

Questions	Evaluation Areas			Outcomes	Equity Review	Data Notes	
	<div style="position: absolute; transform: rotate(-45deg); background-color: #0070c0; color: white; padding: 5px; font-weight: bold;">Compliance/participation of CE providers</div> <div style="position: absolute; transform: rotate(-45deg); background-color: #e67e22; color: white; padding: 5px; font-weight: bold;">Effectiveness of access and referral system</div> <div style="position: absolute; transform: rotate(-45deg); background-color: #27ae60; color: white; padding: 5px; font-weight: bold;">Experience of participants</div>			Overall HHs	BIPOC HHs	% BIPOC	<p>Did participants of different races, ethnicities, or subpopulations experience similar outcomes?</p> <p>BIPOC = Black, Indigenous, or other Person of Color. Based on annual PIT Count and CE data, persons who identify as BIPOC make up 40-45% of the total population of persons experiencing homelessness in the region.</p>
1 How many households were assisted with Housing Problem Solving (HPS)/diversion?	X	X		560	243	43%	Due to data quality issues, HPS data reflects <u>entries</u> within the report period only, not the 713 that have open entries in the report period. DQ also prevents measuring some outcomes from HPS. 116 households entered HPS before October 2022 and had not been exited from HPS as of 3/31/2023, but 47 of those households had been entered into CE. Another 96 appear to have exits from HPS to permanent housing but were assessed into CE. Some remain on the CE list.
2 How many households recorded an HPS event?	X	X		184	73	40%	Possible data quality issues as higher number of HPS events expected. Client detail tab for Diversion not available for HPS outcomes in HMIS, so BIPOC % in this area does not include persons who identify as Hispanic/Latinx and white.
3 How many HPS participants were connected to other resources?	X	X		155	55	35%	Compared to White, non-Hispanic householders, households with BIPOC heads of households were reported less frequently receiving Basic Needs assistance (-15%), Food Stamps/SNAP(-22%), and prevention resources (-9%) in HPS. Hispanic/Latinx households were more likely than non-Hispanic/Latinx households to be connected to those types of assistance (+10-26%) as well as criminal/legal assistance (+8%). Adults with children and youth were also more likely to be connect to resources in HPS than single adults.
4 How many households went on to complete the CE Assessment?	X	X		489	220	45%	See data note on question 1 above. Up to 256 households assessed into CE after HPS appear to be households that do not meet criteria for prioritization in CE (DV, LTH, HUD homeless).
5 How many households received CE assessment without HPS?	X	X	X	309	136	44%	≥56 entries to CE without HPS appear to be households that do not meet criteria for prioritization in CE (DV, LTH, HUD homeless).

Questions	Evaluation Areas			Outcomes	Equity Review		Data Notes
				Overall HHs	BIPOC HHs	% BIPOC	Did participants of different races, ethnicities, or subpopulations experience similar outcomes?
6 How many assessments were phone, virtual, or in-person?	X	X					BIPOC = Black, Indigenous, or other Person of Color. Based on annual PIT Count and CE data, persons who identify as BIPOC make up 40-45% of the total population of persons experiencing homelessness in the region. Working with ICA on a way to calculate this more easily.
7 How many CE households received navigation services?	X	X		102	42	41%	Access to navigation data was limited due to delay in subgrantee program set-up and HMIS set-up. This affected the Mankato area.
8 How many CE referrals were made per opening?		X		5.3	286	42%	687 referrals for 143 openings = 5.3/opening. By project entry type: TH= 2.1, RRH= 4.5, PSH=7.0
9 How many CE referrals resulted in housing with CE-participating programs?	X	X		101	43	43%	Black or African-American householders represented just 24% of successful CE referrals and 24% of move-ins during the period. While data quality issues may cloud outcomes in this area, this is an area for concern as this is 21 percentage points lower than the rate at CE entry. 101 referrals from CE identified as successful with entries to CE housing. However, data quality issues noted above cause an undercount of successful referrals. Initial review of HMIS data found at least 40 program entries that occurred without closing the CE record or which had exits directly from HPS to CE housing. Both of these situations would result in a record appearing as an unsuccessful referral.
10 How many CE referrals were denied and why?	X	X	X	492	205	42%	Overall, Black or African American households were more likely to have unsuccessful referrals reported with these reasons: unable to locate housing, client eligible but provider unable to accept, and eviction history- money owed. Includes referrals categorized as cancelled (156) or declined (336). Most cancelled and declined referrals occur for PSH (68%) although just 45% of openings are in PSH. 39% were reported as unreachable. 14% were reported as client refusals. 6% were denied based on criminal history or rental history. 10% had self-resolved.
11 How many households entering CE were experiencing first time homelessness?		X		258	118	46%	MN First Time Homeless definition used.
12 How many households exited CE to a homeless destination?	X	X		30	11	37%	Reported destination at recorded CE exit. Total 792 exits during 6 month period. 30 exits with homeless destination - 3.7%.
13 How quickly did programs report openings?		X	X				Working with ICA on a way to calculate this more easily.
14 How quickly did programs report results of referrals?		X	X				Working with ICA on a way to calculate this more easily.

Compliance/participation of CE providers
Effectiveness of access and referral system
Experience of participants

Questions	Evaluation Areas			Outcomes	Equity Review	Data Notes
<div style="position: absolute; top: 0; left: 0; width: 100%; height: 100%; transform: rotate(-45deg); background: linear-gradient(to top right, green, orange, blue); opacity: 0.8; pointer-events: none;"> <p style="color: white; font-weight: bold; margin: 0;">Compliance/participation of CE providers</p> <p style="color: white; font-weight: bold; margin: 0;">Effectiveness of access and referral system</p> <p style="color: white; font-weight: bold; margin: 0;">Experience of participants</p> </div>					<p>Did participants of different races, ethnicities, or subpopulations experience similar outcomes?</p>	<p>BIPOC = Black, Indigenous, or other Person of Color. Based on annual PIT Count and CE data, persons who identify as BIPOC make up 40-45% of the total population of persons experiencing homelessness in the region.</p>
				<p>Overall HHs</p> <p>BIPOC HHs</p> <p>% BIPOC</p>		
<p>15 Did any programs fill units outside of CES?</p>	X	X		?		<p>120 housing entries occurred in PSH, RRH, and TH projects during 6-month review period. 101 CE Referrals entered TH, RRH, or PSH. See note on data quality regarding HPS and CE outcomes and exits. Working with ICA on a way to calculate this more easily and with greater detail.</p>
<p>16 How many providers participated in CE Provider meetings to improve CE system?</p>				X	75	<p>75 = total non CoC staff attendees at 4 provider meetings. May include duplicates from month to month. Average per month = 19.</p>
<p>17 How many providers participated in trainings to improve CE system?</p>	X	X		X	21	<p>21= total non CoC staff attendees at 2 CE Assessor and 4 CE Housing Provider trainings. May include duplicates. Average per month = 4.</p>
<p>18 How many providers participated in CE Committee meetings to improve CE system?</p>				X	12	<p>12 = 9 Committee members and 3 other provider staff.</p>
<p>19 How many providers participated in CE DQ to improve CE system?</p>	X	X				<p>Process is currently underway with 15 providers reporting quarter CE DQ. Will have data for next report.</p>