

A VISION FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

DEVELOPING INDICATORS AND BENCHMARKS TO
MEASURE HOUSING STABILITY

May 3, 2017

Janice Chan, System Planner, CHF
Ali Jadidzadeh, Senior Researcher, CHF

Presentation for CHRA Congress 2017



Calgary Homeless
FOUNDATION

OVERVIEW



Part 1. Framework and Approach



Part 2. Logic Model



Part 3. Indicators and Benchmarks



Part 4. Implementation/Lessons

WHO WE ARE

VISION

To make the biggest impact with our community investment towards our collective goal to end homelessness in Calgary.

Calgary's Updated Plan to End Homelessness:

People First in Housing First

Collective impact: call for community ownership and collective leadership to end homelessness

Understanding the different roles we play to end homelessness:

- service provider community
- Government
- private sector
- academia
- media
- faith community
- lived experiences of homelessness
- members of the public

CHF is part of a community committed to **work together** to end homelessness in Calgary


OUR VISION

Funding decisions

- Transparent decision-making based on program performance and alignment with CHF's larger system goals

Program Improvement

- Pilot projects or program changes catalyzed by shared learnings
- Community driven desire for program improvement



Key Performance Indicators

- Performance measures that align with CHF's larger system goals
- Used by agencies to inform practice
- Regular (quarterly) review of indicators and benchmarks

Communities of Learning

- Organized around areas of learning/ knowledge gaps as identified by KPIs
- Self-convening groups driven by shared knowledge and the desire to improve performance

STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

INCREASING LEVEL OF STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT
AND INFLUENCE ON DECISION MAKING



1 Stakeholder Consultation – Logic Model

- Targeted, focus group with representative from each sector: Singles, Youth, Family, Aboriginal and Human Services.

Level of Involvement:

- **Collaborating to develop solutions to build commitment**
- Purpose: to involve stakeholders in the development of solutions

2 Stakeholder Consultation –KPIs / Benchmark

- Program Managers of CHF funded programs
- Solicit feedback for proposed KPIs/Benchmarks

Level of Involvement:

- **Testing ideas or concepts to build knowledge**
- Purpose: To provide information and receive/incorporate feedback or comments

OVERVIEW



Part 1. Framework and Approach



Part 2. Logic Model



Part 3. Indicators and Benchmarks



Part 4. Implementation/Lessons

LOGIC MODEL

GOAL

To build a high-performing system that stably houses chronic and episodic individuals and families experiencing homelessness and is reflective and responsive to Calgary's context and evidence inspired best practices

ASSUMPTIONS OR INFLUENTIAL FACTORS


There are **3** major contributors to the size of a city's homeless population:


- **macro-economic** factors
- the **social welfare** system
- **system responses**


This model is based on CHF's role as funder.

Housing first is an effective approach for providing housing stability for most people experiencing chronic and episodic homelessness.


INPUTS

 Effective and efficient evidence-based programs

 Funding

 Training & Capacity Building

 Partnerships

 Housing Units

 Coordinated Access & Assessment

ACTIVITIES

Evidence-inspired activities for funded programs vary by program type depending on sub-population served.

Intention: **build knowledge** about what activities best work to achieve the desired outcomes and impacts and **share** these through communities of learning.

OUTPUTS

Number of clients **housed** within a program for a certain time period

Number of clients exiting programs into housing

Number of clients that report feeling:

- **connected** to a community/sense of belonging, can include cultural/spiritual supports;
- **financially secure**
- a strong **therapeutic** alliance with their case manager;
- **safe**; and
- **satisfied** with the quality of their housing

OUTCOME

Clients will remain **stably housed**

IMPACT



housing stability for individuals and families experiencing chronic and episodic homelessness

