

Performance Management Work Group

March 24, 2016

Minutes

Attendees: Lynn Morison (Abode Services), Liz Lucas (Abode Services), Jenn Ong (Bitfocus), Jason Satterfield (Bitfocus), Nathaniel Montgomery (IVSN), Allison Ulrich (VA PAHCS) Nikka Rapkin (HomeBase), Sasha Drozdova (HomeBase), Erin Stanton (Office of Supportive Housing)

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. CoC Updates

- *HMIS Update* – UPLIFT launched in Clarity on March 21st. If you have questions about using Clarity for UPLIFT, please contact Jenn Ong at Bitfocus. Bitfocus also continues to work on the Housing Inventory Count (HIC). HUD requested preliminary data by the end of March. Many agencies are still updating data entry – this needs to be done ASAP to meet HUD’s deadline.
- *HUD CoC Program Awards* – HUD Announced Tier 1 Awards in early March. All of Santa Clara County’s Tier 1 prioritized projects, including 6 new projects and a planning grant, were funded. The Tier 2 award announcement is expected later this month or next month.
- *CoC Schedule:*
 - NOFA Committee: The third and final meeting of the NOFA committee will be Monday, April 18th at 1pm.
 - CoC Trainings: There will not be a CoC training in April. The next scheduled training will be in May.
- *Coordinated Assessment:* We have now made over 100 referrals from the community queue and over 1,000 VI-SPDATs have been entered into HMIS. Domestic Violence victim service providers are now completing VI-SPDATs for the confidential queue and referrals are now being made from that queue, as well. We are now starting the planning process to develop coordinated assessment for emergency shelter and transitional housing. We will start focusing on this in April. Please come to the Coordinated Assessment Work Group meeting to participate!
- *Coordinated Assessment Reminders:*
 - A complete and current ROI must be uploaded in HMIS prior to entering the VI-SPDAT. *The matchmakers cannot make housing referrals to clients that do not have a current, complete ROI in HMIS.*
 - Include detailed contact information in the VI-SPDAT and under the Location Tab in HMIS. Contact and location information is used to find clients when a permanent housing program has a referral for them.
 - Refer to the community queue any VI-SPDAT scores of 4+.

3. Communitywide Performance Measures Benchmarking

Today’s meeting focuses on setting local benchmarks for the HUD System Performance Measures. We will look at all of the HUD measures, except for Measure 4 (Income and Employment Growth). Bitfocus is still addressing issues with the report for Measure 4. Today’s goal is to:

- Develop preliminary benchmarks for most HUD system performance measures.
- Identify questions/issues that need to be addressed prior to finalizing benchmarks.

Then, between this meeting and the April meeting:

- Organizations should review the measures that will be measured for individual programs (housing outcome) and bring feedback to the April meeting.
- OSH & Bitfocus will work on answering questions raised today.
- We will continue to work on developing reports for Income and Local Measures.

The goal for the April meeting is to finalize most HUD system performance measure benchmarks and, if possible, work on benchmarks for income and local measures.

Measure 1: Length of Time Homeless

This measure counts the number of days that people are recorded in HMIS as being enrolled in ES/SH/TH programs – that is a proxy for the time they are homeless. HUD recognizes that this doesn’t capture the whole time people are homeless (excludes time on streets). In the future HUD plans to use new data element 3.17 to measure the full length of time homeless, but we don’t have data for that yet.

HUD’s goal is that we will see a reduction in the average and median length of time people are experiencing homelessness from year to year. HUD expects that as we prioritize housing people who have been homeless for a long time through coordinated assessment, this average will fall.

Average and Median Length of Time Homeless Data from 2012-15:

	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	<i>Average</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Median</i>
ES & SH	35 days	13 days	43 days	16 days	46 days	16 days
ES, SH, & TH	77 days	28 days	126 days	42 days	155 days	42 days

Questions for Additional Investigation:

- What is the breakdown in length of stay between emergency shelters and safe haven? Are safe haven stays longer?

