

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

Thank you for participating in our impact analysis process and for the important work your organization is leading in the community!

The Constellation Fund supports its poverty-fighting mission by weighing careful qualitative evaluations with quantitative analyses that are driven by peer-reviewed research, local demographic information, and data directly from nonprofits. What follows is a summary of these findings. However, it is important to put the quantitative information into the appropriate context.



Benefit-Cost Analysis

- Constellation calculates the value of poverty-fighting benefits that accrue to program participants at or below 185% of the federal poverty guideline. The primary two measurables throughout all of our metrics are lifetime improvements to health and income.
- This work results in a private benefit-cost ratio (BCR), which encapsulates the dollar amount of measurable poverty-fighting benefits created by an organization relative to how much it costs. It is worth emphasizing that a private BCR is different than a social BCR, which generally includes public returns on investment (e.g. savings to taxpayers). As a result, our BCRs are often lower than those of a social BCR.
- If your organization is receiving funding for the first time, Constellation will estimate a BCR again next year. It will likely change as we continue to refine and improve this estimate. We recommend you do not broadly share your organization's BCR until Constellation has completed two full evaluations.

Additional Context

CONSTELLATION'S METRICS ARE:	CONSTELLATION'S METRICS ARE NOT:
A Standard for Comparing Opportunities:	The Only Criteria for Making Grant Decisions:
Metrics allow for the weighting of similar and	Observations and qualitative information also play
dissimilar programs.	important roles in our grantmaking.
A Tool for Achieving Transparency:	Report Cards on Potential Grantees:
Constellation welcomes outside voices to examine,	A nonprofit can fulfill its own mission without
criticize, and improve the metrics.	scoring high on Constellation's metrics.
A Diagnostic Device:	Exact and Unchanging:
What do highest-scoring organizations have in	Neither the data captured nor the calculations
common? Lowest?	applied are perfect and, with additional research and
A Method for Assessing Constellation:	refinement, our metrics are designed to evolve.
We measure our own impact the same way we	The Only Approach to Smart Philanthropy:
measure other organizations: how much poverty- fighting good we do with each dollar we spend.	Other funding organizations may employ different but useful standards.



QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS REPORT

Organization Name:

Ujamaa Place

Impact Area: Employmen	t	Geography:	St. Paul
GRANT AMOUNT:	BENEFIT-COST	RATIO:	TOTAL BENEFITS:
\$200,000	\$4.22 : 1		\$ 2,621,306

ORGANIZATION OVERVIEW

ORGANIZATION DESCRIPTION:

Ujamaa Place serves African American men experiencing barriers to employment by providing academic and employment skill development as well as life skill development.

GRANT PURPOSE:

Funding from Constellation will support general operating funds for Ujamaa to focus on continued growth and expansion of services.

BENEFITS

ANALYSIS OF BENEFIT-COST RATIO:

Over the past year, Ujamaa generated \$4.22 for every dollar invested, which is a change from \$1.68 in its previous year's calculation. COVID was the major factor in last year's reduced BCR specifically because Ujamaa's educational programming generated significant benefits last year and the number served dropped dramatically related to the switch to virtual learning and lack of access to GED testing opportunities. The majority of the return this year comes from participants receiving training to achieve their GED, increased wages that participants would earn in the three years after finishing the program and from housing that Ujamaa owns. Returns also come from mental health referrals and housing referrals to other nonprofit partners. Based on existing evidence, we assume that employment training programs impact future earnings as far as three years after participation. All earnings are estimated accounting for employment and wage rates of sub-populations served by the program (e.g. previously incarcerated, disability, and race). Estimates also account for expected or observed duration of employment and hours worked.

