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Household Type Definitions
Single Adult: Age 25+ with no minor child(ren)
Family: Head of Household age 25+ with minor child(ren)
Parenting Youth: Head of Household age 18-24 with minor child(ren)
Unaccompanied Youth: Age 18-24 with no minor child(ren)

Thank you to CSH for assistance with this and all CAM data reports and all data reports
### 2018 Data Dashboard

- **9,365** households presented at Access Points (not de-duplicated)
  - **1,721** households who presented at Access Points were diverted
  - **3,392** households were referred to shelter or warming center
  - **240** households were referred to Rapid Re-Housing programs
  - **1,045** households were pulled from the Homeless Preference HCV waitlist
  - **343** households were referred to PSH

### 2018 Access Point Dashboard

#### Single Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Point Location</th>
<th>2018 Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRC</td>
<td>1,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumaini</td>
<td>3,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAH Project</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,099</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Unaccompanied Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Point Location</th>
<th>2018 Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRC</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumaini</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAH Project</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>753</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Adult Families & Parenting Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Point Location</th>
<th>2018 Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRC (Parenting Youth)</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC (Families)</td>
<td>2,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,266</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1) Q1 data for singles does not include most of the month of January as the single adult Access Points did not open until January 23rd and January 31st;
2) Youth data for Q1 is included in the totals for Q4 in the adult table; 3) This data is NOT de-duplicated

### Notes:
- **80%** of households came to the Access Points seeking emergency shelter; the other **1,873** households came for a number of other reasons including, but not limited to:
  - Assistance with setting up their HCV applicant portal
  - Questions about eviction prevention or utility assistance
  - General problem solving assistance and questions about housing options

Average Length of Time (Minutes) for CAM Access Point Engagement

- **Q1**: 36 min.
- **Q2**: 37 min.
- **Q3**: 34 min.
- **Q4**: 46 min.

Average length of time for Access Point process decreased by 34% from January due to adequately staffing, training, and adjusting the process as needed.
Number of Unaccompanied Youth (Age 18-24) and Single Adults (Age 25+) Presenting at Access Points

6,099 Total Singles Presenting
Avg. 24 Singles Per Day

Number of Parenting Youth (HoH Age 18-24) and Adult Families (HoH Age 25+) Presenting at Access Points

3,266 Total Families Presenting
Avg. 13 Families Per Day

Note:
1) Youth data for Q1 is included in the adult totals for Q1
CAM Diversion Data

**Diverted:** Household has a safe, habitable place to stay for the night whether or not shelter is available.

For those who are diverted, outcomes are being tracked based on people returning to any CAM Access Point within the following time frames:

- Next day
- Within 7 days
- Within 30 days
- Within 6 months

**Examples of Diversion**

Intensive problem solving with households to determine alternatives to homelessness

- Call family members or friends to inquire about the household staying with them for any period of time
- Purchase greyhound tickets (or provide gas) for households to re-unite with family members or friends in another city
- Provide family members or friends with grocery card to offset cost of household staying with them
- When funds available, assist with security deposit, 1st months rent, and/or utility arrearages for household to move into their own unit

**Total Diverted**

1,721 Total Households Diverted

- 8% of total Single Adults presenting at Access Points
- 11% of Unaccompanied Youth presenting at Access Points
- 37% of adult families presenting at Access Points
- 43% of Parenting Youth presenting at Access Points

77% of households diverted did not return. The table below shows the breakdown of households that returned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Returned households</th>
<th>Returned to an Access Point on at least one additional occasion:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next Day</td>
<td>180 (10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 7 Days</td>
<td>270 (16%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 30 Days</td>
<td>178 (10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 6 Months</td>
<td>198 (12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Aside from the total of 399, numbers in this table are not de-duplicated (i.e., the same household may have returned the next day AND within 7 days)

Notes & trends:

1) Diversion data presented here is only for Q2-Q4; diversion data was not tracked consistently in Q1
2) Because this is rolling data, some households that were diverted later in the year may still be captured in the "returned within 30 days" or "returned within 6 months" categories once 2019 data is factored in
3) Diversion rates were consistent across quarters for 2018
4) There was a small sub-set of households who returned often after being diverted; the CAM Governance Committee will be looking closer at this population to better understand
Of the 9,365 households that presented at Access Points in 2018, **3,392** were referred to shelter or warming center. Of those, **71%** showed up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Referred to Shelter</th>
<th>Total Showing Up to Shelter</th>
<th>% Showing up to Shelter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Adults</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>1,714</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccompanied Youth</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Families</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Youth</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,392</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,392</strong></td>
<td><strong>71%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total showing up to shelter may be slightly higher, but the data is reported based on referral outcomes reported in HMIS by shelter providers.

