



**[00:00:00] Janis:** --evaluations piece next. On the track of what we were just asking, thinking now specifically, we've talked about what you want to see and think about overall. If you're currently involved in Moving On programs, what are the specific data points that you are tracking right now, the specific metrics that are being captured. If you're not involved with the program yet, you know what specific data are you interested in seeing. Some of that, I think you've got to in that overall piece, but just wondering if anyone has any specific data elements that they are currently tracking right now.

**[pause 00:00:42]**

Time and program, entry to exit, that's a great one that can give you some averages right of how long people are staying in supportive housing when they're interested in Moving On. Tracking duplication of services, household size. Household size is great, we know that that can create barriers sometimes if people are having trouble finding the size of units in the community or whatever it is they're tracking, SPDAT Scores and length in program.

I'm interested in whoever said that are the SPDATs done while, continuing while they're in housing regularly and it's their score at exit or is it the score at entry to the program? Also tracking what type of PHA they go into, a number of referrals, these milestones like lease up that really helps from the process side. Impact of housing and viral load changes, that's really interesting. Returns to homelessness, absolutely.

Success rate, viral suppression specifically and the impact of housing. Great, we're going to talk about a couple of these things. It sounds like some folks are tracking some key items already. Oh, and I see the SPDATs are done quarterly in your program while in PSH. Great, just some key basics about data elements. They should help you assess whether your target outcomes are being met, whatever those target outcomes are. They should help provide a better understanding about what's working, what's not working, how things can be improved.

It helps to demonstrate the impact of your program to your funders, to your providers, to the people experiencing homelessness in your community and all your other stakeholders. It helps you track performance. Those metrics about number of referrals based on milestones, like to lease up, really, the more data points you collect along that timeline, the more you can figure out where there is success happening, where things are moving smoothly, where there are bottlenecks and things are slowing down.

Dashboards are really helpful. If you can think about updating them regularly just thinking about how people are moving through your program and where they might be getting stuck and where you can improve. It's really important for outcomes tracking for Moving On and all of your programs to be able to be desegregated or separated by race and ethnicity. This can help you look at variances in how people are entering the program, getting access to resources, how many people are able to



lease-up, go through different stages of the process, and can help you make changes as needed if there are inequities that are surfacing.

We've got a couple of resources here about data and equity and racial disparities and disproportionality. Coleen is dropping the links in here too. Just want to also touch on Moving On data tracking in HMIS. The 2022 HMIS data standards which has been released include a Moving On data element. It's really exciting. This is a program-specific element, it's going to be for HUD CoC programs to be used by permanent supportive housing providers.

It will help you indicate which households are being served by a Moving On program if it's something that you offer and what general types of services you're receiving. We put out this data element to help us track how many households are engaging in Moving On programs and what are the exits looking like because we know that not everyone who starts a Moving On program ends up exiting.

There are a lot of different reasons that they may or may not, so what that rate looks like and that also helps us understand where are there returns to homelessness by people who moved on who had been in a PSH so that we can take a look at that across programs and systems. There's more information in the data standards themselves, but I just wanted to show you here, it's elements C2.

It's Federal Partner Program Data Element, Continuum of Care and then C2 Moving On systems provided. You'll see there's a date of these systems provided and then a couple of things here that are options for services. Did you help them with housing application? For example, if you're using emergency housing factors for Moving On, did your staff help them fill out the emergency housing voucher application through the public housing agency?

Two, if you provided financial assistance, if you're giving them help for the security deposit for moving expenses for moving trucks or services, or furniture for housing application fees, whatever else that financial assistance might entail. If that's something that's being offered, then you'll mark that. As well as nonfinancial assistance, housing navigation or transition support, all those services that we talked about in previous webinars on services, housing referral, or placements.

That's just if you're making a referral to, say a public housing agency like you're doing that, whether or not you're providing other supports that's one and then other there's a place to specify. This is going to be an element that's tracked for the head of household because it's really the whole household that we're looking at, it wouldn't be for individual members. It's applicable just to permit for the housing projects. It's going to happen at the occurrence point.

When you're providing the services, you might be entering this more than once if you're providing different services at different times to someone. We've got some links in here for the data standards and an interactive data standards tool for if you want more information about this. Just a couple of key categories for outcomes



tracking, and we're going to talk through some of these more. Demographics are important baseline information.

You want to think about outputs. How many applications are being completed, how many free things are people attending, just what are those different output levels. Then thinking about tenant outcomes, people who have moved on, what are different outcomes for them in different areas? Think about what are the systems-level outcomes and then thinking about equity. Demographics, we just have a couple of things listed here as examples for what you could be thinking about.

