

Chittenden County Homeless Alliance Coordinated Entry Committee Meeting

Wednesday, February 11th, 2026
8:30AM – 10:00AM

Link: [Join Meeting](#)

Coordinated Entry Committee

This committee is charged with identifying systemic approaches for the CCHA to meet HUD's requirements related to Coordinated Entry (CE). The committee will make recommendations to the Steering Committee on improvements to coordinated entry through changes to the CE Policies and Procedures and other governing documents. It will offer the Steering Committee recommendations for the implementation of these changes.

The committee will also monitor coordinated entry and assist with the yearly CE evaluation, incorporating feedback from frontline staff and supervisors to better improve the CE process. The committee will review data on a yearly basis to ensure equity and fairness in the CE process, with an emphasis on examining racial inequities.

MINUTES

1. Announcements & Introductions **5 Minutes**

Ari Kisler and Bryce informed the group about a new legislative bill introduced by House Human Services, which includes significant references to coordinated entry and encourages the merging of the two Continuums of Care (CoCs), prompting the group to monitor developments.

The newest housing bill proposed by the legislature mentions the merging of CoCs and Coordinated Entry.

The PIT data entry should be completed today.

a. Partnership Agreement Update

Bryce will survey partners for availability and schedule the annual partnership agreement review meeting, ensuring sufficient notice and emphasizing that each agency must send a voting representative.

2. January Meeting Minutes Review **5 Minutes**

3. Annual Committee Workplan

40 Minutes

Annual Committee Work Plan Review and Strategic Priorities: Bryce led the committee through a detailed review of the annual work plan, focusing on refining strategic priorities, aligning evaluation and partnership agreement timelines, and addressing accessibility and collaboration challenges.

Strategic Priorities and Implementation Focus: The committee discussed the need to move beyond data collection toward actionable recommendations and system improvements. Stephanie referenced past technical assistance reviews and the importance of using evaluation findings to drive implementation. Crystal suggested leveraging system evaluations to inform recommendations, and Bryce emphasized the foundational role of regular data presentations to the steering committee.

Accessibility of Work Plan Documents: Bryce, Kerri, Ari Kisler, and Meghan discussed ongoing challenges with sharing work plan documents across organizations due to IT restrictions on Google and Microsoft platforms. The group considered adjusting sharing settings and explored alternative strategies for cross-organization collaboration, acknowledging that some entities, such as the VA, cannot access Google resources at all.

Annual Partnership Agreement Review Scheduling: The group debated the optimal timing for the annual partnership agreement review, considering alignment with other evaluation activities and organizational calendars. Stephanie and Travis Poulin suggested end-of-year timing for ease of implementation, while Sophia Senning and Crystal advocated for linking the review to the completion of the annual evaluation to ensure feedback informs planning. The group agreed to assign co-chairs as leads for this process and to remain flexible based on workload and partner availability.

Recruitment and Definition of Partners: The committee discussed the process for recruiting new partners, noting that most additions have been natural extensions of existing collaborations. The group considered broadening the definition of partners to include entities that serve as exit points or resource connections, not just entry points, and explored the potential for formalizing different categories of partnership. They also identified the Membership and Outreach Committee as a resource for targeted recruitment.

Coordination with Housing Retention and Resource Committees: The committee discussed the integration of housing retention resources with the coordinated entry system, identifying gaps in support for individuals transitioning from hotels or unsheltered situations and considering strategies to strengthen connections and outcomes.

Current Retention Support Practices: Stephanie detailed which programs provide ongoing support to clients after housing placement, noting that while some programs follow clients into permanent housing, many do not, especially when case management is tied to shelter-based services. Will added that SSVF and HUD VASH also provide post-housing support.

Identified Gaps and Outcome Differences: Kerri relayed findings from a recent breakout group, highlighting that connections to retention services are more reliable for clients transitioning from shelters than for those coming from hotels or unsheltered situations, resulting in different outcomes. The group discussed the need to strengthen these connections, particularly for non-shelter populations.

Consideration of At-Risk Populations and Assessment Tools: Stephanie and Sophia discussed the potential benefits and challenges of including at-risk populations in coordinated entry, noting capacity and funding limitations. They also raised the question of whether the current assessment tool remains appropriate and suggested a long-term review of eligibility and matching processes.

Policies and Procedures Update Process: Stephanie explained that while appendices to the policies and procedures are updated as needed, the main document is reviewed less frequently. She recommended forming a work group for comprehensive review and emphasized the importance of updating policies and procedures in tandem with system changes to ensure alignment.

Timing of Reviews Relative to Other Activities: The group discussed whether the annual review of policies and procedures should be synchronized with the completion of the annual evaluation or the partnership agreement review. Stephanie suggested that while these documents are related, their review cycles do not need to be strictly aligned, but cross-checking for contradictions is important.

4. Assessment – Adding Pregnancy Questions 20 Minutes

Should we be adding all the CE Assessment questions into the HMIS? Perhaps the addition of the pregnancy question can be done in the short-term, while the CE Committee considers adding the totality of the CE Assessment questions to the HMIS.

Sophia and Meghan raised the proposal to add a pregnancy question to HMIS to improve data collection, noting that while the question exists on the paper form, it is not in the electronic system. Meghan suggested considering a broader update to include all assessment questions in HMIS for improved accuracy and reporting, while Stephanie and Meghan highlighted privacy and legal considerations, referencing past requests for sensitive data by authorities.

Sophia and Meghan will work to bring the topic of adding a pregnancy question (and potentially other assessment elements) to HMIS to the partners who conduct assessments, and evaluate the feasibility and implications of entering assessment data directly into HMIS.

5. 2024 CE Evaluation - VOTE 15 Minutes

How can we connect to the court systems to understand the causes of eviction?

Annual Coordinated Entry (CE) Evaluation Review and Approval: Stephanie presented highlights from the finalized 2024 CE evaluation, and the committee voted to recommend the evaluation for approval by the steering committee.

Evaluation Highlights and Data Trends: Stephanie noted an increase in households previously exited to permanent destinations and discussed the implications of tracking at-risk populations for a more comprehensive understanding of homelessness causes.

Discussion of Data Use for Advocacy: The committee discussed how certain data points, such as the duration of program use by individuals with significant barriers, could be used to advocate for more realistic timelines and increased supportive housing resources. The group considered how to use evaluation findings to inform legislative and policy discussions.

Approval Process and Next Steps: After addressing questions and clarifying the evaluation's content, Sophia Senning and Will Vilardo made and seconded a motion to recommend approval of the evaluation to the Steering Committee. The committee voted, with seven in favor, two against, and one abstention, to recommend the evaluation for steering committee approval at the March meeting.

Will motioned to recommend approval of the 2024 CE Evaluation to the CCHA Steering Committee. Sophia Seconded. The motion carried by a measure of 7 votes for, 2 votes nay, 1 abstention.

6. Other Business

5 Minutes

Coordinated Entry Assessment Hubs & Partners

Hubs:

1. Champlain Valley Office of Economic Opportunity (CVOEO)
2. Committee on Temporary Shelter (COTS)
3. Spectrum Youth & Family Services
4. Steps to End Domestic Violence

Partners:

1. ANEW Place
2. Community Health Centers/Safe Harbor
3. Howard Center
4. Pathways Vermont

5. Supportive Services for Veteran Families at UVM (SSVF at UVM)
6. Veterans Inc.
7. US Department of Veteran Affairs White River Junction Medical Center
8. Champlain Housing Trust
9. City of Burlington Police
10. City of Burlington Community & Economic Development Office (CEDO)
11. Champlain Valley School District (CVSD)