Interagency Council on Homelessness Work Group Scopes

Governor Kotek issued Executive Order (EO) 23-03 on January 10, 2023, as part of a suite of executive orders designed to address the housing and homelessness crisis in the State of Oregon defined by unsheltered homelessness, and an acute shortage of housing units. EO 23-03 directed all state agencies to prioritize reducing sheltered and unsheltered homelessness in all areas of state within their existing statutory authority and budgets.

According to the 2023 Point in Time Count conducted in January 2023 prior to the Governor's suite of executive orders, there are over 20,000 people experiencing homelessness across the State of Oregon. To coordinate agency implementation of this order, the Governor's Office initiated a robust evaluation of programs to better understand opportunities to optimize resources, improve program effectiveness, and ultimately reduce and prevent homelessness statewide. The program evaluation resulted in a set of objectives to achieve the goals of the executive order by aligning and closing gaps in homelessness-related programs across state agencies. By taking steps to improve program effectiveness and accountability, the state can more effectively achieve the outcomes that Oregonians want to see, and people experiencing homelessness deserve: a reduction in homelessness across the state.

In order to fully realize this work, Governor Kotek signed EO 24-03 on January 10, 2024, to refresh the state's Interagency Council on Homelessness and direct them to develop plans for the Governor's consideration in response to the analysis done through EO 23-03. The following document details the objectives leading the ICH work group outcomes, the final work group scopes the interagency council is submitting to the Governor for her consideration, and additional work group tasks identified as out of scope or not applicable for consideration in the Annual Work Plan (a list of these tasks is in Appendix A).

Contents

Executive Order 23-03 Objectives and Implementation Plan

The following list includes the objectives from Executive Order 23-03. Executive Order 24-03, executed on January 10th, 2024, includes a directive to state agencies to implement the following objectives:

- **Define statewide outcomes and goals that drive program implementation:** Establish statewide equitable outcomes and goals to reduce homelessness and drive decision-making on program development and prioritization of funding across the state enterprise.
- **Strengthen programs providing services to people experiencing homelessness across the enterprise:** Align and strengthen existing programs providing services to unhoused people or people at risk of homelessness to the greatest extent possible to strengthen the homelessness to housing service continuum in the state and reduce unnecessary program duplication. Work with state and local partners to improve local and regional coordination of programs and funding leading to better housing outcomes for individuals interacting with different levels of government.
- **Advance racial equity and share progress towards equitable goals:** Improve transparency about what the homelessness system looks like statewide and inform any future efforts to expand the system in a way that increases geographic equity in service availability, reduces racial disparities, and advances more equitable outcomes for Black, Indigenous, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander persons, and people of color, people with disabilities, youth, LGBTQIA+ people, older adults, and historically and currently underserved people.
- **Reduce barriers for service providers:** Improve the administration of homeless service programs to reduce unnecessary barriers for service providers, increase the efficiency of state program administrators, and improve the experience of people experiencing homelessness who are accessing resources. Focus on building the capacity of and addressing challenges for culturally-specific service providers by creating a more inclusive process for accessing state resources.
- **Evaluate programs and improve transparency:** Improve data systems to allow the state to understand and transparently communicate the impact of state investments on individual housing outcomes and support continuous program improvement to address a changing at-risk or unhoused population.
- **Improve how people exiting state institutional settings and systems of care access the housing continuum:** Expand housing choices and strengthen the effectiveness of navigation services for people transitioning out of state institutional settings and systems of care.
- **Coordinate across agencies:** Improve alignment of programs and policies across all state agencies, especially between the homelessness system and the human services, health care and behavioral health systems to ensure people experiencing homelessness are more effectively connected to services for which they are eligible.

The ICH created four work groups with tasks for implementation, including projects identified through the Governor's Office Implementation Report for Executive Order 23-03. The work groups were organized as follows:

Work Groups	Agency Lead	Work Group Projects	Work Group Outcomes	Advisory Body	Primary Agencies
Core Infrastructure	**OHCS**	Shelter and Transitional Housing	Improve system alignment by: - Mapping the current system - Identifying the system gaps - Developing core program standards and policies - Developing and implementing plan to align duplicative programs - Developing housing specific equity outcomes for each core program and service	Interagency Council on Homelessness (ICH)	OHCS (work group lead), ODHS, OHA, ODEM
		Re-Housing			
		Navigation Services and Street Outreach			
		Supportive Housing			
		Prevention			
		Regional/local coordination			
Administrative Improvements	**DAS**	Procurements Process Improvements	Develop strategy to increase culturally specific provider capacity	ICH, Task Force on Modernizing Grant Funding and Contracting, Disparity Study	DAS
			Reduce contracting and procurement barriers		
			Develop proposal for unified grant application process		
		Data Management and Governance	Develop a comprehensive data dictionary, standards, and practices (enterprise wide)	ICH	DAS (project lead), OHCS, ODHS, OHA
			Develop a coordinated data management system to help inform decision making		
			Create governance and data sharing agreements to develop a data trust	Data Trust Planning Committee	
		Outcomes-Oriented Program Development	Outcomes driven program administration	ICH	OHCS (project lead), ODHS, DAS
			Outcomes driven funding strategies (enterprise wide)	ICH	
Service Coordination	**GO**	Improve Housing Outcomes for People on State-Owned or Managed Property	Develop policy to connect people engaging in survival activities on state owned/managed land to housing	ICH	OPRD (project lead), ODF, ODOT, State Library, TIC, CRGC, ODFW, OSMB, ODHS
		Improve Housing Outcomes for People in State Systems of Care	Develop and implement strategies to improve housing outcomes for people transitioning out of state institutions/systems of care		GO (work group lead), CJC, DOC, DOJ, OYA, YDD, OHA, ODHS, ODVA, OHCS, OHA
Cross System Alignment	**GO**	Behavioral health, human services, and homelessness system alignment	Develop strategies to improve outreach by and connection to behavioral health and human services systems to meet people experiencing homelessness where they are in the continuum	ICH	GO (work group lead), OHCS, ODHS, OHA

Each ICH work group was directed to provide a proposed scope of work to the ICH by April 1st, 2024. The following sections include each scope of work created by the work groups, and an approximate timeline, and an indication of whether additional resources are necessary to implement a particular project within a scope. The proposed scopes of work were created between the first ICH meeting on January 16th, 2024, and April 1st, 2024, which is the deadline for the ICH to develop proposed scopes of work for the Governor's consideration. The Governor will consider the proposed scopes of work and make a decision on the components of the ICH annual work plan for the year by May 1, 2024.

Next Steps: ICH Work Groups Outreach and Tribal Consultation

ICH work group scopes also include an initial list of stakeholders, communities, tribes, and local or regional governments to engage with on the scope of work and during implementation. After the following proposed scopes are reviewed by the ICH, work groups will conduct outreach to gather feedback on the scopes, the steps for implementation, timelines, and other components to inform the annual work plan.

To meet the intent and requirements of Executive Order 96-30 and SB770 via ORS 182.162-168, consultation and cooperation with Oregon's Federally Recognized Tribal Nations is critical. The ICH work group leads and the Governor's Office will engage with SB770 cluster groups and consultation via the government-to-government process to facilitate comments and guidance on Tribal priorities and concerns.

Work Group: Core Infrastructure

Work Group Lead: Oregon Housing and Community Services (OHCS)

1.1 Purpose and Scoping Requirements

The Core Infrastructure Work Group create a scope of work to implement the following ICH objectives:

- **Define statewide outcomes and goals that drive program implementation:** Establish statewide equitable outcomes and goals to reduce homelessness and drive decision-making on program development and prioritization of funding across the state enterprise.
- **Strengthen programs providing services to people experiencing homelessness across the enterprise:** Align and strengthen existing programs providing services to unhoused people or people at risk of homelessness to the greatest extent possible to strengthen the homelessness to housing service continuum in the state and reduce unnecessary program duplication. Work with state and local partners to improve local and regional coordination of programs and funding leading to better housing outcomes for individuals interacting with different levels of government.
- **Advance racial equity and share progress towards equitable goals:** Improve transparency about what the homelessness system looks like statewide and inform any future efforts to expand the system in a way that increases geographic equity in service availability, reduces racial disparities, and advances more equitable outcomes for Black, Indigenous, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander persons, and people of color, people with disabilities, youth, LGBTQIA+ people, older adults, and historically and currently underserved people.

The Core Infrastructure Work Group developed scoping recommendations with the goal of strengthening and coordinating programs providing services to people experiencing homelessness and housing instability across the enterprise. The specific program types included in the scope include Shelter and Transitional Housing, Re-Housing, Navigation Services and Street Outreach, Supportive Housing, and Prevention as defined in the Executive Order 23-03 Implementation Report. Additionally, the group considered steps to strengthen regional and local coordination as part of the charge outlined in the homelessness state of emergency (EO 24-02) to meaningfully reduce the level of unsheltered homelessness in Oregon while establishing a framework to support the continued reduction of homelessness in the long-term, even after the state of emergency has ended. The work group proposed steps to achieve the following outcomes in each of the project types listed above:

Included in scope	Required or optional
Mapping the current system	Required
Identifying the system gaps	Required
Developing and implementing plan to align duplicative programs	Required
Developing core program standards and policies	Required
Developing housing specific equity outcomes for each core program and service	Required
Regional and Local Coordination Planning	Required

1.2 Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)

