Performance Measures for Emergency Solutions Grant

Reasons for Performance Measures

- Track success of project
- Facilitate data-driven decisions
- Identify areas for improvement
- Used by DCA in application ranking process
The Big Three

- Income increase
  - Total income
  - Earned income
- Increased access to mainstream benefits
- Housing stability
  - Exit to permanent housing destination

Street Outreach

- Outreach clients placed in shelters
- Outreach clients placed in permanent destinations
- Projected served vs. actual served
Supportive Services

- Income increase
- Increased access to mainstream benefits
- Projected served vs. actual served

Emergency Shelter

- Clients with special needs
- Recidivism within 90 days of exit
- Income increase
- Increased access to mainstream benefits
- Housing stability at exit
- Projected served vs. actual served
Transitional Housing

- Clients with special needs
- Recidivism within 90 days of exit
- Income increase
- Increased access to mainstream benefits
- Housing stability at exit
- Projected served vs. actual served

Hotel/Motel Vouchers

- Clients with special needs
- Recidivism within 90 days of exit
- Income increase
- Increased access to mainstream benefits
- Housing stability at exit
- Projected served vs. actual served
Prevention

- Clients with special needs
- Recidivism within 90 days of exit
- Income increase
- Increased access to mainstream benefits
- Housing stability at exit
- Projected served vs. actual served

Rapid Re-Housing

- Clients with special needs
- Recidivism within 90 days of exit
- Income increase
- Increased access to mainstream benefits
- Housing stability at exit
- Projected served vs. actual served
Client Income Increase 2015-2016

Percent of Clients who Increased Income from Entry to Exit for SFY2015 vs SFY2016

Average Income Change 2015-2016

Average Income Change in Dollars for SFY2015 vs SFY2016
Client Benefits Increase 2015-2016

Percent of Clients who Increased Noncash Benefits from Entry to Exit for SFY2015 vs SFY2016

Housing Stability 2015-2016

Permanent Destination Rates for SFY2015 vs SFY2016 ESG Projects
Appropriate Length of Stay

- Emergency Shelter – Up to 30 days
- Rapid Re-Housing/Prevention – 30 days to 1 year
- Transitional Housing – 30 days to 2 years
- Hotel/Motel Voucher – less than 30 days

Average Length of Stay 2015-2016
HEARTH emphasizes coordinated system for homeless response within each CoC

In addition to performance measures for individual programs, communities must measure performance as a coordinated system

Performance measurement should include CoC, ESG recipients, and other homeless assistance stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Length of time persons remain homeless</td>
<td>Reduction in the average and median lengths of time persons remain homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The extent to which persons who exit homelessness to permanent housing destinations</td>
<td>Reduction in the percent of persons who return to homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of homeless persons</td>
<td>Reduction in the number of persons who are homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Employment growth for homeless persons in CoC program-funded projects</td>
<td>Increase in the percentage of adults who gain or increase income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of persons who become homeless for the first time</td>
<td>Reduction in the number of persons who become homeless for the first time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
System Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Homelessness prevention and housing placement of persons defined by Category 3 of HUD's Homeless Definition in CoC program-funded projects</td>
<td>Reduction in the percentage of Category 3 people who return to homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. Successful placement from Street Outreach</td>
<td>Increase in percentage of people who exit SO to permanent housing, temporary destinations (except street), and some institutional destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. Successful placement in or retention of permanent housing</td>
<td>Increase in percentage of people who exit to or retain permanent housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Accuracy

- ALL appropriate data should be entered into HMIS
- Data accuracy should be checked regularly
- Inaccurate outliers in the data set can have a drastic impact on HUD reporting
- Poor data quality affects the entire CoC
Goals

- Broad statement of intended outcomes
- Does not necessarily need to be quantifiable
- Guides the formulation of more specific objectives

Example

“Increase permanent housing placement for the homeless in the Balance of State Continuum of Care.”

Objectives

- More specific statement of intended outcomes
- Must be focused
- Must be time-specific
- Must be measurable

Example

“Exit 80% of Rapid Re-Housing participants to permanent housing between July 1 and June 30.”
Logic Model

Inputs
• Necessary resources to achieve outcome

Activities
• Necessary actions to achieve outcome

Outputs
• Quantifiable description of what has been done
• Measurable description of impact aligned with objective
  • Often a percentage of outputs

Logic Model Example

Inputs
• Staff
• Financial resources
• Housing providers

Activities
• Secure funding
• Hire and train case manager
• Identify eligible clients for RRH program

Outputs
• 100 homeless clients will be identified for RRH

Outcomes
• 80% of RRH clients will be exited to permanent housing
Questions?