

# VCEH Coordinated Entry Annual Evaluation

## December 2022



The VCEH Coordinated Entry Committee is responsible for planning, policy, oversight and evaluation of Coordinated Entry in the Balance of State Continuum of Care. For more about the VCEH Coordinated Entry Partnership model, policies and procedures, visit:

<https://helpingtohousevt.org/whatwedo/coordinatedentry/overview/>

This report satisfies the requirement that the VCEH Coordinated Entry Committee provide an annual summary report and analysis to the VCEH Board. (*See Appendix 1, VCEH Coordinated Entry Evaluation Policy*)

Partners have put a countless amount of time, energy, and thoughtfulness into continuing to improve Coordinated Entry and the state and local levels. There is a deep commitment in Vermont to do more than meet a federal mandate when we implement coordinated entry. Partners want to truly impact the lives of Vermonters experiencing housing crisis by connecting people to housing help quickly and advocating for the housing resources that coordinated entry clearly identifies.

### **Summary of VCEH Coordinated Entry Committee activities from 8/1/21-6/30/22<sup>1</sup>:**

- The Committee met nine times during this time. 40 people representing 17 organizations participated in committee meetings. (*See Appendix 4, 2021-2021 VCEH Coordinated Entry Committee Members*)
- Ari Kisler, Vermont Office of Economic Opportunity, chaired the Coordinated Entry (CE) Committee. OEO administered federal CoC-funded and state funded Coordinated Entry grants to Lead Agencies. In the program year covering 8/1/21-6/30/22, \$1,374,736 in state and federal funding supported positions in all 11 local Coordinated Entry Partnerships.
- Hosted nine Coordinated Entry Implementer web calls bringing together lead agency staff and key partners to troubleshoot challenges, inform CE Committee work, and identify and share best practices.
  - Part way through the year, a Lead Agency Community of Practice session was added to the second half of the Implementer meetings. This time was set aside to support troubleshooting, best practice development, and peer sharing specific to the responsibilities of Lead Agencies.
- Continued to provide support in setting up a data dashboard.
- Worked with Economic Services Division to create an ESD-specific referral form and process
- A workgroup was formed to conduct a review of the Coordinated Entry Policy & Procedure manual.

### **This evaluation provides important information to understand:**

- Training and technical assistance needs of each local CE partnership as well as shared statewide needs
- Areas of policy and planning focus for the VCEH CE Committee in the coming year, including opportunities to clarify or revise policies and procedures that may be confusing, difficult to implement, or inconsistently applied
- Who is served by coordinated entry, and both local and statewide needs
- Future evaluation methods and indicators

---

<sup>1</sup> The period of performance was reduced from 12 to 11 months this year, in order to align future periods with the state fiscal year.

## 2022 Evaluation Process

This evaluation is intended to review and provide analysis on information from CE consumers (clients) and data from the Master Lists. A Partner Survey was not conducted this year, as the CE Committee adjusted the evaluation policy to shift this component from occurring annually to occurring every other year.

### *Consumer Feedback*

- The CE Committee provided general guidance on how local CE Partnerships should be collecting consumer feedback. *(See Appendix 2, VCEH Coordinated Entry Evaluation Report Tool)*
- Lead Agencies were asked to report on the method used by the local CE Partnership, a summary of feedback, and outcomes or action steps that emerged from a discussion of consumer feedback by local CE Partners.

### *Data Points*

- The data points are established in the VCEH CE Evaluation Policy. *(See Appendix 1)*
- HMIS can produce most of the data needed for this part of the report, and Lead Agencies needed to add in non-HMIS data. *(See Appendix 3, VCEH Coordinated Entry Data Indicators)*
- Lead Agencies were asked to report on the local CE Partnership discussion of the data points and any outcomes or action steps that emerged from that discussion.

### **NEXT STEPS:**

- The CE Committee will update the VCEH CE Evaluation Policy to reflect changes in how often the Partner Survey is conducted and what data elements are collected as part of the evaluation.