Mapping the current system

	Methodology	Agency Lead(s)	Agencies Involved	Timeline & Fiscal Impact
Deliverables: Public dashboard and map of statewide capacity for services on the continuum such as shelter and supportive housing, analysis of unmet need for housing units and/or beds analysis of cost to address the unmet need.				
1	Identify all services on the housing continuum to be included in mapping data. Incorporate related mapping projects identified in other ICH work groups, if applicable. Identify additional necessary participants such as local entities, philanthropic partners, etc. - By project type: including each of the core infrastructure program types (street outreach and housing navigation, shelter and transitional housing, re-housing, supportive housing, prevention). - By need: supportive housing availability deficit, PIT count, severe rent burden, Oregon Housing Need Assessment, etc. - By funding type: federal, state, local, philanthropic - By agency (state, local entities like CoC, CAA, PHA) – see also coordination in #6.2 - By subpopulation: youth, seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, immigrants and refugees, families, etc. - By geographic area	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA, ODVA, ODE	3 months No Fiscal Impact
2	Form cross-agency subgroup to establish consistent back-end data elements and variables for data collection necessary to accomplish the system mapping in Step 1. Step 1 will require data collection from service providers and funding organizations. Step 2 will help facilitate a smooth data collection process by clearly defining the information needed. This would allow for mapping of available services to coincide with potential operational uses of the data (e.g., using data to improve referrals across agencies).	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA, ODVA, ODE	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
3	Compile and compare existing data sets from ORRAI, OHCS, and other agencies or organizations to identify both gaps in data and what additional information is necessary, and available resources to bridge them. - For data gaps, identify existing capacity within state agencies to do required data collection, analysis, and evaluation of programs. - Explore contracting with external research entities for data gaps that cannot be filled by current capacity. This would require additional resources.	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA, ODVA, ODE	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
4	Conduct outreach with external stakeholders and organizations to inform where additional research or	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA	3 months

				Minimal Fiscal Impact
	data collection is necessary to map available resources compared to resource need. - Include steps to involve the OHCS shelter study participants or other existing data collection methods that can help supplement existing information. Include gaps previously identified, such as the need for funds and reimbursement models for emergency sheltering during a local or state emergency and geographic areas that have limited shelter capacity. - Ground truth the gaps identified in Step 3 - Identify if there are local or regional mapping efforts that can be added to the list of resources in Step 3 and help inform Step 6.			
5	Map shelter and transitional housing using the existing resources identified in Step 3 above and any additional existing data collected through Step 4 and 4, illustrating where unmet need exists geographically and by certain types of shelter and/or transitional housing serving specific populations. Identify ongoing resource need for maintenance of the map and data. - Include analysis of where there is greatest unmet need for certain shelter types (i.e. winter shelters or places underserved in severe weather).	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
6	Combine local mapping work with regional mapping work where possible.	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
7	Additional funding required: Explore how the Portland Metro area 211 pilot being used to connect people to available shelter beds can potentially be expanded as a statewide resource for people seeking available shelter beds.	OHCS	DAS	6 months Fiscal Impact

Identifying system gaps and aligning duplicative programs

	Methodology	Agency Lead	Agencies Involved	Timeline & Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Report with a detailed, person-centered user journey of unaccompanied youth under age 25, an analysis of gaps and challenges, a synthesis of outreach, strategies to consider to address gaps, and an implementation plan for aligning overlapping programs without creating unintended consequences.				
1	Identify the user journey of an individual navigating the houselessness to housing continuum to document and describe gaps, experience, and opportunities for state improvement as documented by those closest to the services. The work group proposes a pilot for this work focusing on unaccompanied youth under the age of 25 population, led by ODHS, to leverage existing engagement efforts, such as the CSH Statewide Youth Housing Needs Assessment (2021) and existing youth	ODHS	OHCS, OHA, DOC, OYA, DOJ, ODE, YDD	3 months Fiscal Impact

	consultants (Statewide Youth Action Board and other ODHS Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program efforts).			
2	Through the mapping of the user journey with partner agencies, identify underutilized existing supports or funding streams to address gaps and unmet need (e.g. Foster Youth to Independence (FYI) and Family Unification Program (FUP) vouchers). - Review the CSH Youth Housing Needs Assessment summary report, the State Index on Youth Homelessness, and the full youth services map developed through the work group to identify ongoing policy and service gaps (SC).	ODHS	OHCS, OHA, DOC, OYA, DOJ, ODE, YDD	3 months Fiscal Impact
3	Using 23-03 Implementation Report data and tables, conduct deeper analysis of key differences between state programs that serve youth. - Compare existing program guidance/manuals, state statute and rule, federal guidelines. - Identify near-term opportunities for definition and/or eligibility alignment and determine required steps to implement changes. - Identify current efficiencies (e.g. TANF referral process, opportunities within coordinated entry, etc.) - Identify statutory changes and legislative timeline. Incorporate data from user journey analysis in Step 1 regarding user choice and access to reduce risk of unintended consequences of program alignment.	ODHS	OHCS, OHA, DOC, OYA, DOJ, ODE, YDD	3 months Fiscal Impact
4	Conduct outreach with local organizations and community groups to develop a more well-rounded understanding of the user journey including missing resources or supports, mismatches between available resources and need, and accessibility of services. This should include groups who lack access to the existing system for various reasons (i.e. language, culture, disability) and would not be well-represented in the user journey mapping step. - Conduct focus groups and interviews with: (1) Statewide and local Youth Action Board members who have experienced homelessness in different regions and; (2) youth homelessness service providers from different regions to identify how service gaps differ across the state. - Identify and consult with groups at the local level with expertise on youth homelessness and its contributing factors such as county juvenile justice teams, school districts/McKinney Vento liaisons, Systems of Care, Community Action Agencies, County	ODHS	OHCS, OHA, DOC, OYA, DOJ, ODE, YDD	4 months Minimal Fiscal Impact

	Developmental Disability Programs, Refugee Resettlement Agencies, and CoCs. - Through engagement efforts, identify programs with wait lists and/or outsized demand to understand both the types of programs and areas of the state with the greatest resource needs. - Identify conditions of current system that are important to preserve in more aligned system (service user choice, multiple doors for access, etc.). Will be used to inform work in the work group task for aligning duplicative programs.			
5	Create a report illustrating the user journey identified in Step 1 and gaps and challenges from Step 2 and 4, as well as any strategies to address these gaps and challenges gathered through outreach or from internal agency collaboration and discussion (include best practice research from the Core Infrastructure Work Group tasks), and a proposal to align overlapping programs informed by analysis and outreach.	ODHS	OHCS, OHA, DOC, OYA, DOJ, ODE, YDD	3 months Fiscal Impact

Developing core program standards and policies and housing specific equity outcomes

	Methodology	Agency Lead	Agencies Involved	Timeline & Fiscal Impact
	**Deliverables: (1) Report with detailed comparison of all program standards and polices related to state-funded shelter and transitional housing, (2) recommendation for consistent program standards and policies for shelter and transitional housing, including but not limited to: equitable housing focused outcomes, , tiered funding levels to meet different need levels.**
1	Review definitions (including HUD/federal, state, and agency-level definitions) for each of the Work Group projects for standardization, with collaboration from the Data Management and Governance sub-work group. Begin with shelter and transitional housing, supportive housing, and youth-related definitions.	OHCS, DAS	All	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
2	Identify existing program standards and policies for all state-funded shelter and transitional housing and supportive housing. - Review data gathered by OHCS in recent (fall 2023) shelter survey.	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA	3 months No Fiscal Impact
3	Analyze program standard and policy differences and develop a recommend for consistent program standards for shelter and transitional housing and permanent supportive housing. - Agree to core services definitions by comparing existing definitions across agencies and funding sources. Include analysis of emergency, transitional, seasonal, and alternative shelter definitions and collected input on where definitions and allowable uses may deviate from current practice (e.g.	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact

	inclement weather temporary expansion that impacts continued year-round operations).			
4	Identify existing program requirements, and whether the requirements exist in statute, rule, or contract language, and existing best practices in place for each program and how each of these are enforced. - Determine requirements vs. suggested best practices including low-barrier requirements, habitability standards, and alternative shelter models. Review national best practice research, HUD standards, and local implementation examples. - Identify known barriers to the programs, incorporating focus on youth-specific considerations, if available. - Identify additional barriers for BIPOC communities (language access, other culturally responsive services), barriers related to shelter requirements, and availability (especially domestic violence and family shelter). - Identify what we don't currently track that would impact ability to develop more uniform standards for example, involuntary shelter exits by disaggregated racial demographics. Propose standards enforcement responsibility and mechanisms through contracting and compliance monitoring. - Develop outcomes success measures and additional KPIs if required (OOPD).	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
5	Map how to align program standards and policies to improve coordination across state programs. - Include identifying which shelters add beds in inclement weather and understanding how this approach applies/or could apply to all shelter policies statewide.	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
6	Conduct outreach with external stakeholders and organizations administering state-funded shelter and transitional housing and supportive housing, and people with lived experience, to understand impacts of aligning program standards and policies.	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA	3 months Fiscal Impact
7	Identify enforcement mechanisms for implementing aligned standards and policies.	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
8	Create a report with a breakdown of Steps 1-7, including a series of recommendations to align and coordinate standards and policies to reduce redundancy and address disparities or gaps.	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact

Regional and local coordination

	Methodology	Agency Lead	Agencies Involved	Timeline & Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: A recommendation to identify a coordinating lead in each geographic region and their responsibilities, including development of equitable homelessness action plans that align local, state, and federal resources to achieve specific goals and outcomes to reduce homelessness.				
1	Status quo analysis: Identify all local coordination systems (from county level, include CCOs, CoCs, CAAs, MAC/LPG). Identify the existing structures that OHCS has and compare with other regional structures. Identify goals of coordination (influence, policy best practices, input, etc.) for local coordination systems.	OHCS	ODHS, OHA	3 months

Minimal Fiscal Impact |
| 2 | Gather partner feedback from MAC Group/LPG EO 23-02 emergency coordination efforts with purpose of identifying lessons learned for continuation of or repurposing structures beyond EO 24-02 period.
- Review feedback from OHCS monthly office hours engagements.
- Review ODEM's challenges and barriers work with partners.
- Evaluate effectiveness of standardization of structures and appropriate level of flexibility, effectiveness in increasing local coordination efforts, challenges, implementation considerations for differently sized and resourced groups. | OHCS | ODHS, OHA, DOC, ODEM | Initial Feedback: 2 Months

