

Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program

COLLECTIVE IMPACT EVALUATION, SEMI ANNUAL REPORT



**Measurement
Resources**

Measurement moves missions

Measurement Resources Company

MEASUREMENTRESOURCESCO.COM | 614-947-8899

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Methods..... | 3 |
| Collective Partners..... | 3 |
| YHDP Funded Partners..... | 3 |
| System Partners Not YHDP Funded | 4 |
| Summary of Semi-Annual Report | 4 |
| What Was Done? | 5 |
| Services Provided and Youth Served In Transition-Age Youth Households..... | 5 |
| How Well Was It Done? | 6 |
| Timeliness and Quality of Services..... | 6 |
| Cultural Responsiveness and Developmental Appropriateness of Services..... | 6 |
| Staff Retention | 7 |
| How Are Individual Youth Better Off? | 8 |
| TAY Linked to Prevention, Housing Placement, and Community Services | 8 |
| Eviction Rate | 10 |
| Landlord Engagement and Housing Quality Standards | 10 |
| Conclusion and Recommendations | 10 |
| Appendix A. Data Sources, Limitations, and Compilation | 12 |
| Appendix B. Methodologies..... | 17 |
| Table 1. Total Number of Youth Households Served..... | 17 |
| Table 2. Total Services Provided to Transition-Age Youth, by Program Type | 17 |
| Table 3. Length of Time from Intake to Housing and Community Linkages..... | 17 |
| Table 4. Retention Rate | 18 |
| Table 5. Housing Linkages..... | 18 |
| Table 6. Community Linkages | 18 |

Introduction

Building from quarter one, the Semiannual Evaluation Report summarizes the work of the YHDP collective (including YHDP funded partners and other system partners not funded by YHDP) to reduce youth homelessness through the coordinated community plan. The report identifies what was done, how well it was done, and who was better off because of these efforts during the first and second quarter of fiscal year 2021-2022. To support continuous improvement of the collective, summaries of opportunities to improve service delivery and data tracking are also provided.

Methods

The data in this semi-annual report are derived from the following data sources: partners' internal client tracking, Community Shelter Board's client-level data, and Franklin County Court eviction records. A detailed description of the data sources is found in Appendix A.

Appendix A identifies the quarterly evaluation questions as outlined in the YHDP Evaluation Framework; the data source(s) to answer the question; data limitations uncovered during this quarterly reporting and subsequent action plans for overcoming limitations in future reporting. Some evaluation questions cannot be fully answered during this period due to data limitations, though action plans are in place for collecting and reporting this information in future reports. Answers to evaluation questions in which data were obtained this quarter are summarized in the sections below.

Collective Partners

Through quarter two, eight partners were engaged in the YHDP collective providing services to transition-age youth (TAY) who are at imminent risk of, or literally, homeless. The list of partners and types of services provided to youth are summarized below:

Community Shelter Board (CSB): Community Shelter Board functions as a collective impact organization working to coordinate resources and organizations in Franklin County. CSB works with 20 partner organizations related to homelessness prevention and rapid resolution; street outreach; emergency shelter; rapid rehousing; transitional housing; and permanent supportive housing.

YHDP Funded Partners

Community Housing Network (CHN): CHN is a property manager with permanent supportive housing (PSH) sites across Franklin County. Marsh Brook Place, opened in 2020 and provides 30 one-bedroom apartments and 10 two-bedroom apartments for transition-age youth (TAY) in Franklin County. Huckleberry House provides on-site services for residents.

Home for Families (HFF): Previously the Homeless Families Foundation, Home for Families assists families in achieving housing, economic, and educational stability. HFF uses a housing-first model to place sheltered individuals into housing using rapid rehousing programs and provide targeted housing services for expectant mothers. Further, HFF is linked with Huckleberry House for housing and supportive services for TAY in a transitional housing model. Once connected with housing, all youth receive wraparound services to meet their unique needs. Additionally, through YHDP funding, HFF partners with YMCA to provide rapid rehousing services for single adult TAY.