## Consumer Feedback Summary & Analysis

At the time of the evaluation, all local CE Partnerships had implemented a formal process for feedback from participants. All but one CE Partnership were able to complete their survey process and report on the results. From the responses received, the following themes emerged:

- Most participants had a positive experience with housing navigation and felt respected by staff while accessing coordinated entry (theme appeared in 70% of CE Partnerships).
- There is a need for more housing and rental assistance in most of the state (theme appeared in 60% of CE Partnerships).
- Some participants indicated feeling unsure what exactly coordinated entry was and what their next steps should be after completing the assessment (theme appeared in 50% of CE Partnerships).
- Some participants remembered signing the Release of Information and knew how their information was being used (theme appeared in 50% of CE Partnerships).
- Some participants reported that the assessment itself was respectful (theme appeared in 50% of CE Partnerships), while others felt the questions asked were too personal or they felt some discomfort in answering (theme appeared in 30% of CE Partnerships).

Another point of feedback the Committee noted is the desire by participants to hear more frequently from housing navigators while they are involved with coordinated entry.

## NEXT STEPS:

- The CE Committee will complete the process already underway to create a standardized consumer feedback survey. This will allow for more consistency in data from the surveys by ensuring that all participants are asked the same questions.
  - The Committee is currently considering two separate survey tools:
    - One that is brief and designed to be asked in the moment (after the CE assessment has been completed) to gather initial feedback about the participant's experience with the assessment; and
    - One that is longer and would be conducted once annually to follow up with participants who were involved with coordinated entry over the past year. This survey would gather feedback on the outcomes of participating in coordinated entry and provide participants with an additional opportunity to reflect on the process.
  - The CE Committee will ask Lead Agencies to report on the percentage of total participants that completed each type of survey in next year's evaluation. This information will be used to determine the effectiveness of both survey methods.
- The CE Committee will explore how to better define coordinated entry in outreach materials, including a review of what language is used on outward facing materials, to ensure that community members in need understand how the process can help.
- The CE Committee will develop additional guidance and tools to assist staff conducting the coordinated entry assessment with helping participants understand their next steps. Some potential tools/guidance include:
  - Additional training or guidance to staff completing the assessment to ensure they can clearly explain why certain questions are being asked, such as those to inform making referrals to other resources, those used in prioritization for housing, etc.
    - The need to center consent of the participant in answering questions or providing information will continue to be reinforced.
  - A handout that participants take with them after the assessment, laying out resources/ referrals for basic need items and information about coordinated entry for them review at a later time.
  - Guidance around a suggested frequency for post-assessment communication with participants.
- The CE Committee will discuss how the current process could be adapted to better meet the needs of those experiencing unsheltered homelessness. This may include:
  - Encouraging assessment training for street outreach workers.
  - Further emphasizing the need to prioritize access to shelter and meeting other basic needs as part of the assessment process.
  - Exploring the possibility of a truncated assessment process that could more quickly determine a participant's level of need if completing the full assessment was not feasible.
- CE Partnerships will continue in their role as advocates for those experiencing housing instability. Some potential areas for advocacy include: use of a common application across all housing providers, additional transparency from housing providers about the application and reasons for denial, shorter turnaround times in processing applications for housing.

## Data Points Summary & Analysis

Between 8/1/21-6/30/22<sup>2</sup> there were over 3,000 households in Coordinated Entry. This reflects both households who were already connected before 8/1/21 and those who entered sometime during the reporting period.

1,658 households were assessed for Coordinated Entry<sup>3</sup> between 8/1/21-6/30/22.

- 1,001 (60%) of the households assessed for Coordinated Entry were literally homeless (place not meant for habitation/unsheltered, emergency shelter, or hotel/motel paid for by an organization), a decrease from previous years. A higher proportion of households in Coordinated Entry this year that are not literally homeless, likely reflects an increase in households who have become at risk of homelessness as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 9% of the households assessed had been in the CE system at least once before and returned. This CE reenrollment rate has remained steady from last year.

As of 6/30/22, 1,580 households had exited Coordinated Entry.