Feedback Post Step 3: 3 Months

Minimal Fiscal Impact |
| 3 | Ensure coordination across the state to implement regional plans to reduce homelessness and report outcomes to reflect accountability. Rely on established coordination systems; MAC groups in the CoC's designated regions and Local Planning Groups in the Balance of State. Ensure through the procurement process that appropriate authorized representatives in regions are assigned to funding agreements and routinely check in with regions to ensure both MAC and LPG's leads are assigned and up to date.
Continue with established reporting cadences for both MAC's and LPG's which includes HMIS data, and monthly reports to ODEM for MAC groups. Have a clear and transparent plan for data reflected and publishing cadence for the EO 24-02 dashboard. | OHCS | ODEM | 3 months

Minimal Fiscal Impact |
| 4 | Identify a process for funding distribution and a fiscal lead that reduces duplication in grant and contracts held with the same service providers. | OHCS | ODHS, OHA, DOC, ODEM | 3 months

Minimal Fiscal Impact |
| 5 | Strengthen areas where there is a lack of local/regional coordination with the effective models in place. Include an analysis of coordination with County Community Corrections to understand how local practices differ from state practices and how to best align approaches to improve release or discharge practices. Identify | OHCS | ODHS, OHA, DOC, ODEM | 6 months

Minimal Fiscal Impact |

	where adjusting existing models or structures of coordination are necessary.			
6	Create a report with findings from Steps 1-4, and a list of initial equity outcomes for the Data Management and Governance tasks on data infrastructure, data trust agreements, and analysis. Incorporate a two-way coordination structure for long-term engagement and not just short-term conversations.	OHCS	ODHS, OHA, DOC, ODEM	2 months Minimal Fiscal Impact

Core Infrastructure Work Group Budget

More work will be required to form detailed budget impact estimates. However, the Core Infrastructure Work Group estimates that the largest impacts to both budget and human resources/personnel will be in the categories of mapping and the large data projects (for example, a cross-agency mapping liaison position and for additional contracted support for potential new efforts like external service user dynamic resource mapping) and stakeholder/community engagement. Staff impact to specific agencies is dependent on which scoping efforts are prioritized for implementation and which agencies are leading bodies of work and which are supporting.

Expense category	Impact	Funding source
Mapping	Fiscal Impact	TBD
Engagement and Outreach	Fiscal Impact	TBD
Aligning Program Standards	Minimal Fiscal Impact	TBD
Aligning Duplicative Programs	Minimal Fiscal Impact	TBD
Equity Outcome Development	Minimal Fiscal Impact	TBD

Core Infrastructure Work Group stakeholder engagement plan

The Core Infrastructure Work Group identified the need for stakeholder engagement in many of the suggested scopes and implementation paths. Each of the areas for feedback are listed in the chart below according to organization to better streamline our communication with stakeholders and reduce duplication of requests. Additional considerations for engagement raised in the work groups included:
- Recommendation to get input on why people access services at one agency vs. another.
- Recommendation to limit and breakdown government jargon.
- We must acknowledge distrust of state agencies, especially for specific groups.
- Acknowledge broad provider assumptions that majority of funding will go to I-5 corridor and there is a perceived lack of attention to rural areas.
- Emphasis on the importance of ongoing engagement, not just one-time engagement when the state needs something

Previous engagement efforts that informed scoping work and recommendations for additional engagement needed include:
- Work with Tribal Governments through agency tribal liaisons.
- ODHS Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program engagement efforts via paid youth consultants, Statewide Youth Action Board, and CSH Statewide Youth Housing Needs Assessment
- ODHS Self-Sufficiency Programs Key Performance Measures annual survey results
- OHCS Mental Health and Addiction Association of Oregon Lived Experience Report
- OHCS PSU Research on Lived Experience of Eviction

Organization/Group	Purpose	Associated WBS Task
People with lived experience of homelessness or housing instability – youth, family, adult, DV, immigrant and refugee, veteran, BIPOC community members	Center experience of people accessing services in system improvement.	- Identify known barriers to our programs. - Systems gaps analysis as part of user journey exercise. - Core policy and program standards development. - Service user access.
People with experience within behavioral healthcare system, other institutional systems of care	Center experience of people accessing services in system improvement. (may be led by Service Coordination work group)	- Identify known barriers to our programs. - Systems gaps analysis as part of user journey exercise. - Core policy and program standards development. - Service user access.
Direct service workers	Experts in challenges in navigating current systems.	- Identify known barriers to our programs. - Systems gaps analysis as part of user journey exercise. - Core policy and program standards development. - Service user access.
Continuum of Care members	Coordinating bodies with regional perspective that deliver significant federal and local funding.	- Local outcomes by best practices. - Systems gaps analysis as part of user journey exercise. - Core policy and program standards development. - Service user access. - Shared definitions of culturally specific and culturally responsive and expectations for culturally responsive
MAC Group/LPG members	Emergency coordination groups created through EO 23-02 that delivered funding and met specific outcome goals.	- Local outcomes by best practices. - Systems gaps analysis as part of user journey exercise. - Core policy and program standards development. - Service user access. - Shared definitions of culturally specific and culturally responsive and expectations for culturally responsive
Community Action Agencies	Anti-poverty network of historically funded (OHCS) providers.	- Local outcomes by best practices. - Systems gaps analysis as part of user journey exercise. - Core policy and program standards development. - Service user access.

		- Shared definitions of culturally specific and culturally responsive and expectations for culturally responsive

Core Infrastructure Work Group Constraints

- Many of the identified strategies will require more stakeholder engagement to fully scope and implement. The group has identified which areas will likely need more front-end engagement to develop within the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) table and anticipate that through engagement, additional priorities may be identified. The mapping and developing equity outcomes rely heavily on data analysis and more work is needed to identify potential overlap and division of responsibilities with Outcomes-Oriented Program Development Work Group and the Data Management and Governance Work Group. For example, cross-agency mapping efforts will likely require data sharing agreements and that work will be led by the Data Management and Governance Work Group with the Data Trust Planning Committee as primary agency.
- While developing outcomes and standards for our grantees and funding partners is included in the proposed scope, it is also important to develop standards for state entities to keep us accountable to Oregonians. The internal state standards will largely be developed by the Procurement Process Improvements Work Group and Outcomes-Oriented Program Development Work Group.
- The Stakeholder Engagement Plan identifies key stakeholders, including consumers of behavioral healthcare and people who have experienced institutional systems of care. We anticipate similar engagement recommendations from the Cross System Alignment and Service Coordination Work Groups, which may be carried forward within those work streams rather than Core Infrastructure
- Effective community engagement requires careful time and resource investment. Document translation, providing interpreters (including ASL) and support like childcare, food, transportation, and stipends, are important to ensure effective and inclusive participation. This will likely require resources beyond agency current service level capacity. It is also possible that authentic state engagement with people with lived experience of homelessness may be limited by the experience of past harms at the hands of government.
- Much of the proposed scope of work aims to increase our comprehensive knowledge of the landscape of homelessness and housing instability within Oregon. However, the funding and data controlled by the state is only a portion of that landscape. Our goal is to include relevant local and federal funding, guidelines, coordination, and other conditions within the proposed analysis but there may be circumstances when we are unable to access that information, or it may be determined that is a secondary priority to a full exploration of state resources.
- An additional constraint is the lack of data sharing agreements and a homelessness data system that is not fully integrated.

Work Group: Administrative Improvements

Work Group Lead: Department of Administrative Services (DAS)

1.1 Purpose and Scoping Requirements

The Administrative Improvements Work Group created a scope of work to implement the following ICH objectives, through three distinct sub-work groups organized as the Procurements Process Improvements sub-work group, the Data Management and Governance sub-work group, and the Outcomes-Oriented Program Development sub-work group:

Define statewide outcomes and goals that drive program implementation.
- Establish statewide equitable outcomes and goals to reduce homelessness and drive decision-making on program development and prioritization of funding across the state enterprise.

Advance racial equity and share progress towards equitable goals.
- Improve transparency about what the homelessness system looks like statewide and inform any future efforts to expand the system in a way that increases geographic equity in service availability, reduces racial disparities, and advances more equitable outcomes for Black, Indigenous, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander persons, and people of color, people with disabilities, youth, LGBTQIA+ people, older adults, and historically and currently underserved people.

Evaluate programs and improve transparency.
- Improve data systems to allow the state to understand and transparently communicate the impact of state investments on individual housing outcomes and support continuing program improvement to address a changing at-risk or unhoused population.

Reduce barriers for service providers.
- Improve the administration of homeless service programs to reduce unnecessary barriers for service providers, increase the efficiency of state program administrators, and improve the experience of people experiencing homelessness who are accessing resources.
- Focus on building the capacity of and addressing challenges for culturally specific service providers to create a more inclusive process for accessing state resources.

Work Group Requirements and Outcomes: Implement the Executive Order 23-03 Objectives to increase accountability, improve transparency on program effectiveness, use data for decision-making, and create an inclusive and navigable procurements process by developing scopes for the following work group projects in the table below. DAS will lead scoping for each work group project except for the outcomes-driven projects, which will be led by OHCS. Scoping done for each project by relevant state agencies will inform which project(s) will be prioritized for implementation.