Huckleberry House (Huck House): Huckleberry House operates through three primary avenues: a crisis shelter and counseling center, the youth outreach program (YOP Shop), and permanent and transitional housing sites funded through Community Shelter Board; Victims of Crime Act; Runaway and Homeless

Youth Program; the Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Health Board; and private funding. Clients become connected with Huck House either through the crisis shelter or the YOP Shop. Once connected to the YOP Shop, eligible youth are enrolled in the coordinated entry system (CES) called the Coordinated Access and Rapid Resolution (CARR) Team. The CARR Team is YHDP-funded. At that point, youth are linked with case management, relevant community services, and housing within or beyond Huck House.

YMCA of Central Ohio: The YMCA of Central Ohio operates the Van Buren emergency shelter. The shelter serves adult men, women, and families. At the shelter, staff provide case management, employment support including workforce development, housing search assistance, and access to resources to meet basic needs (meals, hygiene). YMCA also provides rapid rehousing services and works with HFF to provide these services for single adult TAY.

System Partners Not YHDP Funded

Center for Healthy Families (CHF): The Center for Healthy Families works with pregnant and parenting teens in Franklin County. Under a direct service model, Resource Advocates connect eligible teens with resources to support their education, parenting, relationships, and housing. CHF provides referrals for housing, but does not maintain its own units.

Kaleidoscope Youth Center (KYC): Primarily, KYC functions as a drop-in center which provides access to basic needs, supportive programming, technology, and discussion/community for youth. KYC focuses specifically on LGBTQIA+ youth experiencing, or at risk of, homelessness. KYC has recently expanded its services to launch a VOCA-funded Rapid Rehousing program; Supportive Co-Housing Program; and community volunteer Host Home Network.

Star House: Star House operates as a drop-in center which offers resources to meet homeless youths' immediate needs and provide broader stabilization services including employment opportunities and mentorship. Further, Star House in partnership with Fairfield Homes, operates Carol Stewart Village, a 62-unit youth community with on-site supportive services for residents.

Summary of Semi-Annual Report

Between July 1, 2021 to December 31, 2021, YHDP funded partners served 530 unique transition-age youth through the coordinated entry system. From the time a TAY completes an intake with a YHDP funded partner agency (Huck House CARR Team, CHN Marsh Brook, and HFF/YMCA Transitional Housing or Rapid Rehousing), it takes an average of 86 days for that young person to move into community housing. However, the majority of TAY begin receiving community referrals immediately to address their mental health, health, education, employment, mentorship, and life skills needs. Once exited from the coordinated system, 3 percent of those who have exited have an eviction on record in Franklin County within a year. Results from this semiannual report reinforce the opportunities to continue strengthening the collective impact approach through robust data collection and building partnerships that offer creative solutions for improving TAY experiences.

What Was Done?

Services Provided and Youth Served In Transition-Age Youth Households

In the time period July 1, 2021, to December 31, 2021, there were 530 unique youth served across YHDP funded partners, representing 310 unique households (Table 1).¹ Services provided among partners include outreach, referrals, and linkages to community services (e.g., counseling, enrollment in benefits, food pantry), intakes for housing, and successful linkages to housing (Table 2).

| | Partner | Program | Q1 | YTD |
|------------------------------------|----------------|---|-----------|-------------|
| YHDP Funded | CHN | Marsh Brook Permanent Supportive Housing | 39 | 40 |
| | Huck House | CARR Team Coordinated Entry | 63 | 108 |
| | HFF & YMCA | Transition to Home (TH) | 30 | 35 |
| | HFF & YMCA | Transition to Home (RRH) | 60 | 74 |
| | HFF | Rapid Rehousing | 113 | 149 |
| Non-YHDP Funded | Huck House | Emergency Shelter | 56 | 122 |
| | Huck House | Transitional Housing | 34 | 38 |
| | HFF | Homelessness Prevention | NA | 40 |
| Non-YHDP, Non-CSB Funded*** | KYC | Drop-in Services and Housing (Youth served) | 22 | 24** |
| | CHF | Supportive Services (Youth served) | 27 | 51 |
| | Star House | Drop-In Services (Youth served) | 341 | 632 |

