The Outcomes Initiative
Performance Measurement Planning and Drafting Insights

The Drafting Committee focused on developing proposed measures consistent with the overarching goals of the EveryOne Home Plan and HEARTH legislation: permanent housing (acquisition, stability, retention), the length of time needed to achieve the outcomes, and impact of programs on household incomes.

Insights and drafting principles:

1) **We must focus on both permanent housing and our speed in helping clients obtaining it to become a true rapid rehousing community.** To date, other temporary housing or homeless situations had been lumped in with permanent housing successes in how we describe our impact. In many cases we also did not “count” people who left our programs early in our outcomes, in some cases giving us a higher success rate than when every program participant is counted. Our data is surprising when you strip back to look solely at permanent housing outcomes without any “qualifiers”.

2) **What gets measured gets done.** The outcomes that have the priority to be tracked and evaluated are most likely to be accomplished. What can programs reasonably accomplish that fits our mission and can be tracked? Permanent housing stability in the shortest amount of time with income improvements. This is related to the KISs principle below.

3) **Keep It Simple principle.** What is it that matters to serving people well and is consistent with our EveryOne Home Plan direction and HEARTH requirements? Permanent housing stability in the shortest amount of time with income improvements. The performance measures are focused around this. This does not mean programs don’t provide other valuable services and have other positive impacts on households we serve, but these are the ones that matter most to our system-wide mission of ending homelessness, and they are easily understandable. Too many measures will cause confusion and dilute the impact of going to a performance measurement system.

4) **Still value meeting clients where their needs are.** The statistical analysis found no statistically significant differences in permanent housing performance by geography, disabilities, or household type. But, it is clear that not all clients can acquire or stabilize in housing at the same rate. Process/efficiency measures typically reflect half of the clients achieving the housing outcomes in a faster rate, which allows programs the flexibility to serve other people longer as needed.

5) **Implementation requires continual learning and evaluation.** Flexibility from funders, information about other program models, peer learning, specific conversation about the purpose of transitional housing in our community are all essential for implementation, as is an intentional technical assistance, monitoring and implementation process with specific leadership and roles.
Benchmarked Outcome Measures Development Approach

The Drafting Committee is proposing six performance outcome and three efficiency measures, with different benchmarks for different parts of the system consistent with direction from the community, HEARTH, and EveryOne Home outcomes.

Performance Outcomes:
- Rate of permanent housing entry (for programs serving homeless)
  OR
  Length of stay in permanent housing (For PSH and Prevention)
- Reduced rates of people exiting to homelessness
- Income from employment
- Increase in adults exiting with an income
- A children’s measure is still under consideration.

Efficiency/process measures:
- % exit to a known destination
- % occupancy on average monthly basis
- Length of time to acquire housing

System-measure:
- Return to homeless system (RTH) within 12 months: Funders will consider how and if this is tracked and reported at the agency level to inform adjustments and improvements at the system level.

Approach to Measurement Development:
A statistical evaluation of the InHOUSE HMIS data set was conducted to determine which household or program factors make a difference in the rates of housing placement. The statistical analysis determined with a high degree of confidence that most of the factors thought to be correlated with rates of housing acquisition have no significant impact on the rate of households achieving housing in Alameda County. Specifically, disability, household type, and geography were found not to have any significant effect on the rates of people moving to permanent housing. The main factor under our control that did have an impact on outcome rates was the type of program (shelter, transitional housing, outreach) supporting the idea that our measures should be calibrated for different components in our system, but not for different geography or target populations.

After determining the outcome areas, the Drafting Committee reviewed data in the outcome areas from InHOUSE for FY 2009. The bulk of the performance measures are benchmarked to between the 75th and 80th percentile performance, rounded to nearest number ending in 5 or 0. This means that 20-25% of our providers already meet them and in many cases, a large group of additional providers are close.

Where there was insufficient data to create a percentile benchmark, the measure is based on a committee value, the realistic, desired outcome or expectation, but not data-based. A few suggested measures are based directly on an established goal from EveryOne Home. The occupancy efficiency measure is based on an average. In a few instances a measure is
Benchmarked Outcome Measures Development Approach

Benchmarked and adjusted for value purposes (for example, in cases where the 75th percentile was performing at 100% we adjusted to a 95% performance expectation.)

Alternate Progress Measure:
To bring up those who start out as lower performers, the expectation is to meet the standard numerical benchmarks stated for each outcome below OR achieve progress of 10 percentage points from the current performance rate each year until reaching the standard performance.

