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SWAP Timeline

2/17-4/17
- SWAP page on DMHAS website
- Kick-off webinar
- Follow-up calls
- Orgs asked to confirm accuracy of project info from HIC & provide budgets
- Presented to Reaching Home Steering Committee

5/17-7/2017
- Second request for budget info
- Project data pulled from HMIS for HIC projects → Focus Strategies

8/17-1/18
- Focus Strategies shares draft results with all providers
- Focus Strategies meets with Reaching Home Coordinating Committee
- Melville Trust posts SWAP blog

2/18-4/18
- Presented to CAN leadership
- Webinar on draft results for providers who missed Dec. meeting
- Providers receive HIC project info & budget for review
- Revised HIC project info & budget → Focus Strategies
- Project enrollment data from HMIS → Focus Strategies

5/18-10/2018
- Funders receive draft analysis from Focus Strategies
- Providers invited to SWAP results event
- Projects receive final results
- TODAY! SWAP final event
About Focus Strategies

We believe the HEARTH Act and Opening Doors lead the way to finally ending homelessness.
Data Sources

• Projects on the 2016 Housing Inventory Count (HIC)
  – Emergency shelter, transitional housing, rapid rehousing, permanent supportive housing

• Client data exported from the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)
  – Two years of data (January 2015 through December 2016)

• Project budget data for annual operating cost
## Statewide Facts: Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>2018 System Capacity</th>
<th>2016 Inventory Used for Performance Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Capacity 2018 HIC (Beds)</td>
<td>Total Capacity 2016 HIC (Beds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>3,309</td>
<td>2,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive Housing</td>
<td>6,889</td>
<td>6,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,798</td>
<td>10,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Statewide Facts: Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of System Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoC/ESG</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>$1,844,242</td>
<td>$20,418,766</td>
<td>$12,312,948</td>
<td>$34,575,956</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>$2,688,586</td>
<td>$6,135,010</td>
<td>$2,032,983</td>
<td>$10,856,579</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>$2,259,623</td>
<td>$5,577,068</td>
<td>$1,345,924</td>
<td>$9,182,615</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$44,832,182</td>
<td>$57,395,794</td>
<td>$12,780,775</td>
<td>$115,008,751</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,624,633</strong></td>
<td><strong>$89,526,638</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,472,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>$169,623,901</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>CoC/ESG</td>
<td>Other Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of System Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield County (FC)</td>
<td>$10,914,081</td>
<td>$15,621,101</td>
<td>$9,205,876</td>
<td>$35,741,058</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Hartford (GH)</td>
<td>$11,741,431</td>
<td>$28,583,722</td>
<td>$6,271,094</td>
<td>$46,596,247</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater New Haven (GNH)</td>
<td>$13,884,342</td>
<td>$25,559,663</td>
<td>$6,771,845</td>
<td>$46,215,850</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden/Middlesex/Wallingford (MMW)</td>
<td>$1,650,228</td>
<td>$2,941,914</td>
<td>$507,889</td>
<td>$5,100,031</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central CT (CC)</td>
<td>$2,455,633</td>
<td>$2,644,076</td>
<td>$822,770</td>
<td>$5,922,479</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern CT (NE)</td>
<td>$947,512</td>
<td>$2,060,913</td>
<td>$371,108</td>
<td>$3,379,533</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern CT (SE)</td>
<td>$5,156,589</td>
<td>$8,129,985</td>
<td>$2,960,137</td>
<td>$16,246,711</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterbury/Litchfield (WL)</td>
<td>$4,874,817</td>
<td>$3,985,264</td>
<td>$1,561,911</td>
<td>$10,421,992</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$51,624,633</td>
<td>$89,526,638</td>
<td>$28,472,630</td>
<td>$169,623,901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Statewide System Performance
SWAP Performance Measures

1. Bed/Unit Utilization
2. Entries from Homelessness
3. Length of Stay
4. Exits to Permanent Housing (PH)
5. Cost per Permanent Housing Exit
6. Returns to Homelessness
Bed/Unit Utilization Rate

• Measures whether existing bed capacity is being maximized

• Maximizing available bed capacity is essential to ensuring that system resources are being put to their best use and that as many homeless people are being housed through the existing inventory as possible
Statewide Utilization Rate

- Emergency Shelter: 89%
- Transitional Housing: 79%
- Permanent Supportive Housing: 102%
Length of Stay (LOS)

• Measures how quickly programs are helping households end their homelessness
• Helps identify program and system design and operation inefficiencies
• Long LOS suggests programs may not be adopting a Housing First approach
Statewide Length of Stay

- Emergency Shelter: 97 days
- Transitional Housing: 238 days
- Rapid Rehousing: 191 days
Entries from Homelessness

