

Performance Management Work Group

February 23, 2016

Minutes

Attendees: Leila Qureishi (Office of Supportive Housing), Jenn Ong (Bitfocus), Justin Damrel (Downtown Streets Team), Eli Hamilton (HomeBase), Catherine Farry (Sunnyvale Community Services), Michael Mouton (Bill Wilson Center), Vanessa Beretta (City of San José Housing), Madelyn Crawford (Work2future), James Henderson (YWCA – Silicon Valley), Sandra Murillo (Housing Trust Silicon Valley), Jason Satterfield (Bitfocus), Erin Stanton (Office of Supportive Housing), Hilary Barroga (Office of Supportive Housing)

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. CoC Updates

a. HMIS Updates:

- i. Bitfocus is currently updating inventory in HMIS.
- ii. UPLIFT training is coming up for new users and refresher training.

b. **Coordinated Assessment:** To date over 6,000 unduplicated households have completed the VI-SPDAT and approximately 750 households have received referrals to permanent housing programs through the system. Planning continues for incorporating emergency shelter and transitional housing programs and we are getting to ready to start a pilot coordinated assessment process for homelessness prevention programs.

c. **Point-in-Time Count:** Thank you to everyone who participated in the 2017 street count on January 24th-25th. Over the next couple months Applied Survey Research (ASR) will work on combining and validating data from the street and shelter count. They will also analyze data from the survey. Results will be released in June.

d. Upcoming CoC Meetings:

- i. **Coordinated Assessment Work Group:** Next meeting is Thursday, March 9th from 1-3pm at The Health Trust.
- ii. **NOFA Committee:** Next meeting is Monday, February 27th from 12-2pm at Charcot Training Center.
- iii. **CoC Membership Meeting:** Next meeting is Monday, March 20th from 2-4pm.

3. CoC System Performance Measures – Calendar Year 2016 Review

Eli Hamilton from HomeBase reviewed Santa Clara County's HUD CoC application score from 2016. The largest number of points in the NOFA is for CoC performance and strategic planning. Increasingly, HUD is scoring based on actual performance rather than narrative about performance. Points are allocated for actual data, including reduction in PIT counts – sheltered/unsheltered populations, families, veterans, chronically homeless. HUD will also be looking for improvements in our system performance measures year over year.

The group reviewed the system performance measures for calendar year 2016 and assessed progress compared to local benchmarks.

Measure 1: Length of Time Persons Remain Homeless

The first HUD system performance measure is the length of time that people remain homeless. The goal is to reduce the average and median length of time people remain homeless in Santa Clara County. HUD expects that as we prioritize housing people who have been homeless for a long time through coordinated assessment, this average will fall.

Average Length of Time Homeless	2014	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
ES & SH	52 Days	70 Days	73 Days	--
ES, SH, & TH	168 Days	264 Days	307 Days	--

Median Length of Time Homeless	2014	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
ES & SH	16 Days	17 Days	26 Days	--
ES, SH, & TH	63 Days	112 Days	122 Days	--

Both the average and median length of time homeless have gone up over the past three years. However, since the data comes from program enrollments in HMIS it is strongly influenced by length of program stay and does not show a true picture of the length of time homeless.

Measure 2: Reduction in Returns to Homelessness within 2 Years of Exiting to Housing

This measure looks at people who exited street outreach, emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent housing programs to permanent housing and then returned to homelessness within two years after exiting – programs that have an entry criterion of homelessness are used as a proxy for returning to homelessness. Our goal is to see the percentage returning to homelessness go down. Note that this measure looks back two years – the 2016 reporting period covers people who exited to permanent housing in 2014 and tracks what happened to them in the two years since.

