

Chapter 9: Oversight, Governance and Evaluation

While Moving On initiatives vary in size and scope, nearly all programs involve multiple collaborating organizations, including supportive housing providers, local/state housing agencies, CoCs, human service agencies, and private foundations. Programs should develop some kind of management or governance structure in order to ensure that 1) programs are operating successfully and meeting specified goals, 2) partnering agencies are communicating effectively, 3) decisions are being made efficiently and collaboratively, and 4) all players (organizations or individuals) are held accountable for fulfilling their identified roles and responsibilities in the initiative. In addition, as a critical project management tool, programs should include a well-defined performance measurement and impact evaluation component that drive a continual quality improvement process.

Program Management/Governance

The structure and intensity of program management will vary depending on the size and scope of the initiative. In some cases, a single supportive housing provider ó like the Jericho Project in New York or First Place for Youth in San Francisco ó may create a Moving On component within their program. In such cases where there may be a few partnering agencies but programs are relatively self-contained, project oversight may simply involve someone in a high-level management position overseeing staff and operations, monitoring performance, managing resources and reporting outcomes to funders.

Projects that involve multiple collaborating agencies - like the initiatives in Detroit, Los Angeles, New York and Chicago ó may require more complex or formal governance structures to oversee the initiative. For example, in Chicago, the initiative formed several work groups that were tasked to review policies and procedures, collect data, track outcomes and monitor and oversee operations. In Detroit and New York, programs developed an inter-agency õtaskforceö (NY) or õreview boardö (MI) comprised of key representatives from all partnering agencies. These governance committees are responsible for monitoring program operations, troubleshooting barriers to implementation, managing and acquiring resources (e.g., vouchers), facilitating inter-agency coordination and tracking performance. In Detroit, the review board also reviews all tenant applications for Moving Up and provide the final approval for a voucher. Collaborating agencies also developed and signed Memorandums of Understanding in order to formalize partnerships and hold agencies accountable for their respective roles in the initiative.



Program Evaluation and Performance Tracking

In order to build an effective program and ensure its sustainability, Moving On programs need to develop systems, processes and resources for collecting data, tracking outcomes and measuring impact. These data should be used to help programs assess whether they are meeting targeted outcomes, understand what is working and what is not, take corrective actions when necessary to improve performance, and demonstrate impact to key stakeholders. To track performance as close to oreal-timeö as possible, programs should consider developing and maintaining a bi-weekly or monthly dashboard that tracks program outcomes.

Table 9.1 lists some examples of possible data elements and indicators that programs can track - at the tenant and program level - to monitor processes and outcomes. Data sources for these indicators might include administrative data (e.g., public housing data, HMIS), program data (intake/assessments, program budgets, case management documentation), pre/post transition tenant surveys, and other data collection tools.

Data Elements	Key Questions	Indicators
Tenant	What is the demographic profile of movers?	- Race, Gender, Age
Characteristics		- Household size
		- Health/behavioral health diagnoses
Tenant engagement	Is the program effectively targeting the right	- Total # of applications
and targeting	tenants?	- # eligible/# screened
		- % tenants accepted
		- % with 2+ years stable housing
		- % with any prior rent arrears in past 2
		years
		- % with a felony history
		- Self- sufficiency matrix scores
Barriers to Mobility	Is the program successful in connecting	- # moved/# accepted
	interested tenants to new housing	- # connected to a voucher
		- Reasons for non-placement
Housing/Retention	How successful were movers in retaining	- % stably housed at 6, 12,18 and 24
	housing after leaving supportive housing?	months post-transition
		- % moved to
	Where are tenants moving to?	 Own apt/home (subsidized)
		 Own apt/home (unsubsidized)
	Is the program promoting housing choice?	o Family/friends
		- % tenants report having a good choice of
		housing options



Data Elements	Key Questions	Indicators
Tenant Quality of Life	Were tenants satisfied with their new housingWere tenants able to gain/maintain	% tenants satisfied with new housing/neighborhood% employed or stable income source at
	employment? Did tenants feel connected to their community and neighbors?	 6, 12, 18 months post-transition 7 report feeling connected to new community
Service Quality	- How satisfied were tenants with pre- transition, transition and post-transition services?	 % tenants satisfied with services # contacts and hours of services provided
Program Impact on community efforts to end homelessness	 Is the program increasing supportive housing capacity in the community Was the Moving On initiative effective at targeting PSH vacancies to more vulnerable households? How efficiently did programs fill vacancies 	 # of SH units created from tenants moving on #/% of vacancies filled with chronically homeless individuals Average # days to lease up vacant units
Cost Effectiveness	- Is the program cost effective?	- Program costs vs estimated savings

Aside from these quantitative measures, programs should conduct periodic interviews with key partners and participants (tenants, case managers, supervisors, program administrators, etc.) to gather information on how well the program is being implemented and to highlight key challenges, successes and lessons learned that can be used to inform the continual quality improvement process.

In addition to program performance tracking, there is a great need to support more rigorous independent research on Moving On initiatives to gain a clearer understanding of best practices, cost-effectiveness and impact on long-term tenant and system-level outcomes. While a few Moving On programs that have tracked and documented their outcomes demonstrate promising results with respect to post-transition housing stability and tenant engagement¹, very little formal research has been published on this topic². Just recently, CSH released an evaluation report of the Moving On program in Los Angeles conducted by Harder and Co., which documents promising results around post-transition housing stability and highlights best practices and key lessons learned from the program. In addition, an independent evaluation of the New York Moving On initiative is currently underway and has the potential to meaningfully inform the field and future efforts to successfully replicate these efforts elsewhere.

CSH Moving On Toolkit

¹ See these resources for outcomes documented in Moving On programs in Chicago and New York: http://www.csh.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Moving-On-from-PSH.pdf; http://b.3cdn.net/naeh/e9e96a83affb80593a sgm6bpvhk.pdf;

² See this link for a study of a Moving On project in Seattle: http://www.kingcounty.gov/~/media/health/MHSA/documents/LTE_REPORT_9_29_11.ashx?la=en_



Chapter 10: Moving On Costs and Funding Strategies

