

Iowa Balance of State CoC Performance Measures

Quality services are results oriented and person-centered. The Iowa Balance of State Continuum of Care (BoS CoC) has established the following performance measurement process to measure the performance of the BoS CoC projects.

The goal is to create an easily prepared Project Performance Review for mid-year and year-end time points. Report will include selected HUD program performance measures (found in SAGE) and HUD system performance measures (as we can pull the relevant system data for the specific program). These are HUD defined data elements that we should be able

The second report component includes narrative questions that allow the grantee to evaluate to collect easily. The former will be compared against each agency's proposed activities found within their grant proposal; the latter will provide a benchmark to compare the performance of a given project with the CoC's baseline for the comparative housing service type. their performance measures relative to any emergent issues in program delivery or changes within their service population. These qualitative questions complement the quantitative statistics pulled from the HUD reports, allowing each grantee to provide a richer narrative that provides for client successes and a comparison between actual results and proposed results found in the respective grant application.

I. Report Period

Grantees' projects have different start and end dates, but we should be able to set a defined review year (say, calendar or state fiscal year) for all grantees to pull data for the report.

- a. Recommended Reporting Period: July 1 to June 30 to align with funding received from the State
 - o Mid-year report would be for the time period July 1st through December 31 and due January 31st
 - o Year-end report would be due July 31 for the time period July 1st through June 30th

II. Data Quality Standards

Without quality data we cannot accurately measure our success as a continuum in the reduction of harm caused by living homeless in Iowa. Agencies with poor quality data will reduce the competitiveness of the continuum; high quality data across all grantees will maximize the continuum's ability to compete with other CoCs for HUD funding.

Actual data quality metrics will be selected by our HMIS vendor annually. Additions or amendments to the selected criteria may be reviewed, voted on, and implemented annually based on the recommendations of the HMIS vendor (or a coalition of funded housing service providers).

Current data quality metrics will include: (1) Timeliness, (2) overall NULL %, and (3) destination error rate. HUD and ICA recognize these three measures for data quality assessment.

The Research and Analysis Committee recommends that all housing providers within the BoS CoC that utilize HMIS consider running the NULL percent and destination error rate statistics monthly as part of their internal data quality control protocol.

III. Items pulled from Existing Data Systems:

The utilization of existing reports (Sections A, B, C and D discussed in this section)

A. HUD Standard Performance Measures (Source: SAGE/HMIS):

a. 1a. Persons exiting to permanent housing destinations (per data element 3.12) during the year.

We would use the accepted measure for each housing service type. For example, HUD recognized & published level for a successful transitional housing program = 65%.

Grant Target: Grantee defines proposed # individuals that exit program to permanent housing.

Mid-year: Grantee reports actual # individuals that exit program.

Year-End: Grantee reports actual # individuals that exit program.

Outcome Indicator:

Grant Target: % Individuals that exit program to permanent housing.

Mid-year: % individuals (actual) that exit program to permanent housing.

Year-End: % individuals (actual) that exit program to permanent housing.

Notes:

In the application, the grantee provides their target service & performance level.

- Application example: 100 of 150 Individuals (or 67%) exit to permanent housing.
- Midyear example: 40 of 80 individuals (or 50%) exit to permanent housing.
- Comment: at mid-year their output (80 compared to 150) is low and success rate (50% compared to 65%) is low, indicating an underperforming grantee with performance that will need some explanation.

The Research and Analysis Committee believes that the grantee proposed service levels should be accessible by members of the CoC Committee or others with access to the initial grant proposals for Tier I and Tier II projects.

b. 2A Adults who increase their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the year.

B. HUD System Performance measures:

System performance measures will measure performance by housing service type, allowing for all projects within the CoC of a specific project to be compared with each other. This kind of assessment will allow us to identify outlier projects: (1) those performing exceptionally well (that could serve as peer-to-peer mentors for other projects); and (2) underperforming projects that may need technical assistance and support to bring their performance up to the standard recognized by the CoC (or HUD).

a. #2 The extent to which persons who exit homelessness to permanent housing return to homelessness.

Sample comparison for Measure 2, using data provided by ICA (Wickering) for HACAP programs. (Please note that this is a quick analysis; we can finalize the presentation or visualization of the data analysis for the report once we agree on what we want to capture.)

