AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. Discovery Summary
3. Q&A
4. Next Meetings
Innovations in Services

- A structure (people and policies) to care for the highest risk and highest utilizing clients across the City’s ecosystem of services

Innovations in Technology

- A platform to share comprehensive, integrated data that provides context for all our shared clients
What will be our greatest opportunity for impact?
What will be the most challenging?
DISCOVERY METHODS

- Workshops with providers
- Stakeholder interviews
- Quantitative analysis
Journey Map Workshop
MOMENT OF OPPORTUNITY

Post-it notes on the board:
- Health
- Safety
- Environment
- Skills
- Training
- Equipment
- Technology
- Processes
- Procedures
- Policies
- Procedures
- Communication
- Leadership
- Collaboration
- Innovation
- Efficiency
- Effectiveness
- Sustainability
- Customer
- Product
- Services
- Costs
- Time
- Space
- Resources
- Opportunities
- Challenges
- Risks
- Opportunities
- Challenges
- Risks
- Opportunities
- Challenges
- Risks
- Opportunities
- Challenges
- Risks
SCENARIO

John is a 50-year-old male who lives outdoors and has experienced homelessness in San Francisco for more than 13 years. Providers describe John as easy to anger and difficult to engage. Over time he cycles through services throughout the system of care. He is tenacious and has learned how to survive on the streets but has a hard time following through with a plan or making it to appointments.

Attributes:

- Polysubstance use disorder and substance-induced psychosis
- May have cognitive impairment
- Chronic illness

Service Utilization highlights:

- ED visits: 90
- PES visits: 10
- Sobering nights: 20
WHOLE PERSON CARE
JOURNEY MAP

1. CLIENT visits Emergency Department
2. PROVIDER attends to medical needs and connects to services
3. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
4. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
5. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
6. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
7. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
8. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
9. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
10. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
11. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
12. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
13. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
14. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
15. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
16. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
17. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
18. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
19. SF HOT connects to shelter bed
20. SF HOT connects to shelter bed

- 7-day shelter bed placement
- Starts Benefits applications
- Misses Benefits follow-up appointment
- Fights with shelter staff
- Denies access to shelter for not following rules
- Attempts to link to services while in jail
- Discharges client to the street
- Transports to PES on 5150
- HSOC deploys SF HOT
- Offers placement in residential treatment
- Assesses for housing–Coordinated Entry
- Assigns Intensive Case Manager (ICM)
- Leaves substance use treatment program
- Visits Emergency Department and is admitted for inpatient stay
- Transports to Hummingbird by EMS6 and SF HOT
- Drops-in at Hummingbird occasionally
- Reconnects with friends / community
- Uses meth and becomes violent
- Enrolls in substance use treatment program
- Attends to medical needs and diagnoses chronic illness
- Discharges to street
- Transports to Hummingbird by EMS6 and SF HOT
- Attends to medical needs and diagnoses chronic illness
- Discharges to street

EXPRIENCE
IDENTIFIED BARRIERS

- Services are designed for episodic care
- Medical, mental, and social services operate in silos and lack systems for collaboration
- Clients fall through the cracks in times of transition
- Clients and providers experience difficulties connecting to services
- There is a need for low-barrier options to meet clients where they are
- The system of care can be re-traumatizing for clients
**SERVICE EPISODES**

**130**
Average number of urgent/emergent service visits for the top 100 HUMS during 2017-18.

**99%**
Of the top 100 HUMS in 2017-18 visited the emergency room.
Avg: 89
Max: 341

**51%**
Have been homeless for more than ten years.
99 of the top 100 HUMS have a history of homelessness

**5%**
Receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI).

**40%**
Of the top 100 HUMS had at least one county jail interaction in 2017-18.

**50%**
Had either a 5150 or a 5250 (involuntary psychiatric holds).
16 of the top 100 HUMS meet criteria for SB 1045

**42%**
Went to the Sobering center or Detox.
91% had a history of drug or alcohol abuse

**17%**
Are actively engaged with DPH case management or Intensive Case Management (ICM).

**70%**
Are known to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

**67%**
Of the top 100 HUMS were in the top 1% in the previous year.

**$19,423,438**
Total cost of urgent/emergent services for the top 100 HUMS in 2017-18.
Average cost per person: $194,234
Discovery Interviews
What does Whole Person Care mean to you and your organization?

What’s currently working and not working when supporting the WPC population?

What are the biggest challenges with interagency care coordination and data sharing?