You're going to want to know who's interested in Moving On and also who makes it through all the steps of the process. You're going to want to look potentially at things like race, gender, age, the household type and size, is it individuals, it's families, what size, the length of time in permit supportive housing which I know a few people mentioned that they already track. You might want to track health and behavioral health diagnoses if you have these in records. This is something that we'll hear a little bit about from Dr. [unintelligible 00:09:24] in some of the evaluation stuff that they've done.

Income is also something to keep track of potentially. In terms of services. We have the services in the HMIS list but you might want to go even more specific to your own community and dig in a little more. Thinking about how many applicants are there, how many are eligible based on whatever your local assessment and eligibility processes are.

Remember we have that webinar all about assessment and referral processes from a couple of weeks ago that you can refer to, thinking about numbers of households that have been assisted with applications to public housing agencies, to affordable housing buildings, or such other subsidies or resources, the number that are actually connected, that receive that voucher, how many households are receiving transitions for services and flexible financial support, just like we have captured in that Moving On data element?

As you can see, there are a lot of different possible information sources as we go through these different outputs. It's a balancing act in the community, figuring out where can we get information from our public housing agency that's relevant, Where can we get information from providers, where does the CoC have information and who holds that? It's important to try to have someone in a coordinating role that can keep track of all this and really figure out how to look at the bigger picture of all the pieces working together.

Some tenant-level outcomes, just some basic ones that you can take a look at are households that are successfully leasing up in their either current unit, if they're transitioning at place or to a new unit, what kinds of housing destination types tenants are Moving On to, are they moving into their own private housing with those subsidy or are they moving into a public housing unit or onto a housing voucher? You can see that in HMIS or you're putting that into each HMIS if you're that provider.

File name: Moving On Webinar Series Moving On Outcomes Tracking and Evaluations-20210602 1816-1.mp4



Another key indicator is who's withdrawing from Moving On, and then just thinking about why, what are the barriers that kept them from making it through to that lease-up? Then looking at that housing stability at different intervals after Moving On is really important. Emmy's going to talk more about all that stuff that we've seen in other programs, which is going to be exciting. A couple of systems-level outcomes, what percentage of tenants are receiving vouchers through your program, this can help you look at how effective are our screening tools, are we referring the right people?

The length of time from housing application to lease-up because I know someone mentioned is really important, we talked about that before. On a systems level, how many units are made available through the Moving On program and how that maybe impacts your PSH turnover rate. Then how it impacts your ability to enter people into PSH who have been experiencing homelessness and really need that high level of services and support is tremendously impactful.

Finally equity, as I said before, we want to see where are there differences potentially in the rates of success with Moving On, with housing stability, just where are there differences in outcome based on different factors? Then how do we change our programs to see how we can reduce those inequities and provide appropriate support for everyone.

As we've been saying throughout the training series, you're going to need to really work with an inclusive group of stakeholders, including black people, indigenous people, other people of color, other people from historically marginalized populations, and people with lived experience in supportive housing and with Moving On, to understand where there are issues that are driving those inequities that you see.

Where is it, landlord discrimination that's really an issue with leasing up successfully, or where are there other challenges that are creating and driving those inequities at the program level and how do you change your resources that you're offering, the services that are available and whatever supports and assessment processes. How do you just think about all the process changes that you can make to really advance equity? Qualitative feedback is going to be really important.

talked a lot about just some quantitative metrics there, but this is really critical, especially getting information from the people most impacted by Moving On programs as well as your implementing partners. For anyone who's been here before in this training series, you'll know that we started off by doing a focus group with people with lived experience of Moving On, whether it's through programs or on their own to guide our development of this training series. It gave us really helpful information about people's experiences with the programs. Getting that qualitative information at every program level is really important too.

That'll help you make sure that you're responsive to local needs. Whether you're creating a program from scratch or you're modifying an existing program, you're going to want to think about, "Who's this impacting most," especially if you have a

File name: Moving On Webinar Series Moving On Outcomes Tracking and Evaluations-20210602 1816-1.mp4



program, "Who is withdrawn or been unable to move on or has re-entered homelessness. Where could we have changed something to help that household and what can we do different in the future?"

It's important to make sure that people with lived experience are involved in this ongoing implementation decision-making and are compensated for their time and expertise. This is really critical. Getting information from participants, helps you really understand their experience, what went well, what was challenging, what they wished they'd had in the program. It helps you document some key challenges or barriers. Just asking what participants think would be helpful or what would've been helpful can really help to make some small tweaks or big changes that can improve your program.

Getting feedback from implementation partners is important. It's important to do this very regularly, especially when you're getting a program going, and then when you're in implementation so that you can identify any challenges, where are there issues that are related to coordination that are holding up lease-ups?