Included in scope	Required or optional	Source
Build capacity for culturally specific providers	Required	Procurement Process Improvements Work Group
Align recommendations for reducing contracting and procurement barriers	Required	Task Force on Modernizing Grant Funding & Contracting, Non-profit Association of Oregon, DAS Disparity Study recommendations
Align recommendations for unified grant application process	Required	Task Force on Modernizing Grant Funding & Contracting, Non-profit Association of Oregon

Develop a comprehensive data dictionary, standards, and practices (enterprise wide) to align language and approaches used across the state	Required	Data Management and Governance Work Group
Develop a coordinated data management system to help inform decision making: Work with multiple agencies to develop an approach to integrate disparate data systems that once aligned will help inform decision making for policies, funding, and program administration, and provide a comprehensive overview of people served through state systems of care	Required	Data Trust Planning Committee and Data Management and Governance Work Group
Create governance and data sharing agreements to develop a data trust, an approach to data sharing and integration that will improve decision support for the Interagency Council on Homelessness and enable data-informed decision making	Required	Data Trust Planning Committee
Outcomes driven program administration: Using outcomes and equity indicators created by the Core Infrastructure work group, identify methods of driving program administration and development that support the advancement of these outcomes and indicators	Required	Outcomes-Oriented Program Development Work Group
Outcomes driven funding strategies (enterprise wide): Using outcomes and equity indicators created by the Core Infrastructure work group, identify funding strategies that support and advance these outcomes and indicators	Required	Outcomes-Oriented Program Development Work Group

The Data Management Work Group will convene agency data stewards as defined and identified in Oregon's Data Governance Policy under the leadership of the Chief Data Officer and Enterprise Data Governance Program Manager, along with data subject matter experts and data partners, such as Continuum of Care organizations or others who steward housing policy data, to develop core standards and a stewardship plan for governing housing related data assets.

While the overall timeline for data standards development and building of enterprise data governance structures is relatively long, data standards and documentation can continue as independent efforts separate of short-term data integration experimentation and use cases identified by the ICH Outcomes Work Group. The Data Management and Standards Working Group proposes that data and research use cases identified by the ICH and associated work groups be routed to the Oregon Data Trust Planning Committee (see separate SOW) for inclusion in the Committee's Use Case Library and for potential scoping as short-term use cases to test data integration and sharing structures being proposed by the Planning Committee.

1.2 Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)

Procurements Process Improvements Sub-Work Group

	Methodology	Agency Lead	Agencies Involved	Timeline & Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Develop proposal for unified grant application process and other methods of reducing barriers for service providers based on recommendations from the Task Force on Modernizing Grant, Funding, and Contracting.				
1	Gather recommendations from the Task Force on Modernizing Grant, Funding, and Contracting and develop strategies to implement recommendations. Include a strategy for developing a unified grant application process for the state.	DAS	ODHS, OHA, OHCS	6 months No Fiscal Impact

	Deliverable: Using the findings from Steps 2-5 develop a series of recommendations for building capacity for culturally specific providers so that vulnerable populations are able to receive needed services in a timely manner.			
2	Develop statewide definitions and terminology for "culturally specific" and "culturally responsive." Make sure to consult with the Core Infrastructure Work group's development of definitions for all project types.	DAS	ODHS, OHA, OHCS	3 months No Fiscal Impact
3	Analyze current landscape of "culturally specific" providers that includes reviewing agreements in place as well as agreements where agencies failed to contract with culturally specific service providers. Conduct research on available current service provider demographic data, other jurisdictions, and current laws, rules and policies that impact this landscape.	DAS	ODHS, OHA, OHCS	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
4	Gather feedback from agency staff on programs such as the Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program on capacity challenges and barriers for state agencies to contract with culturally specific service providers.	DAS	ODHS, OHA, OHCS	3 months No Fiscal Impact
5	Aggregate feedback from the Task Force on Modernizing Grant, Funding, and Contracting, the Nonprofit Association of Oregon's various research and learnings, and gather additional feedback as needed from service providers, tribes, counties, and communities for capacity challenges, gaps, and lack of services.	DAS	ODHS, OHA, OHCS	Initial Feedback Gathering: 2 months Round 2 of Outreach with Draft Recommendations: 3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
6	Create a recommendations report that includes what can be done within existing service levels and what can be done with additional resources to increase availability of culturally specific services for vulnerable populations. Include rule/policy/process recommendations as well as recommendations for technical assistance and capital support.	DAS	ODHS, OHA, OHCS	2 months No Fiscal Impact

Procurements Process Improvements Sub-Work Group Budget

Expense category	Amount	Funding source
Vendor provided meeting facilitation services	Minimal fiscal impact	TBD
Vendor provided surveys and interview services during outreach efforts (includes compensating individuals with lived experience who participate in outreach efforts)	Minimal fiscal impact	TBD
Total	**Minimal fiscal impact**	**TBD**

Procurements Process Improvements Sub-Work Group Engagement Plan

The Task Force on Grant, Funding, and Contracting is providing a level of outreach to inform the recommendations to reduce barriers for service providers. The Work Group has also provided an initial list of stakeholders for outreach as needed when the annual plan has been completed.

Procurements Process Improvements Sub-Work Group Constraints

The scope is dependent on recommendations from the Task Force on Grant, Funding, and Contracting, which won't be ready until September 2024. The current service level staffing resources may constrain what tasks can be completed.

Data Management and Governance Sub-Work Group

1.1 Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)

	Methodology	Agency Lead	Agencies Involved	Timeline & Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Establish a coordinated approach to data management and standards that is built in collaboration with service providers and partners to improve standardized reporting, service delivery, and provide greater opportunities for data interoperability and data sharing. Enterprise data standards and governance processes make providing services easier, enables greater coordination between service providers, and makes services provided through the state of Oregon more accessible and transparent.				
1	Identify Agency Data Stewards from each program area within scope and convene as a subset of the Oregon Data Stewards Council to evaluate current state of housing and houselessness data collection for programs serving youth, older adults, and/or people with SMI. Work with Service Mapping group and county partners to identify lessons learned from data evaluations currently underway.	DAS	OHCS, ODHS, OHA, OYA, YDD, ODE, ODVA	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
2	Evaluate the Oregon Framework Program and other extant enterprise data governance resources and standards already within use in Oregon. Include review of the Core Infrastructure Work group's list of initial definitions for all project types.	DAS	OHCS, ODHS, OHA, OYA, YDD, ODE, ODVA	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
3	Identify relevant subject matter experts (SMEs) for internal and external outreach on the list of "simple" definitions and the following steps in drafting standards and data sharing agreements.	DAS	OHCS, ODHS, OHA, OYA, YDD, ODE, ODVA	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
4	Draft standards development process for data collected by programs serving youth, older adults, and people with SMI.	DAS	OHCS, ODHS, OHA, OYA, YDD, ODE, ODVA, DOC	3-6 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
5	Vet the standards development process with SMEs identified in Step 3.	DAS	OHCS, ODHS, OHA, OYA, YDD, ODE, ODVA	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
6	Finalize the deliverable, which will include the process and criteria for determining if a dataset requires enterprise standard, and gap analysis of current data and recommendations to address gaps.	DAS	OHCS, ODHS, OHA, OYA, YDD, ODE, ODVA	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Improve transparency of services and increase the state's commitment to incorporating data justice into our practices by building supports and structures for community informed data governance. Sharing draft report				

	with established statewide data standard for programs serving youth, older adults, and/or people with SMI, summary of outreach, and Data Standard Work Plan, Data Standard Draft for public comment, and finalization advances the state's culture of participatory governance to ensure that community's needs are addressed in statewide standards development.			
7	Expand the Agency Data Stewards work group to include additional data parties, such as data providers, collectors, creators, community organizations	DAS	OHCS, ODHS, OHA, OYA, YDD, ODE, ODVA	1 month Minimal Fiscal Impact
8	Utilizing deliverables from Step 14, establish a statewide data standard for programs serving youth, older adults, and/or people with SMI. Include reviewing data assets requiring standards and stewardship plans that are good pilot candidates.	DAS	OHCS, ODHS, OHA, OYA, YDD, ODE, ODVA	4-6 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
9	Conduct external outreach on these data standards with CoCs, partners, and other individuals with experience utilizing Oregon's data systems for data entry or input, retrieval, and storage.	DAS	OHCS, ODHS, OHA, OYA, YDD, ODE, ODVA	Initial Outreach: 4 months Outreach Post-Draft Deliverables: 3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
10	Finalize deliverables for the identified pilot (youth, older adults, and/or people with SMI), including the Data Standard Work Plan, Data Standard Draft for public comment, and the Final enterprise data standard release.	DAS	OHCS, ODHS, OHA, OYA, YDD, ODE, ODVA	7-8 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
	Deliverable: Ensure the sustainability of future data governance and coordination efforts by developing a report with community-informed data governance, and legislative or budgetary requests for sustainable funding for data development and recommendations for advancing the State's goals of participatory governance.			
11	Explore a contract or procurement vehicle with partner institutions and community-based organizations to establish a road map for Community Informed Data Governance, Community Centered Data Governance, and where possible, Community-Led Data Governance as identified in the Homeless Research Action Collaborative's recommendations for HMIS Data Governance and in the Homeless Research Action Collaborative's Equitable Evaluation and Governance Report.	DAS	OHCS, ODHS, OHA, OYA, YDD, ODE, ODVA	1-2 years Fiscal Impact
12	Ensure data management and governance efforts are sustainable for agencies and partners by examining opportunities to create sustainable funding and legislative structures to codify enterprise data governance.	DAS	OHCS, ODHS, OHA, OYA, YDD, ODE, ODVA	Ongoing Fiscal Impact
	Deliverable: Improve internal coordination, collaboration, and decision-making across agencies and the state enterprise, and improve inter-agency data sharing and access by creating an enterprise agency governance model and data sharing agreements to develop a data trust. Data trusts allow for creation of sustainable, replicable processes whereby agencies share and integrate data to address shared policy challenges.			

