How to Drive Performance in Homelessness Prevention Programs

NAEH Conference, 2/22/13
Homelessness Prevention Context

- Employment & Training
- Work Supports
- TANF Cash Grant
- Diversion at Intake
- Eviction Prevention
Homebase Prevents Shelter Entry:

- Finding the most at risk in the community
- Serving the hardest to serve
Program Model

DHS partners with 8 non-profit organizations to run 11 Homebase programs in the highest need communities.

Services include:
- Family and landlord mediation
- Budgeting and financial counseling
- Entitlements advocacy
- Employment and training
- Legal advice and referral
- Short-term financial assistance
What is the Impact of Homebase?
Research from 2012* showed that during the period from November 2004 through November 2008:

Homebase reduced shelter population.

By between 10 and 20 families per 100 HB cases.

By around 15 families per 100 HB cases.

*Can Homelessness Be Prevented? Evidence from New York City’s Homebase Program, Brendan O’Flaherty, Peter Messeri, and Sarina Goodman
This year, Homebase will use the assessment to serve 5,000 high risk families and provide brief services to thousands more.
Increasing Impact through Performance Management
PreventionStat:

- Assessing Individual Risk
- Neighborhood Targeting
- Enrollment
- Client Outcomes
# Targeting

## HOMEBASE Performance Indicators

**PERIOD: FY13, July 1, 2012 - December 31, 2012**

Description: 30% of the Provider’s budget is performance-based. The provider will be scored annually, and any amount of underperformance shall be deducted from the following FY’s budget. When calculating the subsequent FY’s budget impact, the denominator shall be 30% of the budget for the FY in which performance is being assessed. For each percentage point below the goal, the provider may be deducted 1 point up to the value of the indicator.

### Targeting: 40 Points, plus a bonus indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment Score of 6 or More</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonus</strong>: Avg. Risk Assessment Score 8 or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8 or more</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Million Dollar Block^</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ Full Enrollments

Goal is to reduce shelter entrant for the assigned Million Dollar Block by 10%. Provider’s Million Dollar block identified in adjacent maps.

### Enrollments: 30 Points, plus a bonus indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollments (Goal Prorated)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Enrollments</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Enrollments</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonus</strong>: Exceeded Enrollments; 1 point for each 2% over the target</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do we target services?

New Yorkers are below the poverty line: **1,000,000**

According to Census data, at least 13% of all American households are doubled up—that would be **950,000** households in NYC.

The TANF cash assistance caseload is **355,000** households.

Over **120,000** eviction warrants issued each year in NYC.

Less than **20,000** households become homeless each year.
What makes a household high risk for shelter entry and can Homebase target services to these high risk individuals?*

DHS provided a database of 11,105 Homebase families who applied for services between Oct 1, 2004 and June 30, 2008

Analyzed intake and program eligibility data for families with children

DHS provided administrative data on shelter entry over the next 3 years

* Efficient Targeting of Homelessness Prevention Services for Families, Marybeth Shinn and Andrew Greer, 2012
## Risk Assessment Screener

### One Point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>Reintegrating into community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child under 2</td>
<td>Age: 23 - 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No high school/GED</td>
<td>Moves: 1-3 in the past year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently employed</td>
<td>Disruptive Experiences in childhood: 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not leaseholder</td>
<td>Discord (Landlord or HOH): Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Two Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Public Assistance</td>
<td>Age: younger than 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective services</td>
<td>Moves: 4+ in past year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evicted by landlord or leaseholder</td>
<td>Disruptive Experiences in childhood: 3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for shelter in past 3 months</td>
<td>Discord (Landlord or HOH): Severe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Three Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reports previous shelter stay as an adult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The short screener can predict likelihood of shelter entry more accurately than current decisions.

Prediction is hard: Even at the highest levels of risk, most families avoid shelter.

Workers should be able to override the recommendation of the model with written explanations.