• Measures how many people enter programs who are unsheltered or living in shelter (literally homeless)

• Indicator of how well system is targeting highest need households

• High rate of entry from housed situations indicates need for changes to Coordinated Entry and/or shelter diversion
Exit to Permanent Housing

• Measures rate of exits to permanent housing
• Helps identify program and system design and operation inefficiencies
• Low rate of exit to PH can indicate system needs more capacity to provide landlord recruitment, housing navigation, housing-focused case management
Statewide Exits

Emergency Shelter (n=6,659)
- Permanent Housing: 38%
- Unsheltered: 17%
- Emergency Shelter: 24%
- Transitional Housing: 12%
- Other: 6%
- Unknown: 3%

Transitional Housing (n=614)
- Permanent Housing: 62%
- Unsheltered: 6%
- Emergency Shelter: 6%
- Transitional Housing: 5%
- Other: 5%
- Unknown: 1%

Rapid Rehousing (n=635)
- Permanent Housing: 75%
- Unsheltered: 7%
- Emergency Shelter: 8%
- Transitional Housing: 5%
- Other: 2%
- Unknown: 3%
Cost Effectiveness: Cost Per PH Exit

- Typically communities consider cost per unit or cost per household
- To be performance-oriented, need to measure cost per permanent housing exit
- Illustrates whether system resources are being invested in interventions that are effective in ending homelessness
- Helps identify system components or individual programs that are not cost effective
Statewide Cost Per Permanent Housing Exit

- Emergency Shelter: $8,972
- Transitional Housing: $29,981
- Rapid Rehousing: $7,903
Returns to Homelessness

• Measures whether people who exited to permanent housing returned to a homeless program within 12 months
• Identifies whether programs are helping people into housing placements that “stick”
• Can help alleviate concerns about serving higher need clients and helping them exit more quickly
Statewide Returns to Homelessness

- Emergency Shelter: 3%
- Transitional Housing: 5%
- Rapid Rehousing: 1%
Summary and Recommendations
Summary of Strengths

• Great strides in reducing homelessness, particularly for veterans and people experiencing chronic homelessness
• Strong efforts to streamline and standardize system access through Coordinated Entry (CANs)
• An impressive level of investment in Permanent Supportive Housing has helped speed the state’s progress in reducing chronic homelessness
• An increased investment in rapid rehousing
Summary of Challenges

• CANs vary in resources available, standardization of processes, and results

• Despite fairly sophisticated CE implementation and shelter diversion, a large number of households enter system from housed locations

• Transitional housing programs underperform compared to rapid rehousing on most measures

• Although there is a positive history of funding PSH, other homeless crisis response elements, including rapid rehousing, are not funded to scale
Recommendations

• Refine Coordinated Entry and Diversion Practices
• Develop Operating Standards and Improve Effectiveness of RRH and TH
• Set System Performance Targets
• Empower the Funders Collaborative to Oversee Implementation of System Improvement Strategies
Refine Coordinated Entry and Diversion Practices

Despite fairly sophisticated CE implementation and shelter diversion, a large number of households enter system from housed locations
CAN Entries from Homelessness: Emergency Shelter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Unsheltered/ES</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Housed</th>
<th>Other/Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNH</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMW</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=975) (n=1,475) (n=1,404) (n=356) (n=244) (n=181) (n=611) (n=786)
CAN Entries from Homelessness: Transitional Housing

- **FC (n=209)**: Unsheltered/ES 21%, Other/Unknown 30%, Institutional 19%, TH 18%, Housed 16%, In-House 6%
- **GH (n=86)**: Unsheltered/ES 33%, Other/Unknown 18%, Institutional 31%, TH 11%, Housed 31%, In-House 17%
- **GNH (n=112)**: Unsheltered/ES 23%, Other/Unknown 23%, Institutional 16%, TH 6%, Housed 1%, In-House 1%
- **MMW (N/A)**: Unsheltered/ES 100%, Other/Unknown 1%, Institutional 1%, TH 1%, Housed 1%
- **CC (n=29)**: Unsheltered/ES 20%, Other/Unknown 7%, Institutional 9%, TH 21%, Housed 7%
- **NE (N/A)**: Unsheltered/ES 63%, Other/Unknown 14%, Institutional 14%, TH 37%, Housed 0%
- **SE (n=98)**: Unsheltered/ES 14%, Other/Unknown 29%, Institutional 29%, TH 30%, Housed 29%, In-House 21%
- **WL (n=27)**: Unsheltered/ES 29%, Other/Unknown 14%, Institutional 14%, TH 37%, Housed 0%
CAN Entries from Homelessness: Rapid Rehousing