- 65% of exited households were identified as being best served by long-term assistance, with 24% identified as medium-term, and 11% identified as short-term
- 67% of households had at least one member with a disability
- 80% of households were composed of adults only
- Heads of households identified as the following races:
  - White (91%)
  - Black, African American, or African (4%)
  - Multiple races (2%)
  - American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous (1%)
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (<1%)
  - Asian or Asian American (<1%)
- 11% of households were headed by someone 18-24 years old, with 10% headed by someone 62 years old or above
- 46% of the households who exited Coordinated Entry went to a permanent housing destination
- The average length of stay (LOS) in Coordinated Entry for those households who exited was 238.2 days, a significant increase from last year's average LOS (152.1 days).
- A review of the demographics of those who exited, shows that some subpopulations are staying in the system longer than others:
  - Households where one or more members has a disability had an average LOS of 243.5 days, compared to 235.4 days for households without a disability.
  - Households with adults only had an average LOS of 276.7 days, compared to 234.5 days for households with both adults and children.

---

<sup>2</sup> This year's period of performance was one month shorter than previous years and thus only includes data covering 11 months.

<sup>3</sup> Not all questions on the housing assessment must be answered for an assessment to be considered completed; households must simply have answered some questions and agreed to have some level of information shared through Coordinated Entry.

- Households headed by a person 25-61 years old had an average LOS of 255.2 days, compared to 244.4 and 210 days for households headed by a person 62+ years old and 18-24 years old respectively.
- Households identified as being best served by long-term assistance had an average LOS of 272.6 days, compared to 145.4 and 179.5 days for households identified as being best served by short-term or medium-term assistance respectively.<sup>4</sup>
- Households headed by a person who identifies as White had the longest average LOS (246.4 days), compared to households headed by people identifying as other races (American Indian/Alaska Native/Indigenous, Black/African American/African, Asian/Asian American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, multiple races)

As of 6/30/22, 1,623 households remained in Coordinated Entry.

- 73% of remaining households were identified as being best served by long-term assistance, with 20% identified as medium-term, and 6% identified as short-term
- 76% of households had at least one member with a disability
- 79% of households were composed of adults only
- Heads of households identified as the following races:
  - White (90%)
  - Black, African American, or African (4%)
  - Multiple races (4%)
  - American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous (1%)
  - Asian or Asian American (<1%)
- 11% of households were headed by someone 18-24 years old, with 11% headed by someone 62 years old or above
- 18% of households remaining in Coordinated Entry were reported as being unsheltered. This is an increase from last year, when only 12% were reported as unsheltered.
- The average LOS in Coordinated Entry for those households who remained on the list is 372.5 days, a significant increase from last year's average LOS (176.3 days). A review of the demographics of those who have not yet exited, shows that as above, some subpopulations are staying in the system longer than others:
  - Households where one or more members has a disability had an average LOS of 376.5 days, compared to 361.6 days for households without a disability.
  - Households with adults only had an average LOS of 403.6 days, compared to 358.8 days for households with both adults and children.
  - Households headed by a person 62+ years old had an average LOS of 385.1 days, compared to 377.9 and 336.5 days for households headed by a person 25-61 years old and 18-24 years old respectively.
  - Households identified as being best served by long-term assistance had an average LOS of 405.2 days, compared to 328.4 and 294.3 days for households identified as being best served by short-term or medium-term assistance respectively.

---

<sup>4</sup> Long-term assistance is for more than 24 months, short-term assistance is for less than 3 months, and medium-term assistance is for 3-24 months.

- Households headed by a person who identifies as American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous had the longest average LOS (392.3 days), compared to households headed by people identifying as other races (White, Black/African American/African, Asian/Asian American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, multiple races)

Combined data for both households who exited and those who remain shows that 21% spend between 3-6 months in Coordinated Entry, while 21% spend 6-12 months, 17% spend 12-18 months, and 19% spend more than 18 months. Looking at length of stay in these brackets is new; in previous years, data was collected only on the percentage of households staying in Coordinated Entry for more than 3 months. Having a more detailed breakdown will allow the Committee to more carefully monitor changes or trends in length of stay data across all participants in Coordinated Entry.

### CE Partnerships

177 organizations were involved in Coordinated Entry as formal partners (signed onto a local partnership agreement) this year, remaining steady from last year. Partners represent a broad variety of organizations (outreach, homelessness prevention, emergency shelter, transitional housing, rapid re-housing, permanent supportive housing, etc.). The CE Committee noted a decrease in the number of Outreach Providers and Permanent Supportive Housing Providers identified as being part of local partnerships and expressed concern that there could be gaps in needed services around the state. It is unclear if this decrease is reflective of a change in organizations participating in Coordinated Entry or a lack of clarity about how to complete this section of the report. 64% of the organizations in local partnerships were Referral Partners<sup>5</sup>, while 36% were Assessment Partners<sup>6</sup>.

