

Performance Management Work Group Minutes

August 20, 2015

Minutes

Attendees: Kristi Schulenberg (HomeBase), Debbie Pell (Bill Wilson Center), Laura Foster (Bill Wilson Center), Cindy Lui (IVSN), Elisa Espinoza (IVSN), Ana Morales (IVSN), Sandra Murillo (Housing Trust), Stacey Murphy (Abode Services), Consuelo Collard (Catholic Charities), Alejandra Herrera (Destination: Home), Liz Lucas (Abode Services), Michelle Covert (City of San Jose), , Colleen Haley (Destination: Home), Erin Stanton (Office of Supportive Housing)

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. CoC Updates

- **HMIS Transition** – The new Clarity software will launch October 1st. HMIS in ServicePoint will end September 25th at 5pm. HMIS will not be available from 9/25 – 10/1 while data is being migrated. Data will be migrated based on data quality: programs with 95%+ good data will go live in Clarity immediately, programs with 80%-95% data quality will be quarantined in a staging site until data quality is improved to 95%. All programs with data quality below 80% or with other special cases should have a conversation with Bitfocus because they will require special treatment. New user training for Clarity begins September 1.
- **HUD CoC NOFA** – We are expecting the HUD CoC NOFA to come out any day now. Shortly after HUD releases the NOFA we will share more details about the local application process and timeline.
- **Coordinated Assessment** – We are moving rapidly toward implementation of Coordinated Assessment in November/December. The Work Group meets the 2nd Thursday of the month. September's meeting will focus on policies and procedures. Training on the VI-SPDAT and SPDAT will be offered the last week of October.

3. Community Plan to End Homelessness

Kristi Schulenberg from HomeBase provided an update on implementation of the Community Plan to End Homelessness. The main way we are measuring success of the plan is measuring our success in creating 6,000 housing opportunities and in reducing homelessness. We are also measuring progress in implementation of the plan by tracking and analyzing the 27 activities identified in the 2015 Implementation Plan.

The Community Plan's outcomes for reducing homelessness coincide with two of our communitywide performance measures. The first is Measure 3 – Overall reduction in the number of homeless individuals and families, measured by the Point-in-Time Count. The second, is the local goal to build or create 6,000 new housing opportunities. Kristi asked for feedback from the group regarding the methodology for measuring new housing opportunities. Housing opportunities will include new units and new subsidies and the information will be gathered from the CCP, the VA, CDBG Regional Coordinators, and HMIS. There is still some question about

how to count rapid rehousing opportunities. HomeBase is working on determining the methodology for rapid rehousing.

4. Point-in-Time Count

Michelle Covert (City of San Jose) and Erin Stanton (Office of Supportive Housing) shared an overview of the 2015 Santa Clara County Homeless Census and Survey. The Point-in-Time Count provides data for Measure 3 – Overall Reduction in the Number of Homeless Individuals and Families. The total number of people identified in the 2015 Point-in-Time count dropped 14% from 7,631 individuals in 2013 to 6,556 individuals in 2015. This is the lowest number counted in Santa Clara County in over ten years. The count within the City of San Jose dropped 15%. The shelter count stayed fairly consistent with 2013, but the unsheltered count declined by over 1,000 people from 2013 to 2015 representing a huge success for our community. The number of people counted in encampments dropped 37% within the City of San Jose.

The numbers of chronically homeless individuals and families declined in line with the drop in the total homeless population. Transition Age Youth saw a larger decline from 2013, which is attributed to more accurate counting methodology used in 2015. The number of homeless veterans declined by only 2%, but significantly more were in shelters or transitional housing. The unsheltered count of veterans declined by approximately 130 people.

There were also differences in where people were found geographically across the County. While the homeless population declined by 15% in San Jose, the count rose slightly in North County and significantly in South County. Gilroy, Morgan Hill, and San Martin experienced a combined increase from 599 individuals counted in 2013 to 858 individuals counted in 2015. This increase demonstrates the need for further commitment of resources to the southern part of the county.