- **FC (n=153)**: 68% Unsheltered/ES, 6% TH, 5% Institutional, 16% Housed, 4% Other/Unknown
- **GH (n=233)**: 82% Unsheltered/ES, 2% TH, 1% Institutional, 6% Housed, 8% Other/Unknown
- **GNH (n=81)**: 97% Unsheltered/ES, 1% TH, 2% Institutional, 17% Housed, 2% Other/Unknown
- **MMW (n=6)**: 83% Unsheltered/ES
- **CC (N/A)**: 23% Unsheltered/ES
- **NE (N/A)**: 68% Unsheltered/ES
- **SE (n=94)**: 91% Unsheltered/ES
- **WL (n=40)**: 91% Unsheltered/ES

FocusStrategies.net
CAN Entries from Homelessness: Permanent Supportive Housing

- FC (n=221): 23% Unsheltered/ES, 42% Institutional, 20% Housed, 4% Other/Unknown
- GH (n=154): 8% Unsheltered/ES, 74% Institutional, 25% Housed, 1% Other/Unknown
- GNH (n=257): 5% Unsheltered/ES, 1% Institutional, 16% Housed, 2% Other/Unknown
- MMW (n=5): 63% Unsheltered/ES, 3% Housed, 2% Other/Unknown
- CC (n=22): 97% Unsheltered/ES, 3% Other/Unknown
- NE (n=14): 48% Unsheltered/ES, 3% Other/Unknown
- SE (n=18): 40% Unsheltered/ES, 2% Other/Unknown
- WL (n=37): 91% Unsheltered/ES, 2% Other/Unknown
Refine Coordinated Entry and Diversion Practices

• Explore refinements to CE and shelter diversion to increase literally homeless entries into programs

  1. Determine if 211 (first step of Coordinated Access) consistently screens for literal homelessness;

  2. Offer problem solving/“diversion” to clients at all points (outreach, drop in centers, safety net programs);

  3. Ensure all HHs seeking shelter are engaged in diversion or housing problem solving conversation;
Refine Coordinated Entry and Diversion Practices

4. Ensure all shelters utilize a consistent set of policies, procedures and practices for shelter diversion;

5. Identify funding to ensure that all CANs have resources needed to effectively implement diversion;

6. Revisit the CE prioritization process and policy for TH, RRH and PSH to ensure literal homelessness is strongly considered in prioritization.
Develop Operating Standards and Improve Effectiveness of RRH and TH

• The rate of exit from all interventions to permanent housing is lower than what would be expected in a high performing system, particularly for transitional and rapid rehousing.

• The relatively low rate of return to homelessness from TH and RRH is evidence that these program types may not be targeting the highest need households.
CAN Exits From Transitional Housing

- FC (n=184): 59% Permanent Housing, 15% Unsheltered, 9% Emergency Shelter, 7% Transitional Housing, 4% Other, 2% Unknown
- GH (n=166): 57% Permanent Housing, 24% Unsheltered, 12% Emergency Shelter, 9% Transitional Housing, 4% Other, 2% Unknown
- GNH (n=110): 69% Permanent Housing, 27% Unsheltered, 12% Emergency Shelter, 9% Transitional Housing, 2% Other, 1% Unknown
- MMW (N/A): 94% Permanent Housing, 2% Unsheltered, 1% Emergency Shelter, 1% Transitional Housing, 2% Other, 2% Unknown
- CC (n=33): 56% Permanent Housing, 23% Unsheltered, 2% Emergency Shelter, 14% Transitional Housing, 12% Other, 2% Unknown
- NE (N/A): 61% Permanent Housing, 23% Unsheltered, 2% Emergency Shelter, 14% Transitional Housing, 12% Other, 2% Unknown
- SE (n=88): 61% Permanent Housing, 20% Unsheltered, 2% Emergency Shelter, 14% Transitional Housing, 12% Other, 2% Unknown
- WL (n=33): 2% Permanent Housing, 20% Unsheltered, 2% Emergency Shelter, 14% Transitional Housing, 12% Other, 2% Unknown
CAN Returns to Homelessness:
Transitional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNH</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMW</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAN Exits From Rapid Rehousing

