

HUD Form 50900

Elements for the Annual MTW Plan and Annual MTW Report

Part II: Using Standard Metrics



Ivan Pour, MTW Program Director

Laurel Davis, MTW Coordinator

Alison Smith, MTW Coordinator

About this Session

PURPOSE

- During this session, we will discuss the need for standard metrics, their applicability to Moving to Work (MTW) activities, and effective implementation.
- A second, separate webcast is available that includes an overview of the entire revised Form 50900.
- Many of the questions we have received from public housing agencies (PHAs) thus far are incorporated into this webcast.
- Please note that this session is designed primarily for MTW PHAs, although it may also be helpful to HUD field office and headquarters staff working with MTW PHAs.



About this Session

LOGISTICS

- Today's training session is not live, so you cannot submit questions to be answered during the session.
- If you have questions not addressed during the session, please send them to: **mtw-info@hud.gov**.
- Questions will be addressed via HUD's Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document on the MTW website at:
http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/ph/mtw/50900.
- There will be no 'breaks' during the webcast but you can pause the presentation if necessary. You can also rewind to review content again or stop watching and come back to watch it at a later date.



About this Session

OVERVIEW

- This presentation will begin by reviewing the need for Standard Metrics. The presentation will then transition to going through examples of how to apply Standard Metrics to MTW activities and how to present data.
- During the session, you should have a hard copy of the new HUD Form 50900, particularly the Standard Metrics pages at the end of the Form, available that you can use to follow along.
- Many pieces of the Form are too large or complex to show onscreen during this webcast.
- There is also a draft handout, Table of Applicable Standard Metrics by Activity, on the MTW website that would be helpful to have available.



What are Standard Metrics and why do we need them?



www.hud.gov/mtw

What are Standard Metrics?

CONCEPT

- Each MTW PHA tracks the same metrics to enable comparison and/or roll-up of program-wide information.
- Could be implemented at the MTW PHA level or at the activity level.



What are Standard Metrics?

HISTORY

- Standard MTW Agreement (2007-2008)
 - HUD and MTW PHAs discussed the concept of Standard Metrics but MTW PHAs were sensitive to the idea of being required to measure the same things, fearing it could reflect negatively on them individually.
- Subsequent Discussions
 - Some raised this as a preferential way to report, but concerns remained.
- GAO and OIG Reviews (2012)
 - Both cited the need for HUD to be able to better assess whether the MTW Demonstration was meeting the statutory objectives.
 - GAO recommended the collection and use of standard performance data to assess similar activities and the program as whole.



What are Standard Metrics?

DECISION TO IMPLEMENT

- Since 2008, HUD has continued to evaluate the need for more standardized metrics and discussed the concept with OMB during the revisions for HUD Form 50900.
- GAO and OIG reviews, coupled with continued data requests from Congress, reiterated the need for standardized outcome measures.
- Result → HUD decided to move forward with standardized metrics in the new HUD Form 50900 at the activity level.



Standard Metrics in Form 50900

OVERVIEW

- HUD Form 50900 organizes Standard Metrics under the three MTW statutory objectives.
- As the HUD Form 50900 states, MTW PHAs are required to measure all applicable Standard Metrics for an activity.
- MTW PHAs are not required to discontinue the use of agency-specific metrics, but in fact, are encouraged to retain these metrics to the extent practicable.



Standard Metrics in Form 50900

TRANSITION TIMING

- MTW PHAs are expected to provide Standard Metrics for all activities in the next Annual MTW Report submission.
- Standard Metrics must be provided at the time of the proposal for any new proposed activities.
- If an MTW PHA is not currently collecting the data that would be necessary to report on an applicable Standard Metric, it should begin collecting this data now (during the current Plan year) so that it will be ready to report on the data in its next Report submission.



Applying Standard Metrics to MTW Activities



www.hud.gov/mtw

Applying Standard Metrics

SELECTING METRICS

- Review the activity description, anticipated impacts, and relationship to the statutory objective.
- Select Standard Metrics that measure the intended impact(s), under the cited statutory objective(s).
- Consider whether other Standard Metrics under the cited statutory objective(s) are impacted by the activity
- Assess whether Standard Metrics listed under statutory objectives not cited by the MTW PHA could be impacted by this activity.