Meeting regularly with key partners and getting their feedback, helps you just evaluate what's going on with the program, helps you think about what is going well that you should keep doing more of, what lessons you've learned and what challenges that you need to work through, and then how you can modify the program to continue to improve outcomes.

Now, I'm excited to turn it over to Dr. Emmy Tiderington, who I've been working with for many years now on Moving On, to talk all about the evaluation side of all this. After that, we'll have time for questions, Dr. Tiderington, and then we'll have time for questions at the end for everyone as well. Take it away.

**[00:17:31] Emmy Tiderington:** Thanks, Janis. Hope everyone is doing well this afternoon and I appreciate you all being here. I'm really excited to be here today. This is an area of research that I'm particularly interested in. I used to work in supportive housing and witnessed some successful Moving On through the PSH program that I was working in and I'm interested in this type of research to improve this model. I'm excited to see these many other people here, also interested in this topic.

A big thanks to CSH and HUD for including me in this session. For my part of the presentation, I just wanted to highlight some of the previous Moving On initiative evaluations and outcome assessments that have been done. My hope is that by seeing what other evaluators have done in the past, you can take away some of their lessons learned from these efforts and what they've done and apply them to your own work and thinking about how to customize an evaluation to your particular program and initiative.

Janis, I think you're moving the slides forward, if you're able to. Great, thank you. Specifically today, I'm going to present preliminary findings from a scoping review that I recently completed with co-authors Jordan Goodwin and **[unintelligible]**

File name: Moving On Webinar Series Moving On Outcomes Tracking and Evaluations-20210602 1816-1.mp4



**00:18:57]** This review looked across all publicly available and Moving On initiative evaluations that are out there, documentation of mover outcomes in other resources.

I'm going to talk a little bit about the lessons learned from this review, what are the implications for these findings, how can we improve the overall quality and scope of Moving On data question? I'm going to provide some examples of outcome measures and tools that have been used in previous evaluations. Then based on my experience as evaluating the New York cities 2015 Moving On initiative, I wanted to present some of my lessons learned from that evaluation.

Hopefully, we can avoid some potential pitfalls and challenges that anyone you could encounter if you're interested in evaluating Moving On initiative. I will propose some strategies for improving evaluations and tips for getting your own evaluation off the ground. I look forward to hearing your thoughts on this work during the Q&A and I'm happy to receive your feedback and your ideas on what can be done to improve Moving On initiative outcomes tracking evaluation. Max, thank you. Why do a scoping review of Moving On initiatives outcomes what is a scoping review?

There are no reviews, to my knowledge of Moving On initiatives mover outcomes to date that have used rigorous research methods to systematically look across the initiatives that have happened so far. This means we don't know for sure whether these programs are a 100% successful across the board. Maybe there's just a handful of one-off successful Moving On initiatives with positive outcomes. Maybe there are some that are not so successful. It'd be good to know what's being measured in these initiatives, how these outcomes are being measured and this will help us improve future evaluation efforts and ultimately, the implementation of these initiatives.

The research questions that we were interested in answering for this review are what are the most common mover outcomes being tracked in the evaluations, what are the least common, what do we know about the size of these initiatives and and also what do we know about the rates of housing retention and other mover outcomes? In other words how are folks doing after leaving PSH through these initiatives? I saw in the chat that folks have the same question. We we don't want to be moving people on if they don't do well on the end up homeless again. We'll talk a little bit about that today.

The next slide, as I mentioned, we want it to be systematic and rigorous in conducting this review. We followed-- this is our methods here. Arcsine O'Malley's scoping review methods. We use Prisma guidelines for reporting these findings. We only included sources that were available in English and the most current version and that recorded either qualitative or quantitative findings on moving rates of housing retention, the percent of applicants who moved on or other Moving On outcomes at the participant level.

We did not exclude publications outside of the US and there were no date restrictions on the search. However the only reports that we did find outside of the US that met our inclusion criteria were source and a Moving On initiative in  
File name: Moving On Webinar Series Moving On Outcomes Tracking and Evaluations-20210602 1816-1.mp4



Vancouver Canada that we found through one of our subject matter experts. To our knowledge from our review, this is primarily a US phenomenon with Canada coming up behind us. Of course if you all know of others out there, we'd love to hear about them.

The purpose of this review was to map the literature rather than to assess the quality of this evidence. We're not here to pass judgment on the evaluators methods or the rigor of these evaluations. One limitation to note is that we may have some evaluations in this review given that we were only looking for publicly available reports or those that were provided to us by subject matter experts who are familiar with these evaluations. These findings might have looked different where we privy to all Moving On initiative evaluations ever done including any internal evaluations that programs might have.