Attention to “Known Destinations”:
Currently, of the clients that exit a program, data shows 52% exit to a “known” destination, an actual housing destination instead of “don’t know”, “refused”, or left blank. Some of the exits to unknown destinations are a result of data collection shortcomings while some are a reflection of how people discontinue participation in programs without notifying staff. The approach and simplification in crafting performance measures is to allow us to concentrate on improving the percentage of exits to a known destination and subsequently also obtain better data to work with as soon as possible.
## System-wide Outcomes and Efficiency Measures

**Progress Measure:** For all outcome and efficiency goals, programs can meet or exceed the numerical benchmark or show an improvement of 10 percentage points over past year’s outcome rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Shelter (winter and year round shelters)</th>
<th>Transitional Housing (site-based, scattered site, and subsidy-based programs, e.g., Linkages &amp; Project Independence)</th>
<th>Permanent Supportive Housing (site-based and subsidy-based programs [e.g., Shelter + Care and HOST])</th>
<th>Rapid Rehousing (programs with financial assistance and/or supportive services)</th>
<th>Prevention (programs with financial assistance and/or supportive services)</th>
<th>Drop-In Centers (material support and services for homeless or unstably housed, e.g., WDDC, MASC, MSC, Henry Robinson)</th>
<th>Street Outreach (specifically intended to address housing, e.g., HOPE &amp; MOP)</th>
<th>Service Only-Employment Programs (programs targeted to homeless or housing stability)</th>
<th>Service Only-Services tied to perm. Housing (e.g. Lifelong HHESN or APC Service Center for Permanent Housing clients)</th>
<th>Services Only-Case mgmt tied to other housing (e.g. RISE, OHFP, APC Service Center for Trans Housing clients)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtain permanent housing</td>
<td>30% or greater 1</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Increase exits to other perm hsg by 10% over prev year</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Increase exits to other perm hsg by 10% over prev year</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain/retain permanent housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>95% &gt; 6 mos 85% &gt; 12 mos 65% &gt; 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90% of those who have housing at entry</td>
<td></td>
<td>95% &gt; 6 mos 85% &gt; 12 mos 65% &gt; 3 years</td>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting to streets or shelter</td>
<td>&lt;30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;40%</td>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting to permanent OR interim housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit with earned income</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of those adults entering with no income, an increase in those who exit with an income</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to homelessness in 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Efficiency/Process Measures

| Occupancy | 90% single/mix 85% families | 90% | 95% | | | | | | |
| Exit to Known Destination | 85% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 60% | 60% | 70% | 95% | 85% |
| Time from entry to permanent housing for those obtaining permanent housing | 50% of those who gain permanent housing do so within 60 days | Reduce by 10% length of time from entry to permanent housing for programs with avg. stays over 12 mos | Average of 45 days | Average 45 days for those who move; 14 days to first payment for those who stay | 50% of those who gain permanent housing do so within 6 months | 50% of those who gain permanent housing do so within 6 months | 50% of those who gain permanent housing do so within 6 months | Reduce by 10% length of time from entry to permanent housing for programs with average stays over 6 months |
| Other | | | | | | | | 50% of those who gain employment do so within 13 weeks |

---

1 For prevention, persons with Housing Status other than “Literally Homeless” are included.

2 All italicized, underlined numbers are benchmarked on actual performance and subject to annual updating.

---

System-wide goal: Returns to homelessness (as measured by a new entry in HMIS) within 12 months of exit to permanent housing are less than 10%.
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Introduction and Background

The EveryOne Home Plan to prevent and end homelessness in Alameda County by the year 2020 was published in 2006 and an organization by the same name launched in 2007 to lead implementation. Since then EveryOne Home and community stakeholders have worked hard to honor the Plan’s charge to “measure success and report outcomes,” the fourth of the Plan’s five major strategies.

The data presented in this report reflects the performance of the system of care from January through December 2011 on outcome measures related to housing, income, and system efficiencies such as how quickly housing is obtained. It includes some comparisons to 2010 data, and identifies noteworthy trends. The measures discussed in this report represent the community’s best thinking on how to evaluate our progress toward ending homelessness through achieving the outcomes expressed in both the federal HEARTH Act and the EveryOne Home Plan. The EveryOne Home systemwide outcomes first adopted in 2008 are:

1. 15,000 homeless households obtain permanent housing by January 2020;
2. The amount of time between disclosure of a housing crisis/homelessness and stabilization or residence in permanent housing is reduced from months, even years, to weeks;
3. 85% of those that obtain permanent housing will maintain it for at least one year and 65% will maintain their housing for at least 3 years.

The goals included in the HEARTH Act passed in 2009 are similar:

1. Reduce the length of time individuals and families remain homeless (the federal goal is 30 days);
2. Reduce the rate at which individuals and families who are housed return to homelessness;
3. Ensure all homeless individuals and families in a given region are served;
4. Grow jobs and income for homeless individuals and families;
5. Reduce the number of individuals and families who become homeless; and
6. Reduce the overall number of homeless individuals and families.