Applying Standard Metrics

APPLICABILITY

- HUD Form 50900 requires an MTW PHA to use all 'applicable' Standard Metrics.
- To ensure consistency across MTW PHAs to the extent possible, HUD will determine applicability during its review of Annual MTW Plan/Report submissions.
- It's likely that MTW PHAs will sometimes disagree with the Standard Metrics HUD determines are applicable.
- As a tool to help agencies get a sense of what HUD believes are applicable Standard Metrics, HUD has created a draft table available on the MTW website.



Applying Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 1 – PBV ALTERNATE COMPETITIVE PROCESS

- *Description* → the MTW PHA will utilize an alternative competitive process to award project-based vouchers to community partners, in which applications are accepted on a rolling basis from property owners meeting x, y, and z criteria.
- *Statutory Objective* → to reduce costs/cost effectiveness.
- *Anticipated Impacts* → the activity will make the competitive process easier to implement and easier for staff to understand. It will also enable faster selection of properties to be project-based.



Applying Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 1 – PBV ALTERNATE COMPETITIVE PROCESS

- *Applicable Metrics*
 - CE #1 → Agency Cost Savings
 - CE #2 → Staff Time Savings
 - CE #3 → Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution



Applying Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 2 – BIENNIAL RECERTIFICATIONS

- *Description* → the MTW PHA will implement biennial recertifications for work-able households in both the public housing and HCV programs. For all new admissions this policy will be in effect immediately, while for existing participants half will be recertified this year and half will not be recertified until next year.
- *Statutory Objective* → to reduce costs/cost effectiveness.
- *Anticipated Impacts* → this activity will reduce the staff time necessary to perform annual tenant income reviews and rent calculations.



Applying Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 2 – BIENNIAL RECERTIFICATIONS

- *Applicable Metrics*
 - CE #1 → Agency Cost Savings
 - CE #2 → Staff Time Savings
 - CE #5 → Increase in Agency Rental Revenue
 - SS #1 → Increase in Household Income
 - SS #3 → Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status
 - SS #4 → Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
 - SS #8 → Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency



Applying Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 3 – WORK REQUIREMENT

- *Description* → the MTW PHA will institute a 20 hour per-week work requirement for all work-able household members over the age of 18 in the public housing program. A participant can substitute education for this requirement while attending a full-time college or job training program. MTW PHA staff will work with participants that are having difficulty obtaining employment to provide training resources and links to employers. Any household that does not meet the requirement for more than 60 days will be required to engage with MTW PHA staff; after 180 days of non-compliance the household will be terminated from the program.
- *Statutory Objective* → to support self-sufficiency.
- *Anticipated Impacts* → this activity will lead to increased employment and thus income for participants, and a reduction in subsidy paid by the MTW PHA.



Applying Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 3 – WORK REQUIREMENT

- *Applicable Metrics*
 - SS #1 → Increase in Household Income
 - SS #3 → Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status
 - SS #4 → Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
 - SS #5 → Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency
 - SS #6 → Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households
 - SS #7 → Increase in Agency Rental Revenue
 - SS #8 → Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency
 - HC #3 → Decrease in Wait List Time



Applying Standard Metrics - Examples

NOTES ON EXAMPLES

- *HUD's Draft Table of Applicable Standard Metrics*
 - Serves as a guide/starting point for what Standard Metrics apply to certain activities.
 - Not an exhaustive list, and will evolve over time in terms of both included activities and potentially the applicable Standard Metrics.
- *Complex Activities*
 - Broad activities containing a large array of MTW flexibilities will have Standard Metrics assigned primarily based on their component parts.



Applying Standard Metrics - Examples

NOTES ON EXAMPLES

- *SS #8 → Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency*
 - Applies to any activity that has a self-sufficiency impact.
- *Challenges and Benefits*
 - The transition to Standard Metrics will be challenging, will require cooperation, and will inevitably evolve over time.



Presenting Standard Metrics in the Plan and Report



www.hud.gov/mtw

Presenting Standard Metrics

LAYOUT

- Agencies should use the table format from the HUD Form 50900 when presenting Standard Metrics.

Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?

