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EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

• Mixed methods design

• Qualitative Information
  • Document review
  • HSH Staff and City Department Interviews
  • Participant and Provider Surveys, Interviews, and Focus Groups (conducted by Homebase)

• Quantitative Information
  • ONE System data (Coordinated Entry enrollments, primary assessments, problem solving services, housing navigation services, and housing referrals)
KEY QUANTITATIVE ANALYSES
# EQUITY IMPACTS ACROSS COMPONENTS

## CE Processes: Equity Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>TAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access (relative to 2022 PIT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Black over- and Asian underrepresented</td>
<td>Black overrepresented</td>
<td>Black overrepresented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Latinx underrepresented</td>
<td>Latinx underrepresented</td>
<td>Latinx underrepresented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>LGBQQ+ underrepresented</td>
<td>LGBQQ+ underrepresented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female overrepresented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Asian score lower than white</td>
<td>All POC score higher than white</td>
<td>Black score lower than white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Latinx score lower than non-Latinx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>LGBQQ+ score higher than straight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Trans score higher than cis gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>Females score lower than males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prioritization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Asian less likely to be prioritized</td>
<td>Latinx less likely to be prioritized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Black and Multiple Race more likely be experience provider denial</td>
<td>All POC more likely be experience provider denial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Latinx less likely to be experience provider denial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACCESS FINDINGS

- Similar levels of enrollment for adults and youth in 2019 and 2021, lower for families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Location Type</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Adult Enrollments</td>
<td>5,406</td>
<td>5,634</td>
<td>+4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Family Enrollments</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Youth Enrollments</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>+4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EQUITY FINDINGS FOR ACCESS

- Adults
  - Latinx and LGBQQ+ households are underrepresented among those accessing CE

- Families
  - Black or African American headed households may be overrepresented and Latinx headed households may be underrepresented among those accessing CE

- Youth
  - Black or African American and female households are overrepresented and Latinx and LGBQQ+ households are underrepresented among those accessing CE
## PROBLEM SOLVING FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% With PS Service Before Primary Assessment</th>
<th>Resolution Rate</th>
<th>% With PS Service in PS Status</th>
<th>Resolution Rate</th>
<th>% With PS Service in HR Status</th>
<th>Resolution Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Highest Initial Participation by Adults
- Highest Success Rate for Youth
- Lowest success rate with families and families in Housing Referral Status have more resolutions than Problem Solving Status Families
### ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

- Increases in the average assessment score over time for all populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>+8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>+7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>+15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>+22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>+35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>+45.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSESSMENT FINDINGS FOR EQUITY

• Adult Households
  • Asian households scored lower than white households
  • LGBQQ+ households scored higher than straight households
  • Transgender households scored higher than cis-gender males or females

• Family Households
  • Latinx headed households scored lower than non-Latinx headed households
  • Families headed by Black, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander and those identifying as multiple races scored higher than white heads of households

• Youth Households
  • Black youth scored lower than white youth
  • Female youth scored lower than male youth
EQUITY FINDINGS IN PRIORITIZATION

- Asian adults were *less* likely to be placed on a community queue compared to white adults
- Families with a Hispanic/Latinx head of household *less* likely to be placed on a community queue compared to families with non-Hispanic/Latinx heads of household.
- Families with a Black head of household were *more* likely to be placed on a community queue compared to families with white heads of household.
- Youth households had no equity findings
REFERRAL FINDINGS

- Adult and youth populations showed significant increases in the number of days between enrollment in CE and referral to housing
  - Lack of clarity from the data around what accounts for those lags
- Families showed slight decreases in the number of days between enrollment in CE and referral to housing
REFERRAL FINDINGS

• All populations showed
  • Increased number of households referred to Permanent Housing, including Rapid Rehousing
  • Increase in the rate of expired referrals

• Adult and Youth populations showed
  • Increase in the rate of participants refusing a referral

