

Key Change Factors	Examples of Community Activity	Lessons Learned
Inclusive Governance and Centralized Program Oversight	In Worcester (MA), Montgomery County (OH), and Rhode Island, local leadership councils integrated service delivery systems by strategically allocating resources from HPRP, CoC, City, State, and other funding sources. Most communities established a system-level HPRP coordinator position to provide consistent coverage via newly coordinated service partnerships.	<i>Centralized leadership structures are vital in re-orienting system-level planning, allocation, and monitoring, and blending resources for prevention and re-housing assistance. Establishing a systems level coordinator is critical to help regions bridge traditional organizational barriers and boundaries.</i>
Commitment of Cross-Sector and Governmental Leadership to Systems Transformation	In Yolo County (CA), local leaders had established prevention as the centerpiece of their Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness, and used HPRP resources to create a regional system of Housing Resource Centers in support of that goal. Leaders in Worcester integrated HPRP resources with all other homelessness system funding to advance commitment to transforming the region's systems for prevention and housing stabilization.	<i>Commitment of local leaders to systems transformation (both at the jurisdictional and institutional levels) is critical to coordinating and streamlining service delivery systems – leading to more efficient and cost-effective deployment of resources across geographic and programmatic boundaries.</i>
Alignment of Organizational Philosophies	In Charlotte (NC), local leaders established an innovative program that targets rapid re-housing services to homeless households with multiple housing barriers, based on a prior City-wide commitment to the “Housing First” approach. Training for front-line staff in Housing First methodology, as well as rapid re-housing and prevention strategies, helped align service system models across multiple communities in a unified approach.	<i>Advancing a housing stabilization system requires incorporation of both prevention and Housing First solutions, predicated on shared “buy-in” by all stakeholders and systems-wide efforts to align all practices with this approach and its intended outcomes.</i>
Innovative Use of Local Impact Data	In Santa Clara (CA) and Montgomery County, communities are using both HMIS and other performance outcomes data to inform leadership of needed adaptations in planning systems re-design.	<i>Early evaluation of HPRP, i.e. assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of new assessment and assistance approaches and networks, is critical in planning for and creating a desired post-HPRP system.</i>
Service Coordination and Standardization	Sacramento (CA) established “2-1-1” as the community's centralized intake provider, created a standardized assessment tool, and coordinated legal services providers to pre-screen all eviction cases for HPRP. Yolo County created an integrated system of service and access points by establishing six new Homeless Resource Centers and using common intake tools to standardize service delivery.	<i>The development of standard processes, staffing roles, training, and assessment tools allows all local system providers to adopt consistent practices in the delivery of prevention and housing assistance services.</i>

COMMUNITY COMMITMENTS TO SYSTEM CHANGE

Each region or community profiled in this series was strategic in its use of HPRP funds to create or redesign a community system to achieve sustainable housing assistance practices. Each of these communities relied on leaders who were committed to doing “whatever it takes” to achieve desired results. All operated with openness to new possibilities through a fundamental re-orientation of practice and priorities, and each approached implementation with an investment in ongoing systems improvement and transformation.