### Lead Agency

70% of all households assessed for Coordinated Entry had their assessment completed by the Lead Agency. To monitor the effectiveness of connecting households to Coordinated Entry as quickly as possible, the CE Committee collects data on the time between referral and initial outreach, as well as referral and assessment. This year's data shows that:

- Initial outreach by the Lead Agency within 3 days of referral occurred with 81% of households.
- The average number of days between referral and assessment was 16 days (target = 7 days).

---

<sup>5</sup> Referral partners play an important role in ensuring that households are connected to Coordinated Entry when they identify as needing housing help; these partners tend to be service organizations that support people broadly, but not necessarily with housing (e.g. food shelves/pantries, faith community, medical practices).

<sup>6</sup> Assessment Partners support the Lead Agency in ensuring those referred to Coordinated Entry are assessed as quickly as possible; these partners are organizations that work with people to directly support their shelter or housing needs (e.g. emergency shelters, including for youth, veterans, or those fleeing domestic/sexual violence).

## NEXT STEPS:

- The CE Committee will work to clarify certain data elements in the report tool to ensure accurate data is being reported. This may mean refining the report tool or providing additional guidance. Areas to focus on include:
  - # of days between referral and initial outreach by Lead Agency staff
  - Reporting “prior living situation” data in the HMIS (data element used to determine the % of households experiencing literal homelessness, including unsheltered homelessness)
- The CE Committee will continue to encourage local review of partnership agreements to ensure that appropriate partners are signed on and that Lead Agencies can accurately report on who is formally part of the agreement.
- The CE Committee will update the data reporting tool to capture additional data points that are being collected, but not reported on at this time:
  - # of households fleeing domestic/sexual violence at the time of their CE assessment
  - # of Veteran households within CE
  - Demographic and length of stay data on all households in CE combined (in addition to stayers vs. leavers as is currently collected)
  - # of households headed by a young adult with children and the # without children (parenting vs. non-parenting)
  - Demographic data on those households specifically exiting to permanent housing destinations, as well as a detailed breakdown of the types of those destinations
  - % of assessments completed by different types of assessment partners (i.e. emergency shelters, DV/SV providers, youth service providers, etc.)

# Appendix 1: VCEH Coordinated Entry Evaluation Policy

## (as currently approved, see VCEH Coordinated Entry Policies & Procedures)

Once the Local Coordinated Entry Partnership has been implemented, the local CoC and the VCEH will regularly evaluate its effectiveness. Lessons derived from these evaluations will be used to further improve the coordinated entry process.

VCEH will evaluate the coordinated entry process primarily through local CoC implementation, but will also consider aggregate data.

At least annually, each Local CE Partnership will:

- Survey all local Partners to solicit feedback on how well the Local CE Partnership is being implemented, and
- Collect feedback on the coordinated entry process from consumers through a focus group or survey.

The VCEH will establish uniform questions to support this evaluation process.

Every 6 months, the VCEH Coordinated Entry Committee will review the following data points for each local CoC and the aggregate Balance of State CoC:

- The number of Coordinated Entry Partners, and type (Outreach, Prevention, Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, Rapid Re-housing, Permanent Supportive Housing, Other);
- The number of assessments completed (e.g, the number of households placed on the Master List during the time period), including:
  - the number who were literally homeless
  - the number of households returning to the Master List;
- The number of households on the Master List, including the number that are unsheltered (point in time);
- The number (and %) of households on the Master List more than 3 months, including
  - the # who are chronically homeless
  - the # who were rejected or not referred to a project and the reasons why those households were rejected or not referred;
- The average length of time a household is on the Master List (date of assessment to date inactive or housed) during the reporting period;
- The number of household exits to permanent housing, including the number who exit into Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-housing; and
- The number of households who are moved to an inactive list.

The VCEH Coordinated Entry Committee will provide an annual summary report and analysis to the VCEH Board.