***HFF numbers are duplicated among Rapid Rehousing (RRH) and Joint Transitional Housing (TH); thus, TH numbers are encompassed in the RRH numbers. **Due to data limitations, it cannot be confirmed if there are duplicated clients among Q1 and Q2 clients served. *** Non-YHDP, Non-CSB funded programs reported number of youth served, not number of youth households served.**

| Program Type | Number of Youth Households Served | |
|------------------------------|--|------------|
| | Q1 | YTD |
| Homelessness Prevention | 114 | 180 |
| Street Outreach | 8 | 11 |
| Emergency Shelter | 206 | 369 |
| Transitional Housing | 63 | 73 |
| Rapid Rehousing | 189 | 253 |
| Permanent Supportive Housing | 95 | 97 |
| TOTAL | 580 | 836 |

¹ Sum of the total unique households served by partner organizations will not add up to 310 due to duplicated households served across partner organizations.

How Well Was It Done?

Timeliness and Quality of Services

From the date a partner organization first becomes aware of a youth in need, whether via referral or first contact with the youth, the average length of time a youth waits until intake is 24 days, though the largest number of TAY wait three to seven days (Table 3). The average length of time from intake to housing move-in is 86 days, with the majority of TAY waiting longer than one month. The average length of time between intake and community referrals is 85 days, although the majority of TAY receive referrals on the same day. Once a community referral is made, it takes, on average, 55 days for the referral to materialize, with most materializations taking longer than a month to occur. Improvements from quarter one to quarter two may be due in part to more complete data collection that allows for more accurate analysis. However, the ranges in the length of time measure suggest there is likely an opportunity to improve data tracking systems at the partner level. The large variations in these time measures also suggest an opportunity for strengthening creative partnership throughout the coordinated entry system to ensure more consistent response to TAY housing and referral needs.

| Table 3. Length of Time from Intake to Housing and Community Linkages | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | Time to Intake | Time from Intake to Housing* | Time from Intake to Referrals | Time for Referrals to Materialize |
| Quarter 1 | n = 103 Mean = 39 Days Median = 4 Days Range = (0, 1532) | n = 75 Mean = 88 Days Median = 61 Days Range = (8, 413) | n = 13 Mean = 185 Days Median = 120 Days Range = (0, 656) | n = 26 Mean = 122 Days Median = 93.5 Days Range = (8, 567) |
| Quarter 2 | n = 120 Mean = 11 Days Median = 7 Days Range = (0, 55) | n = 5 Mean = 69 Days Median = 68 Days Range = (41, 116) | n = 79 Mean = 14 Days Median = 0 Days Range = (0, 365) | n = 80 Mean = 16 Days Median = 5 Days Range = (0, 369) |
| Year To Date** | n = 223 Mean = 24 Days Median = 6 Days Range = (0, 1532) | n = 80 Mean = 86 Days Median = 62 Days Range = (8, 413) | n = 75 Mean = 85 Days Median = 0 Days Range = (0, 656) | n = 75 Mean = 55 Days Median = 14 Days Range = (0, 567) |
| Frequency Snapshot (Year to Date) | Same-Day = 24 1-2 Days = 40 3-7 Days = 72 8-30 Days = 68 31+ Days = 19 | Same-Day = N/A 1-2 Days = N/A 3-7 Days = 0 8-30 Days = 13 31+ Days = 67 | Same-Day = 43 1-2 Days = 2 3-7 Days = 1 8-30 Days = 2 31+ Days = 27 | Same-Day = 16 1-2 Days = 4 3-7 Days = 14 8-30 Days = 13 31+ Days = 28 |
| *Same-day move-ins are excluded from calculations. **Only data from unique, non-duplicated clients were used in this table. | | | | |

Cultural Responsiveness and Developmental Appropriateness of Services

The YHDP coordinated, community-wide plan highlighted the need to strengthen the cultural responsiveness and developmental appropriateness of services, particularly for unique populations (i.e., LGBTQIA+, pregnant and parenting, racial and ethnic minority, and justice-involved youth) to support successful youth experiences and outcomes. At this point in time, partners have been provided with standardized questions to measure cultural responsiveness and developmental appropriateness across the collective; however, partners may have not integrated these questions into their surveys, and data is

not currently available. During quarter one focus groups, youth provided positive feedback as to partners’ ability to tailor services to their cultural and developmental needs and preferences.

