

# CESH Systems Mapping & Gaps Analysis: Context, Process, and Foundational Research Questions

## Systems Mapping & Gaps Analysis Overview

In 2019, the Sacramento Continuum of Care (CoC) began a Systems Mapping and Gaps Analysis process focused on the homelessness system of care. In February 2020, the CoC's Systems Performance Committee (SPC) identified client level eligibility, access, and flow as the main topics of focus during this process. In order to best understand the complexity of these topics, four systems mapping work products are being developed:

- Work Product #1: Visual Maps Showing Client Referral Pathways
- Work Product #2: Eligibility Matrix of Projects
- Work Product #3: Tableau Dashboards Showing Movements Between Projects
- Work Product #4: Case Study of Full Client Pathways

## Systems Mapping Work Product Purpose

The four Systems Mapping work products will serve as the basis for answering the “Foundational Research Questions” (please see pg. 2), as well as build the CoC's understanding of how client-level eligibility, access, and flow currently look in Sacramento's homelessness system of care. After exploring and building understanding of all four of the work products and the nuances of the system of care, the SPC will identify any additional, deeper level questions, which will be incorporated in the Gaps Analysis.

## SPC Feedback Process

In order to cultivate a deeper understanding of each work product with SPC members, Homebase and Sacramento Steps Forward (SSF) are rolling out each work product in three distinct steps:

1. **Approach:** SSF and Homebase develop a proposed framework and methodology for each work product and present to the SPC for feedback on approach. This step provides SPC members the opportunity to suggest any changes to methodology and approach before SSF and Homebase dedicate significant hours to developing the relevant product.

2. **Preview:** In a later meeting, SSF and Homebase will bring a preliminary version of each work product to the SPC members. At this point, the work product is in draft form. This step allows the SPC to react to a more tangible, non-theoretical version of the work product in order to offer additional feedback on components like the structure of the work product or the scope before the draft is finalized.
3. **Final Presentation & Analysis:** This step will occur after each work product is finalized. Analysis of each work product will focus on the “Foundational Research Questions” developed below. Once this Analysis has been presented, the SPC will be asked for feedback on that Analysis and to identify which of the findings it wants to explore more deeply – these decisions will form the basis of the Gaps Analysis.

## Foundational Research Questions

The following questions were developed based on over 30 qualitative interviews with key stakeholders and input from multiple CoC Committees, including the SPC. These are key questions for understanding client-level access, eligibility, and flow through the homelessness system of care. The answers to each question will be explored by a combination of different Systems Mapping Work Products, as denoted with parentheses below.

1. How do folks access and flow into Sacramento's homeless-dedicated housing projects? (Work Product 1, 2, 3, 4)
  1. Are there any locations where barriers to entry could be reduced or simplified? (Work Product 1, 2)
  2. How do subpopulations (e.g., chronically homeless, families, veterans, transition aged youth) compare in the way they flow through Sacramento's homeless-dedicated housing projects? (Work Product 4)

### *Goals with Gaps Analysis:*

- *Identify barriers to access & opportunities to enhance access, create efficiencies, and facilitate system flow*
2. What are the differences in access, eligibility, and client flow between the different referral systems (i.e., Coordinated Entry, Dept. of Behavioral Health Services, emergency shelter, County-funded permanent supportive housing, rapid re-housing, transitional housing)? (Work Product 1, 2)
    1. What are some successful examples from other communities on connecting these resources?

2. What are some successful examples from other communities on how to best facilitate flow between these systems?

*Goals with Gaps Analysis:*

- *Identify key similarities and differences between the various referral systems in Sacramento & identify opportunities for greater collaboration.*

3. How do temporary housing locations/supports (i.e., emergency shelter, transitional housing, rapid re-housing, or street outreach) connect clients to permanent housing? (Work Product 1, 3)

1. Why are some projects of the same type having more success connecting clients to permanent housing destinations than others? (Work Product 3)

*Goals with Gaps Analysis:*

- *Identify which of the projects are having more success and understand why they are having more success.*