At the federal level, communities will be evaluated on their progress toward these goals as a system rather than individual agencies, and our performance will affect the amount of federal homeless assistance dollars available to Alameda County in the years to come. As HEARTH regulations are released later this year, some means of measuring local outcomes may be revised to comply with the new information about implementing and reporting on HEARTH goals.

To meet HEARTH Act and EveryOne Home Plan expectations, individual programs must perform well on outcome measures that are appropriate to their role in the system of care. The standardized outcomes and performance benchmarks adopted in 2010 for our system sorts programs into the following sectors:

- Emergency Shelter (ES)
- Transitional Housing (TH)
- Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)
- Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)
- Prevention (Prev)
- Drop In Center (DIC)
- Outreach (Outreach)
- Employment Programs (Emp. Prog.)
- Services Only programs tied to Permanent Housing (SO-tied to Perm)
- Services Only programs with Case Management not tied to permanent housing (SO-CM)
This report uses these sector names and their abbreviations as labels on the charts and in the narrative throughout this report. Some outcomes or performance measures such as “exiting with income” or “exiting to known destinations” apply to all sectors. Others are specific to one or several sectors. For example, the outcome “avoiding exits to streets or shelter” applies to Emergency Shelters, Employment Programs, and Services Only-Case Management sectors. Benchmarks, the rate at which outcomes measures are to be achieved (i.e. 65%, 40%, etc.), were established based on the sector’s actual performance in 2009. In most cases 25% of agencies were already performing at that benchmark rate. In addition, the community determined that programs demonstrating an increase of at least 10 points above their prior year’s performance would be viewed as meeting the improvement benchmark even if they had not yet reached the performance benchmark. See Attachment B for a chart of outcome measures and benchmarks by sector.

The ultimate goal of the EveryOne Home outcomes initiative is for all providers to be performing at or above the benchmarks. The community anticipated it would take several years to meet that goal because the established benchmarks were a stretch for many programs, data collection and reporting capacity were still under development, technical assistance would be required, and programs needed time to realize the impact of any changes to their service delivery approach. There was also concern that programs which targeted specific populations (i.e. families versus single adults) or had differing program models (i.e. winter versus year-round shelter) might perform differently over time and need different benchmarks. Several factors including but not limited to those noted above that could influence performance rates were statistically analyzed and accounted for during the process of creating the benchmarks. Such factors and their impact on performance will continue to be monitored over time. This report does explore the potential impact of program size on outcome performance, but not target populations or program design. Subsequent reports will address these issues.

**YEAR TWO PRIORITIES**

Having successfully boosted the quality of the data set in the first year by improving rates of exit to known destinations, agencies and programs concurrently achieved an increase in the rate of persons exiting to permanent housing. For year two, the goals built on year one successes and included:

- Further increasing the rates of exits to known destinations
- Improving rates of obtaining permanent housing
- Reducing the length of time between program entry and acquiring permanent housing
- Expanding report to include program stayers as well as leavers
- Improving incomes through earnings or the obtaining of benefits

EveryOne Home can report substantial progress on year two priorities:

- Exits to known destinations continued to improve in all sectors, with all but two sectors exceeding last year’s systemwide average of 82%
- The system demonstrated a 30% increase in the rate of persons exiting programs with permanent housing from 33% in 2010 to 43% in 2011
- Both transitional housing and emergency shelter providers reduced the length of time between program entry and acquiring permanent housing by 8% and 6% respectively
- This report still includes only data for those persons exiting our system. It does not yet include data for those staying in programs. EveryOne Home expects to issue an expanded 2011 report
that includes stayers in late 2012. Any programs not identified individually in this report will be included in the expanded 2011 report.

- Finally, providers increased the numbers of persons exiting with some income who entered the system with none. Helping people to secure earned income remained a challenge for our system.

This communitywide effort to understand, direct and improve performance is a work in progress. This report puts local performance data in front of the community to support our growth and learning as we seek to better serve those in our community facing homelessness.

**Housing**

- **Obtain Permanent Housing** (Figure 1)

Overall the system has improved the rate of exits to permanent housing (PH) from 28% in 2009, to 33% in 2010, to **43% in 2011**. The Emergency Shelter, Rapid Re-Housing, Drop In Center, and Outreach sectors met their performance benchmarks in 2011, with all four sectors demonstrating improvement since 2010. The Employment Program sector held steady at 23% for the third year in a row; the Transitional Housing and Services Only-Case Management sectors both had slight declines from 2010.

![](Rates People Obtain Permanent Housing by Sector.png)

Figure 1 Percentage labels indicate 2011 actuals. Source for Systemwide data: 2011 APR run systemwide without HPRP. Sources for Sector data: InHOUSE Outcomes Report 2/3/12, run for each sector, 2011 Alameda County.
**Emergency Shelter (ES) Sector** (Figures 2 - 4): Fourteen emergency shelters in Alameda County exited 2,561 people from their programs in 2011.