The next slide if you can move it forward. This is where we got our sources, the search included six major research databases. We searched Google for any gray literature which has sources outside of peer reviewed journals and included evaluation reports that were provided to us by five subject matter experts were familiar with Moving On. From this initial search we gathered 413 total sources to be reviewed against our inclusion criteria. Again, this is when you search a major research database using the search terms Moving On discharge graduation et cetera, you're going to pull in a ton of sources and then they need to be narrowed down and evaluated to see if they actually are talking about Moving On initiative, because that can pull in a lot.

If you go to the next slide this is the-- tiny lettering here but this was our screening procedure. In a nutshell we reviewed the 413 sources for any duplicates and their relevance to those study questions. We excluded those in which Moving On initiative was not described. We excluded sources that might have mentioned a Moving On initiative but didn't describe any outcomes of those initiatives that were mover related. This screening, from that 413 sources, whittled it down to a total of 14 non duplicate sources relevant to these research questions.

The 14 sources described 17 Moving On initiatives including initiatives in Atlanta, Chicago, Cook County Illinois, Columbus Ohio, Detroit, LA, Minnesota, San Francisco, Vancouver Canada like I mentioned Washington County Michigan, several in New York city and we found three sources that describe outcomes from unidentified large urban areas Moving On initiatives. It's possible that these unidentified Moving On initiatives from those sources could be reporting outcomes from one or more above Moving On initiatives the same Moving On initiative or three distinct initiatives outside of the current list of studies.

For sake of clarity and the purposes of this review we considered the three separate **[unintelligible 00:25:39]** that caveat should be noted and we can move on. What did we find in the search? In terms of Moving On initiative size, number of applicants those approved, vouchers distributed and percentage of approved applicants who ultimately executed a move, there's a pretty big range across these initiatives in



terms of size. The way in which each source defines a Moving On initiative or a wave within a single initiative also differ by source.

We don't have comparable information on each of these outcomes across sources. Some of the sources considered a one-time single pool vouchers an initiative quote unquote. Another considered all those who moved on within a year's timeframe or a particular funding cycle to be an initiative. Keeping that in mind when we're talking about what is Moving On initiative.

To give you just a sense of the range and the number of vouchers that were distributed through these initiatives whatever you consider it to be, one of the larger initiatives that we found was San Francisco. They reported 947 applicants with 262 successful moves. One of the smaller initiatives was Chicago housing authorities pilot which started with just 10 vouchers. Again these are hard to compare but move on rates were also somewhat difficult to compare across the sources because of those reporting differences.

Those initiatives that did report the percentage of applicants or voucher recipients who ultimately moved on, so move on rates, Detroit had one of the higher rates of successful exits with 81% of their 245 applicants Moving On according to the source we have and New York city's 2007 Moving On initiative which I was a part of [chuckles] many, many years ago had one of the lower move on rates reporting only about 19% of their 1,118 applicants ultimately Moving On during the initiative period.

Again there's many reasons for this variation. That's a whole other discussion but just wanted to give you a sense of what places are reporting as far as how big these initiatives are. If you go to the next slide, in regards to post move housing retention rate, this was the million dollar question, I guess that's what you say. That I think a lot of people are interested in follow-up timeframes varied in these evaluations. Again this is difficult to compare across initiatives but as you can see, these fantastic news is that in general, these initiatives have very high post move housing retention.

San Francisco recorded 100% retention at one-year follow-up. On the low end, LA is reporting 88% of their movers in housing at one year follow up. These retention rates are fairly comparable with retention rates of people in PSH. If you measure it by that standard this to be considered a overall positive outcome of Moving On initiatives and we can forward. Other outcomes that-- and somebody said does retention mean that they stay housed or stayed in the Moving On initiative? By retention in this case we're talking about post PSH housing retention.

Once they leave PSH, are they staying in there for instance housing choice voucher section eight apartment that's detached from the PSH services. Even if they're getting some aftercare for some time, that apartment that they moved from, the PSH program or they transition in place and case management goes out the door at a certain point, whether they maintain that housing and are still housed at a one-year follow-up for instance, is the type of housing retention we're talking about.



Again staying in the Moving On initiative might mean just that they stayed engaged in the aftercare for three months or something after they left PSH but we're talking about housing retention. So 11 of the 17 Moving On initiatives discussed in this review, reported at least one housing-related outcome. Some of these outcomes were retention like I mentioned, housing quality, safety, satisfaction, as well as post-move housing location related to movers, proximity to services, or the nearest transportation.

The number of initiatives for which these specific outcomes were available in the sources reviewed or presented here. You can see that eight initiatives described in the scoping review have housing retention outcomes. That's how you can read this slide. Transition support outcomes were also commonly reported with transitional and post-move services needed and received being the most commonly reported type of outcome for seven initiatives.