# CESH System Mapping & Gaps Analysis: June Progress Report

Data Collection Phase	Description of Progress Made Since May
Data Phase 1: HMIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HB/SSF working together on a new HMIS data pull for the following range: 7/1/2018 to 6/10/2020. The updated data will be used in WP 3 and 4.</li> </ul>
Data Phase 2: Non-HMIS Participating HIC Providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HB sent surveys to the 15 HIC projects that were not otherwise participating in HMIS.</li> </ul>
Data Phase 3: Non-HMIS, Non-HIC Homelessness Providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial list of projects for Phase 3 of Data Collection reviewed by select SPC members.</li> </ul>

Work Product	Description of Progress Made Since May
WP 1: Visual Maps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinated Entry Visual Map reviewed by the Combined CE Committee.</li> </ul>
WP 2: Eligibility Matrix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HIC provider data (Phase 2 of Data Collection) added to the Eligibility Matrix.</li> <li>Draft Eligibility Matrix ready for SPC member feedback.</li> </ul>
WP 3: Tableau Movement Dashboards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HB started process of transferring ownership of Tableau Movement Dashboards to SSF.</li> <li>HB begins outreach to street outreach and rapid re-housing providers for “special considerations” around their HMIS data to support WP 3 analysis.</li> </ul>
WP 4: HMIS Client-Flow Case Study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HMIS Client-Flow Case Study Proposed Approach ready for SPC member feedback.</li> </ul>



## System Performance Committee Agenda

Thursday, June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2020 from 9-11 AM

### Zoom Meeting Information:

<https://homebasecc.zoom.us/j/91674911453>

<b>I. Welcome &amp; Introductions:</b> Noel Kammermann, Chair		
<b>II. New Business:</b>		
<b>A. Action Item:</b> PIT Subcommittee Update	<b>Presenter(s):</b> Noel Kammermann, Chair & Michele Watts, SSF	<b>Time:</b> 10 minutes
<b>B. Informational:</b> System Performance Measures: RTH Spotlight – What’s Next?	<b>Presenter(s):</b> Homebase	<b>Time:</b> 10 minutes
<b>C. Items for Feedback/Discussion:</b> CESH Work Products <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Approach:</u> <b>HMIS Client Flow Case Studies</b> Proposed Approach – Work Product #4</li> <li>2. <u>Preview:</u> <b>Eligibility Matrix</b> – Work Product #2</li> <li>3. <u>Preview:</u> <b>Phase 3 of Data Collection:</b> Non-HMIS, non-HIC Participating Partners</li> <li>4. <u>Informational:</u> Combined CE Committee Feedback on <b>CE Visual Map</b> – Work Product #1</li> </ol>	<b>Presenter(s):</b> Homebase	<b>Time:</b> 100 minutes
<b>III. Review of new agenda items for next meeting</b>		
<b>IV. Announcements</b>		
<b>V. Meeting Adjourned</b>		

For questions about accessibility or to request accommodations please contact Alexa Jenkins at [ajenkins@sacstepsforward.org](mailto:ajenkins@sacstepsforward.org) or 916-577-9769. Two weeks advance notice will allow us to provide seamless access.

# HMIS Client Flow Case Studies Proposed Approach (Work Product 4)

## Purpose

The Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Client Flow Case Studies is the fourth work product aligned with the California Emergency Solutions and Housing (CESH) systems mapping effort. **This work product will analyze how a sample of individuals move through the homeless system of care from their first project enrollment until their exit.** As opposed to the Tableau Movement Dashboards (Work Product 3) and the Visual Maps (Work Product 1), this work product will not draw conclusions about pathways in aggregate, but instead seeks to provide a closer look at the complexity of the various pathways that individual clients may take through Sacramento's homeless system of care.

## Topic of Focus

It would be difficult to draw useful information from studying the entire population of clients in Sacramento, given that there are numerous unique pathways that any one client could take. Therefore, Homebase proposes analyzing samples of pathways from **specific subpopulations**. As previously discussed with SSF, the proposed subpopulations of focus are individuals who are **chronically homeless, veterans, families, and transition aged youth (TAY)**.