13	Under the leadership of the Oregon Data Trust Planning Committee, create an enterprise agency governance model for data integration and research initiatives, a draft legal framework for data integration and sharing, requirements for ensure sustainable funding for data integration, staffing and management needs for shared research and analysis, identification of priorities and actions to ensure alignment and prioritize community involvement, and make pathways available to adopt new technology and negotiate agreements in a timely fashion.	DAS	Data Trust Planning Committee	1-2 years Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Coordinated Data Management System Business Case, Data Management System technical architecture and capability architecture, Preliminary functional requirements and resourcing needs, and lessons learned from use case sprints.				
14	Convene under the leadership of the Oregon Data Trust Planning Committee a series of short sprint use cases focused on developing a business and enterprise architecture and requirements for a coordinated data management system, including all associated components such as: data integration tools, data lake, data warehouse, data catalog, data transformation, data visualization, security, access control, and monitoring, and advanced analytic tools.	DAS	Data Trust Planning Committee	8-10 months Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Implementation of an enterprise data management system will require time and staff resources for implementation according to Oregon's IT Investment Oversight Policy. As a result, the deliverables and timelines provided in this phase of implementation are high-level and will require further scoping and analysis before project initiation.				
15	If resources are secured, the Coordinated Data Management System will move into advanced planning activities to finalize technical and functional requirements, utilize data architecture to map out appropriate data flows, and fund technical infrastructure to pilot initial use cases as prioritized by the Interagency Council on Homelessness.	DAS	Data Trust Planning Committee	2+ years Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Implementation of a statewide data trust and integrated data system that will require time and staff resources. Details and timeline of deliverable will require further scoping and analysis.				
16	Launching of a statewide data trust and integrated data system.	DAS	Data Trust Planning Committee	2+ years Fiscal Impact

Data Management and Governance Sub-Work Group Budget

Expense category	Amount	Funding source
Personnel – One OPA-4 Enterprise Data Governance Program Manager	Minimal Fiscal Impact	Position was submitted in short session, but at the time of writing has not gone through full audit. If position was not funded in short session, will need OPA-4 FTE added in 2025-2027 Legislative Session.
Establish Oregon Data Development Fund	Fiscal Impact	Would require investment in future Legislative Session through

		Legislatively Adopted Budget or similar, with continuous appropriation factored into ongoing agency current service level
IT Infrastructure for pilot use cases	Minimal Fiscal Impact	TBD
IT Professional Services for System Development	Minimal Fiscal Impact	TBD
Implementation Staffing Resources	Minimal Fiscal Impact	TBD
Total	**Fiscal Impact**	

Short Term (possible investments)
- Contracting with community-based organizations and data equity partners to develop a road map towards community-informed, and eventually community-centered, data governance approaches. Rough cost: $2million

Future State Vision (possible investments)
- Consider statutory changes to ORS 376A.350-364 to align with the enterprise data governance structures and responsibilities of enterprise geospatial data in ORS 376a.500-515. These legislative changes would codify an authority structure for enterprise data governance, establish a statewide executive data governance body with representation from public bodies, and establish a statewide fund for agency data development and capacity building.
- Establishing and creating a continuous appropriation for an enterprise data governance fund, where agencies and partners can receive funding for resourcing and capacity building associated with data governance, especially focused on maturing agencies towards Community Informed or Community Centered approaches to data governance. Rough cost: Continuous appropriation into a legislatively designated fund ($3-$5million)

Data Management and Governance Sub-Work Group Constraints
Data Management and Governance Project Assumptions:
- Workgroup Participants will prioritize participation and contribution to the project
- State agency subject matter experts as identified will contribute and participate in the project and prioritize work group efforts
- Changes in funding, priorities, or legislative mandates do not impact agency capacity to participate in work group activities and standards development
- Identified partners within public bodies, CoCs, and other supporting organizations have capacity, resourcing, and interest in participating in work groups
- Resourcing and capacity recommendations made by the Planning Committee will be piloted willingly by state agencies who will bring staff resources to the table if needed

Data Management and Governance Constraints
- Data governance and management activities are frequently considered "other duties as assigned" by agencies due to limited staff resources. This may impact availability of state agency staff participants if sufficient executive support and prioritization is not given to this effort.
- Data sharing and integration are reliant on trust to be built amongst all parties. Depending on the current level of trust and relationship building state agencies have with external data partners and providers, standards and governance negotiation may be delayed if there is insufficient support from the data provider community or if further time is needed to develop trust and buy-in from additional community partners.

- Time spent negotiating logistics for use case sprints (data sharing agreements, technical challenges, procurement delays) could impact potential delivery timeframes
- Inconsistent data governance practices across agencies may cause delays in use case sprints depending on challenges associated with data documentation, accessibility, and portability.
- Federal and state regulatory statutes may impact feasibility of data sharing for use case sprints/pilots

Outcomes-Oriented Development Sub-Work Group

1.1 Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)

	Methodology	Agency Lead	Agencies Involved	Timeline & Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Identify best and aligned metrics to measure outcomes across all state programs resulting from system-wide investments in the homelessness to housing continuum—Navigation and Street Outreach, Shelter, Re-housing, Supportive Housing, and Prevention—to be reported annually, for the purpose of tracking progress toward the overarching goal identified in Executive Order 24-03 of preventing and reducing homelessness statewide, and reducing identified disparities resulting from inequities in public systems and historic investments.				
1	Develop statewide glossary of shared definitions for key terms including "outcomes," "key performance indicators," "needs," "goals," and other related terms to ensure alignment toward and clear communication on results.	OHCS	ODHS, OHA, DAS	1 month Minimal Fiscal Impact
2	Identify or develop a tool/process for identifying meaningful and effective outcomes and KPIs (example: OHCS Racial Equity and Analysis Tool). The tool should consider the following: - Best practices - Available data - What would be measurable and meaningful - How measurement and tracking can be used to identify and address racial disparities - How outcomes/KPIS can drive progress to vision	OHCS	ODHS, OHA, DAS	4-6 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Report with findings and recommendations from Steps 3-6, vetted through stakeholder outreach, on KPIs and outcomes, identified barriers toward tracking and reporting, and equity implications.				
3	Develop a communications and engagement plan that includes stakeholders, reporting, and integration as part of planning and development - Identify engagement (consultation) points, ensuring access for populations who have been historically underserved - Identify stakeholders - Identify communication points for accountability and information sharing	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA, ODVA, ODE, ODEM	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
4	Work across agencies to: - Identify existing universe of strong, practice informed homeless system needs, KPIs, and outcomes - Determine what we can report with current data and at what level of confidence	DAS, OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA, ODVA, ODE, ODEM	4-6 months Minimal Fiscal Impact

	- Assess access to and reliability of demographic data (race/ethnicity) and other priority population data - Understand cadence of data updates - Determine availability of historical data - Determine, where data is unavailable, low quality, or incomplete, whether the outcome reporting goal is important enough to prioritize developing solution			
5	Engage internal and external stakeholders in prioritizing, identifying equity impacts, barriers - Collect qualitative data (lived experience, etc.) to supplement quantitative data	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA, ODVA, ODE, ODEM	Initial Feedback Gathering: 4 months Round 2 of Outreach with Draft Recommendations from Step 6: 3 months Fiscal Impact
6	Based on state vision/goal, Core Infrastructure system work on system elements, data review, and stakeholder feedback, identify highest priority 1-2 outcomes to track at state and regional levels - Identify priority need metrics/KPIs for Core Infrastructure system identified service areas: Navigation Services and Street Outreach, Shelter and Transitional Housing, Re-Housing, Supportive Housing, and Prevention. - Identify priority outcomes for Core Infrastructure system identified service areas. - Determine optimal number of priority measures/outcomes for clear and impactful reporting and accountability toward goals - Identify the resource needs for maintenance, data infrastructure, and a platform for public use.	OHCS	ODHS, DAS, OHA, DOC, OYA, ODVA, ODE, ODEM	8-12 months Minimal Fiscal Impact

Outcomes-Oriented Development Sub-Work Group Budget

Final scope approval and clarity on roles and responsibilities will be necessary to determine specific needs related to human resources and budget. However, the following aspects of the work would likely require additional staffing and/or financial investment:

1) **Facilitation/coordination:** Coordinating the implementation process across ICH work groups will be a significant undertaking, given the breadth of work included in each scope. Dedicated staff beyond current service level capacity will be needed to accomplish this. It may be beneficial to consider outside facilitation support from a contracted entity, similar to OHA's contract with Manatt for 1115 Waiver implementation.

2) **Community engagement:** Most, if not all, ICH scopes include some level of community engagement. Authentic community engagement requires significant time and resources, including dedicated, culturally competent staff with strong facilitation, communication, and relationship-building skills. In addition to adequate staffing, it is vitally important that those who participate in community engagement efforts are

appropriately compensated for contributing their time, energy, and valuable expertise. Barriers to engagement can also be significant – particularly for people with lived experiences of homelessness – and addressing those barriers requires funding for things like interpreters, transportation, food, and childcare. Thus, an effective community engagement strategy will likely require resources beyond current agency budgets and service level capacity. It is also important to consider that some populations – including Black, Indigenous, and other communities of color who have experienced harm at the hands of the government due to racist policies and practices – may be less willing to participate in state-led engagement efforts. For this reason, the state should consider contracting for community engagement support with culturally competent organizations that have trusted and established community relationships.

Outcomes-Oriented Development Sub-Work Group Constraints

- The key identified constraint is human resources: agency staff have low available bandwidth to contribute significant time and focus to scope implementation given the breadth of the work and current workloads. Execution of this scope will require either a lengthy timeline, additional staff, or de-prioritization of staff's existing work in a meaningful and identified manner.
- Deliverables are highly dependent on partner providers for data collection, a high priority need that has been identified across the enterprise as fundamental to assessing and improving outcomes and funding impacts. Partners have provided feedback that lack of funding specific to this element of program administration and for staffing generally impacts collection, completeness, and quality of data.
- To accomplish this work group's high-level deliverable of external and internal accountability on progress toward equitably preventing and eliminating homelessness statewide, coordination and collaboration across agencies must be active and ongoing. Creating and maintaining a public facing dashboard, and mechanisms to regularly update, publicize, and integrate into accountability and improvement practices is a "joined" deliverable across workgroups and levels of government. While the outcomes workgroup cannot alone hold responsibility for this charge, we identify the challenge as a critical opportunity and risk in implementation of the work of the ICH.