Moving On assistance gaps, so, where the type of assistance that movers needed, but didn't end up receiving was also discussed in relation to three initiatives. Health, and wellbeing, outcomes included overall life satisfaction, community integration, social connectedness, perceived independence, empowerment sense of freedom, financial status, healthcare coverage, and service utilization and changes in physical mental health were also all participant outcomes that have been reported previously.

You can move the less commonly reported outcomes, only two initiatives had anything about access to healthy food so there's some gaps there. Only two reported the type of post-move housing where individuals moved after leaving PSH, for instance, whether they moved to their own apartment in the private market or with family or friends is also less commonly captured and as Janis mentioned, perhaps the HMIS data element is going to be helpful for looking at this.

We can move to the next one. Housing retention rates, just to let you know, the full write-up of the review is not out yet or publicly available, but I'm happy to share our findings with you on all this when the write-up is published. Our main takeaway from the review are that as you saw, housing retention is very high. Very few movers returned to homelessness, which is great, but again, those housing retention rates were only available for eight initiatives, and the sources we were able to locate movers retract for relatively short periods of time.

Only one PSH program reported long-term mover retention rates, Jericho in New York City in one of the sources, reports fewer than 5% of their graduates had returned to homelessness since 1994. My study of 2015 Moving On an initiative in New York city tracked movers over two years after they left PSH and we found that all, but one of the 44 participants that responded to the two-year follow-up were stably housed. Again, great retention outcomes but most of these evaluations only followed people for a year or less after leaving PSH.

We need to collect more data on more movers over a longer period of time to really say for sure, whether this high rate of housing retention holds across movers over time. Obviously, the more we know about how people do over the long-term, the

File name: Moving On Webinar Series Moving On Outcomes Tracking and Evaluations-20210602 1816-1.mp4



better because these initiatives really are all for not if the majority of movers leave PSH and become homeless again, three or four years out. We want to make sure people are successful in the long term.

The other main finding from this review is that overall there's very little publicly available, empirical work, assessing the effectiveness of Moving On initiatives. I have done probably the majority of it, and then there's a lot of great literature from CSH. They've done great work but there's very few people looking at these initiatives. Clearly, we need more evaluations of these programs to provide a really solid evidence-base for this model. There are big differences in the way that data are being collected and reported across the evaluations. Not every evaluation measures or reports the same outcomes in the same ways.

Drawing conclusions from the data set that has a function of different things in it and also that some initiatives report some outcomes, some do not, makes it an incomplete data set, so that's not ideal. Hopefully this presentation gets us closer to being on the same page around the data that's worth collecting. At some point, it'd be great to develop some reporting standards for these evaluations. We can look across these initiatives in a meaningful way and strengthen that evidence base and you can move forward.

I just wanted to give some suggestions for measures related to Moving On outcomes that might be useful for future evaluations, right inclusive housing environment survey, we used the New York City, 2015 evaluation, and this measures, subjective housing neighborhood quality, and safety from the perspective of movers. We triangulated this information with the American community survey, which is through the US census bureau that measures the objective quality and safety of housing and neighborhoods at the census tract level.

This can be useful for you to kind of pull together both the perception of those aspects as well as how it's been measured objectively in that survey. Based on my experience with the 2015 evaluation, I would also suggest that every evaluation includes some tracking of the support services needed and received by movers so that we have a good idea of how to beef up these initiatives and to collect that at different points in time so you can see, "Okay, people really needed it, this type of service when they first left, not so much later on," you can see the figure here is, which also has very tiny print.

This is from LA, one of LA evaluations of Moving On initiative, so you can see how they've tracked and what specifically they were tracking as far as the services that were needed and received and we published a paper on this for different initiatives. That I would suggest other skills that are included in our study that might be useful to all or the Lehman Quality of Life Scale, which was really comprehensive in the outcomes measures, and you can pick and choose within that giant tool particular outcomes that you want to capture there.

Segals External Integration Scale measures people's integration in the community and participation in various activities in and outside the home because we know

File name: Moving On Webinar Series Moving On Outcomes Tracking and Evaluations-20210602 1816-1.mp4



when people go from homelessness into PSH, there can be changes in how they participate in the community that obviously have integration implications for people's recovery and mental health. Likewise, when they leave, PSH, they go to a new neighborhood either further away from friends, family services, et cetera, you want to know how folks are doing community integration-wise. Those are some possible measures and tools you might consider using.

The next slide, some lessons learned from the experience of evaluating the 2015 New York city Moving On initiative, obviously, these are specific to that particular initiative, but they might have application for your initiative and what you might be looking to look at. You can see here, this top-line, we were able to recruit 90 individuals out of the 125 eligible movers in this initiative during our funded data collection period. We did a baseline interview with those 90 individuals before they left PSH, but then of those 90 interview participants who were accepted into the initiative and we interviewed them and went on to draw those hoops of recruiting and interviewing them, 33, ultimately didn't end up Moving On from the program during the study period for one reason or another.