• No disparities in referral rates but equity findings in denial rates by providers
  • Adults & youth identifying as Black or multiple races were more likely to have provider denied housing referral
  • Latinx-headed families were less likely to have at least one housing referral denied by a provider
REPORT FINDINGS AND CONSIDERATIONS FOR NEXT PHASE
TYPES OF FINDINGS

- Overarching Findings (Apply to all of Coordinated Entry)
- Broader System Findings
- Component Findings
  - Access
  - Assessment and Prioritization
  - Referral
FINDINGS ACROSS COMPONENTS

- System generally meets federal requirements
- Need for greater transparency, clearer policies and communication
- Complexity and lack of standardization
- Challenges in both data collection and utilization
- Limited and inconsistent training
- Lack of regular involvement of community in oversight and quality assurance
- Equity impacts in all components of CE
Concerns related to the overall homelessness response system

• Shortage of inventory, especially housing, for all who need it
• Need for more services within the PSH portfolio and new types of inventory that can serve very high-needs person
• High vacancies have CE implications but also impacted by maintenance and staffing issues, process steps and perceived desirability of the housing

Dissatisfaction with coordinated entry is tightly related to these broader system concerns and perceptions, but changes to CE alone will not address these factors.
ACCESS FINDINGS

• People experiencing homelessness do not know where to receive help and some are frustrated by lack of help received from Access Points

• Recommendations from community to move access to more places where people experiencing homelessness are (shelters, jail, food sites, encampments)

Phase 2 Planning Considerations

• Balance between number of places/types of access, and ensuring fair, equitable and high-quality service

• Ensuring access methods chosen are well-understood in community
PROBLEM SOLVING

• Participants reported mixed experience with Problem Solving, some found useful and others not or not sure
• Community stakeholders concerned that Problem Solving is not an appropriate intervention and perceived as second-best outcome

Phase 2 Planning Considerations
• Improving use of and outcomes from PS flexible funding and services
• Considering where and when PS happens and whether required step
ASSESSMENT AND PRIORITIZATION FINDINGS

- Community finds assessment process unclear, “unnecessarily invasive” and that does not get to information relevant to determining what people need to address their homelessness
- Community has strong concerns regarding equity (not necessarily on same populations as the data supports)
- Strong objections to the use of thresholds and statuses, and prioritization done based on inventory
- Concern prioritization does not target for specific interventions, especially for ones that people can be successful in
PHASE 2 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

• Begin process with establishing local criteria and values for prioritization; then address changes to these or adoption of other tools

• Consider whether to use priority thresholds, intervention specific pools or a complete By Name List
  • Note that Prioritization is required and everyone will not get their preferred or most appropriate resource
  • Trade offs of letting people know right away versus creating expectations that may not be fulfilled
REFERRAL FINDINGS

• Concerns regarding inappropriate referrals and lack of information needed to match those with specific needs
• Length of time it takes to get into housing
• Equity findings regarding denial rates

Phase 2 Planning Considerations
• Consider whether to streamline/centralize referrals
• Assessment changes to improve matching information
• Address slow housing pace and disparate denial rates
OTHER IMPLICATIONS FOR REDESIGN PHASE

- **Process and Oversight** improvements include stakeholder participation in planning and ongoing, greater intentional focus on equity, strengthening governance, quality assurance, annual evaluation

- **Data and Documentation** include clear and complete documentation, regularly published data, and performance metrics

- Other **system considerations** such as inventory growth and reducing housing barriers also need to be addressed but are not CE issues
CONCLUSION

• San Francisco CE meets most Federal requirements and mostly aligns with design intent

• Many challenges have been surfaced about the CE process through this evaluation, including in CE implementation and in the perception and understanding of it

• Communities across the country have had to revisit or redesign their CE system once it has operated for a while. Concerns regarding complexity, equity, prioritization, timeliness and appropriate matching to resources are common factors driving CE redesign.
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