Work Group: Service Coordination

Work Group Leads: Governor's Office and Oregon Parks and Recreation Department

1.1 Purpose and Scoping Requirements

The Service Coordination Work Group created a scope of work to implement the following ICH objectives:

Improve how people exiting state institutional settings and systems of care access the housing continuum.
- Expand housing choices and strengthen the effectiveness of navigation services for people transitioning out of state institutional settings and systems of care.

Coordinate across agencies.
- Improve alignment of programs and policies across all state agencies, especially between the homelessness system and the human services, health care and behavioral health systems to ensure people experiencing homelessness are more effectively connected to services for which they are eligible.

The Work Group is tasked with scoping for these outcomes:

1. Research best practices for and conduct cross-agency comparison of current rules, regulations, and policies determining inconsistencies and alignment of how people engaging in survival activities state-owned or managed property are connected to services
2. Develop a clear understanding of existing practices for release, discharge, or ineligibility, and how to improve tracking and coordination across agencies and programs including learnings and best practices
3. Develop and implement strategies to improve housing outcomes for people transitioning out of state institutions and/or systems of care

Included in scope	Required or optional	Source
Research best practices for both work group projects, including examples and case studies implemented in local jurisdictions, other states or countries.	Required	ICH Work Group Scopes of Work Document
Develop a clear understanding of existing practices for release, discharge, or ineligibility, and how to improve tracking and coordination across agencies and programs including learnings and best practices. Use data to understand the rate of exits to homelessness out of different state systems.	Required	In this scope of work document
Develop and implement strategies to improve housing outcomes and reduce exits to homelessness for people transitioning out of state institutions/systems of care	Required	ICH Work Group Scopes of Work Document
Identify additional opportunities of alignment between disparate systems and how this scope of work may relate to the Core Infrastructure work group scope of work for system alignment and navigation services (i.e., identifying if there is overlap in this work group's scope of work and the Core Infrastructure work group's outcome of aligning and integrating the homelessness to housing continuum)	Required	ICH Work Group Scopes of Work Document

1.2 Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)

	Methodology	Agency Lead	Agencies Involved	Timeline & Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Framework including policy changes, best practices, expanded cross-agency supports, and consistent staff training that lead to improved connections between people engaging in survival activities on state-owned or managed property to services such as housing, navigation, or street outreach.				
1	Review and conduct cross-agency comparison of current rules, statutes, and policies to: 1) Determine inconsistencies in policies involving people engaging in survival activities on state-owned or managed land across State agencies (assuming no policy changes) 2) How current practices align or differ from best practices analysis in Step 2 3) Assessment and matrix of current enforcement practices across state and local jurisdictions. 4) 4) Use this information to create a framework for proposed changes.	OPRD	ODFW, DSL, State Library, ODF, CRGC, TIC, ODOT	3 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
2	Research and develop a framework for best practices including examples and case studies implemented in local jurisdictions, other states or countries. To include: • How best to connect people to services • Outreach and Engagement – best practices for safe and meaningful engagement and needed training • Best way to deliver (formatting - print, web, etc.) resources. • Format of each state agency's roles/rules, etc. • State and local training needs: examples - Verbal Judo, Canopy, etc. • Approach – are there good examples that show how we might shift the approach from purely enforcement to connecting people with services – without jeopardizing staff safety. • Review ODOT Threat Assistance Program. • Explore OSP officers assigned to agencies like ODFW to help staff with managing safety threats and include identifying other existing cross-agency supports in place for outreach to people engaging in survival activities on state-owned or managed property. • Identify how this work will align with best practices of other State and local jurisdictions. • What to do when providing a resource(s) is not enough or unwanted – what are the next steps.	OPRD	ODFW, DSL, State Library, ODF, CRGC, TIC, ODOT	6 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
3	An outreach plan including communications with key partners, including local groups and Tribes, to provide an understanding on feasibility of the implementation,	OPRD	ODFW, DSL, State Library, ODF, CRGC, TIC, ODOT	2 months Fiscal Impact

	addressing unintended consequences, and determining ongoing engagement to ensure a collaborative implementation process. To create the strongest and most-human centered policies possible, the development process must include a community engagement component to solicit feedback from providers and other people with lived experience.			
4	Collect information from each step above and create a draft framework for trainings, referral processes, best practices, resource and equipment needs, and potential changes in rules or statute, including enforcement, for connecting people to housing and services.	OPRD	ODFW, DSL, State Library, ODF, CRGC, TIC, ODOT	2 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Findings from analysis of current release, aging out, or discharge practices, including mapping the user journey across multiple programs or populations served, a synthesis of what is currently being tracked by each agency, and proposed methods and analysis for tracking rates of exits from state systems into homelessness.				
5	Research LA County's Just in Reach Program and other examples or case studies from jurisdictions to consider local implementation in Oregon.	ODHS	OHCS, OHA, DOC, DOJ, CJC, ODVA	3 months Fiscal Impact
6	Understand current release or discharge practices, or when someone is no longer eligible for a specific system of care, and how state agencies track exits to homelessness or into temporary or stable housing. Map the pipeline or member journey of release, discharge, and ineligibility for program participation for each of the following agency processes: OYA, YDD, DOC, CJC, ODVA, OHA, ODHS. Work in coordination with the Core Infrastructure Work Group's tasks to map the user journey.	ODHS	OYA, YDD, DOC, CJC, ODVA, OHA, OHCS	3 months Fiscal Impact
7	In addition to each existing process, provide an understanding of which agencies are tracking housing outcomes during transitions, what needs to be put in place to require tracking at exit, and align tracking and analysis to provide information on the rate of exits to different housing types (i.e., homelessness, shelter, transitional housing licensed care facility). Do this work in coordination with the Data Management and Governance Work Group's tasks for existing data collection with a focus on programs serving youth.	ODHS	OYA, YDD, DOC, CJC, ODVA, OHA, OHCS, DAS	3 months Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Create a framework and agreement for creating and sharing a list of recently or to be discharged individuals to connect with service providers, case managers, or other organizations or programs to ensure that people do not immediately exit into homelessness.				
8	Consider how all agencies could utilize a list of recently or to be discharged individuals from state institutions or systems of care to share across programs that individuals may be eligible for and to share with local jurisdictions to notify for needed provider services.	ODHS, OYA, YDD, DOC, CJC, ODVA, OHA	None	6 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Report with the proposed procedure for creating coordination between CoCs and DOC and OHA for placing people into PSH, and steps needing to be taken to proactively arrange for housing in release plans from prison or jail.				

9	Require behavioral health and criminal justice systems to interact with Coordinated Entry and CoCs to provide better access to supportive housing opportunities. Identify what procedures and processes need to be established to create coordination between CoCs and DOC, including access points such as the Medicaid 1115 waiver and proactively arranging for housing in an existing practice such as release plans.	OHCS	DOC, OHA	6-12 months Minimal Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Report with findings from current reservation practices in place, recommendations for changing contracts of braiding funding streams to reserve spaces in state-funded shelters and/or housing for people exiting state institutional settings or systems of care. Explore how to incorporate Step 9 to develop a list for proactively placing eligible individuals into reserved spaces and/or units.				
10	Reserve spaces in state-funded shelter or housing for people exiting state systems of care or institutional settings. OHCS to collect data on whether shelters applying for state funds currently reserve spaces and how this works. Understand how changes to existing contracts for shelter or housing may impact people experiencing homelessness, and for people being released to specific geographies. Based on what is learned in researching contract structures and funding streams, explore opportunities to change existing contracts and braid funding as appropriate to expand housing opportunities for people exiting state systems of care and/or institutional settings.	OHCS	DOC, OHA, ODHS, ODVA, OYA, YDD	1-2 years Minimal Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Specific statute or rule changes to expand the "Valid with Previous Photo" DMV program to people exiting state institutional settings or systems of care.				
11	Expand the "Valid with Previous Photo" program to allow for DMV to issue IDs with current photo to people exiting state institutional settings and become eligible for services and housing. Explore changes in statute and rule to make changes to the process of issuing an ID and requiring a photo on file within the last 9 years.	ODOT/DMV	DOC, OHCS, OYA, YDD	1 year Minimal Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Report with recommendations for implementing a new services and rental assistance program to focus on people exiting state institutional settings or systems of care.				
12	Create a services and rental assistance program (like OHCS' PSH program but with different eligibility) to focus on populations exiting state systems to pair with OHCS development capital. Research programs such as the current partnership between ODHS and OHCS on HUD Section 811 to serve as a model for a potential new program for affordable units available to specific populations such as youth. Assess a funding structure that involves cross-agency collaboration and administration.	OHCS	ODHS	1-2 years Fiscal Impact
Deliverable: Pilot for an outreach and education program to break down barriers for youth applying for housing opportunities and landlords/housing providers offering housing opportunities.				
13	Provide outreach and education to landlords/housing providers and renters to expand housing opportunities for youth. - Agencies involved: OHCS, ODHS, OYA, YDD	OHCS, ODHS	OYA, YDD	1-2 years Fiscal Impact

- Explore how to develop trust and relationship building between housing providers, landlords, and renters to reduce the potential discrimination against youth due to lack of rental history, age, or other factors. - Explore how much of this potential program would involve service providers engaged in outreach vs. state outreach and engagement programs. - Provide education to youth and adults to help navigate requirements on the application side, including how people navigate sharing criminal history with potential landlords. Conduct outreach with YEHP providers, College Housing NW, DevNW, Homes for Humanity, current housing providers renting to youth (including those contracted with CW to provide housing to young adults).			