The tables below display the rates of exits to permanent housing for each shelter in the sector labeled by an abbreviated shelter name (see Attachment C for a index of program names).

For the second year, results indicate that the bed capacity of a program may not correlate to outcomes in emergency shelters. The figures below examine the permanent housing exit rates in shelters by bed capacity of each program, Figure 3 for smaller facilities and Figure 4 for larger facilities. In Figure 3, nine shelters have 18-39 bed capacity with a wide range of permanent housing exit rates from 8% to 80%. The larger facilities range from 40 to 125 beds and demonstrated a similarly wide range of exit rates to permanent housing (13% to 41%). This analysis by shelter size is unlikely to be included in subsequent reports, but future reports will instead examine if exit rates to permanent housing are influenced by program design or target population.
Transitional Housing (TH) Sector (Figures 5 - 6): Thirty transitional housing programs had 735 people exit in 2011. Six percent of those people had more than one exit from TH in the year. Programs labeled with an * have met the improvement benchmark by increasing their performance by 10 percentage points or more over the prior year, but have not yet achieved the performance benchmark of 80%.

Permanent Housing Rates for Transitional Housing

- 13 programs met performance or improvement benchmark
- Sector Average: 59%
- Benchmark: 80%

Highlights

The current HUD national goal is for transitional housing programs to exit 65% of their participants to permanent housing. Fourteen programs (47%) met the national standard, down from 61% in 2010.

Two of the four programs with 100% exits to PH rates are subsidy-based projects where participants remain in the rental unit at exit and transition off the subsidy. Two programs are facility-based where participants must move at exit, which also achieved the same 100% outcome rate.

Eight programs surpassed the 80% performance benchmark, while five additional programs met the improvement benchmark by increasing 10 percentage points or more.

As the following chart indicates, bed/program capacity is smaller for transitional housing than emergency shelters in Alameda County. In smaller programs an increase or decrease of just a few people can have a substantial impact on performance rates. Fewer of the 1-19 person capacity programs met the benchmark in 2011 when compared to their larger counterparts. More analysis is needed over time before concluding how size of programs correlates to rates of exit to permanent housing. In 2011 all four programs with 100% exit rates to permanent housing had capacities of 20-39 persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
<th>Range of 2011 PH Exit Rates</th>
<th># Programs with 100% Exit to PH</th>
<th>% (#) Programs Meeting Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 19 person capacity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0% - 85%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 39 person capacity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24% - 100%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 + person capacity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53% - 90%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5  Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 2/3/12 run TH sector, 2011 Alameda County.

Figure 6  Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 2/3/2012 (run for TH sector), sorted by capacity, 2011 Alameda County.
**Services Only Sectors** (Figure 7): The programs presented below combine four sectors: Outreach, Drop In Centers, Employment, and Services Only—Case Management. Each sector has a different permanent housing benchmark. These are small sectors with only two to four programs in each. They often work in tandem with emergency shelter or transitional housing programs, helping participants with income supports and other service needs, while the housing program works on permanent housing. Figure 7 presents each program’s performance beside the benchmark for its sector. The expanded 2011 report will include additional programs and will present each sector separately instead of this combined format.

![Permanent Housing Rates for Services Only Programs](Figure 7)

**Types of Permanent Housing Obtained** (Figure 8): As in 2010, two-thirds of persons who exit the system to permanent housing do so to unsubsidized permanent housing, which includes rental housing with no subsidy (43%), family or friends on a permanent basis (21%), and ownership (2%). From 2010 to 2011 the percentage of people exiting to permanent rental housing with a subsidy increased by 4 points, while the number exiting to permanent supportive housing fell by 4 points.

![Types of Exits to Permanent Housing Systemwide](Figure 8)

---

**Highlights**

8 out of 13 Service Only programs met their sector’s benchmark.

All 4 Drop In Centers, BHCH, BHRP, BOMA, and WWDI met their sector’s benchmark of 35% exits to permanent housing.
Return to Homelessness (Figure 9)

In 2011 the systemwide rate of return to homelessness was once again 7%. This rate is the percentage of people exiting to permanent housing that subsequently reenter HMIS as homeless within the following twelve months, for the average of the months April 2010, July 2010, October 2010, and January 2011. Homeless is defined as entering a shelter or transitional housing program or entering any other program with a housing status of “literally homeless”. Rates vary from a high of 27% for emergency shelters to a low of 3% for Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) programs. The federal and local goal is that less than 10% of those who exit to permanent housing subsequently return to homelessness.

Despite a slight increase within three sectors, the systemwide rate remains level because it includes prevention program.

