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Overview of MTW Research Study

- Commissioned by HAI Group and advised by a committee that includes CLPHA, NAHRO, PHADA, and Cambridge HA.

- Study has three parts:
  - Documenting MTW Innovations: Released December 2014 (can be found at www.pahrc.org)
  - Develop MTW Performance Measures: Today’s Discussion
  - Test Feasibility of performance measures (in progress): Today’s Discussion

- Abt team: Larry Buron, Melissa Vandawalker, Jill Khadduri, Tyler Morrill, Eliza Keen, and Jeffrey Lubell.

- HAI Lead: Keely Stater
Categories for Performance Measures are Based on MTW Goals

- Cost Effectiveness
- Economic Self-Sufficiency
- Increase Housing Choice
  - Quantity and Quality of Affordable Housing
  - Residential Stability for Targeted Households
  - Expand Geographical Choice
- Other Key Metrics
Guiding Principles for Developing MTW Performance Measures

- Focus on measuring outcomes (rather than inputs)
- Measure outcomes at an agency-wide level, rather than trying to document outcomes of specific innovations
- Use standard measures rather than locally defined measures
- Measures that apply to both MTW and Non-MTW PHAs and capture the non-traditional activities of MTW PHAs
118 Non-MTW PHAs Selected as Comparison Agencies

- To put the measures in context, we need a counterfactual:
  - What would performance look like if agency was not an MTW agency?

- Rigorously selected 3 to 5 Comparison PHAs for each MTW PHA in same Census Division and with same program type (S8-only, both S8 and PH) that are also similar in:
  - Voucher program size
  - Number of PH units
  - Economic conditions (poverty and unemployment rate)
  - Rental market (FMR, median income for renters)
Data Sources

- HUD provided data from:
  - Financial Disclosure Statement (FDS)
  - 50058 and 50058-MTW PIC data
  - REAC physical inspections

- MTW Annual Reports

- Public datasets: Pictures of Subsidized Housing, Voucher Management System (VMS), FMR, Income Limits, and American Community Survey

- Where otherwise not available, PHA-supplied data from email survey
Data Quality Issues

- Data for individual PHAs were not always consistent across sources
- Across PHAs, data were reported data in different ways in the Annual MTW Reports and survey
- Outliers (actual or bad data)
- HUD often provided MTW and non-MTW data in different formats indicating possible differences in how data originally reported
- Low response rate to survey (28 of 38 MTW agencies, 44 of 118 comparison PHAs)
- Some MTW agencies did not have 2014 Annual Reports available
- Data quality issues are fixable if data reported by PHAs specifically for performance measurement system with well defined measures, data consistency checks, and PHA verification that the measures are accurate.
Economic Self-Sufficiency (non-elderly, non-disabled households)

1. Percent of households with earnings increase since admission/earliest date available
2. Percent of households with earnings decrease since admission/earliest date available
3. PHA average annual change in earnings
4. [Share of households heads unemployed at admission, but now employed]
5. [Share of household heads employed at admission, but now unemployed]
6. [Share of households with positive exits]
## Earnings Growth for Non-Elderly, Non-Disabled Households (inflation adjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MTW PHAs (n=38)</th>
<th>Comparison PHAs (n=118)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average PHA % of HHs with...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased earnings</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>4.2 p.p.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased earnings</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>1.9 p.p.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero earnings in both periods</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>-6.0 p.p.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHA average annual change in earnings</td>
<td>$532</td>
<td>$421</td>
<td>$111*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quantity and Quality of Affordable Housing

1. Voucher unit utilization rate
2. Public housing occupancy rate
3. Number of unit years and voucher years of non-traditional assistance
4. Physical inspection (REAC) score of public housing developments
5. Number of units preserved as affordable housing (non-PHA owned)
6. [Number of unit years added to the life of the agency’s public housing stock]
## Voucher Utilization Rate and Public Housing Occupancy Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MTW PHAs</th>
<th>Comparison PHAs</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilization of Available Voucher Slots</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average PHA utilization rate</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>-1.6 pp*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of MTW PHAs that have higher rate than comparison PHAs</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 of 38 MTW PHAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupancy Rate of Public Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average PHA occupancy rate</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>0.2 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of MTW PHAs that have higher rate than comparison PHAs</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 of 33 MTW PHAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: MTW PHAs added between 12,000 and 14,500 voucher slots or public units since the start of MTW.
Non-Traditional Assistance

- Of the 26 MTW PHAs that provided information on non-traditional assistance
  - Approximately 5,300 unit years of property-based housing assistance
  - Approximately 2,600 unit years of tenant-based assistance
Promoting Residential Stability for Targeted Populations

1. Total number of targeted households served through service partnerships

2. Total number of FTE service coordinators and service coordinators per household for
   - Elderly and disabled households in public housing
   - Non-elderly, non-disabled households in public housing
   - HCV households

3. [Number of units created or modified to meet accessibility needs or aging in place]