I think it took vouchers **[unintelligible 00:39:02]** in this particular initiative, a lot longer than anyone expected to locate housing in the very tough New York City rental market. There was some discrimination against voucher holders that came up in our implementation part of the study. If you're in a similarly tough housing market, you might want to consider this when thinking about developing your recruitment timeline and how long you want to give yourself for people to lease-up and move on so if you're doing follow-ups and data collection, you keep that in mind.

We experienced pretty **[unintelligible 00:39:40]** recruitment issues in approaching movers about participation. Most folks were very open to sharing their experiences and were willing to stay in touch with us, but not everyone wants to be followed by an evaluator for two years' time. I know I would be hesitant about signing up for a study for two years,

and especially if they're leaving Homeless Services for more independent living, and are excited to be out away from service providers. Clearly, while evaluators are not, but service providers might say, "No, thank you, please. I'd just rather be left alone." Obviously, if you're following movers for a year or more, it's challenging to keep folks engaged in a longer-term study.

Even if they do want to participate over the course of the two-plus years that you might be following people, just being able to locate them after some months have passed can be tough if they've changed phone numbers or emails, or moved to a different address again. Some people do move, as we can see from the various initiatives, from the first apartment they get out of the PSH to another apartment, especially if the housing quality or neighborhood quality is not there.

You want to take this into account when designing an evaluation and be sure to build in plenty of follow-ups and opportunities for contact information updates. As you can see, we lost half our baseline sample mostly because people who initially enrolled in  
File name: Moving On Webinar Series Moving On Outcomes Tracking and Evaluations-20210602 1816-1.mp4



the initiative and who we interviewed then didn't end up moving on. There was also a few people, not that many, who were lost to contact or dropped out of the study over the two years. Just keeping an eye on these attrition issues when designing an evaluation, and we can move to the next one.

Some strategies that I would recommend to mitigate these recruitment and attrition issues would be to build in robust incentive payments and increase them over time. This is New York City's incentive payments that we increased from \$25 for pre-move interviews, and we paid \$10 for a check-in-by-phone at six months after moving from the PSH program, to then, \$35 for a one-year post-move interview. Another \$10 for a phone check-in at 18 months, and then \$45 for the final interview at two years post-move. A total of \$125 over the two years. If I had to do this again, and I had the funding to do it, I'd want to build in even more paid check-ins, provide higher overall incentive payments to participants to improve recruitment and retention in this study. It always helps.

Also, keep in mind when you're evaluating a pilot initiative-- PSH programs might still be trying to figure out the best way to deliver their housing navigation assistance in the Moving On Initiative. They might not have gotten it down. As you saw from our drop-off in participation from the baseline, which is the folks who said that they wanted to move on to year-one because of those people who dropped out of the initiative, for research purposes, it's always preferable for movers to get robust housing navigation assistance so they can get out the door quickly and be included within that funded recruitment period because moving on issues are usually done on a rolling basis.

Not all movers are moving on the same exact day, that would be unwieldy. It's important to get enough funding to cover that, somewhat, unpredictable, but fairly lengthy recruitment period. If one person moves on in 2015, and it takes people a certain amount of time to lease-up, it could take many months after that to get everybody out the door, if not more than a year, depending on how big your initiative is.

As I mentioned before, more frequent check-ins to keep people engaged, which also help mitigate attrition issues. To improve reliability and validity, evaluators could consider, like I mentioned before, triangulating any self-report data, like mover-reported subjective health measures with more objective data, like clinical or diagnostic records. We added the American Community Survey data to our analysis of *Housing and Neighborhood Quality Supplement Movers Subjective Reports of Neighborhood Characteristics* like I had mentioned before.

There are many ways to build up and triangulate different types of data sources to get at these outcomes in a more rigorous way. It's also great if you can use system data, like HMIS, as mentioned, or the PHA data to measure housing retention and any future contact with Homeless Services. If people end up back in services on some level, that's perhaps a more reliable measure.



If you're having trouble keeping people's contact information updated, Medicaid data to follow movers health service utilization, post-move, getting access to match datasets. Medicaid's not always easy, but if you do have access to these datasets and permission to track folks, I think this type of study would be worth exploring. It hasn't been done yet, to my knowledge. If there's anyone on the webinar today who does have access to these types of data, and has an upcoming Moving On Initiative that they're evaluating, I'd love to chat with you. It'd be great to have robust assessments of Moving On-related cost savings to the systems and to PSH programs.