On average, across the five partners who provided data for this indicator, 57% of direct service providers have completed training related to cultural competency.

Staff Retention

In quarter two, partners reported a total of 24 YHDP direct service providers (DSP) across the five organizations when fully staffed. Partners have lost only one DSP through quarter two. Retention rates are calculated in Table 4.

| Table 4. Retention Rate | | | |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Total YHDP DSP | Total YHDP DSP Lost | YHDP Retention Rate |
| Huck House | 7 | 0 | 100% |
| KYC | 2 | 0 | 100% |
| HFF | 8 | 0 | 100% |
| CHF | 3 | 0 | 100% |
| YMCA | 4 | 1 | 75% |
| TOTAL | 24 | 1 | 96% |
| Note: CHN does not have direct service providers, so they are not currently collecting this data. | | | |

How Are Individual Youth Better Off?

TAY Linked to Prevention, Housing Placement, and Community Services

Partners provided internal client-level tracking data for quarters one and two to capture the number of TAY who received referrals and successful linkages to services². Among YHDP partners with data on referrals and linkages, 74% of all TAY served were reported as having been referred to housing services, and 100% of clients with referrals were reported as having been successfully linked to housing (Table 5).

| | Partner | Program | Number of Youth Served | Number of Housing Referrals | Number Linked to Housing | Percent Referred | Percent Successfully Linked |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| YHDP | CHN (YTD) | Marsh Brook | 40 | 40 | 40 | 100% | 100% |
| | Q1 | | 39 | 39 | 39 | 100% | 100% |
| | Q2 | | 39 | 1 | 1 | 3% | 100% |
| | Huck House (YTD) | CARR Team | 113 | 74 | ~ | 65% | ~ |
| | Q1 | | 48 | 1 | ~ | 2% | ~ |
| | Q2 | | 88 | 73 | ~ | 83% | ~ |
| | HFF (YTD) | Joint Transitional Housing | 16 | 16 | 16 | 100% | 100% |
| | Q1 | | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| | Q2 | | 16 | 16 | 16 | 100% | 100% |
| | HFF (YTD) | Rapid Rehousing | 65 | 24 | 24 | 37% | 100% |
| | Q1 | | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| | Q2 | | 65 | 24 | 24 | 37% | 100% |
| | HFF (YTD) | Overall** | 108 | 61 | 61 | 56% | 100% |
| Q1 | | 77 | 54 | 54 | 70% | 100% | |
| Q2 | | 81 | 40 | 40 | 49% | 100% | |
| Non-YHDP | KYC (YTD) | Non-YHDP | 24*** | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| | Q1 | | 22 | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| | Q2 | | 24 | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| | CHF (YTD) | Non-YHDP | 51 | 39 | ~ | 76% | ~ |
| | Q1 | | 27 | 25 | ~ | 93% | ~ |
| | Q2 | | 34 | 23 | ~ | 68% | ~ |
| <p>*Numbers are based on number of individual youth not youth households. **Program designations were not asked in quarter one; these particular clients may have been served in either HFF's Joint Transitional Housing or HFF's Rapid Rehousing but are listed together here for ease of visualization. ***22 unique but unidentified KYC entries were reported for Q1 and 24 were reported for Q2; the most that can be said about these 46 entries combined is that at least 24 unique clients were served at some point in the YTD.</p> | | | | | | | |

² Note this data reflects reported number of youth served and linked, not number of youth households. Partners likely underreported the data used in these tables, as number of youth served here are lower than those reported for the quarter and YTD in Table 1.

