

2013 Los Angeles CoC Renewal Project Evaluation - Process & Criteria

For CoC Program, SHP, and S+C funded projects in Los Angeles Continuum of Care

Reviewed by the LA CoC Coordinating Council June 7, 2013

Approved by the LAHSA Commission June 28, 2013

Overview

Each year, LAHSA reviews the performance of its funded projects through an evaluation of program design, outcomes, effectiveness, and regional capacity. Results of the evaluations are then used to establish performance targets for subsequent contract periods. This annual cycle of performance appraisal is not only required by HUD but also enables the Los Angeles Continuum of Care to work towards locally defined housing stability and client self-determination goals for all CoC projects. The evaluation design and methodological approach considers the diversity of project types, target populations, and regional capacity present across the CoC and accommodates these differences by measurement adjustments and weighting that provide as much equity and transparency as possible to promote a fair and defensible playing field for all CoC projects.

The Continuum goals are aligned with HUD goals, and are scored elements on the annual HUD McKinney Vento Continuum of Care (CoC) Consolidated Application (SuperNOFA). Continuum goals are based on HUD criteria and include the following broad categories of achievement:

1. **Program Design** – extent to which individual projects employ evidence-based promising practices, adhere to HEARTH-defined program and administrative standards, and comply with industry standard client services practices;
2. **Target Population** – extent to which project serves a priority population;
3. **Performance** – the ability of participants to achieve and maintain placement in stable housing and increase or maintain income;
4. **Utilization and Spend-Down** – the ability to expend project resources effectively and efficiently; and
5. **Regional Capacity Assessment** – the extent to which the specific project type and target population fills an identified gap in the CoC.

These categories are then placed in context with project type, including outreach, emergency shelters, transitional housing projects, permanent housing projects, and supportive service only projects, with performance goal targets based on historical overall performance by the project type.

Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee and Provider Feedback

This tool was informed by the input of a *Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee*, a group that included 2 service provider representatives from each Service Planning Area (SPA). The group met several times throughout 2012 to recommend key performance metrics and scoring criteria including goals for serving priority populations, maintaining and increasing income from employment and benefits, and maintain appropriate bed/unit and HMIS utilization. The Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee discussed the results of the 2012 process and recommended changes and updates for 2013.

Additionally, LAHSA staff provided a number of opportunities for service providers to voice their concerns regarding performance. At LAHSA's Quarterly Performance Roundtable meeting in late October, service providers formed peer groups by project type and shared thoughts on each of their own performance successes, challenges, and recommendations for future performance measurement. Follow up meetings brought together service providers to discuss the same topics in light of the specific target populations they serve. All of the feedback gathered from these meetings were documented and reviewed as part of the performance target revision process.

Throughout the spring of this year, LAHSA staff has engaged the provider community through a variety of venues to further garner input and support for the 2013 process. The Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee was reconvened to discuss the results of the lessons learned from the previous year’s pilot and the plan for implementing the renewal evaluation for the 2013 CoC Consolidated Application. In May, the LAHSA Planning Department convened quarterly SPA-level meetings across the CoC. Outcomes staff presented the proposed evaluation criteria at all ten of those meetings and solicited input from attendees. In June, the LAHSA Coordinating Council was presented the revised criteria and given the opportunity to provide input on the specific measures included in the evaluation criteria.

Evaluation Data Sources

This evaluation report is divided into five sections and analyzes some of the many factors and outcomes that a successful program should exhibit. The data used to populate this application was derived from Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to HUD for operating years ending July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013. Supplemental data is gathered from past CoC applications, LAHSA fiscal records, and CoC 2013 Point-In-Time and Housing Inventory Counts.

Dissemination of Results

Each individual CoC project will receive a report of the project’s score. Agencies will then have ten business days following the release of individual project scores to appeal the results. After the appeals process is completed the final results of this evaluation will be released in the following manner:

- Each CoC grantee will receive their final individual score. An agency’s individual score will not be released publicly.
- Based on final scores, projects will be grouped alphabetically into three tiers of performance. Results of performance tiers will be available as a public document.

Overview of Scoring Categories

Evaluation Component	Score Percentage
1. Program Design	10%
2. Target Population	15%
3. Performance	50%
4. Utilization and Spend-Down	15%
5. Regional Capacity Assessment	10%
Total	100%

Section 1: Program Design

Ten (10) Points available in this section

The following questions are scored worth 5 points each.

Local Evaluation Supplemental Questions - Scored	No	Yes
1. Project participates in HMIS by entering or updating client data within 72 hours of data collection.		
2. For each of the required Universal and Program Specific Data Elements a project does not exceed a missing data rate of 5%. Responses of “Don’t Know” and “Refused” will be considered valid responses.		

The following questions will not be scored this year, though they will be included in the supplemental questionnaire in 2014 to gather baseline data of current program design for CoC Projects. Agencies should review these questions and begin to implement these best practices into their projects as this information may be scored and monitored in future years.

Local Evaluation Supplemental Questions – Not Scored
Does your agency currently have at least one homeless or formerly homeless individual serving on the board of directors?
Does your agency currently (or in the last year) employ clients or former clients of homeless services?
Does the agency provide avenues for direct client input to the Board of Directors for the agency?
Does the project have written eligibility criteria?
Project accepts all clients regardless of length of sobriety and history of substance abuse. Project does not have a policy stating required treatment and/or days of sobriety to enter project.
Project accepts all clients regardless of mental illness. Project does not have a policy stating medication and/or treatment compliance is required to enter project.
Project accepts all clients with past non-violent rule infractions (does not bar clients).
Project accepts all clients regardless of sexual orientation or identify.
Project complies with all applicable fair housing regulation and guidance.
Upon entry into the project, the project agrees to keep clients in the project despite any of the following (less than 30 days): -substance use or mental health relapse/treatment intervention, -brief hospitalization, and/or -brief incarceration.
Agencies should ensure that they have the cultural competencies required to provide services to a diverse client base. These skills include cross-cultural knowledge, self-awareness, a diverse workforce, GLBT issues, and language diversity.
That your agency has demonstrated innovative collaborations with non-traditional partners. Non-traditional partnerships can include formal partnerships between non-profit organizations and governments, the for-profit business sector, academic community (including public schools), and/or the faith-based community, etc. Partnerships must be an unprecedented relationship for the proposer with each partner playing a central role in directly impacting service delivery and performance.