PROJECTED BENEFITS SUMMARY:	
ECO001 - Employment programs leading to increased earnings	\$1,707,821
EDU005 - High school equivalence leading to improved health	\$4,781,250
EDU004 - High school equivalence leading to lifetime earnings	\$1,944,375
HOU001 - Supportive housing leading to increased earnings by population of interest	\$94,920
HOU002 - Supportive housing leading to increased cash assistance by population of	
interest	\$63,224
HOU029 - Rental assistance or subsidies providing immediate economic value	\$100,902
HOU001 - Supportive housing leading to increased earnings by population of interest	\$22,906
HOU002 - Supportive housing leading to increased cash assistance by population of	
interest	\$2,330
HOU029 - Rental assistance or subsidies providing immediate economic value	\$5,446
HEA020 - Mental health care for mental illness leading to increased QALYs	\$67,260
HOU001 - Supportive housing leading to increased earnings by population of interest	\$23,330
HOU002 - Supportive housing leading to increased cash assistance by population of	
interest	\$6,435
ECO002 - Reduced recidivism leading to increased earnings	\$54,139
EDU018 - Scholarships leading to academic credential (2-year/Associate degree)	\$189,958
HEA021 - Mental health care for serious mental illness leading to increased earnings	\$28,456
TOTAL BENEFITS	\$9,092,753

ORGANIZATION'S BENEFIT-COST RATIO:

Benefits:	\$9,092,753
Costs:	\$2,156,964
BENEFIT-COST RATIO	\$4.22 : 1

	<u>16</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	白	<u>10</u>	Q	lœ	Z	ത	ט	ω	N	حر	Metric #											
	Health	Education	Employment	Housing	Housing	Health	Housing	Housing	Housing	Housing	Housing	Housing	Education	Education	Employment	Area							Data Year (ending year a	Fiscal Year (ending year a	Grant Round	Program Nan	Organization
	HEA021	EDU018	ECO002	HOU002	HOU001	HEA020	HOU029	HOU002	HOU001	HOU029	HOU002	HOU001	EDU004	EDU005	ECO001	Metric ID							and month)	and month)		ne	Name
Metric 1	HEA021 - Mental health care for serious mental illness leading to increased earnings	EDU018 - Scholarships leading to academic credential (2-year/Associate degree)	ECO002 - Reduced recidivism leading to increased earnings	HOU002 - Supportive housing leading to increased cash assistance by population of interest	HOU001 - Supportive housing leading to increased earnings by population of interest	HEA020 - Mental health care for mental illness leading to increased QALYs	HOU029 - Rental assistance or subsidies providing immediate economic value	HOU002 - Supportive housing leading to increased cash assistance by population of interest	HOU001 - Supportive housing leading to increased earnings by population of interest	HOU029 - Rental assistance or subsidies providing immediate economic value	HOU002 - Supportive housing leading to increased cash assistance by population of interest	HOU001 - Supportive housing leading to increased earnings by population of interest	EDU004 - High school equivalence leading to lifetime earnings	EDU005 - High school equivalence leading to improved health	ECO001 - Employment programs leading to increased earnings	Metrics	Benefits Summary		Estimated Number of Unique Individuals Served	Relevant Costs	Total Benefits	BCR	2021	Calendar Year	Q4-2022	Gen Ops	Ujamaa Place
	\$28,456	\$189,958	\$54,139	\$6,435	\$23,330	\$67,260	\$5,446	\$2,330	\$22,906	\$100,902	\$63,224	\$94,920	\$1,944,375	\$4,781,250	\$1,707,821	Benefits				\$2,156,964	\$9,092,753	4.22					

																	-	Metric Description	Equation	ECO001
																				ECO001 - Em
PV Tool		lotal wage benefits	Vet wages year 2 and 3	Nages in year 3: Same as above but Card's impact is 0.04 for after second year over the impact in year 2.	Nages in year 2: (# participants)*(Average # hours worked, 30 assumed)*(ave wage, \$15 assumed)*(Impact of program on prob of eployment from Card)	-rom Card, et al., (2017)[See table 4]. We assume the difference in %pts between the short term effect 1-year) of the progra on the prob. of employment and the prob. of employment in year 2.	-or years 2 and 3 we assume that the program increases chances of employment based on Card, etal., 2017).	Assumptions	fear 2 and 3 benefits	Total net benefits from wages - year 1	xt the begining of year 2 the probability of employment for those who did not find jobd during yer 1 is the counterfactual rate of employment (Participants/# with jobd at entry)	Total counterfactual wages	Counterfactual annual wages: Employment rate pre-program x Work time x Wages pre-program	Nages from full-time eployment: 52 weeks working 35hrs/week at \$13 for the 84 participants who found art-time jobs.	Nages from part-time eployment: (26 weeks working 20hrs/week at \$15 for 65% of the 42 participants who ound part-time jobs and retained jobs for 6 months) + (52 weeks working 20hrs/week at \$15 for 35% of he 42 participants who found part-time jobs and retained jobs for one year)	fear 1 benefits		This is a generic metric. The actual estimation depends on availability of outcome data from t may include: Job training programs, job placement programs, programs who provide direct er	(# participants who find employment due to the program) x (# total time of paid work) x (\$ net	ployment programs leading to increased earnings
	Benefit	\$1,707,821	\$581,553	\$377,749	\$203,804	0.044				\$1,126,268	0.34	\$849,160	\$4,044	\$1,533,168	\$442,260		-	ne program. Employme nployment to participar	increase in earnings)	
	\$1,707,821																	ent programs nts.		