---

**Final Housing Program Recommendation after VI-SPDAT and SPDAT Triage**

- **Single Adults (Age 25+):**
  - Avg. VI-SPDAT: 7.1
  - Avg. SPDAT: 39
  - 23% Permanent Supportive Housing
  - 65% Rapid Re-Housing
  - 12% No Housing Supports

- **Families (HoH Age 25+):**
  - Avg. VI-SPDAT: 9.1
  - Avg. SPDAT: 43
  - 11% Permanent Supportive Housing
  - 86% Rapid Re-Housing
  - 4% No Housing Supports

- **Parenting Youth (Age 18-24):**
  - Avg. VI-SPDAT: 8.9
  - Avg. SPDAT: 43
  - 10% Permanent Supportive Housing
  - 88% Rapid Re-Housing
  - 1% No Housing Supports

- **Unaccompanied Youth (Age 18-24):**
  - Avg. VI-SPDAT: 7.6
  - Avg. SPDAT: 38
  - 16% Permanent Supportive Housing
  - 78% Rapid Re-Housing
  - 7% No Housing Supports

**Notes:** 1) Only those scoring 8+ (Single) and 9+ (Families) on the VI-SPDAT receive the full SPDAT for further assessment; 2) Because the Full SPDAT is not done immediately (and is, thus, rolling data), the number of Full SPDATs completed does not necessarily equal the number of people who scored for a Full SPDAT on the VI-SPDAT.
1,847 households were added to the MSHDA Homeless Preference Housing Choice Voucher (HP HCV) waitlist in 2018. Of those, 1,045 were pulled from the waitlist. Those who were not pulled are either still on the waitlist or were removed from the waitlist due to not recertifying their homeless status.

![Graph showing waitlist data by month]

**Note:** This data is inclusive of the HCV waitlist data from the Out-Wayne CoC as well as the Detroit CoC.

---

**Rapid Re-Housing**

Households scoring for RRH on the VI-SPDAT and/or Full SPDAT are entered into the RRH prioritization process. Households are prioritized for RRH resources using the prioritization criteria below, and households are referred to RRH providers when they provider makes a request for an identified number of openings in their program(s).

**Detroit CoC RRH Prioritization Criteria**

- **Priority #1.** Consumers who are unsheltered
- **Priority #2.** Consumers who are fleeing domestic violence
- **Priority #3.** Consumers who are currently in emergency shelter

When there are multiple Consumers with the same score in any of these three categories and not enough RRH resources available for all of them, Consumers will be prioritized in the following order:

- **Tiebreaker #1.** Family status: families and then single adults
- **Tiebreaker #2.** Length of time homeless: longest length of time to shortest length of time
240 Households were referred by CAM to RRH Providers in 2018

RRH Referrals by Household Type

RRH Referrals by Agency

12% of households that scored in the RRH range were ultimately able to be referred to RRH providers based on availability.

RRH Housing Process

Total Housed in RRH: 155

Number of Households Housed in a RRH program in the Detroit CoC

Source: HMIS Housed Data

Length of Time (in days) from Assessment to Housed in RRH

Avg. # of days: 129

Sample size = 155 (households housed in RRH)
Permanent Supportive Housing

Households scoring for PSH are assigned a CAM Housing Navigator or a Street Outreach Navigator (if unsheltered) to collect minimum documents necessary and submit a PSH packet. Households are then referred to PSH providers based on provider-reported availability using the prioritization criteria below.