Already a requirement for ESG grantees, a centralized or coordinated intake system will soon be required for communities using CoC funds. It is still uncertain how or when the Los Angeles centralized system will be operational, but programs could be awarded extra points in the future for exclusively selecting clients from this centralized system.

Section 2: Target Population:

Fifteen (15) Points available in this section

Given the difficulty in achieving successful outcomes when serving clients with chronically homeless characteristics, along with the intense focus on this population in LA County, projects serving a population demonstrating disabling conditions (known physical, mental, and substance use conditions) will be awarded points in accordance with the percent of clients with those characteristics according to response to APR Q22a2 and Q22b2. The threshold for maximum points will be based upon the first quintile of performance in each peer group.

Section 3: Performance:

Fifty (50) Points available in this section

Questions in this section are designed to assess performance outcomes for each project type (i.e. services only, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing). Additional assessment grouping may be applied to projects that serve the same target populations (i.e. families, single adults, transition age youth, etc.) in subsequent applications. Scoring in each measurement area will be determined as follows:

The threshold for maximum points under each category will be based upon the first quintile of performance in each peer group. For those below the threshold, points will be awarded in proportion to project performance against the threshold for maximum points.

SHP Permanent Housing

- ***Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations:*** APR Q29a1 and Q29a2. Of the clients who exited the project, what percentage exited to permanent destinations? Question is worth a total of **20 possible points**.
- ***Permanent Housing Retention:*** APR Q27. Of the clients served in the operating year, what percentage of clients remained in the permanent housing project as of the end of the operating year? Question is worth a total of **20 possible points**.
- ***Increased or Maintained Income:*** APR Q23, Q24. Of the adults served in the operating year, what percentage maintained or increased income from all sources. Question is worth a total of **10 possible points**.
- ***Returns to Homelessness:*** Of the clients exiting the program to permanent housing in the previous operating year, what percentage has not returned to homelessness (as captured in HMIS)? Question is **not scored this year**.

Shelter Plus Care (S+C) Only

- ***Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations:*** APR Q29a1 and Q29a2. Of the clients who exited the project, what percentage exited to permanent destinations? Question is worth a total of **20 possible points**.
- ***Permanent Housing Retention:*** APR Q27. Of the clients served in the operating year, what percentage of clients remained in the permanent housing project as of the end of the operating year? Question is worth a total of **20 possible points**.
- ***Increased or Maintained Income:*** APR Q23, Q24. Of the adults served in the operating year, what percentage maintained or increased income from all sources. Question is worth a total of **10 possible points**.
- ***Returns to Homelessness:*** Of the clients exiting the program to permanent housing in the previous operating year, what percentage has not returned to homelessness (as captured in HMIS)? Question is **not scored this year**.

Transitional Housing Only

- ***Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations:*** APR Q29a1 and Q29a2. Of the clients who exited the project, what percentage exited to permanent destinations? Question is worth a total of **30 possible points**.
- ***Length of Participation in Project:*** APR Q27. Of the clients exiting the project in the operating year, what was the average length of stay? Question is worth a total of **10 possible points**.
- ***Increased or Maintained Income:*** APR Q23, Q24. Of the adults served in the operating year, what percentage maintained or increased income from all sources. Question is worth a total of **10 possible points**.
- ***Returns to Homelessness:*** Of the clients exiting the program to permanent housing in the previous operating year, what percentage has not returned to homelessness (as captured in HMIS)? Question is **not scored this year**.

Supportive Service Projects Only

- ***Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations:*** APR Q29a1 and Q29a2. Of the clients who exited the project, what percentage exited to permanent destinations? Question is worth a total of **50 possible points**.
- ***Returns to Homelessness:*** Of the clients exiting the program to permanent housing in the previous operating year, what percentage has not returned to homelessness (as captured in HMIS)? Question is **not scored this year**.

Section 4: Utilization and Spend-Down:

Fifteen (15) Points available in this section

Question 1: Bed / Unit Utilization:

During the APR period did your project maintain an average occupancy rate of at least 90%? This question will be calculated by averaging the four quarters from Q8/Q9, PIT of Persons/Households Served from the APR. This question is worth **7.5 points** and is an absolute measure.

Question 2: Spending Down Previous HUD Awards:

Given the scarcity of resources given from the federal government, and the historical issues LA County has had with spending down resources, has your project spent down at least 80% of previously awarded HUD contract funds? This question will be calculated by comparing the award amount to the total expenditures (for SHP Q30a4, and for S+C Q31). This question is worth **7.5 points** and is an absolute measure.

Section 5: Regional Capacity Assessment:

Ten Points (10) available in this section

Geographic capacity is calculated by dividing the total number of homeless persons by SPA by population(s) served, as found in the most recent Los Angeles CoC Homeless Count, by the amount of available housing resources for homeless persons (emergency shelter, transitional housing, and vacant permanent supportive housing) reported in the most recent Housing Inventory Count (HIC).

Projects will be awarded points based on which SPA they are located in based on LAHSA's records. The breakdown of points will vary based on the formula used, with a project located in the neediest area receiving the full ten (10) points. With each SPA receiving one less point based on the order they are ranked.