This work product will focus on “**pathways**,” defined as a chain of two or more movements (or 3+ enrollments). For example, a pathway could consist of the following two movements: client moves from Agency A to B, and then from Agency B to C. This pathway contains three enrollments total across Agency A, B, and C.

Please note: because HUD's STELLA program provides an analysis of pathways by project type, this analysis would focus on specific agencies, or project types by agency.

## Proposed Approach/Methodology

In order to pull a representative sample of individuals for each subpopulation, Homebase proposes the following approach:

1. Sacramento Steps Forward (SSF) and Homebase will work together to pull a **new dataset** that includes information about chronic homelessness and families.
2. Homebase will filter the dataset to show only those individuals who:
  - a. Have a **pathway** (i.e. 3 or more enrollments) that

- b. Ended in a **permanent exit** and
  - c. Did not return to the system for **6 or more months**.
3. Homebase will **pull a sample** of 10% for each subpopulation. For example, there were 182 veterans who followed a pathway between 2017-2019; therefore, the sample of veterans would be 18. Similarly, there were 190 TAY individuals between the ages of 18 and 24. Given a 10% sampling method, this would mean a sample of 19.
  4. Homebase will assess the samples to look for commonalities/ similarities in pathways. See *Example Analysis Questions* for an idea of what will be answered through this process.
  5. Homebase will increase the sample size if it is deemed necessary for additional insights.

### Example Analysis Questions

- a. What is the length of time between a client's enrollment in Program A and their eventual exit to a permanent destination? How does this change by number of enrollments? How does this change by subpopulation?
- b. Are individuals in certain subpopulations accessing programs intended for them (e.g., Did veterans experiencing homelessness at some point access a veteran program during their full pathway? Did TAY individuals experiencing homelessness access TAY service providers?)?
- c. Are clients of the same subpopulation following similar pathways? Are they moving through programs in a similar order?

### Questions for Consideration

- Are there any other questions of interest for this analysis?

# May SPC System Performance Measures (SPMs) Break Out Group Notes

## Returns to Homelessness Breakout Group #1: Permanent Housing Strategy

<p><b>Returns to Homelessness Strategy</b> (as written in 2019 application)</p>	<p>Diversify the types of permanent housing available in order to support all population types and reduce returns to homelessness.</p> <p><b>Comment: This group had trouble with the strategy as stated. It was felt that the Returns to Homelessness Strategy should be more focused on extending services customized to each individual into the post-PSH or post-RRH phase of a client's life rather than developing types of alternative housing. Some discussion of board and care as whether this was best described as a variation of housing type or a variation of supportive services.</b></p>
<p><b>Current Key Efforts and Stakeholders</b> (as written in 2019 application)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinated Entry administrators take previous housing type into account when deciding interventions.</li> <li>• In 2018, Coordinated Entry completed 30 transfers between permanent housing destinations to prevent evictions. Transfers can be initiated by clients or providers. Transfers to prevent eviction take priority over the community queue.</li> <li>• In 2019, Sacramento County received \$8.1 million for additional housing services to improve permanent supportive housing and other permanent housing retention including a property liaison and landlord point of contact.</li> </ul>
<p><b>What data analysis or questions</b> need to be <b>answered</b> in order to develop and implement this strategy?</p>	<p>HMIS only records very coarse data about the individual. The PSH housing project and associated service providers know much more. Data needs to be obtained from such providers to get a realistic sense of what the population exiting from PSH needs as services, whether they are transitional or ongoing, etc.</p>
<p><b>Who are the other stakeholders</b> that should be involved in developing, implementing, and monitoring this strategy (including leveraging existing CoC Committees)?</p>	<p>All rapid rehousing and PSH program operators and service providers of their clientele should be involved to develop much richer data about the needs of those exiting from housing.</p>