- Standard Metrics should be clearly labeled, so that they can be distinguished from any MTW PHA-provided metrics.
- MTW PHAs should use the exact text of the unit of measurement from the HUD Form 50900.
- MTW PHAs should show their work if a calculation going into the baseline/benchmark numbers.



Presenting Standard Metrics

SETTING A BASELINE VALUE

- Represents the actual numeric value prior to implementation of the MTW activity.
- *For Approved Activities:*
 - Historical baseline is ideal, and can be formulated from historical data or extrapolation.
 - Current data can serve as a baseline if necessary, and in such a case, the MTW PHA should set the baseline in the MTW Report where the metric (whether Standard Metric or MTW PHA-provided metric) is first presented.
- *For Proposed Activities:*
 - Baseline should be set using data from the prior fiscal year.
 - If you're submitting an Plan in the new format before a Report, and do not have the data available to report on the applicable Standard Metric for a previously approved activity, you can collect the data in the Plan year, and then report on that metric in subsequent documents.



Presenting Standard Metrics

SETTING A BENCHMARK VALUE

- Represents the actual numeric value that the MTW PHA hopes to reach after implementation of the MTW activity.
- An annual benchmark should be provided in the MTW Plan, as opposed to a longer-term benchmark.
- No penalty for not achieving the benchmark.
- Set realistic targets.



Presenting Standard Metrics

REPORTING THE OUTCOME

- Provide the actual numeric outcome for each metric, and state whether the benchmark was/was not achieved.
- Include discussion of the data either above or below the table to explain variances and to put the results into context.



Presenting Standard Metrics

AGENCY-DEFINED METRICS

- MTW PHAs are encouraged to retain/create their own metrics in addition to the applicable Standard Metrics.
- MTW PHA-defined metrics may more accurately describe the intended outcomes.
- These metrics should be presented in the same table format at the Standard Metrics.



Presenting Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 1 – PBV ALTERNATE COMPETITIVE PROCESS

- *Applicable Metrics*
 - **CE #1 → Agency Cost Savings**
 - **CE #2 → Staff Time Savings**
 - CE #3 → Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution



Presenting Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 1 – PBV ALTERNATE COMPETITIVE PROCESS

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings – IN ANNUAL MTW PLAN				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Staff Labor → 350 Total Hours (See CE#2) x \$30 per Hour = \$10,350	Staff Labor → 60 Total Hours (See CE#2) x \$30 per Hour = \$1,800	To be provided in Annual MTW Report.	To be provided in Annual MTW Report.
	Cost of Advertisements → Newspaper and Various Publications = \$1,000 TOTAL COST PRIOR TO ACTIVITY = \$11,350	Cost of Advertisements → Newspaper and Various Publications = \$1,000 ANTICIPATED TOTAL COST = \$2,800		



Presenting Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 1 – PBV ALTERNATE COMPETITIVE PROCESS

CE #1: Agency Cost Savings – IN ANNUAL MTW REPORT				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual cost of task after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total cost of task in dollars (decrease).	Staff Labor → 350 Total Hours (See CE#2) x \$30 per Hour = \$10,350	Staff Labor → 60 Total Hours (See CE#2) x \$30 per Hour = \$1,800	Staff Labor → 51 Total Hours (See CE#2) x \$30 per Hour = \$1,530	The outcome exceeds the cost savings anticipated. MTW PHA saved a total of \$8,820 as a result of the activity. The excessive savings was due to the MTW PHA receiving fewer applications than anticipated.
	Cost of Advertisements → Newspaper and Various Publications = \$1,000 TOTAL COST PRIOR TO ACTIVITY = \$11,350	Cost of Advertisements → Newspaper and Various Publications = \$1,000 ANTICIPATED TOTAL COST = \$2,800	Cost of Advertisements → Newspaper and Various Publications = \$1,000 ACTUAL TOTAL COST = \$2,530	



Presenting Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 1 – PBV ALTERNATE COMPETITIVE PROCESS

CE #2: Staff Time Savings				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity (in hours).	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Actual amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity (in hours).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Total time to complete the task in staff hours (decrease).	Competition Set-up = 100 Staff Hours Competition Review → 10 Staff Hours x 25 Applications Received = 250 Staff Hours TOTAL STAFF HOURS PRIOR TO ACTIVITY = 350	Competition Set-up = 10 Staff Hours Competition Review → 2 Hours x 25 Applications Received = 50 Staff Hours ANTICIPATED TOTAL STAFF HOURS = 60	Competition Set-up = 11 Staff Hours Competition Review → 2 Hours x 20 Applications Received = 40 Staff Hours ACTUAL TOTAL STAFF HOURS = 51	The outcome exceeds the time savings anticipated. MTW PHA saved a total of 299 staff hours as a result of the activity. The excessive savings was due to the MTW PHA receiving fewer applications than anticipated.