Returns to Homelessness within 2 Years of Exiting to Housing	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
Exit from Street Outreach	21.43%	0.00%	27%
Exit from Emergency Shelter	21.02%	16.62%	21%
Exit from Transitional Housing	8.31%	7.75%	6%
Exit from Permanent Housing	2.01%	6.07%	2%
Systemwide	14.78%	11.65%	14%

Overall, we are seeing a reduction in the percentage of people returning to homelessness and we met our benchmark in 2016. The change in returns from street outreach programs looks particularly large because of the small number of people exiting from street outreach to permanent housing. In 2013 (2015 reporting period), 14 individuals exited directly to permanent housing and 3 of them of them returned to homelessness within two years. In 2014 (2016 reporting period), 13 individuals exited directly to permanent housing and zero returned to homelessness within two years.

Returns to homelessness for people who exited from permanent housing programs increased from the 2015 reporting period to the 2016 reporting period. This increase coincides with increases in rapid rehousing capacity. In prior years permanent housing was almost entirely permanent supportive housing. Rapid rehousing programs may see different results from permanent supportive housing due to the differences in program type.

Measure 3: Overall Reduction in Homelessness

The goal for this measure is to see the total number of people experiencing homelessness in our community go down. This measure looks at the total number of people experiencing homelessness in two ways:

- **PIT Count** – looks at one date in time (late January, every other year) and includes both sheltered and unsheltered people. We will learn the results of the 2017 PIT count in June.
- **HMIS Annual Sheltered Count** – looks at all the people who spent at least one night in emergency shelter or transitional housing during the year. So, excludes those who never used a shelter/transitional housing program, but looks at the entire year not just one day.

HMIS Annual Sheltered Count	2014	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
ES Total	4,992	4,937	4,510	5,139
TH Total	1,876	2,054	1,956	2,399
Unduplicated Total	6,468	6,472	6,090	6,893

The total sheltered count appears to have gone down from 2014 to 2016, however we believe this is due to issues with late data entry and in reality the numbers are likely similar. Also, because we have far more unsheltered individuals in our community, there is a limit to how much this data tells us about the overall homeless population. The sheltered count is strongly impacted by program capacity and turnover.

Measure 4: Employment and Income Growth

This measure looks at growth in cash income – whether from employment or non-employment sources. HUD’s primary focus is housing, but helping people maximize their income helps them stay in housing. This measure compares the income of adults at program entry to their income at status updates and exit. Different from the other measures, this income focuses specifically on CoC funded projects, not the whole system. This measure looks at a small subset of clients: clients in CoC funded projects who either left during the reporting period or are still in the program AND stayed for at least one year. Also, it only tracks increases in income. Households that maintain income are not counted. We had some challenges

with the data quality for this measure and as a result we postponed setting benchmarks until next year. Bitfocus worked with COC programs on data cleanup in preparation to submit the SPM data to HUD this summer.

Change in Employment Income for Adult Stayers	2014	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
# of Adult Stayers	274	341	374	--
% Increased Employment Income	0.73%	1.17%	1.07%	--

Change in Non-Employment Income for Adult Stayers	2014	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
# of Adult Stayers	274	341	374	--
% Increased Non-Employment Income	3.28%	3.81%	6.68%	--

Change in Total Cash Income for Adult Stayers	2014	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
# of Adult Stayers	274	341	374	--
% Increased Total Cash Income	4.01%	4.69%	6.95%	--

Change in Employment Income for Adult Leavers	2014	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
# of Adult Leavers	124	329	286	--
% Increased Employment Income	16.13%	25.23%	30.77%	--

Change in Non-Employment Income for Adult Leavers	2014	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
# of Adult Leavers	124	329	286	--
% Increased Non-Employment Income	20.16%	11.55%	15.03%	--

Change in Total Cash Income for Adult Leavers	2014	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
# of Adult Leavers	124	329	286	--
% Increased Total Cash Income	29.84%	32.22%	36.01%	--

Measure 5: Reduction in First Time Homelessness

This measure looks at the number of people who become homeless for the first time. However, the report only looks back two years. If someone was previously homeless three years ago, they are counted as first time homeless. The 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.