<p><b>How should success be measured?</b></p>	<p>Group did not discuss question. Mike Jaske's opinion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better data collection critical to seeing any improvement</li> <li>• the poor data now in HMIS does not offer any explanation of "why" only the "what" of return to homelessness</li> <li>• perhaps a pilot program tracking several hundred persons over multiple years could generate sufficient data to measure improvements if/when more customized services were offered, which might then justify expansion to the entire exiting population</li> </ul>
<p><b>What are the key next steps</b> for making strides on this strategy moving forward?</p>	<p>Group did not discuss question. Mike Jaske's opinion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Get the problem statement and hypothesis down on paper</li> <li>• Brainstorm and select a method for testing, perhaps at pre-pilot scale, and then if successful at pilot scale</li> <li>• Find at least two program RRH and PSH program operators and their service providers willing to engage in this experiment</li> <li>• Devise a selection method that does not impose any new burden of exiters so if assigned to the "control group" without supportive services they would be no worse off than today</li> <li>• Find the money to implement experiment and associated data collection</li> <li>• Go for it!</li> </ul>

## Returns to Homelessness Breakout Group #2: Connections to Mainstream Benefits & Life Skills

<p><b>Returns to Homelessness Strategy</b> (as written in 2019 application)</p>	<p>Improve connections to mainstream benefits and promote life skills development prior to and after clients move into permanent housing, in order to reduce returns to homelessness.</p>
<p><b>Current Key Efforts and Stakeholders</b> (as written in 2019 application)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2019, Sacramento County received \$8.1 million for <b>additional housing</b> services to improve permanent supportive housing and other permanent housing retention including a property liaison and landlord point of contact.</li> <li>• RIL completed a pilot Rental Assistance project, which checks in on individuals exiting homelessness <b>one month after housing</b> to provide additional resources and case management and provides <b>an independent living skills training</b> focused for individuals exiting homelessness.</li> <li>• Turning Point’s Pathways to Success After Homelessness program provides 24/7 on-call support &amp; ongoing psychiatric care to individuals with serious mental illness so they retain permanent housing <b>after exiting homelessness</b>. In FY2017-18, 68.7% (374 total) of clients had 0 homeless days while receiving support.</li> </ul>
<p><b>What data analysis or questions</b> need to be <b>answered</b> in order to develop and implement this strategy?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the additional housing services, that Sac County has the 8.1 millions</li> <li>• Need clarification: different type of services for retention (for those currently housed); when folks lose housing they may not show back up in the system, RTH measurements is a flawed measurements – can we broaden out to capture those who are not reflected In HMIS             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How many people retain their housing @ 1,3,6,12 months (and what are the markers for success</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Need more information around who RTH b/c loss of income, loss of benefits (what difference does it make for those who have benefits or not)             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ex. We current house many people with zero income, we need strategies for employment (and data analysis to understand who is losing their housing b/c no money/employment/adequate connection to mainstream resources – need to drill down on the data)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do we set folks up for life skills before housing – what life skills work ahead of placement into housing, that improve likelihood of self-resolving --</li> <li>• Want to know (1) why people are leaving housing (job loss, rental increase, mental health, medical issues, substance) and (2) on services side, in terms of preparation, there is workshopping and education happening (pay for utilities, rental before its due – behaviors of a good tenant) and maintaining health/income (3) other relevant services (ex. Childcare)             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Examine program to program</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Mainstream and life skills are different – strategies need to be developed specifically, under each*</li> </ul>
<p><b>Who are the other stakeholders</b> that should be involved in developing, implementing, and monitoring this strategy (including leveraging existing CoC Committees)?</p>	
<p><b>How should success be measured?</b></p>	
<p><b>What are the key next steps</b> for making strides on this strategy moving forward?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Develop tight intensive case management tailored to life skills and mainstream (around the transition moments – post move); critical time intervention</li> </ul>