Considerations:

- Until we have data from the new data element, this measure only looks at length of stay in programs, not total length of time homeless. We need to be careful about how we talk about this to avoid misunderstandings about what is actually being measured.
- We are wary of setting a goal for this measure, because it incentivizes pushing people out of programs quickly, not reducing the actual time homeless.
- The VA is also tracking length of stay in programs, but recognizes that a shorter length of stay doesn’t necessarily equate to better housing outcomes.

Proposed community benchmark:

- Set a goal for a very conservative reduction, less than 5%.

Measure 2: Returns to Homelessness (Recidivism)

This measure looks at people who exited programs to permanent housing and then returned to homelessness within one or two years after exiting. Entry into programs that have an entry criterion of homelessness is used as a proxy for returning to homelessness. The measure asks, what percentage of people who exited to permanent housing are returning to homelessness?

HUD's goal is to see the percentage returning to homelessness go down. Over time we can look more closely at different program types, populations, and the types of permanent housing that people exit to in order to understand where we need to put more effort and how we can improve our system.

Recidivism Rates from 2012-15 (% of people who exited to permanent housing destinations that returned to homelessness within each time period):

	< 6 mos	6-12 mos	13-24 mos	w/i 2 yrs
Exit from SO	15.63%	6.25%	6.25%	28.13%
Exit from ES	12.45%	4.47%	5.32%	22.24%
Exit from TH	1.74%	1.74%	2.39%	5.87%
Exit from SH	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Exit from PH	0.79%	1.18%	0.00%	1.97%
TOTAL	7.49%	3.17%	3.62%	14.28%

Questions for Additional Investigation:

- Does data entry/data completeness impact the results? Look at data completeness by program type.

Considerations:

- Improvements in data entry could affect outcomes.
- At this point, it is hard to impact this measure for next year because it looks at historical data. We've probably already passed the point where people returned to homelessness (or didn't) within 6-12 months.
- Impacted by changes in the housing market.

Proposed community benchmark:

- Set a goal for a conservative reduction, perhaps 5%.

Measure 3: Number of Homeless People

This measure looks at the total number of people experiencing homelessness in our community in two ways: 1) PIT Count – looks at one date in time (late January, every other year) and includes both

sheltered and unsheltered people; and 2) HMIS Shelter Count – looks at all the people who spent at least one night in a shelter/TH program during the year.

HUD’s goal for this measure is to see the total number of people experiencing homelessness in our community go down.

Total Number of People Homeless (Sheltered and Unsheltered) 2011-15:

Measure 3 - PIT Count

	2011	2013	2015
Sheltered	1898	1957	1929
Unsheltered	5169	5674	4627
Total	7067	7631	6556

Measure 3 - Annual HMIS Sheltered Count

	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
ES	5503	5371	5139
TH	1817	2091	2399
SH	20	24	25
TOTAL	6923	6946	6893

Questions for Additional Investigation:

- Look at utilization rates for shelter/transitional housing. How do utilization rates impact shelter counts?
- Are there any expected changes in capacity for shelter/transitional housing programs? E.g., programs expected to close, new programs expected to open, TH programs planning to convert to PH.

Considerations:

- Concerns about how the housing market might impact this measure.
- An increase in the annual sheltered count is not necessarily a bad thing. It might mean more shelter/TH beds are available in our community. Also, if we are successful in reducing the length of time homeless (Measure 1), turnover will increase and could result in a higher count of unduplicated people accessing shelter.
- We hope to see a decrease in homelessness show up as a decrease in the unsheltered count. With far more people experiencing homelessness than available capacity in ES/TH programs, we hope they will continue to be utilized as the overall population declines.

Proposed community benchmark:

- PIT: Set a goal for a 10% reduction in the unsheltered count.
- Annual sheltered count: Set a goal for sheltered count to remain consistent.

Measure 5: Number of People Homeless for the First Time

This measure looks at the number of people who become homeless for the first time – this is inflow to our system. However, the measure only looks back two years. If someone was homeless 3 years ago, they are still counted as first time homeless.

HUD’s goal is to reduce the number of people becoming homeless for the first time in our community. HUD expects we are doing this through homelessness prevention and diversion work.