## Appendix 2: VCEH Coordinated Entry Evaluation Report Form

### Annual Report on Consumer Feedback on Coordinated Entry Process

It is critical to get feedback from consumers about how coordinated entry is working for them, even if it can be challenging to get actionable feedback.

Things to consider: Power dynamics, eliciting feedback on the process for getting housing help (vs housing itself), transportation, child care, time, etc.

Recommended VCEH Consumer Feedback Questions:

- How many agencies have you gone to for help?
- Do you feel the way (process) you get help with housing is fair?
- How well was the process for getting help explained to you?
- Did you fill out a release of information form? Did you get an explanation about how your information would be shared?
- How could the process for getting help with housing be better?
- Do you know what your next steps for getting housing help is?
- Do you think that people who need housing in your area know how to get help?
- Did you feel that the housing assessment was respectful?
- What else do you want me to know?

- 1) **Describe the method used by the Coordinated Entry Partnership to get feedback from people experiencing homelessness on the coordinated entry process?** <survey, focus group, interviews, comment box, etc.>
- 2) **Provide a summary of consumer feedback received. Are there any themes that emerged?** <who, how, where, when>
- 3) **Consumer feedback results were shared and discussed with Coordinated Entry Partners...**
- 4) **Where there any outcomes or action steps that came from this discussion?**

### Coordinated Entry Outcomes – Data Analysis

ICA can help you to run the CE Summary Report to provide these data points. You will need to add in any non-HMIS client data. Please only report in aggregate with no identifying information.

- 5) **Complete EXCEL form**
- 6) **Coordinated Entry Outcomes were shared and discussed with Coordinated Entry Partners...**<who, how, where, when>
- 7) **Where there any outcomes or action steps that came from this discussion?**

## Appendix 3: VCEH Coordinated Entry Data Points

<b>1) # of Coordinated Entry Partners (signed onto partnership agreement):</b>		
<i># By Type (some providers may be more than one type)</i>		
Outreach Provider		
Homelessness Prevention Provider		
Emergency Shelter Provider		
Transitional Housing Provider		
Rapid Re-housing Provider		
Permanent Supportive Housing Provider		
Other		
Assessment Partners		
Referral Partners		
<b>2) # of referrals received by the Lead Agency:</b>		
o #/% of households with an initial outreach date within 3 days		#DIV/0!
o Average # of days between referral and initial outreach		
<b>3) # of assessments completed from 8/1/21 – 6/30/22 (e.g. # of HH placed on the Master List during the time period):</b>		
o #/% of assessments completed by Lead Agency		#DIV/0!
o Average # of days between referral to Lead Agency and assessment		
o #/% of assessments completed by Assessment Partners		#DIV/0!
o of these, the #/% of HH who were literally homeless (category 1)		#DIV/0!
o of these, the #/% of HH returning to the Master List		#DIV/0!
<b>4) Current # of HH on the Master List on June 30, 2022:</b>		
o of these, the #/% that are unsheltered		#DIV/0!
<b>5) # (and %) of households on the Master List for 3-6 months (Total- Leavers + Stayers):</b>		#DIV/0!
o of these, the #/% who are chronically homeless		#DIV/0!
<b>6) # (and %) of households on the Master List for 6-12 months (Total- Leavers + Stayers):</b>		#DIV/0!
o of these, the #/% who are chronically homeless		#DIV/0!
<b>7) # (and %) of households on the Master List for 12-18 months (Total- Leavers + Stayers):</b>		#DIV/0!
o of these, the #/% who are chronically homeless		#DIV/0!
<b>8) # (and %) of households on the Master List for more than 18 months (Total- Leavers + Stayers):</b>		#DIV/0!
o of these, the #/% who are chronically homeless		#DIV/0!
<b>9) # (and %) of LEAVER households (HH) on the Master List during the reporting period:</b>		
o all HH (LEAVERS)		#DIV/0!
o HH identified as needing short-term assistance		#DIV/0!
o HH identified as needing medium-term assistance		#DIV/0!
o HH identified as needing long-term assistance		#DIV/0!
o HH with adult(s) and children		#DIV/0!
o HH with adult(s) only		#DIV/0!
o HH where one or more members has a disability		#DIV/0!
o HH with no disability		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: 18-24 years old		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: 25-61 years old		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: 62+ years old		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: Age Unknown (missing/undefined)		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: Black, African American, or African		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: White		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: Asian or Asian American		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: Multiple Races		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: Race Unknown (missing/undefined)		#DIV/0!
o To a Permanent Housing Destination		#DIV/0!
o To a Non-permanent Housing Destination		#DIV/0!
o Removed to the inactive list		#DIV/0!
o Removed self from list		#DIV/0!