Dennis Culhane does his seminal work on cost savings from PSH compared to homelessness, and this ultimately promoted the expansion of that model, so we really need outcome data on a cost level, as well. I already mentioned including longer follow-up periods, if possible, for this type of work, and incorporating qualitative data collection pre and post-move with recipients and staff, like Janis touched on a little bit.

The qualitative data can capture those unexpected outcomes that we didn't think to measure and evaluate implementation processes and the unexpected challenges that can come up during the implementation of these initiatives, and it incorporates people's voices and what they think is important to capture when we consider, what is success of a Moving On Initiative? Some helpful strategies for improving the evaluation of Moving On Initiatives, and we can move to the next slide.

Some tips for getting an evaluation off the ground. Unless you already have funding for this work, you're going to want to locate some, obviously. It's helpful to have money behind the evaluations. Potential funders include foundations interested in Homeless Service outcomes. PSH programs may have internal research dollars or PSH-funders evaluation dollars if they have any.

You'll also need to locate an evaluator. Internal evaluations done by agency staff are an option if you have that at your agency. You can seek out research partners from local universities, particularly social science researchers, like myself, who are interested in housing and homelessness. These folks are usually in schools of social work, public health. Sometimes economics, sociology, or medicine.

To be honest, there are not a lot of other researchers out there doing this type of work right now, but there are researchers who have somewhat related interest areas who might be open to expanding into this area, so it could be worth cold calling people and just seeing if this is something that they might want to work with you on. Private research firms, of course, are another option, if your evaluation funds can cover this.

Most importantly, if you are a provider and want an evaluation done for your initiative, it's always helpful to be a generous research partner to an evaluator, if you do find somebody to work with and do whatever you can to help facilitate access for researchers. I had a fantastic experience at CSH and Robinhood Foundation, which funded some of the 2015 initiative.

File name: Moving On Webinar Series Moving On Outcomes Tracking and Evaluations-20210602 1816-1.mp4



The PSH programs involved in that initiative were all super helpful and communicative with me, as a researcher, and everyone was really accommodating. They provided opportunities for me to observe their implementation processes and provide feedback on recruitment strategies. All that was a huge help and really makes a good quality evaluation in the end. This presentation, mine is, as dedicated STEM, I learned a lot from that experience, and I'm happy to share more with you in the Q&A if you have questions about any of this. I look forward to hearing from you, so thank you for that.

**[00:49:34] Janis:** Great. Thanks so much, Emmy, for all of that. It's just really exciting to hear about everything. We're going to just move into some time for questions. We've had a few come in that I'll talk through. If you have any additional questions, please put them in the chat now, and remember to send them to all participants. We'll get started. There was a question, earlier, about, what are some ideas for motivating the community and gaining support?

I'm going to guess that that's maybe motivating a community to want to do this work. I would say a really important piece here is just to go back to some of those outcomes that Emmy talked about. About success in housing for participants and those other outcomes. This is really beneficial for tenants who are currently in permanent supportive housing who want to move on, who no longer want or need services, are going to do well in independent housing by themselves, but they just need that affordability.

Moving on really helps them, and then it helps free up that space for other individuals. We've got a lot of information from previous webinars, especially in that *Intro to Moving On* webinar that we did at the beginning of this series. I think really starting with some of these evaluation results in other communities is a great way to show this is something that could work here and build that support. Another question was if this move-on strategy had been tracked for transitional housing or rapid rehousing.

I just want to be really clear that Moving On for Permanent Supportive Housing is really a very unique situation and program that's very different from, say, somebody who is bridging out of rapid rehousing to longer-term support. With Moving On, people have the option to stay as long as they need the housing and remain eligible for it. It's just a really different situation than from transitional housing or rapid rehousing, where the programs are time-limited and we're expecting that people will move on at the end.

I know that that's not always how it works in transitional housing programs and that there are a lot of people who maybe need some kinds of supports, like what we're talking about here with Moving On, but it's just not, as far as I know, being tracked or evaluated in quite the same way. Dr. Tiderington, do you know of anything that's been done, like the research you've done with Moving On, around rapid rehousing or transitional housing?



**[00:52:29] Emmy:** Not off the top of my head. That's an interesting question. I think that Thomas Burns might be doing some of that work, but off the top of my head, I'm not familiar.

**[00:52:44] Janis:** I think if you are working in your community on helping people transitioning out of transitional housing or rapid rehousing-- this is the kinds of outcomes-tracking pieces that we talked about here, you could certainly set up for those programs. I'm just not aware of this really happening in that way since it's so very different from moving on from permanent supportive housing. Another question? Yes, the slides will be posted online where we have posted all the other materials when they're available. The transcript will be available as soon as possible as well. You can find that all on the main *Moving On Webinars* series registration page, which I will put the link to in the chat. Are there other questions?