Presenting Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 2 – BIENNIAL RECERTIFICATIONS

- *Applicable Metrics*
 - CE #1 → Agency Cost Savings
 - CE #2 → Staff Time Savings
 - **CE #5 → Increase in Agency Rental Revenue**
 - SS #1 → Increase in Household Income
 - **SS #3 → Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status**
 - SS #4 → Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
 - SS #8 → Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency



Presenting Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 2 – BIENNIAL RECERTIFICATIONS

CE #5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	Rental revenue prior to implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Expected rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Actual rental revenue after implementation of the activity (in dollars).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Rental revenue in dollars (increase).	PH work-able household rent (\$35,000 per month across 100 households) = \$420,000	PH work-able household rent (\$35,700 per month across 100 households) = \$428,400	PH work-able household rent (\$34,900 per month across 102 households) = \$418,800	The outcome did not meet the increase in revenue expected. While revenue did increase slightly (an annual increase of \$3,600), this may be attributed to a slight increase in households subject to the policy. The MTW PHA expects that as the policy continues and participants are able to retain larger portions of earned income, overall revenue will increase.
	HCV work-able household tenant contribution (\$37,500 per month across 250 households) = \$450,000 TOTAL REVENUE PRIOR TO ACTIVITY = \$870,000	HCV work-able household tenant contribution (\$38,250 per month across 250 households) = \$459,000 TOTAL ANTICIPATED REVENUE = \$887,400	HCV work-able household tenant contribution (\$37,900 per month across 255 households) = \$454,800 TOTAL ANTICIPATED REVENUE = \$873,600	



Presenting Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 2 – BIENNIAL RECERTIFICATIONS

SS #3: Positive Outcome in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Report the following information separately for each category: (1) Employed Full-Time (2) Employed Part-Time (3) Enrolled in an Educational Program (4) Enrolled in Job Training Program (5) Unemployed (6) Other	Head(s) of households in <<category name>> prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number)	Actual head(s) of households in <<category name>> after implementation of the activity (number)	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
(1) Employed Full-Time	<p>PH work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across 100 households) = 40</p> <p>HCV work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across 250 households) = 100</p> <p>TOTAL PRIOR TO ACTIVITY = 140</p>	<p>PH work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across 100 households) = 45</p> <p>HCV work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across 250 households) = 110</p> <p>TOTAL ANTICIPATED = 155</p>	<p>PH work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across 102 households) = 45</p> <p>HCV work-able head(s) of households employed Full-Time (across 255 households) = 115</p> <p>TOTAL ACTUAL = 160</p>	The outcome exceeded the benchmark in this category. 20 additional head(s) of households obtained full-time employment in the plan year, 5 more than expected. This may be explained by the activity and an improved employment market in MTW PHA's area.



Presenting Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 2 – BIENNIAL RECERTIFICATIONS

SS #3: Positive Outcome in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
(2) Employed Part-Time	PH work-able head(s) of households employed Part-Time (across 100 households) = 30	PH work-able head(s) of households employed Part-Time (across 100 households) = 30	PH work-able head(s) of households employed Part-Time (across 102 households) = 26	The outcome did not meet the benchmark anticipated. MTW PHA anticipated that improvement in the area's job market would lead to a neutral effect in this category. In fact, it seems that a higher portion of participants obtained full-time employment, explaining the decrease in this category.
	HCV work-able head(s) of households employed Part-Time (across 250 households) = 50	HCV work-able head(s) of households employed Part-Time (across 250 households) = 50	HCV work-able head(s) of households employed Part-Time (across 255 households) = 49	
	TOTAL PRIOR TO ACTIVITY = 80	TOTAL ANTICIPATED = 80	TOTAL ACTUAL = 75	



