Rapid Re-Housing Quarterly Performance Report

Results to March 31, 2016

Robbie Brydon, Research & Evaluation Analyst

Overview

Program evaluation ensures that:
- o   Public investment is used efficiently and optimally
- o   Client and program successes are the focus of delivery
- o   Continuous quality improvement can occur based on evidence
- o   Funding decisions can be made objectively based on relative performance

The indicators below were developed to ensure the Housing First delivers the best performance possible for the clients we serve. These indicators are grouped into four categories, with the largest focus going to Program Outcomes and Client Outcomes:

Program Outcomes are directly linked to the ultimate goal of ending homelessness in Edmonton, focusing on prioritization of homeless people at the community level and achieving key housing and self-sufficiency outcomes for clients participating in the program.

Client Outcomes are the primary focus of all Housing First activities. The assumption is that focusing on Client Outcomes requires attention to achievement of Team and Service Outcomes. In the end, if clients are successful, then the goal of ending homelessness becomes that much more achievable. Client outcomes are largely based on mandated outcomes and indicators prescribed by both provincial and federal funders. Targets will be refined through analysis of data going forward.

Most Team Outcomes and Service Outcomes are not included in this report, but will be available in future evaluations. Agency Outcomes will be implemented in a later phase following the review of Homeward Trust's contracting and monitoring processes, which is currently underway.

Many of the indicators are tied to outcomes defined by our funders, the Government of Alberta under *A Plan for Alberta: Ending Homelessness in 10 Years* and the Government of Canada through the *Homelessness Partnering Strategy* 2014-2019. These outcomes have been rephrased as simple questions here: those in blue text are from the Government of Alberta and those in red text are from the Government of Canada.

Directly above each indicator is a statement in bold identifying **which clients are included in the calculation**. Any *exclusions* are spelled out in italics in the description of the indicator (for instance, some indicators do not count clients if they are missing specific information or died or became incarcerated while in the program). Levels are colour-coded for ease of reading: dark green exceeds expectations, light green meets expectations and red falls short of expectations.

Housing First Key Indicators

How many clients are being housed?

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Active clients plus dependants	127	61	59	247
Active clients	66	61	45	172
Minimum # of active clients	75	75	75	225
Active clients as % of minimum	88%	81%	60%	76%
New clients housed this quarter	7	10	15	32
New clients plus dependants housed	11	10	15	36
New clients as % of minimum	9%	13%	20%	14%

*New Clients Housed excludes clients housed by the Homeward Trust Coordinated Access and Bissell Outreach Housing teams and clients transferred in from another program.

Are we targeting priority clients?

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Aboriginal clients	25	10	11	46
Total clients	66	61	45	172
% Aboriginal	38%	16%	24%	27%
Priority or Chronic	50	47	24	121
Total Clients	58	56	43	157
% Priority or Chronic	86%	84%	56%	77%

Are clients graduating to self-sufficiency?

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Successful Exits	27	15	31	73
Valid exits	30	21	47	98
Successful, % of exits	90%	71%	66%	74%

Summary

Caseload: Two agencies have significantly increased caseload, but the other Rapid Re-Housing program continues to support less than two-thirds of their intended minimum number of clients. George Spady's RRH will be melded into ICM programming as of April 1, 2016.

Reaching Priority Populations: Overall, RRH programs generally reach priority populations and the chronically homeless. However, aboriginal clients are underrepresented at all agencies, relative to the homeless population in Edmonton. Of the three agencies, one has a focus on priority clients (mostly families), one has a focus on chronically homeless clients and one has neither of these focuses. All agencies have taken clients exclusively at the lower end of (or below) the suggested SPDAT acuity range.

Successful Housing Outcomes: Over the last year, three quarters of clients leaving the program were in stable housing. Half of all clients who leave with stable housing do so within eight months, however this may increase as longer-term clients from the two newer agencies begin to exit the program. Even so, these two agencies have significantly shorter program durations and fewer (though increasing) long-term clients.

Time to Housing: The average client takes 46 days from when they begin the housing search process to moving in. However, 20% of clients take 81 days or more. This is a very small increase from the previous quarter.

Emergency Service Usage: Over the last year, self-reported usage of medical and justice services increased significantly.

