

## Q&A on ESG Progress Reporting Form

**Process Improvement:** We are trying to accomplish something entirely new with the Statewide HARA roll-out. We understand that there will be a learning curve for us as well as all of you. With regard to the Report Form, we have compiled a number of questions and comments and completed an initial review. The following Q&A is in response to that review. Following the initial submission of your Reports we anticipate identifying some further issues. Our plan is to complete identified improvements and publish a revised form by February 29. None of the changes will impact the current workflow requirements, so please continue to complete the existing 2011 ESG Workflow as defined in your Binders or at the MCAH WebSite under Documents Center>“Everything HARA.” Please attend the new ESG Workflow Training if you have not already done so. See MCAH Calendar [www.mihomeless.org](http://www.mihomeless.org) .

All ESG recipients are expected to provide supported referrals as appropriate to the client's needs and safety. That is, organizations should follow-up with those referred to insure that they reached their destination or problem-solve barriers.

**Q1. What agencies should be included in the Page 1 Counts?** Data from all the ESG grantees and sub-grantees should be included in these counts. All grantees and Sub-Grantees should label their Provider Pages that capture ESG beneficiary data with the extension “HARA.”

**Q2. What clients should be included in the Page 1 Counts?** Clients typically benefit from ESG funds in two ways. Some ESG dollars are passed through to support the financial needs of the clients, such as security deposits or rental assistance. Other dollars are used to support staff and program operation that deliver stabilization and other services to clients. If dollars are used to support staff and/or program operation, then all clients in that program benefit from ESG and should be included in the report. Data must be organized such that all clients in the “HARA” titled provided pages benefit from the program.

**Q3. Should only those clients that receive financial assistance from ESG through the HARA be included on the Report?** It is anticipated that HARAs will in fact support the distribution of aid from multiple sources. ESG dollars provided to HARAs are intended to support a quality assessment process that insures the “right” resources and referrals are made available to those in housing crisis. All activity within HARA’s should be reported on this form. See Q2.

**Q4. What about the short service clients that we provide assistance to that do not meet the Literal Homeless or at Imminent Risk (Response 1 & 2 on the Housing Status Question) that we are not currently required to enter into the HMIS?** MSHDA is in the process of reviewing the Reporting Form and will provide guidance when we release the next version. Please continue to count these off line.

**Q5. How does this process related to HUD’s new Homeless Definition?** Currently all clients receiving “Literal Homeless – Response 1 on Housing Status” and those receiving “Response 2 via an eviction” will also qualify as homeless. Going forward for purposes of our counts as well

as HUD's, those receiving "1" or "2" will qualify for Homeless services. Fortunately our Michigan Definition (Is Client Homeless?) is similar to the new definitions. We are not adapting the System until we receive guidance from Bowman as it will have report implications. As you know, we will need to construct a logic stream for those clients who meet other federal definitions of homeless. This will not impact our workflow decisions with regard to ESG at this time.

**Q6. With regard to the "Inquiries" line on the reporting form, should I only report those that don't that we don't enter into the System – those that don't meet the Literal or Imminent Definition?**

1. It was not our intent to restrict the count of inquiries to just those that are not entered into the System. We were actually trying to clarify that the "inquiry count" should include all consumers that call for information including those that don't meet the homeless and imminent risk categories. Additionally some communities have not been separating inquiries by Household Type and we are aware of that and if you don't have the data or you don't have the data for all calls, report the total number on this form.
2. There was also a problem in the initial run of the automated HMIS Report because it did not include an additional provider filter. That is, the number returned correctly if you ran the Automated HMIS Report "EDA." However, if you ran with multiple provider pages, the number was exaggerated. The Automated HMIS Report has been fixed so that it filters properly when you run multiple provider pages.

**Q7. With regard to the "Screening" line on the reporting form, why is my number lower than the number admitted to the program?**

1. The screening number is actually a count of households in that only one member of each household completes the form.
2. A second reason that your number may be low is if you did not completed the Risk Matrix – located at the end of the screening assessment - with all those screened. The Matrix is critical to supporting the core logic used to evaluate these programs and is included in the query pull logic. Specifically, HPRP required programs to target resources for those that "but for these resources" would be homeless (Prevention) or would stay homeless (Rapid Rehousing or Diversion). We were one of few states that could substantiate that our "prevention" clients looked like our "homeless" clients in terms of risk. If HARAs are properly targeting, both populations should be similar.

