



## **PIMIT Workgroup Meeting Minutes May 7, 2009**

### ***Items Relevant to Other Workgroups***

- *All Workgroups:* The team reviewed the Action Plans of the other teams. The notes and comments around that review are included in these minutes. [From the larger convening meeting, our group identified the following changes we think are needed for our group and how we interact with other groups/larger issues for workgroups: (A) PIMIT can be a review/clearinghouse of surveys, to assist with connecting to outcomes, and assessing burden on respondents; (B) We would like to offer training on how to use measurement for performance improvement; (C) We would like to task other workgroups with problem solving identified trends, e.g., housing retention; (D) We would like to add consumer's to our workgroup]

### ***Attendees***

*Barb Ritter, Chair*

*Heather Wiegand, Co-Chair*

*Denise Dunn*

*Vanessa McDonald*

*Alissa Oetman*

*Stacey Varela*

*Gerry Leslie*

*Andrea Kuhn*

*Rich Burgis*

*Teresa Duhl*

*Marj Knurick*

*Nancy McCrohan, PPA*

*Scott Southard, PPA*

### ***Discussion Items***

#### **Introductions/Other Items**

- NM began by walking the team through the meeting's agenda.
- BR discussed the passing of Craig Holderbaum. BR brought up the idea of making donations in his name. BR will take the lead on the idea; MK will inform BR after the meeting where donations are being collected.
- Currently, Region 4 is not represented in our team. BR plans to make some calls related to this.
- The hoops around building affordable housing, and a data set reflecting current realty numbers discussed. MK noted that there are a lot of hoops for people to jump through in her area.

#### **Action Plan Status**

*Action Item #1.1 Inventory data systems and identify data to share.*

- There are two more data sets the team wants to review. This will be done at future team meetings.

*Action Item #1.2. Identify and implement ways of sharing data through the Campaign to End Homelessness Web site.*

- BR brought a handout for the team detailing 2008 total homeless and employment statistics. All of last year's data was reanalyzed to allow for year-to-year trending. The Annual Report will be available at the Housing Conference and on the WEB. Highlights were discussed by the team below:
  - There was an increase of 10.1% from 2007 to 2008 in homelessness.
  - Although both singles and families increased this year. The family homelessness increased in virtually every CoC with the largest changes occurring in rural Michigan. Barb checked with HUD to see if this pattern was replicated nationally and they confirmed that this pattern was also noted in the "yet to be published" AHAR Region 1 was discussed, and it was noted that the presence of the HARP vouchers actually resulted in the community being more engaged – that there are increases but also measurement improved.
  - There were decreases in Single homelessness in Regions 3 and 6 which resulted in an overall slight decrease in homeless even when the additional families were added. These Regions both have larger housing programs that focus on singles and chronics. HARP was especially helpful.
  - There were differences in outcome performance for Emergency Shelters in the large urban areas. Barb noted that TH programs did evidence that difference and that the ES in especially Detroit have scope issues. She also thinks that the stressors on clients may be different and is looking for a risk adjustment measure. Urban areas face unique challenges. Members noted that while cities like Grand Rapids kept their industries within the city, Detroit moved them to outside. AK noted that it is easy to see the impact of this problem just by simply driving around Detroit, there is less traffic.
  - The rest of the team discussed the HARP work. Some noted that it had brought communities together by showing them that there is homelessness in their areas. DD noted a concern around the drying up of the vouchers. There is some worry over losing that tool. Stimulus funds on prevention should help (Michigan gets 53 million total).
  - MK noted that the original perception in Livingston County was that there wasn't any homeless in their area. They have now gone through 180 vouchers and there is a waiting list for more.
  - The team discussed the challenge in showing the communities that there are homeless; how to look for them and how to find them. DD gave an example of this from her region: Couch-surfers, the places to hide and sleep. Many of these are young adults. It has been shown living in a state like this can affect their future and education. The perception is that the homeless is simply the drunk, they are missing the 10-year old with their mother.
  - There has been a loss of ten dollars in average annual income. It was noted that it takes a lot to show a loss with this much data. Trends tend to be very stable.
  - As usual more first time homeless exit into housing. Many long-term homeless have lost their family support systems and therefore have fewer resources to turn to.

- BR discussed the differences between at-risk and poor. The focus of the work should be on prevention if the hope is to improve the process. BR asked the team for feedback on this idea. The most obvious difference was the presence of a disability.
- Regarding singles, disabilities drive the homeless numbers. They are usually older and male. Although some communities have street programs that focus on women and therefore have more in the count. Flint is an example.
- AK talked about Detroit; people migrate to places that have care available. BR noted that Michigan has less on the ground support for substance abuse. More are needed, need more detox. There has to be a way to give them a “timeout” before they lose their house.
- AK noted that in the urban communities there are more chronic individuals and singles. They are repeaters, going to the same shelters, time and time again. It was noted that Washington has had some great success in working with detox, etc. DD noted it would act as a great model. The national average for chronics is about 10%, we are at 13%. Detroit has a higher chronic percentage, between 19% and 20%.
- The exit data in reference to employment was pretty good, at 18%.
- BR discussed the basic HUD outcomes, actual numbers are better than this. She asked the team for feedback on this. The HUD goal is to have 60% staying for no more than six months. People are typically staying in houses longer.
- It was noted that the Web site and the data on it will improve over time as the regions add to it more and more.
- The Web site will be officially launched at the Affordable Housing Council in June. This will include a presentation and panel discussion. It will be easy for each of the communities to run reports with info from the Website Passwords will be used and access will be limited. Don’t want just anyone running reports and publishing data, e.g., journalists, to ensure that data are appropriately quoted and interpreted. There will be detailed data available on the statewide and regional level and some data where CoCs have approved the use.