Presenting Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 2 – BIENNIAL RECERTIFICATIONS

SS #3: Positive Outcome in Employment Status				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
(6) Other – Participating in MTW PHA Provided Case Management	PH work-able head(s) of households participating (across 100 households) = 50	PH work-able head(s) of households employed participating (across 100 households) = 95	PH work-able head(s) of households participating (across 102 households) = 100	The outcome here exceeded the benchmark. MTW PHA anticipated that 95% of head(s) households affected by this policy would participate in the MTW PHA provided case management (a total of 333 head(s) of households). In fact, 350 head(s) of households participated, an excess of 17 head(s) of households. This is also represented as a 98% participation rate.
	HCV work-able head(s) of households participating (across 250 households) = 160	HCV work-able head(s) of households participating (across 250 households) = 238	HCV work-able head(s) of households participating (across 255 households) = 250	
	TOTAL PRIOR TO ACTIVITY = 210	TOTAL ANTICIPATED = 333	TOTAL ACTUAL = 350	



Presenting Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 3 – WORK REQUIREMENT

- *Applicable Metrics*
 - SS #1 → Increase in Household Income
 - SS #3 → Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status
 - SS #4 → Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
 - SS #5 → Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self-Sufficiency
 - SS #6 → Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households
 - SS #7 → Increase in Agency Rental Revenue
 - **SS #8 → Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency**
 - **HC #3 → Decrease in Wait List Time**



Presenting Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 3 – WORK REQUIREMENT

SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self-Sufficiency				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (increase). The PHA may create one or more definitions for "self sufficiency" to use for this metric. Each time the PHA uses this metric, the "Outcome" number should also be provided in Section (II) Operating Information in the space provided.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) prior to implementation of the activity (number). This number may be zero.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Actual households transitioned to self sufficiency (<<PHA definition of self-sufficiency>>) after implementation of the activity (number).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Local Definition #2: Number of households no longer requiring housing assistance.	<p>PH work-able head(s) of households meeting this definition (across 100 households) = 0</p> <p>TOTAL PRIOR TO ACTIVITY = 0</p>	<p>PH work-able head(s) of households meeting this definition (across 100 households) = 5</p> <p>TOTAL ANTICIPATED = 5</p>	<p>PH work-able head(s) of households meeting this definition (across 102 households) = 3</p> <p>TOTAL ACTUAL = 3</p>	<p>The outcome here was not achieved. While the outcome was an improvement from the baseline, it fell two households short of the anticipated benchmark. However, increases in earned income for work-able households in the public housing program has increased substantially. Therefore, continued success under that definition should lead to more public housing households moving off the program.</p>



Presenting Standard Metrics - Examples

EXAMPLE 3 – WORK REQUIREMENT

HC#3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Unit of Measurement	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on wait list prior to implementation of the activity (in months)..	Expected average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Actual average applicant time on wait list after implementation of the activity (in months).	Whether the outcome meets or exceeds the benchmark.
Average applicant time on wait list in months (decrease).	Average applicant time on public housing wait list = 13 months	Average applicant time on public housing wait list = 13 months	Average applicant time on public housing wait list = 13 months	The outcome information meets the anticipated benchmarks. MTW PHA anticipated that this activity would have no impact on the wait list time for participants.
	Average applicant time on HCV wait list = 29 months	Average applicant time on HCV wait list = 29 months	Average applicant time on HCV wait list = 29 months	
	AVERAGE TIME PRIOR TO ACTIVITY = 21 months	ANTICIPATED AVERAGE TIME = 21 months	ACTUAL AVERAGE TIME = 21 months	



Other Resources



www.hud.gov/mtw

OTHER RESOURCES

HUD FORM 50900 WEBPAGE

Those looking for additional information on the implementation of the new HUD Form 50900 should go to :

http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/ph/mtw/50900.

This website contains:

- Form 50900 FAQ (this document will be updated regularly)
- Links to PDF and Microsoft Excel versions of Form 50900
- Links to this webcast on the Standard Metrics, accompanying handout and the webcast providing an overview of the entire HUD Form 50900.



Additional Questions

Please email:

mtw-info@hud.gov

with any questions not answered on this
webcast.



www.hud.gov/mtw