Of all TAY seen by YHDP partners, 89% were given referrals to community services, regardless of the outcome of the referral (Table 6). Year-to-date successful linkages to community services range from 0% to 100%, with an average of 88% across all YHDP partners. This number is skewed due to data limitations in that not all partners track if referrals come to fruition for the client. Additionally, as linkages typically take some time to come to fruition, less than a 100% linkage rate does not necessarily mean unsuccessful linkages, rather that the linkages may have not yet come to fruition in the designated time periods.

Table 6. Community Linkages

| | Partner | Program | Number of Youth Served* | Number of Community Referrals | Number Linked to Community Services | Percent Referred | Percent Successfully Linked |
|-----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| YHDP | CHN (YTD) | Marsh Brook | 40 | 36 | 35 | 90% | 97% |
| | Q1 | | 39 | 1 | 0 | 3% | 0% |
| | Q2 | | 39 | 35 | 35 | 90% | 100% |
| | Huck House (YTD) | CARR Team | 113 | 85 | ~ | 83% | ~ |
| | Q1 | | 48 | 23 | ~ | 48% | ~ |
| | Q2 | | 88 | 71 | ~ | 95% | ~ |
| | HFF (YTD) | Joint Transitional Housing | 16 | 16 | 16 | 100% | 100% |
| | Q1 | | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| | Q2 | | 16 | 16 | 16 | 100% | 100% |
| | HFF (YTD) | Rapid Rehousing | 65 | 65 | 65 | 100% | 100% |
| | Q1 | | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| | Q2 | | 65 | 65 | 65 | 100% | 100% |
| HFF (YTD) | Overall** | 108 | 102 | 81 | 94% | 79% | |
| Q1 | | 77 | 54 | ~ | 70% | ~ | |
| Q2 | | 81 | 81 | 81 | 100% | 100% | |
| Non-YHDP | KYC (YTD) | Non-YHDP | 24*** | 14 | ~ | 58% | ~ |
| | Q1 | | ~ | 13 | ~ | ~ | |
| | Q2 | | 24 | 14 | ~ | ~ | |
| | CHF (YTD) | Non-YHDP | 51 | 50 | 50 | 98% | 100% |
| | Q1 | | 27 | 26 | 26 | 96% | 100% |
| Q2 | | 34 | 34 | 34 | 100% | 100% | |

*Numbers are based on number of individual youth not youth households. **Program designations were not asked in quarter one; these particular clients may have been served in either HFF's Joint Transitional Housing or HFF's Rapid Rehousing but are listed together here for ease of visualization. ***At least 24 unique clients were served at some point in the YTD.

Eviction Rate

Among all youth who have exited YHDP from September 2019 through December 2020 (369 unique youth), in Franklin County, 20 were summoned to court for eviction related cases (5% of total clients exited) within a year of exiting the program. Of the 20³ clients with eviction related cases within a year of exiting the program, 10 were evicted from their property (3% of total clients exited). The remaining 10 individuals unaccounted for either had the case dismissed (8 individuals) or had the case terminated for another reason (2 individuals).

Landlord Engagement and Housing Quality Standards

Partners reported there are 48 landlords engaged in their programs, 28 of which work with the YHDP population. Partners manage a total of 67 YHDP-funded housing units and zero housing units required multiple inspections to pass quality standards.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The Collective Impact system continues to meet its goal of serving transition-age youth in need of housing and community services. Building from quarter one, a refined data collection system has allowed for a more complete analysis of partners' work and impact.

Opportunities to increase the collective's impact on youth are as follows:

Among the Collective, explore opportunities to address quarter one recommendations. Youth perceptions of safety was emphasized as a critical point for which there is a need to identify best practices and resources without compromising youths' success, independence, and the affordability of units. Another carryover recommendation is to incorporate the use of near peer practices where appropriate.

Increase the number of community referrals provided to youth. Regardless of the outcome of the referral, 89% of all TAY seen by YHDP partners were given referrals to community services. While all TAY may have access to information about community services, providing a specific referral and warm handoff may increase the likelihood of a successful linkage. In light of partners' consensus around the need for youth to be "ready" for housing in order to be successful, community referrals may become a priority.

