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Why Data Visualization?

• Data visualization ‘shows’ the story
• Visual images help audiences understand complex ideas quickly
• Inter-related data outcomes can be captured
• Data visualization promotes questions and ideas for cross-system collaboration

A picture is worth a thousand words.....
RRH Data Analytics Project
Phase I - Six Sites

- Salt Lake County, Utah
- Iowa
- Oakland County
- Phoenix
- San Diego
- Memphis
RRH Data Analytics Project – Three Goals

- HMIS Data Pull to Understand RRH Services
- Develop Community Capacity to Visualize/Analyze RRH Data
- Use Data to Establish Local RRH Improvement Plans
Using HMIS Data to Guide Local Commitment to System Performance

Change leadership means:
—thinking big about impact,
—responding to urgent needs, &
—actively tolerating risk.

—Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Advances May 2015, Building A Culture of Health By Working Together
### HUD System Performance Measures

- **System Performance Indicators**
  - Length of episode
  - Return to homelessness
  - Number of homeless persons
  - Job and income growth for homeless persons
  - Number of persons homeless for first time
  - Homeless prevention/placement
  - Successful placement in permanent housing
What’s new from HUD on performance?
What’s new from HUD on Performance?

• System, not project, performance
• System indicators will be scored in 2016
• Importance of scoring will steadily increase
• Will represent the majority of COC score
RRH Data Analytics Project – Theory of Change takes a *System Lens* Focus
CoC Homeless Service System 2013 - 2014

- **Coordinated Assessment and Intake**

- **Diversion / Homelessness Prevention**
  - Support Services Only

- **Emergency Shelter**
  - 9,830 households

- **Perm. Supportive Housing**
  - 1,206 households

- **Rapid Re-Housing**
  - 1,654 households

- **Transitional Housing**
  - 8,342 households

[Diagram showing the flow of homeless service system with various housing options and service types.]
Location of County Rapid Re-Housing and Transitional Housing Providers
CoC Rapid Re-Housing Providers
(Total Households Served 2013-2014)

Each house represents a RRH Provider;
Size of house = # of HHs Served

RRH Family vs. Single

Family 26%
Single 74%
CoC Transitional Housing Entries into TH (TH Programs labeled “Txx”)

Number of Households Served by Each TH Program

- < 20: T64, T34, T26, T24, T20, T70, T91, T51, T19, T38, T86, T89, T57, T47, T35, T45, T53, T73
- 20–49: T18, T37, T72, T88, T25, T79, T39, T84, T31, T52, T49, T23, T87, T33, T56, T36, T80, T41, T40, T54, T61, T75, T85, T48
- 50–99: T27, T42, T30, T71, T63, T76, T60, T62, T65, T81
- 100–199: T29, T55, T43, T77, T67, T90, T68, T44, T21, T22, T82, T32, T74, T16, T28
- 200–499: T46, T59, T17, T50

Txx = Transitional Housing Program

1,773
1,006
859

Rapid Re-Housing Data Dashboard
Program Descriptors
Program Outcomes / Evaluation
Core Component Assessment
Data Quality Issues
Impact HUD System Performance Measures

THE CLODBURST GROUP
Rapid Re-Housing Households - Demographics (unduplicated HHs)

1,654 RRH Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Disability</th>
<th>Substance Abuse Disability</th>
<th>Physical Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transitional Housing Households - Demographics (unduplicated HHs)

8,342 TH Households

5,011

3,331

Mental Disability: 2,885 (35%)
Substance Abuse Disability: 4,043 (48%)
Physical Disability: 2,376 (28%)
Questions:
What RRH quarterly enrollment targets can be set by RRH Provider System?
Rapid Re-Housing Households/Provider:
Average Time(days) Homeless before RRH

Each house represents a RRH Provider;
Size of house = # of HHs Served

Questions:
What is expected length of time homeless before RRH?

Do Providers review whether they have Pre-RRH shelter data for all households?
**Questions:**

What is the expected rate for return to homelessness?

Does the average level of RRH Assistance by Provider correlate to their return to homelessness rate? (Refer $$ in Excel Table)
1. Missing RRH Exit Data

2. Dates that Overlap in RRH Exit and Entry into Shelter

41% of Households Returning to Homelessness entered Shelter before Exiting RRH

1% of households returned to shelter but did not have an exit date from RRH
Driver Diagram – RRH Improvement Plan

Targeted RRH Strategies

- Expand RRH subsidies to 1000 households/year by 12/2015
- Educate community and stakeholders on RRH success by 10/15
- Increase RRH funding sources beyond ESG $$ by 12/15
- Educate and recruit RRH providers - Increase RRH providers 25% by 12/15
### Driver Diagram Process – Define Rapid Re-Housing Improvement Aims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Goal</th>
<th>Aim #1</th>
<th>Aim #2</th>
<th>Aim #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Improve Rapid Re-housing Systems for the Prevention and Ending of Homelessness</td>
<td>Expand Rapid Re-Housing program to 1,000 households per year by June 2016.</td>
<td>Reduce returns to homelessness by persons exiting the Rapid Re-Housing (one year after end of assistance) by 10% by February 2016.</td>
<td>Increase formal partnership with employment resources in communities by May 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sample Diagram For Aim #1 – Primary/Secondary Drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim #1: Expand Rapid Re-Housing program to 1,000 households a year by June 2016.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Drivers:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Increase RRH funding sources beyond ESG resources by 20% by December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Educate and recruit RRH providers, increasing RRH provider capacity by 25% by February 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RRH Data Analytics Project Impacts: System Learning with HMIS Data

- Improved HMIS Data Quality
- System Leaders Assess RRH Services
- Relational interactions of outcomes made visible
- Increased inquiry and dynamic thinking about RRH Issues
- Focused commitment to RRH as a best practice, continuous system improvement