OVERVIEW



Part 1. Framework and Approach



Part 2. Logic Model



Part 3. Indicators and Benchmarks



Part 4. Implementation/Lessons

HOUSING STABILITY -LITERATURE SCAN

	Measurement/Indicator Examples	Sample Literature Referenced
Quantitative Measures for Housing Stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housed (%) • Maintained initial housing for at least 6 months (%) • Enrolled in program for more than one year and maintained housing for at least one year (%) • Number of re-housing episodes 	<p>Perlman and Parvensky (2006), Turner (2015), Distasio and McCullough (2014), Rollins, Billhardt and Olsen (2013), Pearson, Montgomery and Locke (2009), Tsemberis, Gulcur and Nakae (2004)</p>
Qualitative Measures for Housing Stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Stability • Sense of Belonging/Community • Relationship with worker and/or team • Perception of safety • Quality of housing 	<p>Frederick et al. (2014), Toronto Shelter, Support and Housing Administration (2014), Hollywood Homeless Youth Partnership, 2013, BC Housing,), Pearson, Montgomery and Locke (2009), BC Non-Profit Housing Association (2012), Distasio and McCullough (2014), Luborsky et. al (1996)</p>

CURRENT KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Existing KPI—required by provincial government	Analysis
Occupancy (%)	New method
Housed (%)	New method
Positive reason for leaving (%)	New definition of housing stability
Positive reason for leaving + positive exit destination (%)	New definition of housing stability
Interactions with mainstream services (%)	Self-reported data
Reduction in public systems use (%)	Self-reported data
Positive reason for leaving + income at exit (%)	Measured qualitatively
Remaining in program OR with positive reasons for leaving (%)	New definition of housing stability

CURRENT KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Existing KPI—required by provincial government	Analysis
Occupancy (%)	New method
Housed (%)	M
Positive reason for leaving (%)	
Positive reason for leaving + positive exit destination (%)	
Interactions with mainstream services (%)	
Reduction in public systems use (%)	
Positive reason for leaving + income at exit (%)	
Remaining in program OR with positive reasons for leaving (%)	h



Key Criteria:

- Mutually **exclusive/unique** measures
- Greater **reliability**
- **Less** administrative burden
- **Agencies know best** how to achieve the outcome of housing stability

DEVELOPING THE INDICATOR

HMIS Data Set

In order to provide evidence for our measurements, we used the HMIS data set:

Date: April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2015 (three years)

Assessments:

- Move-in: 2,793 move-ins
- Follow-up: 2,978 clients with 11,853 three-month follow-up records
- Exit (if exited): 1,431 exits

DEVELOPING THE INDICATOR

Proposed Benchmark Groupings

Sector/Program					
Singles				Youth	Family
<u>Type 1</u> -Harm Reduction -Place Based -Assertive Community Treatment 2 Programs	<u>Type 2</u> -Abstinence-Based - Scattered Site -Intensive Case Management 2 Programs	<u>Type 3</u> -Harm Reduction -Place-Based -Intensive Case Management 5 Programs	<u>Type 4</u> -Harm Reduction, -Scattered Site, -Intensive Case Management <u>Type 4.A</u> <u>Mid-Acuity</u> 4 Programs <u>Type 4.B</u> <u>High-Acuity</u> 4 Programs	9 Programs	6 Programs

DEVELOPING THE INDICATOR

Proposed Benchmark Groupings

Sector/Program				Youth	Family
Singles					
<u>Type 1</u> -Harm Reduction -Place Based -Assertive Community Treatment	<u>Type 2</u> -Abstinence-Based - Scattered Site -Intensive Case Management	<u>Type 3</u> -Harm Reduction -Place-Based -Intensive Case Management	<u>Type 4</u> -Harm Reduction, -Scattered Site, -Intensive Case Management	9 Programs	6 Programs
HR Harm Reduction	AB Abstinence-Based	<u>Type 4.A</u> <u>Mid-Acuity</u> 4 Programs			
SS Scattered Site	PB Place Based	<u>Type 4.B</u> <u>High-Acuity</u> 4 Programs			
ICM Intensive Case Management	ACT Assertive Community Treatment				



DEVELOPING THE INDICATOR

Defining Stable Housing



What is the *minimum number of months* a client would have to stay housed in a program to achieve “x” outcome → *graduation?*

DEVELOPING THE INDICATOR

Defining Stable Housing

What does graduation mean?