Future reports may calculate this outcome measure differently based on guidelines expected to be issued by HUD later this year. EveryOne Home is also interested in examining return to homelessness from various exit destinations (rental with subsidy, rental without subsidy, family and friends, and home ownership) to assess whether some destinations are more likely to result in a return to homelessness than others.

Figure 9  Source: InHOUSE Report "Returns to Homelessness v 12.02.03", run by systemwide with HPRP and by sector for each quarterly increment, 2011 Alameda County.
Housing retention is measured at six months, twelve months, and three years to comply with local and federal outcome measures. The federal department of Housing and Urban Development expects 72% of persons moving into permanent supportive housing to maintain it for at least six months. Alameda County PSH programs exceed that federal benchmark as well as the local goals indicated in Figure 10 below. Locally this outcome is measured by excluding tenants who had moved in more recently than the time period being measured; for example, not counting tenants who had moved in less than six months ago for the first benchmark of six months.

![Rates of Retaining Permanent Supportive Housing](image)

**Figure 10** Percentage labels indicate 2011 actuals. Length of Residency for Exited and Current Residents as of 12/31/2011. Source: InHOUSE CoC APR, 2/17/2012.

Permanent supportive housing is a very cost-effective solution for chronically homeless, disabled persons when compared to the high expense of hospital stays and criminal justice involvement incurred by the community for people living in places not meant for human habitation. It is critical to target this deeply subsidized, service-rich resource to those who need it most. EveryOne Home and community stakeholders recognize that people with disabilities stabilize while in permanent supportive housing and may not always need the level of service and subsidy provided in such programs. When it is in the best interest of a participant, programs are encouraged to help people move to other less costly, less service-rich permanent housing. This strategy increases availability of PSH to currently homeless, disabled individuals. Approximately 11% of PSH tenants exited their units in 2011, the same percentage as 2010. Of the 230 people who exited PSH in 2011, 49% exited to some other form of permanent housing. Over one third (37%) exited to permanent housing other than PSH which is less expensive to the system of care, including rental housing with subsidy, rental housing without subsidy, and staying with a friend or
family on a permanent basis. These positive exits from PSH to less expensive housing and services help ensure the system’s ability to target the right resources to the right people, at the right time.

Exit Destinations from Permanent Supportive Housing

- Permanent Supportive Housing: 12%
- Other Permanent Housing: 37%
- Other Places*: 32%
- Homelessness (ES, TH, Streets): 11%
- Unknown: 8%

Figure 11  Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 2/3/12 (run for PSH Sector), 2011 Alameda County.
* “Other places” includes staying with friends or family on a temporary basis, hospitals, jail or prison, substance abuse treatment or detox, hotel or motel without an ES voucher, Safe Haven, and deceased.

Income

- Change From No Income To Some Income (Figure 12)

Eight sectors now meet their benchmark, whereas in 2010 only four did. Those same eight sectors also saw improvements in their performance on this outcome; two sectors improved by over 30%. The following programs successfully assisted 100% of their clients who entered with no income to exit with income:
- Abode Services Lorenzo Creek SHP
- Bonita House HOST S+C
- City of Berkeley S+C TRA
- LifeLong Medical Care BIST UA Homes
- Alameda Point Collaborative Service Center
- LifeLong Medical Care Project Respect
- Second Chance RISE
- ANKA Drop In Center

Rate of Increase of Persons Who Exited With Income And Entered With None

Figure 12  Percentage labels indicate 2011 Actuals. Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 2/3/2012 (run by sector), 2011 Alameda County.
Earned Income (Figure 13)

Rate of exiting with earned income is a federal outcome and therefore has been adopted locally. From 2010 to 2011 all sectors increased the percentage of people exiting with earned income. Only one sector, Services Only- Case Management, surpassed its benchmark.

![Exit with Earned Income by Sector](image1)

**Figure 13** Percentage labels indicate 2011 Actuals. Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 2/3/2012 (run by sector), 2011 Alameda County.

Employment Programs Sector (Figure 14): In addition to exiting people to permanent housing, exits with employment are also essential to the stabilization of homeless households. Currently the reporting of this outcome only captures persons who exit the employment program, not those who obtained employment and are still participating in the program. The expanded 2011 report will include outcomes for persons remaining in programs, which will provide a more complete picture of employment programs’ performance helping participants gain earned income. In 2011 the range of persons who exited from employment programs with earned income was 21% and 35%. The performance benchmark for Employment Programs is 40%.

![Exits with Earned Income for Employment Programs](image2)

**Figure 14** Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 2/3/2012 (run by sector), 2011 Alameda County.
System Efficiencies

Rate of Exiting to Known Destinations (Figure 15)

Known destinations include all exit destinations other than “don’t know”, “refused”, or null (unanswered). Improving this rate was an intentional focus at most agencies and within the system to ensure that all analysis was based on robust data sets. Drop In Centers and Outreach Programs showed the greatest rates of improvement on this measure for the second year in a row. All but one sector, Services-Case Management Only, met or came within a few percentage points of meeting this benchmark.

