

F&E – ESG-CV Evaluation Debrief

- Rapid ReHousing Projects Reviewed = 3
- Rapid ReHousing Projects Total = 5

F&E – ESG-CV Evaluation Agency

Agency Feedback (1 Agency)

- Uncovered errors in their data, asked for correction in advance
- Sheet was too robust to digest
- Pointed out costs of running RRH programs shouldn't be considered one-sized
 - Factors attributed to cost factors were robust case management supported by higher staff wages, lower case load ratio's and high-touch frequency client visits
 - Participants wrapped by a team approach for a whole person x and x's sustainability post program exit
- Difficult to be asked to compare program to program, and didn't' have opportunity to prepare for this question even though there are various provider meetings (timeframe of evaluation delivery might have prevented this)
- Time to present opportunity felt short

F&E – ESG-CV Evaluation Committee

Committee Member Feedback (2 members)

- Sufficient time be afforded providers for review of their data
- Don't develop consumer input unless it can be a in a credible manner
- Sort data (columns) so it's easier to determine who's seeking funding
- Add data on returns to housing (homeless)
- Improve data summary and include possible cover sheet
- Better way to capture cost per placement
- Ensure data is accurate prior to evaluation information being publicized

F&E – ESG-CV Evaluation Committee

About Returns to Homelessness and Days Homeless

- Both data points are only available through the System Performance Measures
- Unable to pull in any existing compliance report
- Custom report indicates only one household returning to homelessness at the 24-month mark, yet the SPM trends show a five-year average of 19.6% from all PH projects (including PSH)

Accurate Cost Per Enrollment or Exit not quickly obtained since projects in this eval were calculated based on individual contract amounts which didn't include match dollars