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Center for Innovation through Data Intelligence (CIDI)

- CIDI is a data analytics team under the Deputy Mayor for Health and Human Services

- Mission: To improve coordination and quality of services provided by NYC’s Health and Human Service agencies and other non-HHS agencies
  - Informing citywide policy
  - Analyzing cross-agency policy issues
  - Conducting independent research
  - Utilizing data from a variety of agency sources
Chelsea Foyer at the Christopher

- Opened in 2004. Based on Foyer model developed in the UK
- Provides 40 homeless, runaway, and foster care youth, ages 18-25, with supported transitional housing
- Funding from multiple public & private contracts
- Residents participate in a personalized program of services for up to 24 months
- *Services infused with Good Shepherd Services’ signature strength-based youth development practices*
Chelsea Foyer at the Christopher

Key Program Components

- Rigorous Application Process
- Contract and Action Plan
- Limited Structure/High Expectations
- On-Site Support Services
- Program Fee
- Workforce Development Culture

On-Site Support Services

- Case Management Services
- Life-Skills Development
- Workforce Development
- Community Building
- Housing and Aftercare Services
Evaluation Logic Model

Program Components

- Life-Skills Development
- Limited Structure & High Expectations
- Program Fee
- Case Management Services
- Workforce Development
- Community Building
- Housing and Aftercare Services

Outcome

- Stable Housing
- Safety and Security
- Resources
- Educational Attainment
- Employment

Measurement

- Emergency shelter stays
- Incarceration
- Access to financial supports (SNAP, Cash Assistance, Medicaid, SSI) as needed
- High school graduation/GED and higher education
- Employment and earnings
Building on Existing Evaluation Framework

A. DEFINE
Program Planning

B. MEASURE
Data Collection & Management

C. LEARN
Analysis & Reporting

D. IMPROVE
Using Findings and Insights

- **MEASURE**: Collect meaningful outcome data in a broader context
- **MEASURE**: Examine longer term outcomes that are not reliant on participant reporting
- **LEARN**: Analyze specific program impact through the use of a comparison group

Source: Adapted from Eckart-Queenan & Forti (2011)
Evaluation Design

- Comparison Group: applied for NY/NY III and were found eligible under Population I, but were not placed in housing through this program

- Quasi-experimental evaluation using a propensity score matched comparison group → matched using demographic characteristics and service use in two years prior to start date

- Measured outcomes during two time periods:
  - Two years after program start date or first eligibility date
  - One year after exit date (or proxy)
Outcomes were measured by matching program data with NYC administrative data

- Human Resources Administration (HRA): Cash Assistance and SNAP benefit receipt, Medicaid expenses, SSI status
- Department of Homeless Services (DHS): Stays in single adult homeless shelters and family shelters
- Department of Correction (DOC): Jail stays

Analysis: Modified Poisson regression to calculate relative risk of service use
Demographics of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n=297)</th>
<th>Comparison Group: Unplaced NY3 (n=159)</th>
<th>Chelsea Foyer Participants (n=138)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean age in years (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Service Use in Two Years Prior to Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Total (n=297)</th>
<th>Comparison Group: Unplaced NY3 (n=159)</th>
<th>Chelsea Foyer Participants (n=138)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACS Foster Care</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC Jail Stays</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS Single Adult Shelter</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS Family Shelter</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA SNAP</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA Cash Assistance</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reduction in Service Use Two Years after Start Date

DHS Single Adult Shelter
- Comparison Group (n=159): 28.9%
- Foyer Participants (n=138): 16.7%

DOC Jail
- Comparison Group (n=159): 16.4%
- Foyer Participants (n=138): 6.5%
Reduction in Service Use

- Significant overall impact on single adult shelter and jail use from the start date through two years

- Foyer participants were 36% less likely to have a stay in the single adult shelter system

- Foyer participants were 55% less likely to go to jail
Additional Service Use

- In the two years after start date, Foyer participants had:
  - lower rates of DHS family shelter stays and cash assistance than the comparison group but these did not reach significance
  - lower rates of SSI use but this was explained by differences in rates of mental health diagnoses
  - equal rate of Medicaid use
  - higher rate of SNAP usage (not significant)

- During the period one year after exit, Foyer participants had lower rates of service utilization relative to the comparison group (except for SNAP), but these did not reach significance
Limitations

- Analyses conducted on a small sample size due to program capacity and data availability
- Matching large administrative datasets with small samples
- Comparison group was constructed based on known characteristics
  - Unable to match on juvenile justice and probation contact
  - Unable to match on mental health diagnoses, although relationships remained after controlling for mental health
  - Did not have outcome data from Runaway and Homeless Youth Shelters
Programmatic Implications

- Contact with jail and the single adult shelter system in the two years prior to the start were also found to have a large impact on subsequent contact with those systems.
  - Develop extra supports for individuals who enter the Foyer with prior system involvement.
  - Cultivate networks within social service and criminal justice systems to improve continuity of care for Foyer participants.
Policy Implications

- Lower rates of homeless shelter stays and jail stays for Foyer participants point to the benefits of expanding this program model.
- Provides evidence that the Foyer model was beneficial for a broader at-risk group than previously defined.
- Policy and funding mechanisms should reflect this new definition of at-risk youth who can benefit from supportive housing.
- Main stream funding designed to finance model through city, state and federal agreements.
Research Implications

- Through the use of administrative data, participant outcomes can be tracked across multiple systems for longer periods.
- Develop standards of best practices for evaluation using administrative data.
- A multi-system research agenda is vital to capturing a range of outcomes that are relevant to both city agencies and non-profits.
- Research on at-risk youth should be expanded to include other vulnerable youth in addition to those aging out of foster care.
Looking Forward…

- Examination of differences in duration of stays and associated costs
- Further integration of program data to assess impact of:
  - Length of stay and program engagement
  - Individual characteristics
  - Changes in program model over time
- Addition of longer-term data as it becomes available
Thank you!

Learn more about the Chelsea Foyer at the Christopher program model at Session III. A at 3:15PM!