**[pause 00:53:51]**

Is anyone tracking outcomes based on project-based versus scattered-site projects? Emmy, can you--?

**[00:54:39] Emmy:** Yes, I think that's a super important comparison, but because a lot of the existing evaluations to my knowledge-- and Janis, let me know if you've seen different, but generally, are looking at one single initiative. That's usually one PSH program or a handful of PSH programs, and it's not doing much comparison of the type of PSH folks are moving on from. It's just looking at it as one lump of folks leaving, but I do think it's a very valid research question that you have, to compare the outcomes of those two types of PSH programs.

**[00:55:23] Janis:** Yes, and it's really going to depend on what the differences look like in your local programs. I think, in a lot of cases, we see communities that really have programs that focus on one or the other, like where most people are transitioning in place with scattered-site housing, or like in the case of the New York City Moving On Initiatives starting in 2015 where tenants were not allowed to **[unintelligible 00:55:53]** place. Even if they were scattered-site, they had to move, and a lot of people were coming from project-based units as well.

**[00:56:02] Emmy:** I will say, just to add in again, from the New York City Moving On Initiative, in the qualitative, this came off-- and there's a paper that I wrote on it about people's qualitative experiences transitioning from PSH. It was interesting to hear some of the differences between people who were coming from project-based versus scatter site projects. Again, it's very small, and I think we had 27 people or something, so it's really hard to draw major conclusions and generalize them to all project-based PSH programs or scatter site programs. I'm happy to share that paper if people are interested.

**[00:56:49] Janis:** Great, thanks. Now we can add that to the resources when we post the slides and other materials from this presentation, which is going to be up on that *Moving On Webinars* series page that Colleen put the link in for. Just a comment



here from HousingWorks, that they're trying to build a dashboard that's project-based and compares projects, but still putting that evaluation team and capacities in place.

That's exciting, we would like to hear more about that as it develops. Another question here about participant selection criteria for the program. How you can track, identify, invite, and encourage participants to engage with the program given that research is showing that it's just a small percentage of households at any given time, so helping understand that not everyone will be ready.

We talked about this a lot in our Moving On Assessments webinar as we talked about assessments, what are some of the criteria as you do screening? And thinking about participant readiness to "move on," is it a difficult term for people? I know that people struggle with that one. It's a bit of a triggering word, but basically, a lot of the Moving On assessments look at, how are people doing now in their housing stability?

Are they paying rent on time, and utilities on time? And are they able to do that without, say, a case manager needing to come to them three times before the deadline to remind them to get that paid? How are they doing with their connections to mainstream services? Are they seeing doctors in the community? Are they seeing mental health professionals, if they need that? How are they taking care of their needs? And how would they do if those intensive housing-based services weren't there? There are some tools that we talked about in that webinar that are helpful.

The other thing's just thinking about, how is the situation going to change for someone after they move on? That's this conversation that's not just within assessment tool, but also, beyond that, are people mentally prepared, emotionally prepared to be living independently in a different situation? And are they financially prepared to manage what that new situation is going to look like? Emmy or Emma, anything else you want to add about participant selection?

**[01:00:00] Emmy:** Not on my end so much. I think developing those tools and validating them is so important, and we have yet to get to that place. Yes, I'm interested in seeing more of that work out there.

**[01:00:19] Emma:** I think I'll just add that-- someone asked about, how does someone withdraw from the Moving On program? And it's just important to note that, unfortunately, right now, once someone's moved on, there's not really a pathway for them to get back to PSH. It's just important to know that that's a systems issue where it's not easy. If someone moves on and says, "Oh, this isn't for me. I actually really do need PSH," it's not an easy transition for someone. Someone can't just move back into PSH, and so it's really important to have that in mind.

As much as the program should be centered and be really strengths-based in terms of transfers for tenants, it's always just really important to be upfront and honest about that, and make sure that the individual or the family really feels like they're prepared to move on knowing that it's not like they can just come back if they decide they wanted to.

File name: Moving On Webinar Series Moving On Outcomes Tracking and Evaluations-20210602 1816-1.mp4



[silence]

**[01:01:34] Janis:** Great. Any other questions that have come up for folks?

**[pause 01:01:37]**

All right. Well, thank you so much, everyone, for your time today. For everyone who joined us throughout this series, we really appreciate all of your time. We're going to be putting together a document just recapping some of the common questions that we've received throughout this series with some information that'll be available in a little while, as well as putting up the materials from this session, as soon as they're available, online.

We look forward to just continuing to hear about how Moving On is going in different communities and looking for opportunities to engage with you around that. Thank you so much for your time again today, and we will talk with you later.

**[pause 01:02:43]**

[end of meeting] [background conversation] [non-interview related banter]

**[01:17:21] [END OF AUDIO]**