**HUD System Performance Measures
IA-501 Iowa Balance of State CoC**

Measure 2

The Extent to which Persons who Exit Homelessness to Permanent Housing Destinations Return to Homelessness

Returns to homelessness

Project (TH) FY2016	Total # Exits to PH (2 years Prior)	Returns to homelessness			
		< 6 Months	6 to 12 mos	13 to 24	2 years
JC HUD V	43	0	1	2	3
Percent		0%	2%	5%	7%
LC HUD II	76	0	0	1	1
Percent		0%	0%	1%	1%
WC Local	10	0	0	2	2
Percent		0%	0%	20%	20%
HACAP TH	129	0	1	5	6
Percent		0%	1%	4%	5%

BoS CoC	758	33	29	61	123
Percent		4%	4%	8%	16%

HACAP as % of CoC	17%	0%	3%	8%	5%
------------------------------	-----	----	----	----	----

A note for discussion:

Sample data was provided by Gary earlier, but this simple descriptive exercise allows us to understand a few items. First of all, we see a substantial increase in return rates after 12 months across projects and within the CoC; the return rate doubles at 13 to 24 months from exit and again after two years. Data visualization through a comparison of a CoC-wide benchmark and each grantee provides a better understanding of emerging and existing service trends. A comparison of similar housing service types should provide insight into promising practices and areas of improvement across the CoC geography.

Secondly, it would appear that the HACAP TH projects are performing better (green cells) than CoC aggregate except for then rural Washington County local project at the 13 month or longer (pink cells) since the initial exit from TH (into permanent housing). Sample size (n=10) is small for the only rural project, but it opens a potential exploration to determine if other environmental factors maybe influencing what appears to be a measure of underperformance in WC Local. Such analysis may lead to identification of specific issues that impact service success along a given population characteristic (for

example, rural and urban populations). More importantly, it may serve as a tool to establish peer-to-peer mentors for housing projects that are performing below the CoC benchmark for the respective housing service type.

The initial data for the system performance measure will be provide by the ICA; analysis will be completed the Research and Analysis Committee and included into the biannual report. Eventually, this process may be performed by ICA staff when they develop visual data dashboards for the Council.

C. eLocks draw report:

This data element will verify a grantee’s level of funding draw for a specific timeframe. In CoC grant applications, returning applicants have been asked if they have utilized HUD funds in a timely fashion. A direct capture of draw down data from eLocks provides third party verification.

All grantees will be asked to submit their eLocks voucher report that verifies fund draw down year-to-date. They will also want to provide documentation that confirms when they can start drawing funds given the frequent contract delays with HUD.

D. Coordinated Entry Reports (still to be established)

Data element to be tracked includes (1) Housing service provider participation in the CE Process Priority List (PL) placement meetings and attendance at essential system trainings.

The Research and Analysis Committee understands that it may take up a year after the CE Process goes statewide by January 2018 for it to have additional data elements for performance reporting by housing service type. Once the system is operational, the Coordinated Entry Committee/Advisory Group or the agency coordinating the statewide system may recommend additional data elements that measure quality performance relative to coordinated entry.

IV. Narrative Questions for consideration (proposed)

1. Are you on track to meet your proposed project outputs identified by your proposal and eSNAPS? (If no, please explain why, 500 word limit)
2. Did you meet your project outcomes within 10% of target? (Please explain any variance greater than 10%)
 - a. What cities and counties do you serve?
3. What should the Council know about the local homeless populations in your service area?
 - a. Do they have any unusual needs and/or barriers to permanent housing?
 - b. Explain any identifiable gaps of service for homeless populations (youth, DV, correctional, chronic, veterans, families, seniors) within the CSRs you are involved.
 - c. Are there any fair housing issues that the Council should be aware, especially with respect to protected classes or refugee populatons?
4. Who have you partnered with to connect homeless people to non-housing resources? [check list of referrals]
 - a. Referral list (starting example)t: IowaWorks, community college job training, Salvation Army, local community health centers, local hospitals, community action, general assistance, Iowa Legal Aid, 211, public housing authority, DV provider, substance abuse

counseling, school free & reduced lunch program, food pantries & meal sites, public transportation,

- b. Note: if we include this question do we want to know about (1) family-level referrals for clients or (2) community-level partnerships to build/strengthen the local homeless services network?
5. How are you involved in the annual January Point-in-Time [PiT] count?
 - a. Planning and coordination with other community stakeholders?
 - b. Bed count, street count and/or service count?
 - c. Do agencies in your service area (or CSR) do any additional PiT counts during the year? (If so, when?)
6. What have you done in the last six months [this year] to promote the BoS coordinated entry process in your service area?
7. Please provide a client success stories

Mid-year questions: 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6

Year-end questions: 1 through 7

Conclusion:

Each element in this approach to performance evaluation provides a unique line of evidence. As we pull them together for evaluation, patterns for success and underperformance should emerge. A review of such data should allow us to identify quality performers that should be rewarded for their success and underperforming projects that should be assisted or replaced by more innovated program designs or projects that will address a service gap within the CoC.