Based on multiple choices for exit reason in the exit interview

Graduated program =

- **Completed program**

OR

- **Left program for a housing opportunity; includes:**
 - **transferred to another program**
 - **family reunification**

OR

- **Death**

All other reasons for exit would not be measured.

DEVELOPING THE INDICATOR

Defining Stable Housing

For each sub-group, what **length of time** should be considered **stably housed**?

Analyzed exit outcomes for moved-in clients between April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2015

Number of Consecutive months housed	Singles			Number of Consecutive months housed	Youth Sector		
	Total Exits	Number of Clients Graduated	%		Total Exits	Number of Clients Graduated	%
3	24	7	29%	3	7	2	29%
6	116	59	51%	6	22	14	64%
9	79	53	67%	9	6	5	83%
12	58	35	60%	12	4	4	100%

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Measuring housing stability



Quantitative Measures



- Percentage of clients who remain consecutively housed in a program for at least nine /six months or more and are currently housed
- Percentage of clients who have graduated the program
- Percentage of clients who completed program with a positive reason for leaving returning to shelter within one year

Qualitative Measures



- Financial Stability
- Sense of belonging in community
- Relationship with case manager
- Perception of safety
- Quality of housing

MEASURING HOUSING STABILITY

Quantitative Measures – HS Indicator 1

Percentage of clients who remain consecutively housed in program for at least **nine months** or more and are currently housed



Joe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was stably housed in Q6 and Q7 - Was not counted as stably housed in Q8 - Once rehoused for nine months again in Q11, he is counted as stably housed
Mary	- Has not achieved housing stability in the program yet
Alex	- Was stably housed from Q3 – Q6
Jill	- Was stably housed in Q12

Example: 3 years of housing program data

Quarter	Months	Joe	Mary	Alex	Jill
Q1	3	🏠	🏠	🏠	🏠
Q2	6	X	🏠	🏠	X
Q3	9	X	X	🏠	X
Q4	12	🏠	X	🏠	🏠
Q5	15	🏠	🏠	🏠	X
Q6	18	🏠	X	🏠	🏠
Q7	21	🏠	🏠	X	🏠
Q8	24	X	🏠	X	X
Q9	27	🏠	X	🏠	X
Q10	30	🏠	🏠	🏠	🏠
Q11	33	🏠	X	X	🏠
Q12	36	X	🏠	🏠	🏠

MEASURING HOUSING STABILITY:

Remained Consecutively Housed

Quantitative Measures – Benchmarks for HS Indicator 1

Percentage of clients who *remain consecutively* housed in program for at least **nine months** or more and are currently housed

	Sector/Program						
	Singles – 9 M					Youth	Family
	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4		6 M	9 M
A				B			
BENCHMARK	77%	70%	81%	66%	54%	69%	72%
AVERAGE	67%	60%	71%	56%	44%	59%	62%

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Measuring housing stability



Quantitative Measures



- Percentage of clients who remain consecutively housed in a program for at least nine /six months or more and are currently housed
- Percentage of clients who have graduated the program
- Percentage of clients who completed program with a positive reason for leaving returning to shelter within one year

Qualitative Measures



- Financial Stability
- Sense of belonging in community
- Relationship with case manager
- Perception of safety
- Quality of housing

MEASURING HOUSING STABILITY

Quantitative Measures - HS Indicator 2

Percentage of clients who have graduated the program


Calculation:



of **graduated** clients

of exited clients

Justification:



Capturing those who:

- Achieved stable housing
- Never achieved stable housing: left before 9/6 months or are harder to house

DEVELOPING THE INDICATOR

Defining Stable Housing

What does graduation mean?