h tinsufficient) tinsufficient) tinsufficient) EDU005 - Hig				asure ogram match	od/sufficien	opulation mai ood/sufficien	ounterfactual ood/sufficien:	uality of data ood/sufficien	ootnotes, if i				quation	letric escription	letric omnonents					
				1	t/insufficient)	'ch t/insufficient)	match t/insufficient)	t/insufficient)	equired											
Rating Explanation Good	I hird-party outcomes Factor Iool	Strength of Evidence	Pating Evolution	Kating Explanation	Good	Good	Good	Good		Return to the top	Metric 2		(# participants) x (# participants who pass the high school equivalence test) x (QALY increase) x (\$	This metric estimates the impacts of obtaining a high school diploma equivalent on lifetime health, e adjusted life years (QALY).	Number of participants: Use EDU004 instructions.	% of participants who receive their GED: [SELECT] Use EDU004 instructions	QALY increase: [5.1] We estimate that high school graduation boosts the future health status of stud based on the work of Muennig, et al. (2010)	\$ value per QALY: [50000]	Referral factor: [SELECT] Apply only to programs without preparation components. If the number of involved" may be appropriate. If the number of takers is not known, select a lower referral factor.	
Pootnote red No No No ALY) × (% Referral fact timated in terms of quali sents by 5.1 QALYs at agr			Ecotinate rea	Footnote red	No	Zo	No	No	Rating Rubr				QALY) x (% Referral fact	timated in terms of quali			ents by 5.1 QALYs at ag		est takers are known, "h	

Program match (good/sufficient/ir	Measure						Need to discount	Adjustment for th	œ	~	0	(1)	4	(.)	N	_				Metric Notes
nsufficient)							to PV?	ird-party outcome		•		Referral factor	\$ value per QA	3 QALY increase	% of participant	Number of part				
Good	Rating												F		ts who receive th	icipants		Participant Dat Test passers kr Test takers only	Type of Progra Test preparatio No test prepara	Use the numbe Apply the appr discounted to p
	Explanation	Strength of Evidence	Third-party outcomes Factor Tool	PV Tool		Benefit	No	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known							neir GED		Metric Components	a: nown $\rightarrow Q = 1$ $\gamma \rightarrow Q = appropriate counterfactual passing rate$	m: n provided. \rightarrow No referral adjustment required ation provided \rightarrow Select appropriate referral adjustment	r of participants and the estimated number of GED earners using EDU004 instructions. opriate referral factor ONLY to programs that don't provide preparation for the test. Benefits should resent value.
No	Footnote required?					\$4,781,250	1.00						50000	5.1	0.75	25				then be

Metric Description	Equation	EDU004			Footnotes, if req	Quality of data (good/sufficient/in	Counterfactual ma (good/sufficient/in	Population match (good/sufficient/in
		EDU004 - Hig			uired	sufficient)	atch sufficient)	sufficient)
This metric estimates the impact of receiving a GED certificate on lifetime earnings. It also allows for the estimat the subsequent increased chance of enrolling in college or earning a higher educational degree.	(# participants) x (Q1: % participants who receive their GED) x (\$ difference in lifetime earnings of an individual v equivalence and expected higher education achievement vs. no high school completion) x (% Referral factor)	h school equivalence leading to lifetime earnings	Metric 3	Return to the top		Good	Good	Good
ion of benefits from	with a high school				Rating Rubric	No	No	No