3 out of 4 PSH packets submitted in 2018 were for chronically homeless households

Detroit CoC PSH Prioritization Criteria

- **Priority #1.** Chronically homeless households who are unsheltered (ranked by SPDAT score & length of time homeless – highest to lowest)
- **Priority #2.** Chronically homeless households who are sheltered (ranked by SPDAT score & length of time homeless – highest to lowest)
- **Priority #3.** Non-chronically homeless households who are unsheltered (ranked by SPDAT score & length of time homeless – highest to lowest)
- **Priority #4.** Non-chronically homeless households who are sheltered (ranked by SPDAT score & length of time homeless – highest to lowest)

Total Households Referred to Permanent Supportive Housing Programs: **343**

55% of singles and 84% of families that scored in the PSH range were ultimately referred to PSH based on availability

87% of PSH referrals were for chronically homeless households
PSH Referrals Returned

1 in 3 households were returned to CAM by PSH providers after referral to a PSH provider. The primary reason was that the consumer refused an available unit (primarily SRO).

Total households returned in 2018: **121**

---

**Number of PSH Returns by Quarter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Breakdown of Reasons for Returns**

- Client refused unit: 50
- Agency refused client: 45
- Unable to contact client: 15
- Client in institution: 10
- Already housed: 5
- Lack of Program: 5

*Note: The total returns for Q2 are significantly higher in part because two PSH programs mistakenly requested too many referrals than their program could house.*

---

**PSH Housing Process**

- **Total Housed in PSH: 238**

**Number of Households Housed in a PSH Program in the Detroit CoC**

**Length of Time (in days) from Assessment to Housed in PSH**

- Avg. # of days: **84**

Sample size = 238 (households housed in PSH)
Detroit CAM Governance
Committee 2018 Accomplishments

Implemented innovative opportunities
1. Implemented use of youth VI-SPDAT and Full SPDAT
2. Conducted considerable training for CAM staff, including training on working with specific populations (i.e. people fleeing DV)
3. Began collecting data on employment and income for people referred to emergency shelter in order to better understand the strengths and barriers related to gaining employment and income for this population

Strengthened partnerships and cultivated consistent/collective vision and messaging
1. Transitioned from CAM-focused shelter provider committee to funder-led shelter advisory group
2. Developed a process for better coordination between YWCA Interim House (Detroit’s DV shelter) and CAM staff in order to better serve people fleeing domestic violence

Refined the CAM process through utilization of data and best practices
1. Successfully transitioned our CAM Access Points from a Call Center to in-person locations
   a) Implemented shelter diversion as the front door of the system;
   b) Designated an Access Point appropriate for youth;
   c) Ensured CAM staff and CAM-participating agencies were sufficiently trained for successful rollout
2. Created and implemented comprehensive plan for evaluating the CAM Lead Agency
3. Determined working definition for shelter diversion and strategy for tracking/reporting this activity
4. Implemented new strategies to improve the Homeless Preference HCV application, recertification, and lease-up process

Clarified roles and relationships among CAM implementers and CAM participating agencies
1. Created CAM Policies & Procedures, adopted by the Detroit CoC
2. Created MOUs between key partners in the implementation of CAM

CAM Areas of Focus for 2019

Continue to refine and improve CAM process and operations through utilization of data and best practices
1. Develop a more robust system for tracking and reporting data to provide agency/project/population specific data to various groups:
   a) Shelter, RRH, and PSH provider groups
      i. Use data to improve the CAM process, interaction between CAM and individual providers, client interaction, and quality of housing and services provided
   b) Population-specific work
      i. Use data to inform process changes to better accommodate specific populations and to track progress in meeting benchmarks for functional zero
   c) Cross-systems collaborations
      i. Use data to build political will with cross-systems work (i.e. healthcare & employment)
   d) System funders and CoC Board
      i. Use data in evaluation of projects and implementation of best practices
2. Utilize data and best practices/innovative ideas from other communities to refine the local diversion process

Explore opportunities for innovation and implement as appropriate and feasible
1. Implement process for collaboration between CAM and other mainstream systems:
   a) Employment/Benefits: Connect people experiencing homelessness to income solutions
   b) Healthcare: Utilize Street Medicine Detroit in a more robust way; partner with hospitals to target frequent users
   c) Education/School System: Ensure families with children are enrolled in school and connected with their homeless liaisons
   d) Child Welfare: Coordinate closely to assist in meeting reunification plans for families that have been separated

1. Focus on population-specific work:
   a) Ending chronic homelessness
   b) Ending veteran homelessness
   c) Charting a plan to end youth homelessness

Right size resource allocation and prioritization
1. Utilize findings from gaps analysis and other funding information and data to review current resource allocation; ensure it’s fair & aligns with availability of resources and adjust as needed