Continue efforts to develop and standardize data collection across collective impact partners. There is an opportunity to provide more support to partners in developing methods to track the outcome of referrals, and specifically whether or not the linkage is successful. Presenting preliminary results to partners may be one method to highlight the interpretation of the data and where there may be gaps to fill.

Decrease the amount of time a youth waits between being referred to an organization and completing an intake. Organizations can capitalize on youths' motivation to engage in services by responding as

³ The following data limitation should be noted: fourteen of the twenty TAY served were matched to Franklin County records on both name and date of birth. Therefore, the evaluation has greater confidence for those 14 cases. The remaining cases were matched on less than two criteria. Therefore, there is less confidence. This speaks to the limitations in linking TAY between multiple systems without a unique system-level client ID.

quickly as possible to all referrals and inquiries, even if only briefly. In this reporting period, the average wait time for intake is 24 days.

Incorporate cultural responsiveness questions into partner surveys. To date, partners have yet to incorporate standard cultural responsiveness questions into regular client-level surveys. This information is key to assessing the cultural and developmental appropriateness of services.

Appendix A. Data Sources, Limitations, and Compilation

CSB Client-Level Data and Franklin County Court Eviction Data

To find the eviction rate for youth served by the YHDP, historic eviction records data for Franklin County were downloaded from their online database and search tool.⁴ These data were joined with client-level data provided by CSB of all TAY who have exited YHDP from September 2019 through September 2021, matching court hearing data to clients where applicable. The data from Community Shelter Board contained 641 unique individuals, 172 of whom had more than one program exit date. In order to count the number of people, and not the number of court appearances, each person's most recent program exit date was used.

The first limitation to this analysis is that eviction records are limited to Franklin County; therefore, if someone exited the program and was later evicted in another county, there will not be a record of that. Additionally, not everyone in the CSB data could be matched to Franklin County records by date of birth, due to incompleteness of data in county records. In these instances, individuals were matched solely by first and last name.

Partner Internal Client Tracking

Building from the quarter one baseline data, one-on-one partner meetings, and final quarter one data, partners were asked at the beginning of January to provide quarter two data for the timeframe of October 1, 2021 to December 31, 2021. Each partner was sent an Excel template indicating all applicable measures for the individual organization including uniform definitions for each measure, to ensure organizations conceptualize the measures correctly and return accurate data for analysis. Data was fully collected by the end of February with any clarifications needed having been addressed.

⁴ Franklin County Municipal Court Records Search, <http://www.fcmclerk.com/case/search>

Table A1 identifies the evaluation questions as outlined in the YHDP Evaluation Framework (numbers in parentheses align with the Coordinated Community Plan Measurement Framework number); the data source(s) to answer the question; data limitations uncovered during this semi-annual reporting and subsequent action plans for overcoming limitations in future reporting. As described in the table, some evaluation questions cannot be fully answered during this timeframe due to data limitations; though action plans are in place for collecting and reporting this information in future reports.

Table A1. Evaluation Questions

| Evaluation Question | Data Source | Data Limitations | Action Plan for Limitations |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>1. What is the average length of time from being identified as “literally homeless,” to “exited to permanent housing” (5)?</p> <p>a. What is a typical journey for a youth from identified as “literally homeless” to a successful exit to permanent housing?</p> | <p>CSB data will be used to assess the average length of time from being identified as “literally homeless,” to “exited to permanent housing”</p> <p>Focus Group data is used to describe a typical journey for youth in this process</p> | <p>Through discussions with CSB, it was decided that reporting on the length of time in interim reports would limit the insights drawn about the full population of youth served under YHDP funding given the limited timeframe.</p> | <p>The average length of time will be reported on in the final, annual evaluation report rather than provided on an interim basis.</p> |
| <p>2. How many near-peer partners are working with youth and how does this effort impact youth outcomes (10)?</p> | <p>Partner Tracking</p> | <p>Discussions with YHDP partners in quarter one revealed that partners lack clarity on the term “near-peer” partners and are not tracking this data. Therefore, Aubre and MRC took an opportunity to re-introduce the partners to the near peer model and encouraged partners to think about how to implement these best practices.</p> | <p>CSB will continue to provide clarity to partners on the role of “near-peer” partners. MRC will implement a data collection strategy for partners to collect and submit this data on a quarterly basis.</p> |