Income Stability: After 9 months in program, 96% of clients had some form of income and 21% of clients earned income from employment.

Quarterly Report: Agency Feedback

In constructing the quarterly report data was pulled across Efforts to Outcomes. The data is reflective of both the work of the front-line as well as agency leadership. In addition, indicators are a result of the work within the Housing First Advisory Council in discerning what information is most helpful to those at an agency level.

ETO data is unable to show the details of operations or changes within an agency or team which contribute to these numbers. Similarly, ETO is not able to show why a team had either an incredible success or an obstacle to attaining goals. Telling this story is a critical piece in our journey as a Housing First program.

In order to enable a productive, two-way dialogue about performance, agency feedback is needed to add context for interpretation. After reading though this report, please provide Homeward Trust with some comments, feedback, and reflections in response by (date). For instance, consider:

- Are the data in the report accurate? Were you expecting different results?
- What stands out for you in the data provided?
- What were the events or actions at a program level that had a strong impact on specific indicators this quarter?

Housing First Performance Indicators

> **Program Outcomes: The Housing First program should be focused on ending homelessness, starting with those most in need.**

Are we targeting priority clients?

Performance Indicator 1: The percentage of clients on Housing First teams who are priority populations and/or chronically homeless at intake. Excluded: Clients with no intake information.

Clients active at end of period

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Priority Population	48	8	7	63
Chronically Homeless	21	45	20	86
Priority or Chronic	50	47	24	121
Total Clients	58	56	43	157
% Priority or Chronic	86%	84%	56%	77%

Clients housed in the previous year

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Priority Population	51	4	5	60
Chronically Homeless	26	21	24	71
Priority or Chronic	55	22	27	104
Total Clients	62	27	47	136
% Priority or Chronic	89%	81%	57%	76%

Targets		
More than expected **>80%**	Expected **60-80%**	Less than expected **<60%**

Priority populations include youth (up to age 24), families with children, people fleeing domestic violence and those referred from SOS. Priority plus Chronic does not equal the Priority or Chronic category because many clients are in both categories.

Performance Indicator 2: The percentage of Aboriginal clients on Housing First teams' caseloads. Excluded: Clients with no SPDAT (pending data resolution) and clients with no ethnicity information.

Clients active at end of period

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Aboriginal clients	25	10	11	46
Total clients	66	61	45	172
% Aboriginal	38%	16%	24%	27%

Clients housed in the previous quarter

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Aboriginal clients	4	2	4	10
Total clients	8	12	15	35
% Aboriginal	50%	17%	27%	29%

Clients housed in the previous year

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Aboriginal clients	28	4	15	47
Total clients	69	32	50	151
% Aboriginal	41%	13%	30%	31%

Targets		
More than expected **>50%**	Expected **40-50%**	Less than expected **<40%**

This indicator refers to clients who self-identify as Aboriginal, regardless of official status. Note: Most data relevant to the last quarter for Hope Mission are not presently available due to technical difficulties. These data will be available in the next report.

Acuity at intake – distribution of clients by SPDAT score at intake. Excluded: Clients with no intake SPDAT.

Clients housed in the previous quarter

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
>52	0	0	-	0
42-52	0	0	-	0
35-41	1	0	-	1
<=34	6	10	-	16
# Clients housed	7	10	-	17
Average acuity	28.0	25.1	-	26.3

This is contextual information about the acuity of incoming clients, not a set performance indicator.

Are we housing people quickly enough?

Performance Indicator 3: The 80th percentile of number of days between when clients are accepted for intake for the Housing First program and when they are housed, when ordered lowest to highest. Excluded: Clients with no intake information, clients for whom intake is greater than 450 days or less than 1 day (assumed to be incorrect data) and clients still in intake (not yet housed).

Clients housed in the previous year

Percentiles	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
50th	48	54	33	46
80th	84	92	62	81
90th	99	115	95	98
# of clients	58	27	47	132

Targets		
More than expected	Expected	Less than expected
<30 days	**30-45 days**	**>45 days**

This chart shows the 50th, 80th and 90th percentiles: the 50th indicates that half of clients are housed in that number of days or fewer; the 80th indicates that 80% of clients are housed in that number of days or fewer and the 90th indicates that 90% of clients are housed in that number of days or fewer. Clients who were in intake two separate times in the same year (and were successfully housed both times) are counted twice.

