



YOUTH HOUSING OUTCOMES & KPI METHODOLOGY

PURPOSE

This document is intended to:

- 1) itemize details of the FY22 Key Performance Indicator (KPIs)¹ methodology, specifically the measure of youth housing outcomes²,
- 2) explore key takeaways, and
- 3) identify solutions to improve on this measure.

BACKGROUND/CONTEXT

TCP initially presented the FY22 KPIs for the Youth system during the 06/20 Youth Policy Workgroup (WG) meeting which piqued review and discussion across ICH forums, particularly around the rate of permanent housing outcomes between subpopulations.

Feedback from additional discussion with the ICH Youth Committee (CMTE) on 09/18 indicated need for a deep dive on the youth housing outcome data and the ICH's proposed approach for detailing youth system needs and priorities in the ICH Annual Update³.

Subsystem	Served in FY22 (Total Count Experiencing Homelessness)	Housed in FY22 (Exits to Permanent Destinations)	Percent (of Total Served)
Families	1,046	834	79.7%
Veterans (Single)	606	272	44.9%

¹ The KPIs help monitor performance on the District's goals for the Continuum of Care (CoC). TCP as the HMIS and CAHP System Administrator analyzes data to compile the KPIs which are reported on an annual basis following each fiscal year.

² There are five (5) KPIs TCP reports on annually:

- Number of households (families and single persons) served throughout the fiscal year/at PIT
- Number of households exiting the CoC for permanent destinations
- Number of households returning to the CoC after an exit (with 6-12 mos)
- Number of households experiencing homelessness for the first time
- Average length of time households experience homelessness

³ The ICH is legislatively mandated to complete an annual update on system progress to include subpopulation service needs.

Single Adult	7,834	1,281	16.4%
Youth (Single)	931	18	1.9%

DEEP DIVE: YOUTH HOUSING OUTCOMES & FY22 KPI METHODOLOGY

FY22 KPI METHODOLOGY

Following the 08/15 ICH Youth Committee, TCP provided their detailed methodology used to report on the permanent housing outcomes for young adults 18 – 24 years old served in FY22.

- Start: 1,080 people who were under 25 at program entry and/or who were served by a youth provider in FY22. Not all youth were served by youth providers, but also (according to DOB info entered in HMIS by youth providers):
 - 44 people were 25 or older when they entered in FY22
 - 6 had no DOB info
- Of the 1,030 documented youth left (=1,080-44-6)
 - 99 were minors (served mostly by Bruce House) which leaves us with the **931** noted in the KPIs as the number of 18-24 y/o served in FY22. (This is the denominator in the calculation for the KPIs.)
- Of the 931 youth:
 - 194 did not exit their program/the CoC by the end of FY22
 - 495 were served in programs (Adult LBS, COVID response, the Sanctuary) that do not document exit destination (we just know that they were no longer there at the end of FY22).
- Of the 242 remaining:
 - 18 were over age 24 at exit (so they were not counted as a “youth exit”)
 - 152 exited but to non-permanent destinations
 - 53 had inconclusive information regarding both their destination and age at exit (data quality issues, distinct from issues mentioned above where the DQ issue was either related to their destination OR DOB, counted here because there was an issue with both)
- That leaves the 19 youth counted as exiting to permanent housing destinations.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

There are three critical takeaways informed by this methodology review:

1) Data Quality

- a. There are significant data quality concerns that can be immediately addressed both in correcting FY22 data and preparing for the FY23 KPI data pull:
 - i. 53 clients who were served in FY22 but who had inconclusive information on age and destination at exit.
 - ii. There are 495 were served in programs (Adult LBS, COVID response, the Sanctuary) that do not document exit destination (we just know that they were no longer there at the end of FY22). Note that the HMIS workflow for these program types will be updated to require exit destination on other fields to be completed at exit starting in FY24, 10/01/2024.

2) Positive versus Permanent Housing Destinations

- a. Following initial feedback and internal review, youth serving agencies have reviewed their direct program data and have documented discrepancies with the KPI analysis.
- b. TCP notes the distinction between general “positive” or “successful” exits and that of “permanent housing” exits. That is, providers reviewing their data understand that other exits such as reunification with family, relocation out of state, enrollment in college, are positive or successful exits for the youth but are not considered permanent housing exits by HUD⁴ which guides TCP methodology for KPI reporting.
- c. Related system process and implementation flag:
 - i. 44 people were age 25+ when they entered or were served by a youth program in FY22.

3) Housing Supply and System Infrastructure

- a. The issue is specific to unaccompanied young adults with a housing placement rate of ~2%.
- b. Housing outcomes for youth-headed families are 71.5% housing placement rate, on par with the success of the family system at 79.7%.
- c. The contrast between the two categories of youth served:
 - i. All families experiencing homelessness, including youth-headed households, have access to rapid re-housing (RRH) assistance.
 - ii. Single adults, especially young adults, have limited access to RRH slots – 600 District-funded RRH slots for all Single Adults; 18 District-funded RRH slots for Young Adults.

Summary

- Even significant improvement in data quality is only likely to increase the rate of housing outcomes by ~5 -7% to a rate of ~15%, still markedly lower than that of the family system.
- So, although the disparity in youth housing outcomes is fundamentally concerning and although other KPI metrics appear positive, the most impactful solution to improving permanent housing outcomes is an increase in permanent housing resources.

NEXT STEPS

The following next steps were identified, per the discussion and review at the 09/19 ICH Youth CMTE meeting:

- TCP will be pulling reports from HMIS and distributing to providers for data quality checks.
 - Performance Quality Initiative (PQI) reports will be pulled for the last quarter of FY23 before TCP pulls the annual KPI numbers for all of FY23.
 - Providers will have an opportunity to address data quality issues, including updates related to the new workflow changes for outreach and low barrier shelters.
- ICH will incorporate feedback for the next ICH Youth CMTE meeting on 10/31, including:
 - Advancing the Annual Update to reflect feedback from the community
 - Identify ICH Youth CMTE Priorities and Projects for FY24

⁴ <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/4966/system-performance-measure-7-destination-classification/>