**VCEH Coordinated Entry Committee**

**Minutes**

**February 21, 2017, 12:30 – 3pm**

**Randolph**

**Attendees:** Kathleen, Springfield Supported Housing, Brooke Jenkins, Good Samaritan Haven, Deb Hall and Sarah Grandchamp, Homeless Prevention Center, Andrea, AHS Americorps VISTA, Kara Casey, VNADSV, Ari Kesler, VCRHYP, Doug Sinclair, Charter House, Meghan Morrow, ICA, Sarah Phillips, OEO, Brian Smith, AHS/DMH, Renee Weeks, Upper Valley Haven, dawn butterfield, Capstone

**Check in on Tasks from Last Meeting**

* Release of Information: ICA is going to work on figuring out a ServicePoint solution to tracking client release of information. Bethany and Brian will work with Meghan and Caitlin. – *THIS IS STILL NEEDED*
* HMIS Data Sharing Agreement - The HMIS Advisory Board review the HMIS data sharing agreement template and agreed that it met the requirements and was adequate.
	+ Action Item: Meghan will email the CE Committee and the CE lead agencies the data sharing agreement
* Keep working on local implementation of CE – updates?

Sarah will be visiting Springfield and Brattleboro this month. Only Lamoille County and Orleans County have yet to identify a lead agency. Rutland is convening a meeting on March 9th. Others spoke about Partnership Agreements in the works.

* + Action Item: Sarah will generate a list of the CE Lead Agencies and get posted on the VCEH website.

**Finalize PSH Prioritization**

Brooke did a ‘test run’ of the PSH prioritization with some current client information. In general, it worked well. There are still some concerns that youth or younger adults (those with high needs, but not a long history yet of system use) could be missed. The group discussed ways to incorporate “length of time homeless” into the prioritization. Some additional edits were made to the PSH recommendations.

* + Action Item: circulate the draft PSH recommendations and “poke holes in it” with local partners so that we can continue to move this towards a VCEH board vote
	+ Action Item: The Housing Barriers Assessment should be updated to include the PSH prioritization items

**Confidentiality Principles & Policy**

We reviewed the draft confidentiality principles & policies, which can be an appendix to the Partnership Agreement. There was feedback that the document should reference the HMIS data sharing language in the partnership agreement. Kara offered to draft some language on safety/victims of DV/SV, and to provide a resource or training link. The group made some grammar and order edits.

* + Action Item: Kara will send Sarah safety/DV confidentiality language

We also discussed the need to include organizations in the Release of Information, who may sit at Housing Review Tables but not be a CE partner. It was discussed that folks at the HRT should sign onto the CE Partnership Agreement, and be a referral partner at the least. The issue of changing attendees (adding new organizations) at HRT tables was raised – The group discussed adding a section of the meeting where non-core partners could attend to bring cases to conference. For these, a different ROI could be used. There was concern about adding partners, after clients have signed a release of information that did not include a specific partner. These are important issues that HRTs should be managing. HRTs cannot be revolving door meetings.

The group discussed the need to create a clear client and/or agency grievance process for CE. This is an item for future discussion.

**Housing Review Teams**

We further discussed the role of HRTs in coordinated entry. We talked about:

* Avoiding discussing everyone at the HRT meeting – HRTs could create a threshold for when/what cases are discussed – e.g., when financial resource are needed, when it requires case coordination, or when there are changes in the case, etc.
* HRTs are best used to case coordinate complex, high-needs housing cases – teaming around challenging circumstances, and not necessarily to discuss all cases in a local CoC
* HRTs are not best used as planning tables – that is the role of the local CoC
* HRTs can be a place to review local prioritization lists – e.g., PSH. The local lead agency can bring list(s) to the HRT for review – is the list still accurate? What is the next best option/brainstorm options for households on lists for long periods of time
	+ Action Item: Sarah will draft some guidance for HRTs based on our conversation about confidentiality and the role that HRTs can play within the Coordinated Entry

**Review HUD CE Checklist & Requirements**

We reviewed sections of the HUD CE Checklist – requirements and recommendations. In general, there was agreement that we have worked on most areas of the checklist. Much of the remaining work is to formalize our plans in writing. The checklist can provide us a way to organize the remainder of our work.