We believe the decreases in homelessness in Santa Clara County reflect extensive efforts to respond to the needs of unhoused populations in the community. In particular, strategies to move people directly into housing through the provision of rental subsidies and supportive services have been successful. This is positive sign that our strategies are working, but the number of people homeless in our community is still huge. We have a lot of work to do. And we saw increases in some areas, particularly South County, so we need to make sure we target that area. The good news is that we have evidence that our strategies work and that can help us advocate for more resources and more effort to keep going.

Erin and Michelle asked the group for feedback on the methodology used for the count. Suggestions included considering either conducting a night count or starting the count earlier in the morning, before it gets light. Some participants who volunteered for the count in 2013 or 2015 felt that it was already too late in the morning when they went out, thus making it harder to get an accurate count.

5. Family Options Study

In July, HUD released the Short Term Outcomes report for the Family Options Study (http://www.huduser.org/portal/family_options_study.html). The purpose of the study is “to provide the strongest evidence possible” about the effectiveness of different interventions for

homeless families. The study compares outcomes and cost for three types of interventions, compared to “usual care:” permanent housing subsidies, community based rapid rehousing and project based transitional housing. The study followed 2,200 families with 5,000 children in 12 communities across the country. Participating families were randomly assigned to one of the four groups and followed for 36 months. The report released in July covers outcomes from the first 18 months following assignment.

The study found permanent housing subsidies to be a highly effective intervention, significantly reducing the length of time families experienced homelessness and leading to significant positive impacts on adult and child well-being.

Community based rapid rehousing was found to reduce homelessness somewhat and to have positive impacts on family income and work effort, but the study did not find the same strikingly positive results that some other studies and data sources have indicated. The Family Options study found that families assigned to rapid rehousing had equivalent results compared to those in usual care for most indicators. One possible reason for this is that rapid rehousing is a relatively new program model and there are inconsistencies in how it is delivered in different communities.

Project based transitional housing was not found to be an effective intervention. While it did result in some reduction in time spent in emergency shelter, there were no impacts on most other areas of assessment when compared to usual care.

Based on the findings of the study, HUD is pursuing several policies, including funding permanent housing vouchers and investing in rapid rehousing, while continuing to study and pay close attention to how rapid rehousing is implemented and its outcomes. The Work Group supported finding ways to invest locally in evaluating the long term impacts of rapid rehousing in our community. It was also noted that families in the study did very well with permanent housing subsidies even without any services attached to the subsidies and perhaps we should consider assessing the appropriate long term level of services needed with permanent housing subsidies.

6. Local Measures

The Santa Clara County Communitywide Performance Measures include HUD’s required System Performance Measures and locally defined measures. The HUD System Performance Measures will be programmed into the new HMIS software according to HUD’s programming specifications. Local measures are measured based on locally defined methodology and will be measured from HMIS as much as possible. The group reviewed the current methodology for local performance measures and noted some areas for changes and improvement.

Measure 4b – Housed clients will have access to sufficient resources to meet their basic needs:

This measure was originally created for the CCP and was measured using a formula based on scores in certain domains of the Self-Sufficiency Matrix. Going forward, our community is transitioning from using the Self-Sufficiency Matrix to using the SPDAT as a case management tool. The SPDAT domains do not match up precisely with those that were used to measure this outcome. The purpose of this measure was to get a more holistic perspective on client self-

sufficiency (compared to the other, narrower, income measure). The Work Group recommends changing the outcome to measure overall improvement in SPDAT scores, which will demonstrate improvements in stability and well-being.

Non-HUD Measure b – Clients who need behavioral health services are assigned a service provider through a mainstream health system or report regularly accessing community based services within 90 days of being housed. The original language proposed for this measure came from the CCP and was intended to incentivize case managers to strive to connect clients with behavioral health services. A measure related to behavioral health services could potentially also provide information about how easy or difficult it is for clients to access needed services. Work Group members raised several concerns related to this measure, including that it is too vague and will be challenging to measure consistently and that it will be difficult to measure from HMIS due to privacy concerns about including behavioral health related information in HMIS. At this time, the group proposes considering reverting to the original CCP language and measuring the outcome for permanent supportive housing only. An additional outcome could be added at a later date to include other program types.

7. Check Out

The next meeting of the Performance Management Work Group will be Thursday, October 15th from 1-3pm.