Figure 15  Percentage labels indicate 2011 Actuals Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 2/3/12 (run by sector), 2011 Alameda County.

Reducing exits to streets or shelter (Figure 16)

EveryOne Home and community stakeholders aim for reductions in the rate of exits from Shelters, Employment, and Services Only-Case Management Programs back to the streets or other shelters. All three sectors met their goal with fewer exits to the streets or shelter than the benchmark rate; however, 2011 showed significant increases for both Emergency Shelters and Services Only-Case Management programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exits to Streets or Shelter</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Emp. Prog.</th>
<th>SO-CM only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 Actual</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Actual</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Actual</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>less than 30%</td>
<td>less than 40%</td>
<td>less than 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16  Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 2/3/2012 (run by sector), 2011 Alameda County.
Length of Stay (Figure 17)

Measuring the length of stay in a given program is the best proxy EveryOne Home and community stakeholders currently have for measuring length of time homeless. Emergency shelters and transitional housing are encouraged to reduce the amount of time between program entry and exit to permanent housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Average Length of Stay (LOS) in days for Exited Persons</th>
<th>Average LOS per Exit to Permanent Housing</th>
<th>% of those exiting to PH who do so within 60 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-Housing</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17 Source: InHOUSE Report “Length of Stay - Averages v 12.03.15” (run for ES, RRH, and TH sectors) and ES Sector “Outcomes” Report 2/3/2012, 2011 Alameda County.

Shelters and transitional housing programs noted a drop in both the average length of stay for all persons exiting and a marked decrease in the length of time to exit to permanent housing: a 5 day decrease in shelters (6%) and a 32 day decrease in transitional housing programs (8%). These reductions in lengths of stay contribute to a lower cost per person served within that sector, and more turnover within the programs to serve more homeless people over time.

As anticipated, rapid re-housing programs experienced increases in average length of stay for all persons exiting and those exiting with permanent housing (11% and 6% respectively). Given that the program can subsidize participants for up to 18 months (547 days) and 2010 was the first full year of rapid re-housing in Alameda County, an increase in lengths of stay was expected. Even with these increases, the program remains a short-term intervention with an average length of stay of under four months, nowhere near the maximum allowed by federal regulations.
Conclusion

On April 25th, 2012, an EveryOne Home Community Meeting was held to solicit stakeholders’ input to determine the key successes of 2011 and further refine the priorities for 2012 and mandates for future work, including repurposing parts of the system of care to produce the greatest results in ending homelessness. Some work is already underway such as the exploration of a coordinated intake process and the assessment of our current use of transitional housing resources. Additionally, EveryOne Home will continue providing technical assistance, facilitating the sharing of best practices from local agencies and national models and supporting data driven refinements to our system of care in order to ensure we achieve the outcomes to which our community is committed. To that end, EveryOne Home is excited to award cash prizes in 2013 for outstanding attainment of outcomes in 2012 and to offer the EveryOne Housed Academy to further the improvement in outcomes performance. While this work is underway, the outcomes achieved in 2011 uniquely guide the implementation of these activities as providers and investment replicate what is working best and devotes attention to more improvement in 2012.

EveryOne Home and community stakeholders celebrate the ongoing improvements in performance and in capacity to collect and analyze data across the system. Especially noteworthy are:

- the increases in exits with permanent housing
- the increased rates of people exiting the system with some income who entered with none,
- the retention rates in permanent supportive housing,
- the reduced lengths of stay in shelters and transitional housing, and
- a return to homelessness rate lower than the national average.

This progress propels the conversation about how to better the services we deliver and the outcomes we achieve for persons facing homelessness. The anticipated release of HEARTH regulations and new HMIS standards this year will also drive efforts in data collection, reporting, and defining successful outcomes.

A focus of 2012 will be on further improving reporting capabilities. In addition to generating data about both stayers and exiters from programs, community members want to see the results as real numbers as well as percentages, and more detail about exits from permanent housing and returns to homelessness. Community stakeholders praised the system’s progress in collaboration, while calling for further coordination as well as increased understanding of the interconnectedness of the outcomes, programs and sectors in our system.

