CES TRIAGE TOOL UPGRADE STAKEHOLER INPUT SUMMARY

This document reflects a summary of considerations and questions captured from a series of input sessions on the CES Triage Tool Upgrade that engaged the following key stakeholder groups and leadership tables. This summary has been provided for applicant reference in understanding the background of this RFP's development. ***A consolidated list of the most pressing and prioritized questions pulled from the collective input has been listed in the RFP document and should be reviewed and responded to by all applicants.***

Abt Associates
CES Policy Council
Chrysalis
City of Santa Monica
Conrad N. Hilton Foundation
CSH (Corporation for Supportive Housing)
Enterprise Community Partners
Home For Good Funders Collaborative
Homeless Youth Forum of Los Angeles
Homelessness Policy Research Institute
Kaiser Permanente
LA County Board Supervisor, SD 3
LA County Dept of Health Services - Housing for Health
LA County Dept of Mental Health
LA County Homeless Initiative
LA County Office of Diversion and Reentry
LA Homeless Services Authority
Lived Experience Advisory Board
Rainbow Services
UniHealth Foundation
United Way of Greater Los Angeles

If we are able to upgrade our CES Triage Tools, what would success look like to you?

- Clear understanding of triage tool purpose and greater confidence in the tool.
- Greater sense of relevance to every participant connection with prevention/diversion efforts/resources
- Expansion of system capacity to serve more participants, particularly underserved populations of color.
- Increased equity experienced and actualized in our system.
- Triage tool roadway to other resources and opportunities besides housing.
- More responsive system and reducing wait times.
- Increased retention/success to lease. Vacancy times reduced and utilization rates increases.

What are some of the tensions and tradeoffs that will need to be considered in this project?

- How do we use the tool and process to help build provider and case manager agency?
- Balancing tool reliability vs. accuracy. Use of self-report, observation, and validated data.
- Balancing needs of particular populations/vulnerabilities with need for consistency/comparability.
- Building in flexibility/boundaries for implementation within ideal
- How will researcher place community/clients at front of project?
- How project connects or is expected to inform other system improvement work?
- Balancing service depth with system speed.
- Concrete and consistent tool, with Nimbleness/Adaptability for future.
- Testing Service/Speed/Matching, working beyond acuity
- What does continuous improvement mean? Process, timing, resources?
- What are other cities doing/looking at that LA should consider through this process?
- How are we applying an equity lens and looking at biases when approaching the tool?
- How do we integrate into our current system? What are the implications to our current system and individuals already assessed?

CONSIDERATIONS/QUESTIONS BY CATEGORY

Category	Considerations/Questions
ASSESSMENT	○ Maintain accessibility of tool language, but explore how to further localize and have wording options to support client tailoring. Explore how wording may change as translated into other languages. ○ Supporting survey administrator with self-assessment, observer response options, and non-scored rapport/relationship building questions, and having an actionable end to conversation. ○ Maintain holistic nature of tool, while looking at lessening length through progressive engagement and relational questions (decision tree). ○ Further define essential eligibility questions (ADA/Shared housing), and look at incorporating client choice/motivational interviewing questions. ○ Feedback questions incorporated into tool/process to support continuous improvement. ○ Look at incorporating magnitude/severity scales, rather than just thresholds where it makes sense. ○ How can contact section be enhanced to ensure better maintenance of connection with clients throughout process?
ADMINISTRATION	○ Identify the appropriate time and ideal place(s) to administer the assessment. Ensuring client and surveyor are both in a mindset that will allow for a successful survey. ○ Look at how tool can help be used for immediate problem solving and service solutions. ○ Enhanced frontline training for those administering the tools (Trauma Informed Care, DV) and system/service options. ○ Balancing self-report with observed behavior and validated data. ○ Incorporation/training for non-traditional administrators of the tool. What does a team assessment look like vs. single interview assessment? ○ What are expectations around the tools administration and how does that need to change – contract requirements, outreach worker expectations, etc. ○ Balancing adding to the process vs. efficiency.
APPLICATION	○ Explore how scoring can support more service decisions besides housing interventions. ○ Reframing purpose of scoring (“pre-screen”, “advising”) to support expectation setting. ○ How would case conferencing and screener observation be part of the scoring process? ○ How does validated data fit in with self-report and observation? ○ How do we apply the data beyond individual client solutions, to broader systemic improvement work? ○ How can matching process be enhanced/sped up? ○ Investigate through the data accuracy of the matches made with retention in intervention overall and across multiple subpopulations. ○ What’s next? How does the tool and system set up the next steps for clients and case managers?