Service Coordination Work Group Budget

Expense category	Amount	Funding source
Staff time and resources	Fiscal impact	TBD
Resources for outreach and engagement	Fiscal impact	TBD
Funding for additional staff trainings, staff resources for implementation of safety supports when conducting outreach, increased outreach for connecting people to services, etc.	Fiscal Impact	TBD
Reserve spaces in state funded shelter and/or housing	Minimal fiscal impact	TBD
Expanding the DMV Valid with Previous Photo program	Minimal fiscal impact	TBD
New rental assistance program for people exiting state institutional settings or systems of care	Fiscal Impact	TBD
Total	**Fiscal impact**	**TBD**

Service Coordination Work Group Engagement Plan

The stakeholder engagement plan will need to follow the annual work plan. Some strategies listed above will need engagement and outreach before program evaluation or new program implementation to understand need and if the strategy is appropriate to addressing current challenges experienced by people exiting state institutions or systems of care. As a result, our work group has provided a list of initial stakeholders but have not included a timeline for engagement.

Service Coordination Work Group Constraints

Constraints are listed in the WBS table above. Most constraints discuss the need to understand the existing landscape, the overall need for specific services for a specific population, and the added resources necessary to expand existing or implement new programs.

Some strategies listed above will need engagement and outreach before program evaluation or new program implementation to understand need and if the strategy is appropriate to addressing current challenges experienced by people exiting state institutions or systems of care. As a result, our work group has listed stakeholders but have not included a timeline for engagement.

Work Group: Cross System Alignment

Work Group Leads: Governor's Office

1.1 Purpose and Scoping Requirements

The Cross System Alignment Work Group create a scope of work to implement the following ICH objectives:

Coordinate across agencies.
- Improve alignment of programs and policies across all state agencies, especially between the homelessness system and the human services, health care and behavioral health systems to ensure people experiencing homelessness are more effectively connected to services for which they are eligible.
- Improve alignment between the homelessness system and the human services, health care and behavioral health systems
- Conduct a best practices analysis for behavioral health services

1.2 Work Breakdown Schedule (WBS)

	Methodology	Agency Lead	Agencies Involved	Timeline
Deliverable: Status quo analysis of state contract requirements to provide services to people experiencing homelessness where they are for the purpose of identifying opportunities to improve expectations in contract to meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness.				
1	State contract requirements (CCOs): Analysis of the OHA's current contractual requirements of Medicaid providers or other contracts specific to enrollment, outreach, and navigation (I.e., CPOP), to understand whether the state has place-based requirements to serve people experiencing homelessness within the homeless to housing continuum: camping, shelter, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing. If we do have requirements, what are they, and what data or outcomes do we track to evaluate whether we are meeting those requirements?	OHA	None	June-December 2024
2	State contract requirements (CMHPs): Analysis of the OHA's current contractual requirements of behavioral providers to understand whether the state has place-based requirements to serve people experiencing homelessness within the homeless to housing continuum: camping, shelter, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing. If we do have requirements, what are they, and what data or outcomes do we track to evaluate whether we ae meeting those requirements?	OHA	None	June-December 2024
Deliverable: Status quo analysis of CCO, CMHP, and FQHC practices to provide health and behavioral health services to people experiencing homelessness where they are for the purpose of identifying promising practices to support expansion of.				
3	CCO Practice: Evaluate CCO practices related to enrollment, navigation and providing mobile health and behavioral health services to people experiencing homelessness. Review CCO practices for coordination of services that fall outside of the capitation rates related to housing.	OHA	ODHS, OHCS	June-December 2024

	If the CCO does coordination services outside of the capitation rate, what data outcomes do CCOs evaluate?			
4	CMHP/County Practice: Evaluate County/CMHP practices related to enrollment, navigation and providing mobile health and behavioral health services to people experiencing homelessness .	OHA	ODHS, OHCS	June-September 2024
5	FQHC practice: Evaluate FQHC practice to provide behavioral health and health services to people experiencing homelessness where there are.	OHA	ODHS, OHCS	June – December 2024
Deliverable: Report with best practices analysis and recommendations for implementation.				
6	Best practices analysis to provide health and behavioral health services to people experiencing homelessness where they are in the homelessness system. This analysis should include local strategies and strategies in other states that maximize billable services. Review will include interviews and data requests from key innovative providers in both urban and rural settings doing mobile health and or other mobile BH services that intersect with people experiencing homelessness. Example interviews include organizations and entities such as: Cascadia Behavioral Health, Portland Street Medicine, CAHOOTS, Central City Concern, CMHPs. Review will also include an examination of the role that Medicaid-eligible supportive housing services play within the homeless services system, especially for interventions such as Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). OHCS proposes a collaboration with Portland State University, or another similar institution, for the report and analysis work with input from state staff for this work. Likely cost for the analysis will be no more than $100,000 depending on the number of data sources that require interviews and local data analysis.	OHCS	ODHS, OHA	June-December 2024
Deliverable: Develop a pilot to provide behavioral health and health services on site, and a report summarizing the impacts and recommendations for future work to improve service provision.				
7	As part of the homelessness state of emergency (EO 24-02), work with MACs to identify high priority shelters or transitional housing to pilot enhanced coordination with CCOs for the purpose of providing health and behavioral health services on site (e.g., medical respite model). - Identify what support and services can be provided in a shelter, transitional housing. - Explore modeling out enrollment and navigation services, out-patient treatment-based options in shelter and transitional housing - Identify who can provide those services	OHCS	ODHS, OHA	1 year Minimal Fiscal Impact

	- Seek alignment with the Medicaid 1115 Waiver Identify how those supports and services can be paid for (maximizing Medicaid reimbursement, e.g., leveraging THWs and cross training housing/CCO staff)			
Deliverable: Draft POP				
8	Developing a policy option package to expand mobile health and behavioral health services in a way that maximizes billable services to people experiencing homelessness where they are.	OHA	ODHS, OHCS	TBD

Cross System Alignment Work Group Budget

Expense category	Amount	Funding source
Staff time and resources	Minimal fiscal impact	TBD
Resources for outreach and engagement	Minimal fiscal impact	TBD
New POP to expand mobile health and behavioral health services	Fiscal Impact	TBD
Total	**Fiscal impact**	**TBD**

Appendix A: Additional Work Group Tasks

Identifying the System Gaps: Using mapping step as foundation, identify where existing populations served does not match the overall need, or need of specific population. Agencies involved: ODHS, OHCS, OHA with additional input from OYA, YDD, ODVA, DOC, DOJ, ODE		
Task	**Timeline**	**Notes**
- Duplicate and iterate on user journey exercise for additional populations identified as priorities through need analysis mapping in 1.1. - Methodologies, interview templates and processes, and sampling procedures to be documented and improved through iterations. - Within user journey exercises, identify mismatch of available supports with population need, e.g. acuity of unhoused population with available supportive housing, and experience prior to episode of houselessness to better inform prevention strategy development (CSAG). - Will require skilled front-end engagement with service users and direct service staff and support with visualization/reporting of results that may not currently exist in all agencies that will lead population-specific user journey discovery processes.	1 year +	Additional user journey visualizations
Improving Housing Outcomes for People Exiting State Institutional Settings and Systems of Care		
Task	**Timeline**	**Notes**
Review existing national standards for case management and housing navigation and compare to case load, case manager, and housing navigator roles across state agencies.	3 months	
Research best practices in Eugene's street response program (Cahoots) connecting people experiencing homelessness to outreach workers via 311 and align with the Cross System Alignment work group's analysis of best practices for street outreach programs.	3 months	

Reduce barriers to gaining stable housing opportunities, such as removing criminal or rental history requirements from state funded affordable housing.
    Agencies involved: OHCS (lead for state funded developments)
2 Explore potential changes necessary in rule to make changes to rental or criminal history requirements for housing opportunities.
3 Coordinate with public housing authorities to reduce barriers in eligibility criteria for housing choice vouchers.
4 Understand feasibility of these changes when considering affordable housing using federal resources, which may have separate requirements for rental or criminal history.
    Reduce barriers to state-funded housing that may include language access, cultural responsiveness, disability accommodations, previous rental history debt, and others that may also impact an individual's ability to gain stable housing.
	1-2 Years	

Expand case management to all agencies finding housing placement for people exiting state systems of care or institutional settings. Agencies involved: DOC, CJC, DOJ, ODHS, OHA, OYA, YDD, ODVA, DAS	1-2 years	
5 Understand the existing need for additional case management, whether it is by program, specific population, or a state system (i.e., State Hospital, child welfare programs, youth experiencing homelessness, veterans)		
6 Identify strategies for recruiting and retaining provider staff to avoid negative impacts of an increased caseload and high staff turnover.		
7 Explore fair compensation and long-term funding commitment needs for this particular strategy.		
8 Identify strategies for seamless transition of case management services for youth transitioning out of systems to maintain service and support providers.		
9 Investigate what housing navigation services are provided by current case managers and whether it is feasible to incorporate more navigation responsibilities into current roles or if housing navigation services require unique expertise and additional staff.		
10 Identify whether existing statute or rule for case management exists, and whether that should be changed to require housing navigation services, or if new legislation is needed to hire case managers and navigators for a statewide application.		
11 Understand the challenges of needing to address that housing navigators will need to also be able to rely on housing availability to be able to successfully place individuals in need of housing and explore how this strategy can be coupled with the strategy for reserving spaces in shelter and housing for people exiting state institutional settings or systems of care to create sustainable positive outcomes.		
12 Research how an existing Washington DCYF program that contracts with CBOs for housing supportive services could potentially be a model for approaching navigation and rental supports while also giving service providers access to flexible state funding for families and youth receiving housing vouchers and for youth exiting state juvenile rehabilitation.		
13 Monitor and review Child Welfare's collaboration with Multnomah County to fund additional case management and housing navigation supports for FUP and FYI voucher programs.		
14 Research Washington's Office of Homeless Youth (OHY) Independent Youth Housing Program as a potential model for supporting youth exiting foster care with rent assistance and case management services. Conduct outreach with YEHP grantees, philanthropic groups and other funders, Oregon Alliance, Child Welfare case managers, and youth and families with lived experience in the foster care, behavioral health, adult		

and youth justice systems, and other systems relevant to this strategy.		

