

# Minutes

## Arizona Balance of State Continuum of Care

### Coordinated Assessment Workgroup

#### April 2, 2013 teleconference

**Attendees:** Cindy Furrh, Old Concho; Scott Rich, Symmetric Solutions; Carol Quasula, Catholic Charities; Ken McKinley, Open Inn; Maureen Rooney, ADOH; Margaret Kilman, DES; Danelle Valenzuela, DBHS; Jennifer Burch, Mohave County

**Guests:** Catherine Dunning, 211; Michelle Thomas, 211; Mark Lewis, 211

**Meeting Called to order: 2:00pm**

#### DISCUSSION:

Cindy asked if everyone had the chance to see the Socialserve demonstration presented by Van Gottel on two occasions since the last meeting. Everyone had. Feedback from the committee on the Social Serve demonstration included comments relating to the tool's user-friendliness, good resources for referrals, and the ability to collect and export data. A committee member noted that Van Gottel stated his company is currently in the beginning stages of creating coordinated intake systems for other continuums of care (COCs) but also has experience working with agencies and communities on intake and screening tools. Another noted that Van Gottel has experience in the field, and liked that. The committee expressed doubt that there would be other web-based companies that would have more experience or knowledge with coordinated intakes for the use of the COCs as this concept is newly mandated from HUD.

Committee members addressed the issue of how Socialserve would be funded. Maureen said that ADOH had received a rough estimate of \$70,000 to design the assessment tool and, in addition, there would be an annual cost for the service. The annual fee will be higher at first, while it is being fine-tuned, but would drop to a more manageable amount after a year or so, roughly estimated to be \$5,000. Actual costs will depend on the functionality that the CoC requires. (Importing data into HMIS, as an example, would increase costs.) Maureen stated that ADOH will take the lead in finding funds for this project.

Catherine asked for clarification on how this committee intends to use Socialserve—as just a referral engine, or something more extensive. The committee noted that the system will be used to refer, track, and place individuals to services. Catherine stated that she does not see Socialserve conflicting with 211 but asked the committee why we don't use our current HMIS system. The committee noted a primary reason is that not everyone in the larger service network is using HMIS. It was also noted that the assessment tool is intended to be available to the general public.

Scott noted and the committee agreed that we do not intend to turn this tool into a case management system. It is a referral system to get clients to the right door. All providers will use the same assessment. The idea is that this will be a screening tool and will also track anyone who has an interest in housing from referral to placement. The goal is to track the numbers, and meet HUD requirements, but to also use this system as a way to find gaps in services in order to better meet the needs of our communities. Scott noted that he has looked at other options and thinks Socialserve will work the best for several reasons: it is already being used in Arizona, Pima County is also looking at this tool for Coordinated Intake, it's simple and easy to use, and it will be used by more individuals than HMIS. Margaret reiterated our committee's goal that we will want to use and look at this service from a planning perspective so the BOS COC can make comprehensive decisions based on real data. This would be difficult to do with HMIS. If the 211 service does not fit this model that is fine; 211 can continue to refer clients to partnering agencies and the agencies will implement the assessment from there.

**NEXT STEPS:**

The committee agreed that we need to come up with a basic timeline. Maureen noted that we have until October 2014 to have the coordinated intake system initiated. Scott offered to put together a white paper explaining how it would work, what data we would get out, and a suggestion of a basic timeframe. Maureen will talk to Socialserve to get an idea of how much lead time they would need once we are ready. Scott noted that we should ask Socialserve if they have questions for us. Cindy said she would edit down the Alameda assessment into draft assessment questions prior to the next meeting.

Cindy suggested that we schedule our next meeting for two months out to provide time for these next steps.

**NEXT MEETING:** June 4, 2013 at 2pm. Teleconference

Meeting adjourned: 2:40pm.