Based on multiple choices for exit reason in the exit interview

Graduated program =

- **Completed program**

OR

- **Left program for a housing opportunity; includes:**
 - **transferred to another program**
 - **family reunification**

OR

- **Death**

All other reasons for exit would not be measured.

MEASURING HOUSING STABILITY

Not consecutively housed but graduated

Quantitative Measures – Benchmarks for HS Indicator 2

Percentage of clients who have graduated the program

	Sector/Program						Youth Less 6 M	Family Less 9 M
	Singles					Type 4		
	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	A	B			
BENCHMARK	60%	67%	43%	65%	34%	39%	59%	
AVERAGE	50%	57%	33%	55%	24%	29%	49%	

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Measuring housing stability



Quantitative Measures



- Percentage of clients who remain consecutively housed in a program for at least nine /six months or more and are currently housed
- Percentage of clients who have graduated the program
- Percentage of clients who completed program with a positive reason for leaving returning to shelter within one year

Qualitative Measures



- Financial Stability
- Sense of belonging in community
- Relationship with case manager
- Perception of safety
- Quality of housing

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Measuring housing stability



Quantitative Measures



- Percentage of clients who remain consecutively housed in a program for at least nine /six months or more and are currently housed
- Percentage of clients who have graduated the program
- Percentage of clients who completed program with a positive reason for leaving returning to shelter within one year

Qualitative Measures








- Financial Stability
- Sense of belonging in community
- Relationship with case manager
- Perception of safety
- Quality of housing

MEASURING HOUSING STABILITY

Qualitative Measures

Five level Likert Scale

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
				

MEASURING HOUSING STABILITY

Qualitative Measures


	Survey Questions
Financial Stability	1. I have a stable source of income. 2. I feel I can pay my rent and other expenses when they are due and have money left over.
Sense of Belonging/ Community	3. Since being housed, I feel connected to a social network (cultural or religious community, family, friends, neighbourhood), to the extent that I want. 4. I participate in community events or receive community services outside of my home, to the extent that I want.
Relationship with worker and/or team	5. I can depend on and trust my worker and/or someone on the team. 6. My worker is available, helpful and reliable when I need them, and if not, someone else from the team is.
Perception of safety	7. I feel safe in my home. 8. I feel safe in the area that I live in.
Quality of housing	9. I am satisfied with the condition of my housing unit. 10. My housing is a good fit for my lifestyle in terms of location, community, and cost.

MEASURING HOUSING STABILITY

Qualitative Measures -Analysis

Housing Stability Survey Results Type 3: Harm Reduction + Placed Based (N=137)

■ Strongly Disagree
 ■ Disagree
 ■ Neither Agree nor Disagree
 ■ Agree
 ■ Strongly Agree



MEASURING HOUSING STABILITY

Qualitative Measures -Analysis


Five level Likert Scale

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
				
-2	-1	0	1	2

MEASURING HOUSING STABILITY

Qualitative Measures -Analysis

Housing Stability Survey Results -Aggregate Data



OVERVIEW



Part 1. Framework and Approach



Part 2. Logic Model




Part 3. Indicators and Benchmarks




Part 4. Implementation/Lessons

STEPS TO IMPLEMENTATION


Timeline



NOVEMBER 2015 CONSULTATION SURVEY RESULTS



MARCH 2016 CONSULTATION SURVEY RESULTS



STEPS TO IMPLEMENTATION

Lessons Learned

1. Connection to assessment questions

- Consultation earlier in the process with people administering assessments
- Existing assessments vs. new assessments

2. Complexity in KPI calculations for agencies

3. Internal Organizational Challenges

- Implementation timeline
- Staff changes

QUESTIONS?



Janice Chan

System Planner

E-mail: Janice@calgaryhomeless.com

Tel: 403-718-2923