| Evaluation Question | Data Source | Data Limitations | Action Plan for Limitations |
|--|--|--|---|
| 3. What percentage of youth are reporting that services are delivered in a culturally responsive and developmentally appropriate manner (11)? | Partner Youth Surveys and Focus Groups | Partners were not systematically surveying youth to assess the cultural responsiveness and developmentally appropriateness of their services. MRC provided each partner structured survey questions to assess these constructs during quarter one. Focus Group data during quarter one provides insights into this question. | Partners received the survey questions during quarter one. Partners did not provide data for quarter two; MRC will continue to support partners in implementing the survey and overcome barriers to implementation. |
| 4. What percentage of unstably housed youth are linked to prevention and housing placement (13)? | Partner Tracking | CHN data provided are limited to youth successfully housed so youth who were referred to CHN but not housed is unknown. Also, KYC does not currently track individuals' housing status among those they serve and did not provide client identifiers to assess for duplication of individuals served across partners. | MRC will continue to provide partners with data reporting templates to streamline data sharing and meet with partners to discuss opportunities for more complete data collection. |
| 5. What is the current retention rate of staff working with youth experiencing homelessness and how does staff retention impact youth housing outcomes (14)? | Partner Tracking | No limitations to note. | No limitations to note. |
| 6. How many partners are convened/engaged in the coordinated plan and/or efforts aligned to the coordinated plan (20)? | CSB | No limitations to note. | No limitations to note. |

| Evaluation Question | Data Source | Data Limitations | Action Plan for Limitations |
|---|---|--|---|
| 7. What types of initiatives have occurred and how many providers have been trained related to cultural competency/trauma informed best practices (21)? | Biannual collective impact survey | Data for this measure is collected through the biannual collective impact survey which will be completed and analyzed for the Quarter Three report. | No limitations to note. |
| 8. How many youths were linked to other community services (mental health, health, education, employment, mentorship, life skills, etc.) (22)? | Partner Tracking | CHN data provided are limited to youth successfully housed so youth who were referred to CHN but not housed is unknown. Also, KYC does not currently track individuals' referral status among those they serve and did not provide client identifiers to assess for duplication of individuals served across partners. | MRC will continue to provide partners with data reporting templates to streamline data sharing and meet with partners to discuss opportunities for more complete data collection. |
| 9. How many landlords are engaged and providing leases to youth (23)? | Partner Tracking | HFF was unable to provide a total number of landlords engaged (only able to specific number of YHDP-focused landlords), and CHF was unable to specify the number of YHDP-focused landlords. | MRC will meet with partners to discuss opportunities for more complete data collection. |
| 10. How long does it take for a youth to be linked to services (24)? | Partner Tracking | Due to the nature of the referral methods, partners may or may not be able to track whether a referral came to fruition; thus, data on linkage rates is limited. Further, differences in the way partners engage with youth (drop-in, referral, or other) creates variance in the dates and data partners collect. | MRC will meet with partners to discuss opportunities for more complete data collection. |
| 11. What is the eviction rate for youth within one year? How has COVID-19 policies impacted this rate (25)? | CSB Data and Franklin County Court Eviction Records | Data are limited to Franklin County records; if a youth was evicted from a residency in another county, their eviction would not be captured. Further, some court records did not include date of birth (only name) which increases the uncertainty that it is the same individual as reported in CSB data. | No opportunities identified for change. |

| Evaluation Question | Data Source | Data Limitations | Action Plan for Limitations |
|--|---|--|--|
| 12. How many housing units meet quality standards and how does this impact housing outcomes (26)? | Partner Inspection and Reinspection Reports | In light of quarter one limitations, this question has been adapted. | MRC will incorporate questions about housing quality into round two of focus groups. |
| 13. Overall, how well is CSB and the system meeting the objectives outlined in their coordinated community plan? | Collective Impact Survey | No limitations to note. | No limitations to note. |

Appendix B. Methodologies

Table 1. Total Number of Youth Households Served
Data pulled directly from CSB reporting.

