

Coordinated Entry

A Better Way Is Possible



Voices from the Community

Monica Steptoe, Homeless Prenatal Program, Program Director at Jelani House

Loretta Vallot, Larkin Street Youth Services, Associate Director of TAY Navigation

Lessy Benedith, St. Vincent de Paul, Director of Homeless Services

Co-Presenters:

Laura Valdez, Dolores Street Community Services, Executive Director

Joe Wilson, Hospitality House, Executive Director

Equity Issues in Coordinated Entry Systems

Coordinated entry is the foundation of the homeless response system in San Francisco and across the country in 400+ Continuums of Care. The equity issues in coordinated entry and automated decision-making are not unique to San Francisco--but San Francisco can exercise bold leadership in addressing them.

Fundamentally, coordinated entry obscures the mismatch between housing options and unhoused people and minimizes the value of human relationships.

The pie is too small. Resource scarcity is not resource equity.

Don't shrink the problem--grow the solution.

“The reality is that our current systems are not designed to provide care or secure social justice; they are built to manage the symptoms of austerity. To somehow more fairly divide a pie that is simply too small.”

- Virginia Eubanks, *Automating Inequality*

Prioritization and Racial/Gender/LGBTQ Equity

Prioritization shrinks the pool of people who are eligible for housing down to the number of people who are referred to housing. Research shows that prioritization tools imbed racial and gender (and likely also language and cultural) biases:

1. Courtney Cronley, associate professor at the University of Tennessee, found that white women score consistently higher than Black women on the VI-SPDAT.
2. C4 Innovations found that white people scored statistically significantly higher on the VI-SPDAT than BIPOC.

Yet BIPOC are grossly overrepresented in homeless response systems nationally.

“Critiques are right; the VI-SPDAT was never designed using a racial or gender equity lens.”

- Iain De Jong, Pres. & CEO of OrgCode

Problems in San Francisco

- 1. Problem-solving:** Efficacy rates are low across populations (especially for families) and its use as a category “shrinks the problem.” Everyone is homeless.
- 2. Diversity of housing options:** Adults, youth, and families get prioritized to what is available, versus matched with options that will meet their needs.
- 3. Data and transparency:** Providers need regular access to data that show the scope of the problem (total numbers of unhoused people) and demographics (for equity).
- 4. Linguistic, cultural barriers:** Impact the most vulnerable populations.
- 5. Resource scarcity:** People have to get worse before they can get help.

“Coordinated entry is a machine for producing rationalization, for helping us convince ourselves that only the most deserving people are getting help.... Those who fall through the cracks face prisons, institutions, or death.”
- Virginia Eubanks, *Automating Inequality*

Interim Solutions for an Equitable Redesign

1. **Decentralize access with multiple entry points** --particularly in communities of color--while maintaining coordination. The youth CE system operates this way and multiple entry points could be expanded in the adult system as well.
2. **Ensure flexibility in problem-solving resources** by spreading them across community-based programs. Build community capacity to navigate housing options.
3. **Define the scale of the problem accurately:** eliminate categorizations (e.g., “problem-solving status”) that understate the problem AND the solution.
4. **Focus on housing exits** and diversify housing options with a system-wide definition of race, gender, and LGBTQ equity.
5. **Minimize prioritization scoring:** focus instead on broadening access, expanding criteria, and targeting solutions based on different levels of need.
6. **Implement recommendations** already made, e.g., by family and youth providers.

Questions & Discussion

Towards an Equitable Redesign

