



FSS Performance Measurement System

(AKA Composite Score)

Anice Chenault & Jogchum Poodt, HUD

April 23, 2019

Purpose- Family Self-Sufficiency Performance Measurement System


1. U.S. Housing Act of 1937 - Section 23 (i)(2)
2. The information will help PHAs determine the extent to which PHAs are administering effective and impactful FSS programs that help participants to successfully graduate from the program and make progress toward economic security. The information will also help HUD understand the extent to which individual FSS program performance, and the performance of all FSS programs receiving HUD FSS coordinator funding as a group, improves or declines over time
3. HUD plans to use the performance measures to identify high performing and troubled FSS programs. In the future, HUD will likely consider the FSS performance score of an FSS program in determining FSS funding awards. HUD may also use the rating system to identify PHAs that could benefit from technical assistance to improve their programs.

Family Self-Sufficiency Performance Measurement System

1. This new FSS performance measurement system, gives a composite score to PHAs with existing FSS programs with the exception of Moving to Work (MTW) agencies because they report differently in PIC.
1. HUD **will start to use** this performance measurement system in the FY19 Renewal NOFA. It may also be used in other funding determinations.

Composite Score


- All based on PIC data
 - Final Methodology published October, 2018.
 - Will be used in FY19 NOFA

 - **FSS Performance Measurement System:**
 - [FR FINAL Notice *Family Self-Sufficiency Performance Measurement System* \(“Composite Score”\)](#) (November 15, 2018)
 - [Updated FSS Performance Measures \(spreadsheet\)](#)
 - [Methodology for Final FSS Performance Measurement System](#)
- 

Family Self-Sufficiency Performance Measurement System

Under the performance measurement system, at least once per year, HUD will analyze data to calculate FSS performance scores for each FSS program for which sufficient data are available to calculate the score.

A PHA's FSS composite score will be calculated based on three measures, weighted as follows:

- A. Earnings Performance Measure (50 percent)
 - B. Graduation Rate (30 percent)
 - C. Participation Rate (20 percent)
- 

Overview of the Earnings Measure (50 percent)

Extent in which the earnings of FSS participants increase over time after joining the FSS program.

- *Higher of* baseline to most recent OR baseline to average monthly earnings x 12
- Comparison family for each participant family (age, baseline earnings, length of time in housing assistance)
- If the participant left housing assistance, use most recent earnings when they left.
- Looking at cohort who entered FSS 4-7 years ago prior to the end of the most recent quarter of data available through PIC to calculate the latest FSS performance scores.

- Methodology considers
 - (1) FSS programs that encourage increased earnings vs. education/training
 - (2) volatility of earnings of low income workers
 - (3) economic conditions vary from place to place.

Methodology Considerations: Graduation Rates (30 percent)

The graduation rate element seeks to understand the number of participants that have graduated from a PHAs FSS program.

Evaluates the graduation rate of FSS participants who entered a PHA's FSS program 5 to 8 years before the end of the most recent quarter.

Allows for sufficient time to elapse so that FSS participants who will graduate will have done so.

Accounts for program turnover rates of those who have exited public housing or HCV assistance

National Average – 26-34%

Methodology Considerations: Participation Rate (20 percent)

The participation rate seeks to understand how the number of participants being served compares to the minimum number of participants expected to be served under the guidelines outlined by each NOFA.

Reviews the number of coordinators funded in past 3 fiscal years.

Evaluates the number of participants actually served by programs.

Evaluates data based on the year in which the PHA was funded.


Evaluates most recent data to compare to the 3 year average, applies the higher of the two.

Considerations

Checks and Balances between metrics

- Participation goes up too high, graduation and earnings may fall
- Graduate too early, earnings not to potential
- Etc.

Benchmarked on first run of full methodology

- No other program like it to determine “what’s good?”
 - 20% high performing, 60% standard, 10% low, 10% troubled
 - Benchmarks don’t change so goal is to move everyone up
- 

PHA Number	PHA Name	CY2017 PIC Counts (Details)	FY16 NOFA Counts	Most Recent Number of Positions Funded	(FY18) Number of Positions Supported by PIC Count
AK901/AK001	Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	972	738	4	19
CA003	Oakland Housing Authority	252	221	4	5
CA014	Housing Authority of the County of San Mateo	657	437	5	13
CA019	Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino	186	190	3	4
CA056	Housing Authority of the City of San Jose	133	139	2	3
CA059	Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara	239	188	3	5
CA063	San Diego Housing Commission	437	473	6	9
CT004	Housing Authority of the City of New Haven	175	118	2	4
DC001	District of Columbia Housing Authority	240	275	4	5
FL004	Housing Authority of the City of Orlando, FL	27	#N/A	0.5	1
GA004	Housing Authority of Columbus, Georgia	101	104	2	2
GA006	The Housing Authority of the City of Atlanta, Georgia	125	0	4	3
IL002	Chicago Housing Authority	1255	1175	15	25
KS053	Lawrence-Douglas County Housing Authority	205	249	5	4
KY001	Louisville Metro Housing Authority	261	180	4	5
KY004	Lexington-Fayette Urban County Housing Authority	73	85	2	1
MA005	Holyoke Housing Authority	190	201	2	4
MA901	Commonwealth of Massachusetts	954	871	14	19
MD002	Housing Authority of Baltimore City	1716	951	7	34
NC003	Housing Authority of the City of Charlotte, N.C.	5210	5275	2	110
NE002	Housing Authority of the City of Lincoln	131	122	2	3
NH010	Keene Housing Authority	85	96	2	2
NV001	Housing Authority of the City of Reno	136	108	2	3
OH031	Portage Metropolitan Housing Authority	28	30	1	1
OR002	Home Forward	473	511	8	9
PA001	Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh	587	713	8	12
PA002	Philadelphia Housing Authority	285	80	5	6
TX006	Housing Authority of the City of San Antonio	1173	1289	17	23
VA019	Fairfax County Redevelopment & Housing Authority	103	121	2	2
WA001	Seattle Housing Authority	391	357	6	8
WA002	King County Housing Authority	319	95	5	6
WA005	Housing Authority of the City of Tacoma	3317	162	3	66
WA008	Housing Authority of the City of Vancouver	263	246	3	5

What elements of the existing composite score would you like to see applied to MTW sites?

Do these metrics make sense for MTW?

How should we collect the data?

Discussion