**Q8. With regard to the "Case Management" line on the reporting form, why does my count appear low?** The initial version of the Automated HMIS Report only counted those plans that were initiated during the Report Period. If a client had been working with the HARA prior to the Grant Period, they did not pull in. After dialoging the issue I have adjusted the automated HMIS Report so it includes all those with a Housing Plan regardless of the initiation date. Case Management Detail is provider on the 3<sup>rd</sup> tab of the automated Report so that you can audit the activity.

**Q9. Why is my Household Count wrong?** As with HPRP, Household Counts rely on you spreading the Intake to family members. If you failed to do that, the client will appear as a single household.

**Q10. Is the line “Total Singles / Total in Families (admitted) the same as the “Total Completed Housing Assessment?”** The answer is yes. We inadvertently created a duplicate count. This will be fixed in the February review.

**Q11. What if the sum of the Families vs Singles is larger than the Overall Total in the automated HMIS Report?** Frequently the sum of the sub-populations is greater than the unduplicated Overall Total when clients present in more than one sub population during the time period – entered in Family and as a Single during the time period. The more agencies / provider pages that you have in your ESG Project, the more this is likely to happen.

**Q12. With regarding to measuring whether a client required sheltering during the course of the intervention (the final 2 counting questions), how did the number get pulled in the Automated HMIS Report?** It was felt that HARA staff would not know if sheltering was required until the client was exited. The Question is included on the Exit and the sum of the two questions should equal your total exits, if you have answered the question on all clients.

**Q13. What is the process for setting targets and evaluating performance rates?** MCAH has offered training on evaluating outcomes and setting target for months? Additional live sessions will be posted in February. We are also hosting CQI Continuing Discussions the first Tuesday of each month to create a venue for dialogue. Please go to the MCAH WebSite and download the “Setting Targets” Pod Cast. The URL for the Podcast and the supporting Outcomes materials may be found:

[http://www.mihomeless.org/MCAH/Document\\_Center/Entries/2010/10/19\\_Continuous\\_Quality\\_Improvement.html](http://www.mihomeless.org/MCAH/Document_Center/Entries/2010/10/19_Continuous_Quality_Improvement.html)

**Q14. Can I leave a program off the CoC level reports if they are not funded by ESG and they are not achieving good outcomes?** No. The reason that we are asking you to review your performance as a CoC is so that you can identify programs that need help. You should set your target knowing that your overall performance will be impacted by this outlier. The critical piece is that you have identified realistic strategies to improve the performance for this provider. Those strategies may put you in competition of the Award this year.

**Q15. How do I calculate the “Percent of total clients served” question on the CoC portion of the Report Form?** Run the “#1Homeless Count” for the CoC to complete Line “Total Unduplicated Clients Served by the CoC located in the Homeless Demographics Folder on ART. You may use either the Provider Group or select all visible providers in the Provider Agency version of the Report. The percentage is calculated by dividing the “Total Admitted from the automated HMIS Report – Line 3 or line 7 (same numbers)” by “the total homeless in the CoC from the “#1 Homeless Count Report.” We are using the “Homeless” Count Report rather than the “All Persons” Report, because you are only required to complete HMIS entry on those that qualify for homeless services and we are monitoring the percentage of the community’s homeless that were routed through the HARA. Our goal is, of course, 100%.

**Q16. What level of detail would you like in the text portion of the Report?** We would like you to be detailed in your responses so that as we go through our Process Improvement steps we

have as much information as possible. Please also take the time to complete the “Process Review Monitor Form” detailing any strategies for change that have resulted in measurable improvement. These will become our core of best practices.

**Q17: With regards to integrating DV data onto the ESG Quarterly Progress Reports, MSHDA is working to avoid duplication between those individuals reported through the HMIS system and those individuals reported in aggregate by the DV programs. We are proposing the following revisions in reporting, but recognize that some agencies may need additional time to alter their data collection system. Please refer to the following guidance:**

1. If **all** homeless DV clients were referred to the HARA, the automated HMIS Report should be accurate and the numbers may be copied directly onto the HARA Quarterly Report. The DV program does not need to complete a separate form.
2. If **none** of the DV clients were referred to the HARA or other ESG sub-recipients, then HARA’s may add the numbers to the automated HMIS Report. The HARA should note on the ESG Quarterly Report that DV clients were not served at the HARA, but that DV information is aggregated into the total.
3. If **some** of the DV clients were referred to the HARA, the DV agency(ies) must indicate the **total** homeless that were served, both referred and not referred, when reporting quarterly data to the HARA. In addition, the DV agency must provide the detail counting on page 1 quarterly for only those homeless persons that were **not** referred to the HARA or other ESG sub-recipients, thereby enabling the HARA to calculate unduplicated overall totals. When providing data to the HARA on clients served, DV agencies must also indicate in the text what percentage of the DV clients were also served by other ESG recipients.