e	(7)	4	ω	N			Metric Notes							Metric Components
		Referral factor	Difference in lifeti no high school co	Q: % of participar	Number of partici				۵0- ۵- 	<u>אר א</u> ל	ט משדע	0 <	0	요하고
			time earnings of an individual with a high school equivalence and expected higher education achievement vs. 103700 ompletion	ants who receive their GED 0.78	zipants 25	Metric Components	First, determine if the program provides preparation for the GED or simply encourages participants to take the test; this will inform if you need a referral adjustment. Apply the appropriate referral factor ONLY to programs that don't provide preparation for the test.	Referral factor: [SELECT] Apply only to programs without preparation components. If the number of test takers are known, "highly involved" may be appropriate. If the number of takers is not known, select a lower referral factor.	Difference in lifetime earnings of an individual with a high school equivalence and expected higher education achievement vs. no high school completion: [103700] Estimated using the college enrollment and graduation rates for low-income individuals and estimated lifetime earnings by educational level. See Constellation's Impact Metrics Framework documentation for details. Benefits are already discounted to present value.	Asian: 0.86 Pacific Islander: 0.93 White: 0.93 All races: 0.75	Select the appropriate counterfactual passing rate: Counterfactual rate of passing high school equivalence test in comparable population. (GED Testing Services, 2014). Black: 0.75 Hispanic: 0.84 American Indian: 0.82	When only the number of takers is known, estimate the number of passers as: Q = % Counterfactual rate of passing GED tests.	Q: % of participants who receive their GED: [SELECT] When the program provides the number of passers, Q = 1.	Number of participants: Program may provide the number of participants passing the GED test OR the number of participants who take the test (or are referred to testing) within the period analyzed. See the estimation instructions for Q for each type of available data.

Equation	HOU001 HC		Footnotes, if require	Quality of data (good/sufficient/insuffi	Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insuffi	Population match (good/sufficient/insuffi	Program match (good/sufficient/insuffi	Measure					Need to discount to PV	Adjustment for third-pa	8	7
	0U001 - Sup		đ	cient)	cient)	cient)	cient)						ŚΛ	arty outcome		
(# participants r	portive housin			Good	Good	Good	Good	Rating								
eceiving services) x (\$ average increase in wages)	g leading to increased earnings by population of interest	Metric 5						Explanation	Strength of Evidence	Third-party outcomes Factor Tool	PV Tool	Benefit	No	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known		
			Rating Rubric	No	No	No	No	Footnote required?				\$1,944,375	1.00			

Need to discu	Adjustment fu										Metric Notes	Metric Description Metric Component
ount t	or thir	ω	7	6	сл	4	ω	N	_		0,	Ø
o PV?	d-party outcome							Net increase in v	Number of partic			
No	Dir							/ages one year aft	ipants		This metric can be 21), and families w programs.	This metric estimatively adults, famili erm, affordable facility adults, famility and programization or in programs of services. Sprograms; many of particip encouraging particip and far estimate the metric under 21), and far estimate the metric stimate the metric for a supportive hous 2012). We assume Single adults: \$1,6 Adults with children Jnaccompanied you
0	irect Outcome							fter entering supportive housing by population		Metric Components	e applied to programs serving the following household compositions: Single adults, unaccompar with children. No discounting is needed. This metric can be applied to permanent or transitional	ates the impact of supportive housing programs on increased wages. Supportive housing is a dii lies, or youth who are homeless, low-income and at risk of homelessness, or disabled identify a ousing. Programs may include rental subsidies or entirely free housing, either in property manage private properties in the community. Individuals participating in supportive housing generally hava ragement services that are designed to preserve tenancy and address their current needs. Serv port, health support/treatment including substance abuse and mental health, life skills, parental Supportive housing programs may be permanent, allowing participants to remain indefinitely, or cipants to move into market housing eventually. This metric applies equally to permanent or tran other metrics apply to one type or the other. This metric can be used for the following household compositions: Single adults, unaccon milies with children. Request participation data for all the groups that apply for the program at ha is separately for each group in the evaluation template. ages one year after entering supportive housing by population: [SELECT] Net increase in wages ing services. This impact is estimated controlling for pre-post wage trends and other covariates e one year of additional income. 695 an: \$4,172 <i>jouths:</i> \$11,453 s: \$4,093
1.00	100%							1695	56		ed youths (under supportive housing	act service that d secure long- ed by the e access to escanay include skills, among other transitional, sitional housing panied youths nd. Then, nd. Then, one year after ving at least a year (Chase, et al.,