## Return to Homelessness Breakout Group #3: Prevention & Diversion for Formerly Homeless Individuals

<p><b>Returns to Homelessness Strategy</b> (as written in 2019 application)</p>	<p>Fund prevention &amp; diversion targeting formerly homeless individuals in order to reduce returns to homelessness.</p>
<p><b>Current Key Efforts and Stakeholders</b> (as written in 2019 application)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several programs provide financial assistance to households at risk including housing repairs, legal services, benefits counseling &amp; one-time rental assistance</li> </ul>
<p><b>What data analysis or questions</b> need to be <b>answered</b> in order to develop and implement this strategy?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does Prevention services prevent folks from returning to homelessness in 24 months?</li> <li>• What aspects of prevention are working? What programs are successful?</li> <li>• Sub-populations – are there some sub-pops who benefit more from Prevention &amp; Diversion programs? Are there generic strategies that help everyone equally?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Who are the other stakeholders</b> that should be involved in developing, implementing, and monitoring this strategy (including leveraging existing CoC Committees)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other prevention program providers – develop a working group? HMIS struggles with services-only. Possibly interview other communities that are using prevention pools or tracking prevention services using HMIS</li> </ul>
<p><b>How should success be measured?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 24 months without a return to homelessness</li> <li>• Equity in prevention services</li> <li>• Feedback loop from prevention service providers (quarterly) – What services are in demand? More information is needed to determine success</li> </ul>
<p><b>What are the key next steps</b> for making strides on this strategy moving forward?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Form the prevention program working group             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Inventory the existing providers</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Look at communities using HMIS to track prevention services</li> <li>• Continue to work on racial disparity analysis in returners</li> </ul>

## Returns to Homelessness Breakout Group #4: Landlord Support and Engagement

<p><b>Returns to Homelessness Strategy</b> (as written in HHAP application)</p>	<p>Establish supports for landlords who are renting to formerly homeless individuals or providers, in order to reduce the number of evictions and returns to homelessness.</p>
<p><b>Current Key Efforts and Stakeholders</b> (as written in HHAP application)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CoC has designated \$850,000 of HHAP funding to Landlord Engagement.</li> <li>• County FHP program</li> <li>• City Pathways to Health and Home</li> <li>• SHRA has assigned a person to Landlord Engagement (landlord liaison)</li> </ul>
<p><b>What data analysis or questions</b> need to be <b>answered</b> in order to develop and implement this strategy?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problem separately engaging with landlords, landlords pitting us against each other</li> <li>• Need coordination so that we are not competing against each other</li> <li>• Who will manage the funding, what will the funding go toward?</li> <li>• What is the average amount of damage that happens to a unit that makes a landlord not want to participate in the future?</li> <li>• Average cost of an eviction, what benefit do we provide to prevent an eviction. So that we can move people before they are evicted.</li> <li>• With the current Landlord Engagement programs, which are most successful?</li> <li>• Need to look at evictions during the time period we are studying. Find out from landlords why people are being evicted. Ask landlords what could have been done to prevent the evictions. If we have the data then we can look at the why and use analysis to look at problem areas.</li> <li>• Accommodations for disabled, many are needing various accommodations, help with landlord education</li> <li>• Pet deposits – assistance with that</li> <li>• Need to also talk to the person who was evicted, why they think they were evicted – get both sides of the story. What we might have done to support them to stay housed.</li> <li>• Provider, landlord and client – each of their thoughts about why evicted, and what could have prevented the eviction</li> </ul>

<p><b>Who are the other stakeholders</b> that should be involved in developing, implementing, and monitoring this strategy (including leveraging existing CoC Committees)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CA Apt Association</li> <li>• CA Landlord Association</li> <li>• Metro Chamber</li> <li>• Legal Services of No Cal</li> <li>• Providers who support people being evicted</li> <li>• Disability rights</li> <li>• Veterans groups who assist with Landlord Engagement and eviction</li> <li>• Mental Health Full Service Partnerships who support people in PH</li> </ul>
<p><b>How should success be measured?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase # of landlords willing to work with us</li> <li>• # evictions prevented – this might be hard to get as a data point</li> <li>• Reduction of evictions</li> </ul>
<p><b>What are the key next steps</b> for making strides on this strategy moving forward?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Looking at the data, need the data for analysis</li> <li>• Start engaging the stakeholders</li> <li>• Need a coordinator/convener of the effort</li> </ul>