2012 will also emphasize achieving greater rates of obtaining permanent housing and increasing income and jobs. Participants asserted the need for continued Rapid Re-Housing resources in light of their demonstrated effectiveness. Given the rate of improvements on many performance benchmarks, community members expressed an interest in exploring whether those should be raised for future years.
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*Systemwide Outcomes and Efficiency Measures*

**Progress Measure:** For all outcome and efficiency goals, programs can meet or exceed the numerical benchmark or show an improvement of 10 percentage points over past year’s outcome rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Shelter (winter and year round shelters)</th>
<th>Transitional Housing (site based, scattered site, and subsidy-based programs, e.g., Linkages &amp; Project Independence)</th>
<th>Permanent Supportive Housing (site-based and subsidy-based programs [e.g. Shelter + Care and HOST])</th>
<th>Rapid Rehousing (programs w/financial assistance and/or supp. services)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtain permanent housing</td>
<td>30% or greater ²</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Increase exits to other perm hsg by 10% over prev year</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain/retain permanent housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% &gt; 6 mos 85% &gt; 12 mos 65% &gt; 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting to streets or shelter</td>
<td>&lt;30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting to permanent OR interim housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit with earned income</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of those adults entering with no income, an increase in those who exit with an income</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to homelessness in 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency/Process Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>90% single/mix families 85% families</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit to Known Destination</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time from entry to permanent housing for those obtaining permanent housing</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Reduce by 10% length of time from entry to permanent housing for programs with ave. stays over 12 mos</td>
<td>Average of 45 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Systemwide goal:** Returns to Homelessness (as measured by a new entry in HMIS) within 12 months of exit to permanent housing are less than 10%.

¹ For prevention, persons with Housing Status other than “Literally Homeless” are included.

² All italicized, underlined numbers are benchmarked on actual performance and subject to annual updating.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention (programs with financial assistance and/or supportive services)</th>
<th>Drop-In Centers (material support and services for homeless or unstably housed, e.g. WDDC, MASC, MSC)</th>
<th>Street Outreach (intended to address housing, e.g. HOPE &amp; MOP)</th>
<th>Service Only-Employment Programs (programs targeted to homeless or housing stability)</th>
<th>Service Only-Services tied to perm. Housing (e.g. Lifelong HHISN or APC Service Center for PH residents)</th>
<th>Services Only- Case mgmt tied to other housing (e.g. RISE, OHFP, APC Service Center for Trans Housing clients)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Increase exits to other perm hsg by 10% over prev year</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90% of those who have housing at entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>&lt;40%</td>
<td>95% &gt; 6 mos</td>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>85% &gt; 12 mos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>65% &gt; 3 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 45 days for those who move; 14 days to first payment for those who stay</td>
<td>50% of those who gain permanent housing do so within 6 months</td>
<td>50% of those who gain perm. housing do so within 6 months</td>
<td>50% of those who gain permanent housing do so within 6 months</td>
<td>Reduce by 10% length of time from entry to permanent housing for programs with average stays over 6 months</td>
<td>50% of those who gain employment do so within 13 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment C
Program Abbreviations and Data Contributors

In this report, tables and charts within six sectors identify the achievements of specific programs within that sector (Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, Drop In Centers, Outreach, Employment Programs, and Service Only-Case Management not tied to permanent housing). Program names are identified in the report using the four letter abbreviations noted in the tables below. The first two letters represent the agency, the second two represent the program. Any of these programs making a 10 point improvement in an outcome area and thereby meeting the improvement benchmark will be noted by an asterisk preceding the program abbreviation.

Other programs’ data is included in the findings for a sector but is not specifically identified program by program for the permanent supportive housing, rapid re-housing, prevention, and services only – tied to permanent housing sectors. Following the tables showing the program abbreviations is a list showing which program data is included in these four sectors.

New programs or those programs not included in this report will be included in the expanded 2011 report anticipated for late fall 2011.

