

# HMIS/CES COMMITTEE MINUTES, 4/19/2022 8:30AM

*Attendees: Melissa Kopf, Teddie Pierce, Kalia Barth, Beverly Lino, Brian Robison, Caressa Hearp, Scott Abbott, Axel Zijderveld, Lorree Lewis*

## **Case Conferencing**

Brian led a discussion of case conferencing methodology, using HUD verbiage and a Department of Veterans Affairs document as a starting point. Discussion topics included:

*CASE CONFERENCING PURPOSE:* It was floated that the meetings could be a standing opportunity to address potential housing barriers for high-vulnerability clients, but this is only somewhat compatible with a Housing First model. HUD documentation generally implies that case conferencing is intended for situations where either the client or the project is rejecting referrals. However, a preemptive CC meeting could be triggered whenever one or more units becomes available.

*HOUSING NAVIGATOR COMMITTEE AS INITIAL MODEL:* Melissa pointed out that they are more geared toward resolving systemic issues in the private market with only a vestigial client-based case conferencing process.

*MEETING FREQUENCY:* There was some concern that weekly would be too often, but Teddie mentioned that initially there would be need for process discussion. We decided to start out weekly with an option to cancel (and to make less-frequent later).

*FACILITATOR OPTIONS:* The CES Operator is unlikely to provide this role. Teddie mentioned that it doesn't have to be from a provider (and in fact this could circumvent conflict-of-interest issues). Lake County Mediations could be a place to start. Also, an open letter to the LCCoC could get some leads.

*PRIVACY AND CLIENT ENGAGEMENT:* It was mentioned that HUD generally assumes the client is not present. Teddie agreed to look into what could be discussed with just an HMIS ROI and no client present; we generally presume it would be limited to exactly what's in the ROI. Lorree offered that she is experienced with models in which the client is present for the first meeting and identifies both trusted parties and trusted information, and then further meetings could proceed within those limits.

## **Wrap-Up**

Items to be discussed next week:

- Remaining Case Conferencing issues

## HMIS/CES COMMITTEE MINUTES, 4/26/2022 8:30AM

*Attendees: Melissa Kopf, Teddie Pierce, Beverly Lino, Brian Robison, Caressa Hearp, Scott Abbott, Holly Masterson, Axel Zijderveld, Lorree Lewis*

### **Case Conferencing**

Brian led a continuing discussion of case conferencing methodology, with a Department of Veterans Affairs document as a reference. Discussion topics included:

*BASIC CASE CONFERENCING FLOW:* It was floated that the basic flow would be:

1. CES Operator would securely identify to the CC facilitator a short list of clients that meet the criteria for case conferencing;
2. CC facilitator would contact one designated, preferably HMIS-licensed person from each agency with a list of HMIS Client IDs and possibly highly-restricted demographics data;
3. Agency designees and CC facilitator would collaborate (respecting client privacy) to determine who, if anybody, has knowledge of and/or rapport with the client, and a designee would be determined to “own the case”;
4. The case owner would attempt to contact the client, explain the case-conferencing process, and invite the client to participate. They would also determine which parties the client would like to attend or not, whether the client would be attending, and possibly what information the client would like to allow/restrict. (If the client will not be present, an additional ROI may need to be executed, especially to include non-HMIS parties.);
5. A meeting will be held at a standing time with the CC facilitator, the case owner(s), the client (if possible), and any allowed parties.

There was general agreement that this would be a viable flow.

*ATTENDEES:* In addition to representatives from HMIS-licensed agencies and primary homeless-system providers, attendees could include members of medical providers (physical and behavioral), law enforcement, Social Services and/or Public Housing Authority, housing providers, educational providers, EDD, and so forth, on a case-by-case basis and as approved by the client during the case owner’s interactions with them.

*MEETING TRIGGERS:* In the long-term, the meeting would have a regular (weekly or bi-weekly) time slot but would only be held when a trigger condition was met. Possible triggers could be an opening coming up from a services provider, a rejection of a referral by a client, or a rejection of a referral by an agency.

*TRAINING AND EARLY INFORMATION:* Teddie submitted that it would be helpful if the client were informed about case conferencing and its usefulness as early as possible, for example during the intake process at an Access Point. Ideally there would be standardized training and materials for APs.

### **Wrap-Up**

Major outstanding: facilitator individual unidentified; appeal email to LCCoC pending

Next meeting time and topic: TBD (likely 5/10)