Are clients becoming independent and self-sufficient?

Performance Indicator 4: CBO Retention Rate Formula – the number of clients still housed plus those who have successfully exited, divided by the total number of clients enrolled, accounting for returns of exited clients. The resulting value is presented as a percentage. Excluded: Clients who left the program due to death or incarceration.

All clients ever active in program

Percentiles	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Active or successful	134	111	-	294
All clients	143	128	-	364
Percent	94%	87%	-	81%

Targets		
More than expected	Expected	Less than expected
>85%	**70-85%**	**<70%**

Note: This indicator has NOT changed to use the revised definition of successful exit. This formula shows the retention rate for all clients active during the year and uses the CBO rate, counting those who leave and re-enter only once. Success is a yes/no option at the worker's discretion when dismissing a client from the program. Please note, shorter periods will tend to create higher rates, so agencies commencing programs in the last two years will not be comparable to other agencies.

Performance Indicator 5: Percentage of graduates or successful exits returning to the Housing First program within one year.

Clients who graduated 1 year to 2.5 years prior to the end of period (i.e., Oct 2013 – Mar 2015)

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Returners	0	0	1	1
Prior Successful Exits	31	21	2	54
Percent	0%	0%	50%	2%

Targets		
More than expected	Expected	Less than expected
<5%	5-15%	>15%

Note: This indicator has changed to use the revised definition of successful exit. This indicator examines whether clients who successfully completed the program are returning to any Rapid Re-Housing program within one year of graduation.

Are clients moving on to successful outcomes, including graduation?

Performance Indicator 6: Percentage of all exits that are graduations or other successful housing. Excluded: Clients who left the program due to death or incarceration (noted in top row) and clients referred to another Housing First provider.

Clients who exited the program within the previous year

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Unsuccessful	3	6	16	25
Successful	27	15	31	73
Neutral	2	3	3	8
Missing	0	0	1	1
All exits	32	24	51	107
Valid Exits	30	21	47	98
Successful, % of valid exits	90%	71%	66%	74%

Targets		
More than expected	Expected	Less than expected
>70%	50-70%	<50%

Note: This indicator has changed to use the revised definition of successful exit. Housing status at exit is used as the indicator of a successful exit. Where an exit assessment was not completed or a neutral answer was given ("Other", "No Response", "Family or Friends"), the dismissal reason is used to determine whether the exit was positive or negative. If this is also indeterminate, the exit is recorded as neutral and excluded from the calculation, as are all deaths and referrals to another Housing First program or agency.

Performance Indicator 7: Percentage of clients lost to follow-up (disappeared) after 3 months in the Housing First program. Excluded: None.

Clients who attained 3 months in the program (the 3-month milestone) during the previous year

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Lost to follow-up	1	0	8	9
Eligible at 3 months	90	73	81	244
Percent lost	1%	0%	10%	4%

Targets		
More than expected **<5%**	Expected **5-15%**	Less than expected **>15%**

This indicator considers clients who, at any point during the year, were active in the program and had been so for at least three months.

Team Outcomes: Teams form a system of access points and evidence-based services working together to end homelessness.

Are we serving as many clients as we can?

Performance Indicator 8: Client-to-worker ratio – the number of active clients on the caseload versus the number of funded Follow-up Support Workers, as counted at the end of a reporting period.

Clients active at the end of the period

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Client : worker ratio (x:1)	22.0	20.3	15.0	19.1
Client + dependant : worker ratio (x:1)	31.8	6.1	5.9	7.5

Targets		
> Contract minimum	Contract minimum	< Contract minimum

This indicator considers the number of workers funded in the contract, regardless of whether the positions were filled. Agencies are considered to meet the expectation if their ratio is within 0.5 of the contract minimum.

Are clients becoming more stable in their housing?

Performance Indicator 19: Percentage of clients who remain housed at 6 months. Excluded: Clients who left the program before 6 months due to death, incarceration or being referred to another Housing First provider.