*Action #1.5. Identify tools and data to support 10-year plan, and program/agency performance improvement and efficiencies.*

- The review team, NM, Andrea, and Teresa, discussed their experiences going through the 10-year plans, looking for the type of measures needed for plans, and examples of good measures.
  - The plans are each different. The team was concerned by the variations they were seeing. There should be standard issues that should be addressed in each of these plans (exiting into housing, retention in houses, positive housing destination, etc.). We need to make use of measures that HUD needs, e.g., recidivism should be available to include in their plans. One of the concerns is that there are no references to baselines. Outcomes should be easy to track, but there are few outcomes as part of these plans.
  - The following measures will be available on HMIS, and hence posted to CTEH website: retention in housing; recidivism; change in employment; changes in income; self-sufficiency matrix.

- ◆ DD discussed the process of creating 10-year plans. She called it challenging. It could have been easier with a template. BR noted that this is something we can do.
- ◆ The idea of a template for the 10-year plans, built into a conversation about what the team can create to help focus all of the 10-year plans (see next series of bullets).
- BR discussed creating a subteam to tackle this problem around the measures. She recommended several people. The actual volunteers included, Andrea, Alissa, Rich, Stacy, Heather, Gerry, BR, and NM.
  - The hope will be then to go through each measure one at a time. The group drafted a template of a table to outline the type of information relevant to measurement. This can be put on the Web site and the regions can track their work on it. The team worked on the form that would make up the process. This document will act as a benchmarking tool. The idea is to concentrate on measures that will link to the overall goals of the Campaign.

### **Communication discussion with Paul Beiring**

- PB is the new Statewide Regional Specialist. He spoke to the group about his new role and his work with the different workgroups.
  - One point he brought up was the gap in how we share information at the regional levels. DD noted as well the fact that there is so much information that it becomes a burden. An idea was put forth to create highlights or briefing statements, something easier to take back to the regional councils and continuums. Some ideas were also put forth regarding the minutes, emphasizing work and assignments moving forward as compared to the discussion that took place. Resources should be emphasized as well.

### **Other Action Plans Reviewed**

- To begin the review the team looked at the summary matrix created for the convening. BR was concerned with it and thought it missed some of PIMIT deliverables. Some were concerned it was not accurate.
- HW wondered how much of an overlap is occurring in the work of the different workgroups. She asked if she could work with a team member from another workgroup to go through the action plans to spy this out. She will report back at the next meeting. HW also plans to look at membership list of the groups. The hope is to find some names she recognizes and build the lines of communication around our group.
- *EISSS Review*
  - It looks like they are missing a plan to measure client outcomes, e.g., unemployment rate, self-sufficiency.
  - The review of unemployment and change of employment, should be noted, is available on HMIS.
  - 2-1-1 is working on an Eligibility Data System and the group wondered how it would coordinate with or if it would even duplicate Bridges which is in process?
  - Wondered if 2.1 and 2.3. are moot, because we have HMIS available. [later discussion in the large group suggested that they did not mean to create databases]
  - 3.2. How does this relate to SOAR and Bridges?
  - The team noted that when things refer to automation, our team should be included, especially before work is added to their Action Pan.
- *HA&M Review*

- The team began by questioning the surveys in the plan. Shouldn't our group be looking at that helping them connect to outcomes? (What are the long-term benefits of the survey, etc.?)
- 3.1. Are there outcome measures? How can the teams tell what works and what doesn't? Outcomes need to be defined.
- Holding a focus group is an output, not an outcome, it was noted by the team.
- BR recommended that performance improvement process measure is need for housing related tasks. They should circle in on what works, find out what are the best practices. What can PIMIT do to contribute to this workgroup's work moving forward?
- *CBC Review*
  - We suggest they measure the success of their communication strategies, i.e., satisfaction.
  - How our groups work together to distribute our recommendations for measures?
  - 3.2. looks like it duplicates our data support
- *Training Review*
  - Our group would like to provide education and training on measurement of progress in 10 year plans. How can we collaborate on this?
  - 3.2.2. Needs to include of measurement in quality improvement.
  - 2.2 looks like it overlaps with HA&M group
  - We wonder if training help is needed to deal with multiple casemanagement approaches/models? What about common care plan?

### ***Tasks Completed***

- Review of 2008 data analyses, some of which relates to the website
- Review of other team's Action Plans.
- Discussed 10-year plan research, came up with a follow up plan to help the regions.

### ***Assignments***

- HW is going to look into building the communications between our team and the others. She is also planning (with the help of a team ember of another team) to review the Action Plans of the different groups. She will be reporting back to the team at a future meeting.
- A subteam will be created to create measures that will assist in the evaluation of the 10-year plans. A draft of a form to shape this work was developed in the meeting. NM will contact people for follow through on this task.

### ***Next Meeting***

- Thursday, June 11, 2 PM to 3 PM -- with a sub-group meeting immediately following until 4 PM. Location, Go-To Meeting Log in, and telephone number are shown on the agenda for the next meeting.