- **FC (n=112)**: 8% Permanent Housing, 6% Unsheltered, 11% Emergency Shelter, 1% Transitional Housing, 1% Other, 55% Unknown
- **GH (n=241)**: 9% Permanent Housing, 1% Unsheltered, 1% Emergency Shelter, 1% Transitional Housing, 18% Other, 77% Unknown
- **GHN (n=116)**: 6% Permanent Housing, 2% Unsheltered, 1% Emergency Shelter, 1% Transitional Housing, 18% Other, 92% Unknown
- **MMW (n=11)**: 18% Permanent Housing, 9% Unsheltered, 9% Emergency Shelter, 1% Transitional Housing, 1% Other, 55% Unknown
- **CC (N/A)**: 9% Permanent Housing, 1% Unsheltered, 1% Emergency Shelter, 1% Transitional Housing, 9% Other, 63% Unknown
- **NE (N/A)**: 27% Permanent Housing, 9% Unsheltered, 1% Emergency Shelter, 1% Transitional Housing, 9% Other, 79% Unknown
- **SE (n=133)**: 63% Permanent Housing, 9% Unsheltered, 1% Emergency Shelter, 1% Transitional Housing, 2% Other, 2% Unknown
- **WL (n=22)**: 13% Permanent Housing, 4% Unsheltered, 2% Emergency Shelter, 1% Transitional Housing, 1% Other, 79% Unknown

Legend:
- Permanent Housing
- Unsheltered
- Emergency Shelter
- Transitional Housing
- Other
- Unknown
CAN Returns to Homelessness: Rapid Rehousing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnh</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMW</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Develop Operating Standards and Improve Effectiveness of RRH and TH

• Transitional Housing - explore whether programs embrace a housing first model, provide housing focused case management, and avoid using mandatory service participation requirements

• Rapid Rehousing – explore whether programs are implemented with fidelity to best practices

• Recommend Funders Collaborative continue to build on existing efforts to develop a framework and standard set of policies and procedures

• Utilize the National Alliance to End Homelessness’s (NAEH) rapid rehousing operating standards for rapid rehousing and progressive engagement.
## Set System Performance Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>RRH</th>
<th>PSH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilization Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Performance (BYC)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Target</td>
<td>improve to 90%</td>
<td>improve to 85%</td>
<td>maintain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Stay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Performance (BYC)</td>
<td>97 days</td>
<td>238 days</td>
<td>191 days</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Target</td>
<td>improve to 45 days</td>
<td>improve to 150 days</td>
<td>improve to 150 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exit Rate to PH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Performance (BYC)</td>
<td>26% (S)/45%(F)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Target</td>
<td>improve to 40%(S)/65%(F)</td>
<td>improve to 80%</td>
<td>improve to 85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeless Entries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Performance (BYC)</td>
<td>24% unsheltered</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Target</td>
<td>Improve to 75%</td>
<td>improve to 60%</td>
<td>improve to 85%</td>
<td>improve to 75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Set System Performance Targets

• Shift gradually to performance-based contracting; support process of performance improvement

• Consider steps to move towards performance-based contracting model
  – Design multi-year process to rollout targets
  – Start with series of conversations with providers/other stakeholders to refine targets and determine their measurement
  – Begin tracking and reporting
  – Only later, begin tying payment to performance; structure to incentivize strong performance rather than penalize for poor performance
Set System Performance Targets

• Performance data need to be valid and replicable

• Recommend:
  – Housing Inventory Count should align with projects in HMIS
  – All projects should be reflected in HMIS
  – Collecting Budget information
Empower Funders Collaborative to Oversee Implementation of System Improvement Strategies

• Acting on recommendations requires a high level of coordination and alignment of funding

• Decentralized structure of the homeless system in Connecticut works to ensure coverage of all regions of the state; also allows a lack of standardization and significant variations in performance among the CANs

• Connecticut has a strong tradition of collaborative governance models; the types of changes indicated by this analysis will be challenging to tackle through collaborative governance.
Empower Funders Collaborative to Oversee Implementation of System Improvement Strategies

• A Funders led initiative is more likely to achieve the desired results.

• Funders Collaborative is playing the role of an overarching governance body using data to identify system strengths and pinpoint areas needing improvement.

• Critical for Funders Collaborative to lead implementation of recommendations by guiding refinement of CE and diversion, holding funding recipients accountable for shifting program models, and establishing and implementing performance targets in a consistent manner across all regions.
For more information...

• For all written correspondence, reports, and webinars go to: www.ct.gov/dmhas/SWAP or www.ctcandata.org

• For data questions contact Beau Anderson @ Beau.Anderson@ct.gov

• For general questions about SWAP contact Steve DiLella @ Steve.DiLella@ct.gov
Funders Collaborative

• Alice Minervino, DMHAS Alice.Minervino@ct.gov
• Kim Karanda, DMHAS Kimberly.Karanda@ct.gov
• Steve DiLella, DOH Steve.DiLella@ct.gov
• Beau Anderson, DOH Beau.Anderson@ct.gov
• Suzanne Piacentini, HUD suzanne.piacentini@hud.gov
• Becca Allen, Melville Trust rallen@melvilletrust.org