With Permanent Housing	2014	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
Unduplicated Total	6,007	6,381	6,175	
Returning Homeless	1,709	1,831	1,518	
First Time Homeless	4,298	4,550	4,657	4,506

The trend over the last two years is an increase in people experiencing homelessness for the first time in the last two years. What we don't know yet is the reason why. Also, because this count only includes people participating in HMIS programs, the increase could be driven by changes in program capacity and composition, not just changes in the total number of people who are homeless.

Measure 7: Successful Housing Placement

The first successful housing placement measure looks at positive outcomes from street outreach, including exiting to both temporary and permanent destinations.

Street Outreach	2014	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
Temporary Destinations	3.73%	0.77%	7.69%	--
Permanent Destinations	8.70%	4.25%	26.92%	--
Total Successful Exits	12.42%	5.02%	34.62%	10%
Total Number of Exits	161	259	26	

The second measure looks at exits to permanent housing destinations from emergency shelter, transitional housing, and rapid rehousing programs.

Exits to Permanent Housing	2014	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
Emergency Shelter	14.13%	15.10%	30.78%	25%
Transitional Housing	53.04%	50.72%	54.08%	75%
Rapid Rehousing	71.02%	57.80%	72.61%	85%
System	23.64%	27.92%	48.11%	25%

The third measure looks at retention of permanent supportive housing.

Permanent Housing Retention	2014	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
Exit to or Retain Permanent Housing	92.42%	96.02%	97.26%	90%

Local Measure A: Clients are enrolled in health insurance

This measure looks at enrollment in health insurance. It was originally written as a goal to achieve within a certain time limit. However, it worked better to structure the report to look at all current program enrollees and assess whether or not they have health insurance. Using this approach allows us to capture the health insurance enrollment at any point that it is entered into HMIS. This measure looks at all household members, including children.

% of Housed Individuals that met Goal	2015	2016	2016-17 Benchmark
Permanent Supportive Housing	66.12%	71.89%	90%
Rapid Rehousing	91.90%	94.50%	90%
Unduplicated Total	69.73%	79.03%	90%

Next Steps

There is a lot more work to be done on data quality and completeness and ensuring reports are telling us what we think they’re telling us. This will be an ongoing challenge, especially with so many partner agencies and limited resources. We will continue to monitor and promote strong data quality. Bitfocus has a continuous data quality improvement plan that they work on with all HMIS partner agencies.

We want to use system performance measure data to help us improve our work, but we need high quality data so that we can have confidence in what the measures are telling us. You can help us by:

- Letting us know when you make changes to programs or data practices.
- Promoting strong data quality at your own agency.
- Making sure your agency is participating in continuous data quality improvement.
- When numbers in a report change, ask why and look into it – make sure it’s not a data issue.
- Make sure your agency is completing annual and status updates. Your successes don’t count if they’re not in HMIS!

4. CoC Performance Measures and Benchmarks for FY2017-18

We will devote our May Work Group meeting to setting measures and benchmarks for FY17-18. There are measures that we identified as things we wanted to measure in the initial planning for systemwide performance measures, but chose not to implement in FY16-17 for various reasons. We will need to decide if we want to add them back next year. These include: 1) Average and median length of time

from coordinated assessment survey to permanent housing; 2) Housed clients have access to sufficient resources to meet their basic needs; 3) Change in the number of homeless persons in all projects with no prior enrollments in HMIS; and 4) Percent of issued housing subsidies that are leased up and number of days from issuing housing subsidy until it is leased up.

There are also some measures that we reported on, but did not set benchmarks for the first year. We will need to develop benchmarks for next year. These include: 1) Change in employment/non-employment/total income during the reporting period for system stayers and leavers; 2) Housed clients monthly income is greater than or equal to \$850 (benchmarks for TH and RRH); and 3) Housed clients are enrolled in health insurance (benchmark for TH).

5. Check-Out

The next Performance Management Work Group meeting will be Thursday, May 25th from 1-3pm at The Health Trust.