect for both RRH and PSH projects. Tom noted that despite data quality challenges, increasing income is crucial for long-term success, so we do need to make sure this data is correct in the system.

Regarding length of time in the project, Erin noted that while not everyone can or should move on from PSH, we should be encouraging that for people who don't need intensive services any longer. How do we encourage this? Tom asked if we should assess this at, for example, the five year mark? Mary Ann noted that we do have the Moving On questions in HMIS now for PSH providers. Vickie asked how clients are able to move forward without mandating services? Erin noted that providers should be re-engaging and finding ways to meet clients where they are. Sometimes this takes creative solutions.

Shamika noted that case workers need to encourage people who are able to move on rather than staying comfortable where they are. Vickie noted that the level of case management Erica is providing to one RRH client has changed his whole mindset for the better. We do see more urgency with RRH clients because they are time-bound; perhaps we need a little more urgency with PSH clients as well.

Next Meeting

The next DAC meeting will take place January 12, 2022.