



F O C U S
strategies

San Francisco Coordinated Entry Evaluation
Presentation to LHCB

PRESENTERS:

**KATHARINE GALE, PRINCIPAL ASSOCIATE &
TRACY BENNETT, DIRECTOR OF ANALYTICS AND EVALUATION**

JULY 11, 2022

CONTENTS OF REPORT



-
- Evaluation Methodology
 - CE Requirements
 - History and Description of CE in San Francisco
 - Findings from SIP Process
 - ***Evaluation***
 - ***Overarching findings***
 - ***Access and Problem Solving***
 - ***Assessment***
 - ***Prioritization***
 - ***Referral***

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)



FOCUS
strategies

KEY QUANTITATIVE ANALYSES

EQUITY IMPACTS ACROSS COMPONENTS



CE Processes: Equity Impact	Household Type		
	Adult	Family	TAY
Access (relative to 2022 PIT)			
Race		Black over- and Asian underrepresented	Black overrepresented
Ethnicity	Latinx underrepresented	Latinx underrepresented	Latinx underrepresented
Sexual Orientation	LGBQQ+ underrepresented		LGBQQ+ underrepresented
Gender			Female overrepresented
Assessment			
Race	Asian score lower than white	All POC score higher than white	Black score lower than white
Ethnicity		Latinx score lower than non-Latinx	
Sexual Orientation	LGBQQ+ score higher than straight		
Gender	Trans score higher than cis gender		Females score lower than males
Prioritization			
Race	Asian less likely to be prioritized	Latinx less likely to be prioritized	
Referral			
Race	Black and Multiple Race more likely be experience provider denial		All POC more likely be experience provider denial
Ethnicity		Latinx less likely be experience provider denial	

ACCESS FINDINGS



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

Access Location Type	2019	2021	% Change
Total Adult Enrollments	5,406	5,634	+4.2%
Total Family Enrollments	1,353	1,177	-13.5%
Total Youth Enrollments	935	975	+4.3%

EQUITY FINDINGS FOR ACCESS



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

PROBLEM SOLVING FINDINGS



	% With PS Service Before Primary Assessment	Resolution Rate	% With PS Service in PS Status	Resolution Rate	% With PS Service in HR Status	Resolution Rate
Adults	69%	4%	8%	13%	10%	3%
Families	63%	1%	13%	4%	9%	12%
Youth	54%	10%	19%	25%	8%	15%

- 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

Household Type	2019	2021	% Change
Adult			
Average Score	80.5	87.5	+8.7%
Median Score	84	90	+7.1%
Family			
Average Score	50.3	58.0	+15.3%
Median Score	48	59	+22.9%
Youth			
Average Score	72.1	97.4	+35.1%
Median Score	72	105	+45.8%

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS FOR EQUITY



- Adult Households

- Asian households scored lower than white households
- LGBTQQ+ 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



FOCUS
strategies

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

BROADER SYSTEM FINDINGS



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.



F O C U S
strategies

THANK YOU!



(916) 436-1836



FocusStrategies.net



340 S Lemon Ave, STE 1815, Walnut, CA 91789