<b>10) The average length of time a LEAVER household (HH) is on the Master List (date of assessment to date exit due to being inactive or housed) during the reporting period for:</b>		
o all HH (LEAVERS)		
o HH identified as needing short-term assistance		
o HH identified as needing medium-term assistance		
o HH identified as needing long-term assistance		
o HH with adult(s) and children		
o HH with adult(s) only		
o HH where one or more members has a disability		
o HH with no disability		
o Head of Household is: 18-24 years old		
o Head of Household is: 25-61 years old		
o Head of Household is: 62+ years old		
o Head of Household is: Age Unknown (missing/undefined)		
o Head of Household is: Black, African American, or African		
o Head of Household is: American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous		
o Head of Household is: White		
o Head of Household is: Asian or Asian American		
o Head of Household is: Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		
o Head of Household is: Multiple Races		
o Head of Household is: Race Unknown (missing/undefined)		
o To a Permanent Housing Destination		
o To a Non-permanent Housing Destination		
o Removed to the inactive list		
o Removed self from list		
<b>11) # (and %) of STAYER households (HH) on the Master List during the reporting period:</b>		
o all HH (STAYERS)		#DIV/0!
o HH identified as needing short-term assistance		#DIV/0!
o HH identified as needing medium-term assistance		#DIV/0!
o HH identified as needing long-term assistance		#DIV/0!
o HH with adult(s) and children		#DIV/0!
o HH with adult(s) only		#DIV/0!
o HH where one or more members has a disability		#DIV/0!
o HH with no disability		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: 18-24 years old		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: 25-61 years old		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: 62+ years old		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: Age Unknown (missing/undefined)		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: Black, African American, or African		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: White		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: Asian or Asian American		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: Multiple Races		#DIV/0!
o Head of Household is: Race Unknown (missing/undefined)		#DIV/0!
<b>12) The average length of time a STAYER household is on the Master List (date of assessment to date of report) during the reporting period for:</b>		
o all HH (STAYERS)		
o HH identified as needing short-term assistance		
o HH identified as needing medium-term assistance		
o HH identified as needing long-term assistance		
o HH with adult(s) and children		
o HH with adult(s) only		
o HH where one or more members has a disability		
o HH with no disability		
o Head of Household is: 18-24 years old		
o Head of Household is: 25-61 years old		
o Head of Household is: 62+ years old		
o Head of Household is: Age Unknown (missing/undefined)		
o Head of Household is: Black, African American, or African		
o Head of Household is: American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous		
o Head of Household is: White		
o Head of Household is: Asian or Asian American		
o Head of Household is: Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		
o Head of Household is: Multiple Races		
o Head of Household is: Race Unknown (missing/undefined)		
<b>13) Narrative responses:</b>		
o For those households unable to be reached within 3 days of referral (#2 above), provide a brief overview of the reasons or barriers to meeting the target:		
o For those households removed to the inactive list (#10 above), provide a brief summary of the reasons (if known):		
o For those households who removed themselves from the list (#10 above), a summary of the reasons (if known):		

## **Appendix 4: 2021-2022 VCEH Coordinated Entry Committee Members**

Agency of Human Services

BROC Community Action

Capstone Community Action

Champlain Valley Office of Economic Opportunity

Charter House Coalition

Economic Services Division, Department for Children and Families, Agency of Human Services

Groundworks Collaborative

Homeless Prevention Center

Institute for Community Alliances (HMIS lead agency)

John Graham Housing & Services

Northeast Kingdom Community Action

Office of Economic Opportunity, Department for Children and Families, Agency of Human Services

Pathways Vermont

Samaritan House

Springfield Supported Housing Program

Supportive Services for Veteran Families at UVM

Upper Valley Haven

Vermont Coalition to End Homelessness

Veterans Affairs – Healthcare for the Homeless Program