### Shelters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSV</td>
<td>Abode Services Sunrise Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANES</td>
<td>Anka Behavioral Health Emergency Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANWS</td>
<td>Anka Behavioral Health Winter Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHDW</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project Dwight Way Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHMO</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project Men's Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOHH</td>
<td>BOSS Harrison House Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSC</td>
<td>BOSS South County Homeless Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFMW</td>
<td>Building Futures with Women and Children Midway Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFSL</td>
<td>Building Futures with Women and Children San Leandro Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHES</td>
<td>Covenant House Emergency Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDES</td>
<td>East Oakland Community Project Crossroads Emergency Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FELM</td>
<td>FESCO Les Marquis Emergency Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMWS</td>
<td>St. Mary's Center Winter Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEES</td>
<td>YEAH! Emergency Shelter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GWOS</td>
<td>Goodwill Industries One Stop Employment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUBE</td>
<td>Rubicon Berkeley Employment Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transitional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABHS</td>
<td>Abode Services Housing Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLK</td>
<td>Abode Services Linkages Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABPI</td>
<td>Abode Services Project Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APBP</td>
<td>Alameda Point Collaborative Barbers Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDH</td>
<td>Alameda Point Collaborative Dignity Housing West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APUV</td>
<td>Alameda Point Collaborative Unity Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>Anka Behavioral Health Transitional Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHIH</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project Independent House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHTH</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project Transitional House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHVA</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project VA Transitional Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOCM</td>
<td>BOSS Casa Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOHF</td>
<td>BOSS Harrison House Family Transitional Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOHS</td>
<td>BOSS Housing Stabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOMC</td>
<td>BOSS McKinley House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOPA</td>
<td>BOSS Pacheco Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORP</td>
<td>BOSS Rosa Parks House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSF</td>
<td>BOSS Sankofa House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSH</td>
<td>BOSS South County Sober Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRP</td>
<td>Covenant House Rites of Passage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOFT</td>
<td>East Oakland Community Project Families In Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOMC</td>
<td>East Oakland Community Project Matilda Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOOH</td>
<td>East Oakland Community Project Our House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBY</td>
<td>FESCO Banyan House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FELK</td>
<td>FESCO Linkages Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPOP</td>
<td>First Place For Youth Oakland PATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPOY</td>
<td>First Place for Youth Oakland Youth Housing Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPTH</td>
<td>First Place For Youth THP Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFTP</td>
<td>Fred Finch Turning Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODAS</td>
<td>Operation Dignity Ashby House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODDT</td>
<td>Operation Dignity Dignity Commons Transitional Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDBH</td>
<td>Womens Daytime Drop-In Center Bridget House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABHP</td>
<td>Abode Services HOPE Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODMO</td>
<td>Operation Dignity Mobile Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODSS</td>
<td>Operation Dignity Mobile Outreach Season of Sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Drop In Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDI</td>
<td>Anka Behavioral Health Drop In Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHRP</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project MSC Representative Payee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHCH</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project Multi-Service Center Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOMA</td>
<td>BOSS MASC Multi-Agency Service Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDDI</td>
<td>Womens Daytime Drop-In Center DIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Services Only -CM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHWR</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project Womens Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCM</td>
<td>Oakland Homeless Families Program Case Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCM</td>
<td>St. Mary's Center Case Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sectors below do not report program-specific data within the report. The programs listed below the sector heading denote the programs whose data contributes to the sectors’ performance.

### Permanent Supportive Housing

- Abode Services Bridgeway Permanent Supportive Housing, Carmen Avenue, Concord House, HOPE Housing, Lorenzo Creek S+C and SHP, STAY Well Housing
- Alameda County Housing and Community Development PRA, SRA, SRO, and TRA
- Alameda Point Collaborative Non-Subsidized, Barbers Point, Dignity Housing West, Mariposa, Miramar, Unity Village, Perm APP, Spirit of Hope 1
- Ark of Refuge Walker House
- Berkeley Food and Housing Project Russell Street Residence CCL
- Bonita House HOST
- BOSS Peter Babcock House, Regent Street
- City of Berkeley Shelter + Care Alameda City Collaborative, Bonita House SRA, COACH, RCD-SRA, TRA, Square One
- LifeLong Medical Care Erna P. Harris Court, UA Homes, Dellums, Hamilton, Oaks

### Prevention Sector

- Bay Area Youth Center Hayward Housing Stabilization
- Bay Area Youth Center Private Housing Stabilization
- East County HRC Dublin/Unincorporated County Housing Stabilization
- East County HRC State Livermore/Pleasanton Housing Stabilization
- Mid County HRC Alameda Housing Stabilization
• Mid County HRC Hayward Housing Stabilization
• Mid County HRC State San Leandro Housing Stabilization
• North County HRC Berkeley Housing Stabilization
• North County HRC Urban County Housing Stabilization
• Oakland Downtown HRC Housing Stabilization
• Oakland Eastmont HRC Housing Stabilization
• Oakland Eastmont HRC Pathway Home Housing Stabilization
• Oakland TAY Housing Stabilization
• South County HRC Fremont Housing Stabilization
• South County HRC State Union City Housing Stabilization
• South County HRC Urban County Housing Stabilization

Rapid Re-Housing Sector
• Bay Area Youth Center Hayward Housing Stabilization
• Bay Area Youth Center Private Housing Stabilization
• East County HRC Dublin/Unincorporated County Housing Stabilization
• East County HRC State Livermore/Pleasanton Housing Stabilization
• Mid County HRC Alameda Housing Stabilization
• Mid County HRC Hayward Housing Stabilization
• Mid County HRC State San Leandro Housing Stabilization
• North County HRC Berkeley Housing Stabilization
• North County HRC Urban County Housing Stabilization
• Oakland Downtown HRC Housing Stabilization
• Oakland Eastmont HRC Housing Stabilization
• Oakland Eastmont HRC Pathway Home Housing Stabilization
• Oakland TAY Housing Stabilization
• South County HRC Fremont Housing Stabilization
• South County HRC State Union City Housing Stabilization
• South County HRC Urban County Housing Stabilization

Services Only – Tied to Permanent Housing
• Abode Services RISE Project
• Alameda Point Collaborative Service Center
• BOSS RISE Project
• LifeLong Medical Care Project Respect
• Second Chance RISE Project