Number of First-Time Homeless People Enrolled in Programs 2012-15

	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
ES, TH, SH	5,547	4,347	4,037
ES, TH, SH, PH	5,930	4,660	4,743

Questions for Additional Investigation:

- Are RRH programs reaching a new group of people that we weren’t previously reaching?
- Could we look past the two year history to see if more people were homeless more than two years ago?

Considerations:

- When looking at ES/SH/TH, the number of first time homeless people decreased significantly. This shows a decline in inflow to our system. HOWEVER: when we include PH programs, we actually see a small *increase* in first time homeless people.
- One big change from 2013-14 to 2014-15 was the significant increase in rapid rehousing capacity in the community. Is this why the number increased when including PH programs? Are RRH programs reaching a new set of people that we weren’t previously counting?
- A lot of factors that impact first time homelessness are beyond the CoC’s control. The current inflow of over 4,000 people/year is beyond our capacity to address with the current scale of homelessness prevention programs.
- Concerns about how the housing market will impact this measure.

Proposed community benchmark:

- Set a goal for a very conservative reduction, less than 5%.

Measure 7: Exits to and Retention of Permanent Housing

HUD is looking at improvements in exits to permanent housing from all other program types. In addition, this measure looks at “successful placements” from street outreach, which include not just

permanent housing destinations, but also some temporary and institutional destinations. Finally, the measure looks at retention of permanent housing for permanent housing programs other than rapid rehousing.

Measure 7a: Successful Placements from Street Outreach

Percentage of Exits from Street Outreach programs to Successful Destinations 2012-15:

	Prior Goal	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
% to PH	10%	6.00%	5.21%	2.43%
% ALL Successful	--	6.24%	7.67%	3.40%

Questions for Additional Investigation:

- Does data entry/data completeness impact the results?
- How does the number of exits to unknown destinations affect the results?

Considerations:

- The majority of exits from street outreach programs are to unknown destinations.
- Need to define what it means to exit to a temporary destination – does staying in a shelter for one night mean exiting to a successful destination?

Proposed community benchmark:

- Adopt prior goal of 10% as the goal for all successful exits.

Measure 7b.1: Change in Exits to Permanent Housing

Percentage of Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations 2012-15:

	Prior Goal	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
ES	30%	14.45%	13.21%	12.30%
TH	75%	56.89%	54.09%	48.33%
RRH	90%	83.52%	79.13%	61.47%
ALL (Unduplicated)	--	23.74%	22.82%	24.10%

Questions for Additional Investigation:

- Look at results by subpopulations – e.g. families with children, youth, etc.
- Look at different categories within program types – e.g. nightly shelter vs. 90 day stays.
- Look at data entry levels – does incomplete data entry affect results?
- Look at the range of results for individual programs – are there outliers that are skewing the results? Are there patterns based on different categories of programs within program types?

- For Rapid Rehousing – compare the number of people exiting before finding housing to the number of people exiting after losing housing.
- Is there any correlation between the length of support/length of program stay and outcomes?

Considerations:

- Targeting people with higher needs may lower success rates.
- Make sure all programs are correctly categorized in the appropriate housing type.
- The HUD measure looks at the overall system outcome for all program types combined – this can be skewed based on the number of exits from different program types each year. For example, each individual program type went down from 2013-14 to 2014-15, but the overall system outcome improved because of changes in the number of exits from each program type.

Proposed community benchmark:

- Keep prior goals for each individual program type.
- Set a goal to increase overall system outcome by 5%.

Measure 7b.2: Change in Exit to or Retention of Permanent Housing (All PH except RRH)

Percentage of People Retaining Permanent Housing or Exiting to other Permanent Housing 2012-15:

	Prior Goal	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
PH Exit/Retention	85%	94.59%	92.79%	95.56%

Questions for Additional Investigation:

- None

Considerations:

- The strong results reflect better data entry and a commitment to maintaining housing, including re-housing people who lose their housing.

Proposed community benchmark:

- Increase goal to 90%.

4. Check Out

The next meeting will be April 28th, 2016 from 1:00-3:00pm at The Health Trust.