Table 2. Total Services Provided to Transition-Age Youth, by Program Type
Data pulled directly from CSB reporting.

Table 3. Length of Time from Intake to Housing and Community Linkages
Using data from only YHDP funded partners (Huck House CARR Team, CHN Marsh Brook, and HFF/YMCA Rapid Rehousing and Transitional Housing), data was separated into Quarter One (Q1) and Quarter Two (Q2) reports. Any client IDs that were duplicated within a partner's data from Q1 to Q2 (i.e. the client was reported as served in Q1, and then re-reported in Q2 by the same partner) were eliminated from the data set (one occurrence). Columns were calculated using the following approaches:

1. Time to Intake: For all rows with a referral date and an intake date, the time between referral and intake was calculated using the function: =DAYS(Intake Date, Referral Date). If no referral date was present, but there was a date of first contact (indicating the youth likely walked in lieu of being referred to the organization), the time was calculated using the function =DAYS(Intake Date, Date of First Contact). Then, using the numbers resulting from the function, the mean, median, and range were calculated using the corresponding Excel functions for Q1 data only, Q2 data only, and combined Year-to-Date (YTD) data.
2. Time from Intake to Housing: For all rows with both an intake date and a move-in date, the time between intake and housing was calculated using the function: =DAYS(Move In Date, Intake Date). Then, using the numbers resulting from the function, the mean, median, and range were calculated using the corresponding Excel functions. This was repeated with Q1 data only, Q2 data only, and combined YTD data.
3. Time from Intake to Community Referrals: For all rows with both an intake date and a date on which community referrals were given, the time between intake and referrals was calculated using the function: =DAYS(Referral Date, Intake Date). For Q1, no YHDP partner was able to provide a date that referrals were given for any client; therefore, this figure was only applicable for Q2 data. Using the numbers resulting from the function, the mean, median, and range were calculated using the corresponding Excel functions.
4. Time for Referrals to Materialize: For all rows with both a referral date and a date that referrals materialized, the time between referrals being given and referrals coming to fruition was calculated using the function: =DAYS(Date Referral Materialized, Date Referral Given). For Q1, no YHDP partner was able to provide a date that referrals were given for any client; therefore, this figure was only applicable for Q2 data. Using the numbers resulting from the function, the mean, median, and range were calculated using the corresponding Excel functions.

Note. Listwise deletion was performed for negative, missing, or blank values for the above calculations

Table 4. Retention Rate

Partners provided this information as part of the data request. Partners indicated the total number of YHDP Direct Service Providers in their program and the total number of YHDP DSPs lost during the data collection timeframe. From this, a retention rate was calculated.

Table 5. Housing Linkages

Data was cleaned to eliminate any client IDs that were duplicated within a partner's data from Quarter One to Quarter Two (i.e. the client was reported as served in Quarter One, and then re-reported in Quarter Two by the same partner; one occurrence). Then, data was sorted according to partner and quarter to identify the number of clients served in the data set provided; the number of housing referrals given; and the number with a confirmed move-in (linkage). Percentages were then calculated to identify of the total clients served, what percent are given referrals to housing, and what percent are successfully linked. The evaluation framework and thus the data request does not provide further specificity as to what it meant when partners report a referral to housing and/or what type of housing the client moves into.

Table 6. Community Linkages

Data was cleaned to eliminate any client IDs that were duplicated within a partner's data from Quarter One to Quarter Two (i.e. the client was reported as served in Quarter One, and then re-reported in Quarter Two by the same partner; one occurrence). Then, data was sorted according to partner and quarter to identify the number of clients served in the data set provided; the number of community referrals given; and the number with a confirmation date that the referral came to fruition (linkage). Percentages were then calculated to identify of the total clients served, what percent are given referrals to community services, and what percent are successfully linked. The evaluation framework and thus the data request does not provide further specificity as to what it meant when partners report a referral to community services and/or what type of community service the client is connected to.