What is success for Whole Person Care?
Discovery Approach / Overview
STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

To understand the perspective of key stakeholders and partners across City departments, agencies and disciplines:

**DPH**
Barbara Garcia
Roland Pickens
Alice Chen
Greg Wagner
Colleen Chawla
Bill Kim
Barry Zevin
Kavoos Ghane Bassiri
Kelly Hiramoto
Anna Robert
Joseph Pace
Janet Moomaw
Pam Swedlow
Kelly Eagen
Hemal Kanzaria

Ben Liu
Margot Kushel
Hali Hammer
Amy Peterson
Aldon Mendez
Craig Murdock
Deborah Borne
Iveht Pineda
Winona Mindolovich
Albert Yu
Rajiv Praminik
Jim Genevro

**HSA**
Jeff Kositsky
Kerry Abbott

Dara Papo
Edmund Poon
Umeke Cannariato
Lisa Rachowicz
Megan Owens
Gigi Whitley

**DAAS**
Cindy Kauffman
Rose Johns
Jill Nielsen
Carrie Wong
Crystal Chang

**Anthem Blue Cross**
Beau Hennemann
Eric Schwimmer

**SF Health Plan**
Courtney Gray
Fiona Donald
Sumi Sousa
Van Wong

**Mayor’s Office**
Aneeka Chaudhry
Joy Bonaguro

**Controller’s Office**
Laura Marshall

**Other Orgs**
Rachel Metz
Tanida Maselli
Josh Bamberger
Vitka Eisen
System of Care
1. Need to **operate in an integrated way**

Different systems are all working for the same patient population, so how do we connect those systems? For example, allowing someone from a non-DPH organization to access CCMS.

2. Need for a more **coordinated delivery system**

How do we get the system so that everyone experiencing homelessness has “no wrong door” and can get matched to appropriate housing and supports, stabilized in housing/right level of care?
3. Need for shared priorities

We need to stop thinking about clients as yours or mine. We need to develop a shared client mentality.

4. Need to realign resources

A success of WPC would be realizing how to better coordinate existing resources rather than adding a bunch of new resources.
5. Need for **more step-down and step-up housing options**

At the end of treatment, all we have to offer is a stabilization room, not conducive to recovery.

6. Need to **improve access to benefits**

We are placing eligibility workers in navigation centers – enrolling individuals in Medi-Cal and other services simultaneously.
Data Considerations
Data Considerations / Insights

1. Data **quality**

*We are missing even basic data from the street medicine team encounters.*

2. Data **governance**

*How data is entered, stored, and used varies greatly, ranging from handwritten sheets to excel spreadsheets to functional databases. There is no standardization in data collection and use.*
Data Considerations / Insights

3. Data accessibility

We need to have knowledge sharing across departments because sometimes clients are lost to follow-up when they transition between services.

4. Data integration

Data integration alone is insufficient. There also needs to be time and personnel allotted to use the data and run reports so that integrated data are useful.
5. Data **use for improvement, evaluation**

*Existing data is not being used for improvement, evaluation, or accountability.*
What we heard We need to have a plan in place in order to “flip the funding switch” when Whole Person Care is over. We need to be ready to make the transition to a different source of funds, potentially by becoming a Targeted Case Management (TCM) city.

Whole Person Care is about creating lasting collaborative relationships and facilitating coordination and knowledge sharing between departments.

Moving forward, it is essential to focus on projects that cross departments, lay the groundwork for collaboration and coordination, and identify an empowered system owner to continue the work.
CONCLUSION

1. Discovery Report includes System of Care, Data and Sustainability recommendations based on the insights gained from stakeholder interviews.

2. Whole Person Care deliverables map onto these recommendations, including the Top 100 HUMS project, Coordinated Entry and Benefits Navigation Pilot.

3. Recommendations will also be used in process evaluation of the SF WPC pilot.
What will be our greatest opportunity for impact?
What will be the most challenging?
Thank you!
The journey map tells the story of a prototypical high utilizer of multiple systems experiencing homelessness in San Francisco. The map depicts client and system “actions”, the involvement of services and departments over time, and client painpoints. Taking a human-centered service design approach highlights how systemic barriers impact our shared clients over time.

**John** is a 50-year-old male who lives outdoors and has experienced homelessness in San Francisco for more than ten years. He has polysubstance use disorder and experiences substance-induced psychosis. John has hepatitis C and may have cognitive impairment but has never been formally evaluated.

He frequently visits the emergency department (30 times this year) and had two medical inpatient stays for serious infections. John visited PES 10 times last year, usually due to his methamphetamine use, and was placed on 5150 involuntarily holds for grand disability several times. He spent 20 nights at the sobering center and tried going to detox once but left after several days.

Producers describe John as easy to anger and difficult to engage. Over time he cycles through services throughout the system of care. He is tenacious and has learned how to survive on the streets but has a hard time following through with a plan or making it to appointments.

**Identified Barriers**

- Services are designed for episodic care
- Medical, mental, and social services operate in silos and lack systems for collaboration
- Clients fall through the cracks in times of transition
- Clients and providers experience difficulties connecting to services
- There is a need for low-barrier options to meet clients where they are
- The system of care can be re-traumatizing for clients

**Average number of urgent/emergency service visits for the top 100 HUMS during 2017-18. By service:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Average visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Department</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent Care</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PES: 7.9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Inpatient: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOP 100 HUMS JOURNEY MAP**

The map depicts client and system “actions”, the involvement of services and departments over time, and client painpoints. Taking a human-centered service design approach highlights how systemic barriers impact our shared clients over time.
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