The higher the risk score, the more success at preventing shelter entry.
Applicant Assessment Scores

8,700 assessments 7/1/12 -12/31/12, 25 Point scale
Neighborhood Mapping

Sample CD 303 Map
# Enrollment & Outcomes

## Enrollments: 30 Points, plus a bonus indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Enrollments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Enrollments</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BONUS:</strong> Exceeded Enrollments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Families with Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Enrollments, % of Caseload</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Families Without Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Enrollments, % of Caseload</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Client Outcomes: 30 Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family with Children receiving prevention services who did not enter the shelter system within 1 year.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Adults receiving prevention services who did not reside 21 days or more in the shelter system within 1 year.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult families receiving prevention services who did not reside 21 days or more in the shelter system within 1 year.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeting</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Outcome</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Contract Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family with Children</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singles &amp; Adult Families</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY13 Total Budget</th>
<th>Performance Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,617,387</td>
<td>$785,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FY14 Budget Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14 Budget Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-$39,261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollments by Provider

4,544 enrollments, July 1 – December 31 2012
Service Provision

- The hardest to serve...are the hardest to serve
  - Individualized plans
  - Partnership agreement—with flexibility
  - Doubled-up households as a housing option
  - Have to be willing to adjust your effectiveness goal—100% retention is fishy

- Effective prevention services do not have to include financial assistance, at least right away

- Focus vast majority of resources on highest risk cases, but also create low resource, light touch services
Service Provision

• “Brief” service model: Offer a range of services that are progressively more intensive and expensive only after initial interventions doesn’t work
  – Workshops
  – Housing advice
  – Financial empowerment
  – Meaningful referrals
# Client Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Statistics</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>5-Yr. Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>★ Adults receiving preventive services who did not reside 21 days or more in the shelter system (%)</td>
<td>FY08: 96.0%</td>
<td>FY12: 90.0%</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY09: 95.8%</td>
<td>FY13: 70.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY10: 94.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY11: 91.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY12: 91.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★ Adult families receiving preventive services who did not enter the shelter system (%)</td>
<td>FY08: 95.9%</td>
<td>FY12: 90.0%</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY09: 98.6%</td>
<td>FY13: 70.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY10: 94.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY11: 95.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY12: 97.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★ Families with children receiving preventive services who did not enter the shelter system (%)</td>
<td>FY08: 89.8%</td>
<td>FY12: 90.0%</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY09: 91.3%</td>
<td>FY13: 70.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY10: 92.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY11: 90.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY12: 93.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

★ Critical Indicator  “NA” - means Not Available in this report
Next Steps

Continually study and improve assessment tool

Release cost-benefit study
Prevention and Shelter Diversion

Matthew Ayres
Minneapolis-Hennepin County
Office to End Homelessness
Context

• Hennepin Co. Population: 1,168,000
  – 45 urban, suburban and rural municipalities
• Largest City: Minneapolis: 388,000

• Hennepin County passed a right to shelter policy in 1988, which ensures shelter to all families who were eligible.
Context

• Hennepin can shelter around 340 families at any given time.
  – 3 county funded shelters (100 rooms, 16 rooms, 125 rooms)
    • In 2012, Hennepin’s shelters served 1453 families
    • Average length of stay: 46 days
  – One non-county funded, non-collaborative shelter (100 families)
    • Non-county shelter served 362, LOS = 70 days
• Vacancy Rate – 1.6% in Minneapolis
Context

Families in Hennepin County Emergency Shelters

2000-2012

- County-contracted shelter
- Mary’s Place
Context

• All “Hennepin” beds are accessed through a central intake process, via county intake workers.