4. [Share of targeted population successfully retained in assisted housing]
## Service Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MTW PHAs (n=23)</th>
<th>Comparison PHAs (n=36)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHA average # of FTE service coordinators</td>
<td>10.8 (3.7)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.9* (1.8*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of PHAs with a Service Coordinator</td>
<td>14 of 23 PHAs (61%)</td>
<td>14 of 36 PHAs (39%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Elderly or Disabled Households in PH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of PHAs with Service Coordinator</td>
<td>9 of 23 PHAs (39%)</td>
<td>14 of 36 PHAs (39%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For non-elderly, non-disabled Households in PH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of PHAs with a Service Coordinator</td>
<td>11 of 23 PHAs (48%)</td>
<td>12 of 36 PHAs (33%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For HCV Households</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of PHAs with a Service Coordinator</td>
<td>11 of 23 PHAs (48%)</td>
<td>5 of 36 PHAs (14%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expanding Geographical Choice

1. Percent of voucher holders that live in neighborhoods with a poverty rate:
   - Below the median for the PHA’s jurisdiction (city/county/state)
   - Below the 25th percentile for the PHA’s jurisdiction
   - Below the median for the metro area (or state for statewide PHA)
   - Below the 25th percentile for the metro area

2. Share of vouchers that are port-ins

3. Share of vouchers that are port-outs

4. Share of vouchers that are project-based
Poverty Rates Where Voucher Holders Live Compared to PHA’s Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>MTW PHAs (n=38)</th>
<th>Comparison PHAs (n=118)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below the median</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>-0.2 p.p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the lowest 25th percentile</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0.1 p.p.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Key Metrics

1. Percent of households with income <30% of AMI, between 30 and 50% of AMI and > 50% of AMI
   - New admits to voucher program
   - New admits to public housing
   - All voucher holders
   - All public housing households

2. Average of rent as percent of gross income

3. Percent with reasonable rent burden ($100 or less or less than 40% of gross income)

4. Length of time on voucher

5. Length of stay in public housing
### Income of New Admittances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>MTW PHAs (n=38)</th>
<th>Comparison PHAs (n=118)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newly Admitted Voucher Households with Income Relative to AMI of</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at or below 30%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>-3.1%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30% and &lt;=50%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50% and &lt;=80%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newly Admitted Public Housing Households with Income Relative to AMI of</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at or below 30%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>-3.5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30% and &lt;=50%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>1.8%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50% and &lt;=80%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.7%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Length of Stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>MTW PHAs</th>
<th>Comparison PHAs</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voucher Program</td>
<td>(n=38)</td>
<td>(n=116)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Years</td>
<td>7.4 years</td>
<td>8.3 years</td>
<td>-0.9 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Years</td>
<td>7.7 years</td>
<td>8.1 years</td>
<td>-0.4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>(n=35)</td>
<td>(n=105)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Years</td>
<td>6.5 years</td>
<td>6.6 years</td>
<td>-0.1 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Years</td>
<td>6.1 years</td>
<td>6.5 years</td>
<td>-0.4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost Effectiveness Measures

1. Voucher admin costs per voucher-year
2. PH operating cost per occupied unit-year
3. HAP subsidy per voucher-year
**Cost Measures – Still in Development**

- For Non-MTW Agencies, can use FDS data:
  - HAP for the HCV program divided by number of unit months leased for HCV program
  - Total Operating expenses for the HCV program divided by number of unit months leased for HCV program.
  - Total operating expenses for the Low Rent Public housing program divided by number of unit months leased for Low Rent Public Housing program.

- Issues for MTW that led us to survey data
  - Non-traditional assistance could be under HCV or PH program expenses.
  - Does HAP in FDS represent HCV HAP only?

- Large range of MTW cost estimates from survey
  - Would like to confirm / get info from sites that have not yet provided it.
Summary (preliminary)

- The picture of how MTW agencies do on these performance measures is inconclusive as we still have other measures to finalize and other data quality checks to do.

- Of the results shown:
  - Sometimes MTW appears to do better, particularly on measures related to the MTW goals (higher earnings growth);
  - Sometimes non-MTW agencies appear to do better (HCV utilization) and sometimes no different (PH occupancy rate, poverty rate of neighborhood).
  - Both, on average, meet standard PHA requirements for serving ELI.
  - MTW agencies have used their flexibility to provide thousands of additional people with non-traditional (non-HCV, non-PH) housing assistance.

- There is a lot of variation across MTW PHAs and comparison PHAs, so need to flesh out when findings being driven by small number of PHAs and when it’s a consistent story.
Recommendations for MTW Performance Reporting System

- Revise and possibly reduce the performance measures based on the experience and feedback on these measures.
- Create more detailed definitions of measures.
- Collect prospectively.
- Imbed data consistency checks in data collection tool and have external check (flag outliers, compare to other data reported, compare to previous year).
- **Design performance measurement system so that PHAs can see building blocks of each measure and verify the accuracy of their data.**
- Consider requesting applicable measures for non-MTW agencies as well.