Expand the Direct Cash Transfer program and explore replicating the program for other populations.
    Agencies involved: ODHS
15 Analyze existing need for increased cash support for youth populations, and for other especially vulnerable populations exiting state systems of care (i.e., people with SMI or behavioral health needs) or institutional settings (i.e., people with accessibility needs that impact release to state-funded shelter or housing).
16 Research the ODHS YEHP pilot for DCT in three communities and the launching of DCT as a prevention pilot in one community.
17 Analyze using existing need, the total funding for youth payments, case management supports from local entities, technical assistance, evaluation, and staff resources for implementation.
    Conduct outreach with current YEHP DCT grant organizations and youth recipients, youth with lived experience, and Point Source Youth.
	1-2 years	

Establish navigation services across all agencies seeking housing for populations they serve. Agencies involved: DOC, ODHS, OHCS, OHA 18 Using the ODVA Incarcerated Veterans program as a case study, explore the amount of funding and staff time necessary to implement a navigator for people exiting institutional settings and for people no longer eligible for a specific system of care such as foster care or child welfare. 19 ODVA funds two Incarcerated Veterans program coordinators (Approx. $300k per biennium) that manage outreach to and enrollment of veterans in earned state and federal benefits, in state carceral settings in eligible programs 6-9 months ahead of release. ODVA also connects veterans exiting to local county and Tribal Veteran Service Officers. 20 Identify the need for navigation for populations interacting with these state settings (i.e., how many people enter state correctional facilities and are in need of housing upon release). 21 Explore how expanding navigation services as an overarching statewide service to connect all eligible participants to multiple state programs helps to improve housing outcomes for people exiting state institutional settings and/or systems of care. 22 Explore how this work overlaps with the OHA and Medicaid waiver implementation, especially the Medicaid 1115 waiver related to navigation services looking to be provided for HRSN by CCOs. 23 Rely on the Core infrastructure work group tasks to identify need and define navigation services and case management.	1-2 years	

Task	Timeline	Notes
Establish a funding proposal based off of the staff position details and funding structure for ODVA navigators.		
Provide trainings to establish or strengthen a peer support network within existing institutional settings or systems of care to improve outreach for eligible programs. Agencies involved: OHCS, ODHS, OYA, YDD, DOC, DOJ, CJC Research ODVA's current program on training incarcerated veterans to help with outreach and relationship building within existing institutional settings, and explore how to expand the program to other state settings. Conduct research with ODVA coordinator staff, current program participants, service providers, and people with lived experience.	6-12 months	

Data Management and Governance

Task	Timeline	Notes
Include an analysis of the feasibility and resources required to align REAL-D and SOGI data gathering standards and processes between the State and county juvenile departments to better understand needs of and inequities for youth involved in multiple systems.	3 months	Will require additional skillsets.

Outcomes-Oriented Program Development

Task	Timeline	Notes
Draft state/ICH vision - Review existing vision statements (state, agency, division level visions -- example: USICH) - Determine how the following considerations impact or should be incorporated into the state's vision statement: o Funding history as indicator of vision o Desire to create a homelessness response system that ensures that instances of homelessness are rare, brief, and non-reoccurring o Desire to create a future where metrics and feedback loops are in place to ensure that everyone can gain access to a safe, stable, accessible, and affordable home when the need arises o Functional Zero		
Engagement on vision with stakeholders Finalize vision after incorporating stakeholder feedback		
Formulate clear statement on the history and role of state in current human and housing crisis of homelessness		
Identify and articulate the "Why?" Examples: - Improved outcomes for Oregonians experiencing homelessness and housing instability, centering equity - Internal assessment, alignment and consolidation, accountability, and informed and equitable funding allocation - Homelessness systems alignment, local collaboration and coordination, effective funding distribution Ongoing system transparency and identification of gaps		

Appendix B: Additional Considerations for the Core Infrastructure Work Group

Design Considerations

The current landscape of homelessness funding, supports, interventions, and approaches is sweeping and often difficult to navigate. The scoping efforts identified conditions and considerations that crossed program types and outcome goals and where possible, the work group made attempts to align efforts. Specific design considerations across projects and outcomes include:

- Mapping the current system is a necessary first step that will set the groundwork for identifying system gaps and aligning duplicative programs. This process should be informed by and inform the development of housing specific equity outcomes.
- Identifying what we want to achieve in any scoping project is important and often there are two separate outcomes to consider: 1) the external facing goal of simplifying processes and improving access for people who are seeking services, and 2) the internal (state) goal of analysis.
- Incorporating input and feedback from people with lived experience and who are providing direct service is critical for successfully meeting outcomes.
- Each project type (Shelter and Transitional Housing, Re-Housing, Navigation Services and Street Outreach, Supportive Housing, and Prevention) has unique considerations, opportunities, and limitations to consider in scoping an approach to achieve the required outcomes. The level of effort and resource to do this work for each project type simultaneously would be significant. The Work Group took the approach of recommending pilot projects within categories that build on existing work already underway or are more developed to test the approach and outcomes with the intention that further iteration would follow with additional project types. Examples in the Work Breakdown structure include the shelter focus in mapping activities and focus on unaccompanied youth in identifying system gaps and aligning duplicative programs.
- It is possible to view the inter-related work of the mapping outcome and systems gaps analysis through structuring the mapping as quantitative data analysis and the qualitative systems gaps work as an opportunity for data analysis. This suggestion led to the proposed strategy of identifying systems gaps through documenting user journeys.
- The state's biennial funding structure and disproportionate use of one-time funding for this critical safety net system reduces effectiveness and continuity of services and is a barrier to intentional system design and alignment.
- Affordable housing availability, especially affordable housing with appropriate levels of services, impacts all project types.
- There is opportunity for the ICH to support provider concerns like staffing shortages, burnout, and capacity building through recommending consistent funding streams and adequate funding levels. Staffing levels also have equity impacts.
- Service providers often braid federal, state, and local funds. While total investment is important to understand, there are limits in what the state can control and has visibility into regarding funding and program compliance. We recommend incorporating data from other sources where possible, but we will need to prioritize how much effort to invest in analysis of non-state resources.

The Core Infrastructure Work Group identified unique considerations according to outcome or project.

- Systems gaps analysis may encompass at least three categories of work: 1) service users (supports for people aging in place, mismatch of acuity of unhoused population with available housing system supports), 2) between or among agencies (some agencies can pay people with lived experience for their expertise, some can't), and 3) between federal and state funding sources.
- DOJ likely has a role in understanding where duplicative programs can be aligned. For example, loan documents and legal language in supportive housing development.
- It is important to recognize the large role of Continuums of Care in the Regional and Local Coordination work stream.
- Housing support services and the systems that support them are typically limited to those individuals/families who are experiencing difficulties in a crisis phase that puts them in contact with

institutional intervention systems. A prevention system that could prevent people from experiencing these negative outcomes could be best achieved by broadly sharing data that is beyond what is typically considered part of the housing system.
- Policy and program group identified the issue of subgrantee relationships as being important and an often low-visibility element in this work.
- Current equity data analysis work tends to be limited to parity analysis. This proves overrepresentation but we need to identify equity data needs beyond parity.

Appendix C: Additional Considerations for the Data Management and Governance Work Group

Building a Data Ecosystem that Delivers on Strategic Priorities

> *"There is no such thing as a single-issue struggle because we do not live single-issue lives."*
>
> Audre Lorde, *"Learning from the 60s"*

State data systems collect a wealth of information that if utilized ethically and effectively, can directly inform policy, and be leveraged as a tool to improve program outcomes. Frequently, these data are collected across disparate, siloed systems, and fragmented throughout different agencies, programs, and service areas. This fragmentation limits the state's capacity to utilize data in a coordinated, enterprise fashion, and limits visibility of each individual agency into the needs of their constituents. As agencies work together to improve the outcomes of Oregonians, data sharing and integration are vital to obtaining a fuller picture of the needs and services provided across the state.

The State Chief Data Officer has worked in partnership with ICH Work Group Members to develop a comprehensive strategy and approach to advance the three data-related outcomes identified by the Interagency Council on Housing. This approach provides a long-term vision and series of short-term plans for building an enterprise data ecosystem. These project plans incorporate both modern technologies and processes to pilot data sharing use cases to address immediate needs, while developing the organizational maturity around data standards and governance that will ensure high-quality, usable, authoritative data resources are available now and into the future.

Enterprise Data Requires Operational Maturity

Delivering on an enterprise vision for data and analytics to ensure the right data gets to the right people at the right time requires investment in the operational elements that support data and analytic maturity. Only by investing in the capabilities, infrastructure, and enablers that undergird our current data ecosystem can Oregon deliver on its long-term vision of a comprehensive data management system that integrates disparate datasets to deliver public sector value.

Capabilities
Research
Analytics
Governance and Management

Infrastructure
Technology
Standards
Templates

Enablers
People
Culture
Partnerships

> *In building a comprehensive data ecosystem that addresses standards, integration, sharing, and analysis, Oregon will be able to address the core objectives prioritized by Governor Kotek and the Interagency Council on Housing, and create sustainable capacity and alignment to address critical public sector challenges that arise in the future.*

Combining Short Term Pilots with Long Term Vision

This ecosystem vision incorporates short-term (12-36 months) pilots to establish enterprise structures and advance best practices in data governance, but implementation will require structured investments in future biennia to sustainably resource these efforts. Data governance and sharing are an ongoing journey, and the state should be prepared to stagger ongoing resourcing and investments over the coming biennia to ensure that the short-term outcomes of the ICH Work Group efforts are sustainable in the long term.

Data Governance, Sharing and Integration Require Long-Term Vision and Investment

Short-Term (2023-2025)
- Advance Data Standards and Governance
- Pilot Use Cases
- Build Data Trust Framework for Oregon

Long-Term (2025-2027)
- Data Equity and Governance Road Map
- Data Trust Advanced Pilot

Future Vision (2027-)
- Sustainable Data Governance Funding Model
- Data Trust Expansion Investment