• These Central Intake Staff determines eligibility for shelter, but also looks at opportunities for preventing homelessness or diverting by identifying alternatives to shelter.
Context

• **Prevention** is keeping people in the housing they are in, or helping them move to a new place without an instance of homelessness

• **Diversion** is helping people who are homeless avoid shelter
Context

• Three-tier prevention and diversion process before shelter:
  – Mainstream Prevention
  – Targeted Prevention
  – Diversion, or shelter alternatives

• Shelter – Rapid re-Housing
Prevention

• Two types:
  • **Mainstream** Prevention - $15.6m
    – TANF/Emergency Assistance
    – Emergency General Assistance (singles)
  • **Targeted** Prevention
    – Family Homeless Prevention and Assistance Program (FHPAP)- $1.8m
Prevention

- Emergency Assistance: $12,500,000
- Emerg. General Assistance: $3,100,000
- FHPAP: $1,871,250
Prevention- Mainstream

• Mainstream Resources - 2012
  – Emergency Assistance (EA) served 9003 households
  – Average cost of $1307 per family

• People seeking shelter are triaged for prevention, if preventable they will get EA.
  – Typical uses are first month rent, deposit, back rent, utility bills, etc. Will pay 2 months back rent and up to $3000 for Utilities
  – Heavy county staff time to verify and confirm info, get agreements with landlord, cut checks, etc.
  – Only available once every 12 months
Prevention - Mainstream

• Eligibility
  – Below 200% Federal Poverty Guidelines
    • ($46,100 gross/year for a family of 4)
  – Not have used EA in the past 12 months
  – Have a child eligible for federal assistance (TANF)
  – The crisis needs to be resolvable, and the situation sustainable after resolution
Prevention - Targeted

- Dedicated resources from state of MN
- Family Homeless Prevention and Assistance Program – $1.87 million
  - 31% for Prevention Activities ($550k)
  - 61% for Re-housing
- Prevention can only be issued to a family if EA has been used in the past 12 months
- Targeted funds are distributed via 1 urban and 11 sub/exurban non-profits
Prevention – Targeted Screening

• Eligibility
  – 30% AMI ($25,170)
  – Trigger Crisis (current or in next 30 days)
    • Eviction, foreclosure, doubled up and must leave, discharge from institution
    • Sudden increase in rent or utilities, sudden loss of income, rental arrears, excessive overcrowding
    • Violence in the household
  – No other plan or resources
  – Reasonable expectation that crisis can be resolved
• Eligibility Scoring – must be 20+ for funds
  – At or below 15% AMI ($12,585) + 20 Pts
  – 16-29% AMI + 10 pts
  – Rent Burden at 66-80% income + 5 pts
  – Risk Factors + 1 pt each
    • Eviction history, no credit history, lack of rental history, unpaid rent in past, poor credit, past misdemeanors, other felony
    • Critical Felony (3pts), pregnant or has one child under 6 (5pts), HH under 30yrs (5pts) Homeless in past 3 years (5pts), single HH (3 pts)

• Can override eligibility with authorization and 15-19 points
Prevention

– FHPAP FY12 served 796 families with prevention
– Average cost of $690
– Of those served, 5% returned to seek shelter that fiscal year.

– Generally $700 to prevent or $7000 to resolve an episode of homelessness.
Diversion (Shelter Alternatives)

• With the values that:
  – Shelter is very expensive
  – Shelter is not housing
  – Shelter should only be last resort

• Hennepin Central Shelter Intake Staff screens each shelter applicant for Diversion (shelter alternatives)
Diversion (Shelter Alternatives)

• Due to our “right to shelter” policy, beds are at a premium, so all prospective guests are rigorously screened to ensure shelter is last resort

• This includes last night’s location, family, friends, resources for housing, etc.

• Often diversion leads to identification of a prevention case.
Diversion (Shelter Alternatives)

• Each applicant is asked where they spent last night, and staff calls to see if they can stay again.

• Applicants from out of state who have a place to go back to will be offered transportation assistance.
Diversion (Shelter Alternatives)

• Self Elimination – some shelter policies self divert people:
  – Our shelters require a guest pay for their stay if they have income: all available resources must be used for shelter
  – Re-voucher each week
  – Comply with all public assistance programs and all partners
  – Look for housing
  – No guaranteed housing vouchers or subsidy, made clear at intake.
Diversion (Shelter Alternatives)

• In 2012, there were 4375 requests for shelter
• 1453 unduplicated families entered shelter.
Matthew Ayres
Matthew.ayres@co.hennepin.mn.us
612-596-6645