Clients who attained 6 months in the program (the 6-month milestone) during the previous year

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Housed	58	32	59	149
Eligible at 6 months	62	32	67	161
% Housed	94%	100%	88%	93%

Targets		
More than expected **>90%**	Expected **80-90%**	Less than expected **<80%**

Note: This indicator has changed to use the revised definition of successful exit (see Methodological Changes). Housed refers to clients who were still active in the program or had exited successfully.

Performance Indicator 20: Percentage of clients who remain housed at 12 months. Excluded: Clients who left the program before 12 months due to death, incarceration or being referred to another Housing First provider.

Clients who attained 12 months in the program (the 12-month milestone) during the previous year

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Housed	37	30	38	105
Eligible at 12 months	41	31	50	122
% Housed	90%	97%	76%	86%

Targets		
More than expected **>90%**	Expected **80-90%**	Less than expected **<80%**

Note: This indicator has changed to use the revised definition of successful exit (see Methodological Changes). Housed refers to clients who were still active in the program or had exited successfully.

Do clients have a reliable source of income prior to leaving Housing First?

Performance Indicator 21: *After 6 months in housing, percentage of clients receiving income from government or employment sources. Excluded: Clients who did not complete an intake interview or a 9-month follow-up.*

Clients who had a 9-month follow-up provincial assessment completed during the previous year

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Intake				
Government	37	22	17	76
Employment	16	0	6	22
Other	12	4	0	16
No income	0	2	1	3
Govt or employment	49	22	22	93
After 6 months				
Government	39	26	22	87
Employment	17	2	3	22
Other	12	5	4	21
No income	0	0	0	0
Govt or employment	50	27	23	100
% Govt or employment	98%	93%	96%	96%
# of clients eligible	51	29	24	104

Targets		
More than expected **>90%**	Expected **80-90%**	Less than expected **<80%**

This indicator shows income by source for all clients who had a 9-month follow-up interview during the study year (covering the period from 6 to 9 months in the program). Data for the same clients at intake are shown for comparison. Government refers to provincial government income: AISH and Alberta Income Support. Other includes all other forms of income: pension, student, EI, aboriginal funding, etc.

Are clients able to sustain themselves after 6 to 12 months of service?

Performance Indicator 23: Median number of months to graduation or successful housing, for clients who are successful.

Clients who exited successfully during the previous year

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
50th	7	14	7	8
80th	12	24	11	13
# of clients	27	15	31	73

The 50th percentile indicates that half of clients graduate in that number of month or fewer; the 80th indicates that 80% of clients graduate in that number of months or fewer. There are no clients who graduated twice in the same year. This indicator replaces "At 12 months in housing, percentage of clients who fulfill graduation criteria" and has no pre-determined targets.

Performance Indicator 24: Percentage of clients on caseload who have been in program more than 6 months, at end of period.

Clients active at end of period

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Clients >6 months	36	42	22	100
Active clients	66	61	45	172
% >6 months	55%	69%	49%	58%

This indicator shows how many active clients have been in the program for more than 6 months. This indicator replaces "At 6 months in housing, percentage of clients who fulfill graduation criteria" and has no pre-determined targets.

Performance Indicator 25: Percentage of clients on caseload who have been in program more than 18 months, at end of period.

Clients active at end of period

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Clients >12 months	14	33	12	59
Active clients	66	61	45	172
% >12 months	21%	54%	27%	34%

This indicator shows how many active clients have been in the program for more than 12 months. This indicator replaces "At 12 months in housing, percentage of clients who fulfill graduation criteria" and has no pre-determined targets.

Active clients at end of period and clients dismissed within the last six months

	E4C	George Spady	Hope Mission	Agency Total
Prov. Asst. Errors	3	9	61	12
SPDAT Errors	5	18	-	23
Core Data Errors	4	0	16	4
Total Data Errors	12	27	-	39
Caseload	66	61	45	127
Clean Data Score	91%	78%	-	85%

Targets		
More than expected **>90%**	Expected **70-90%**	Less than expected **<70%**

This indicator shows the reliability of the data used for the rest of this report. The first two rows count how many required assessments were more than 10 days overdue plus duplicate assessments completed. The third row captures core data errors including duplicate program enrollments, incorrect use of the dependent label and clients on the caseload who have been unhoused for more than three months. The score is calculated as: 100% – Total Data Errors/Caseload/2. Data is assessed two weeks after the end of the period to allow teams some time to correct any initial errors.