	_				1						-				
Metric Description	Equation	HOU002				Footnotes, if requ	Quality of data (good/sufficient/in:	Counterfactual ma (good/sufficient/in:	Population match (good/sufficient/in:	Program match (good/sufficient/in:	Measure				
		HOU002 - Su				uired	sufficient)	atch sufficient)	sufficient)	sufficient)					
This metric es service that he secure long-te the organizatic ongoing case job placement types of servic encouraging p programs; ma	(# participants	pportive housi					Good	Good	Good	Good	Rating	-			
timates the impact of supportive housing programs on increased cash assistance. Supportive housings adults, families, or youth who are homeless, low-income and at risk of homelessness, or disaberr, affordable housing. Programs may include rental subsidies or entirely free housing, either in private properties in the community. Individuals participating in supportive housing general management services that are designed to preserve tenancy and address their current needs. Ser support, health support/treatment including substance abuse and mental health, life skills, parenta servicipants to move into market housing eventually. This metric applies equally to permanent or trans or the other.	receiving services) x (\$ average increase in cash assistance)	ng leading to increased cash assistance by population of interest	Metric 6	Return to the top							Explanation	Strength of Evidence	Third-party outcomes Factor Tool	PV Tool	Benefit
ing is a direct led identify and operty managed by y have access to vices may include vices may include al skills, among other or transitional, nsitional housing						Rating Rubric	No	No	No	No	Footnote required?				\$94,920

			Third-party outcomes Factor Tool
			Strength of Evidence
Measure		Rating	Explanation Footnote required
Program match (good/sufficient/in	sufficient)	Good	No
Population match (good/sufficient/in	sufficient)	Good	No
Counterfactual ma (good/sufficient/in	atch sufficient)	Good	No
Quality of data (good/sufficient/in	sufficient)	Good	No
Footnotes, if req	uired		Rating Rubric
			Return to the top
			Metric 7
HOU029	HOU029 - Re	ntal assistance	e or subsidies providing immediate economic value
Equation		(\$ Total value of	of cash or subsidies given to or used by participants)
Metric Description		Many housing participants pa housing progra value to partici Wherever possi data is not can for doing so ar Note that in ca participant to the not be used, a instrumental in	programs include some sort of housing stipend, rent subsidy, or cash rental assistance to reduce the amount of rent ay. These subsidies may be permanent and constant, or participants may be weaned off of them over time. While ams often have down-stream impacts on future earnings and health, this metric captures the immediate economic ipants of reduced price rent. sible, the benefit should be the exact monetary value of subsidies or rental assistance provided to participants. If this eruly tracked, it may be possible to calculate the value from available data, or make reasonable assumptions; option: e included below. It is where participants receive a government housing subsidy and the program is not instrumental in connecting the hat subsidy - that is, in cases where the participant enters the program with the subsidy in hand - this metric should s the program is not meaningfully responsible for the economic value the participant receives. If the program is n making the connection, this will be treated as a referral.
			Metric Components
	Value of rental	assistance or su	ubsidies \$265,531.2
2			
ω			

	HOLION1 - SI	montive housing leading to increased earnings by nonulation of interest
Equation		(# participants receiving services) x (\$ average increase in wages)
Metric Description		This metric estimates the impact of supportive housing programs on increased wages. Supportive housing is a direct service that helps adults, families, or youth who are homeless, low-income and at risk of homelessness, or disabled identify and secure long-term, affordable housing. Programs may include rental subsidies or entirely free housing, either in property managed by the organization or in private properties in the community. Individuals participating in supportive housing generally have access to ongoing case management services that are designed to preserve tenancy and address their current needs. Services may include job placement support, health support/treatment including substance abuse and mental health, life skills, parental skills, among ot types of services. Supportive housing programs may be permanent, allowing participants to remain indefinitely, or transitional, encouraging participants to move into market housing eventually. This metric applies equally to permanent or transitional housing programs; many other metrics apply to one type or the other.
Metric Components		Number of participants: This metric can be used for the following household compositions: Single adults, unaccompanied youths (under 21), and families with children. Request participation data for all the groups that apply for the program at hand. Then, estimate the metric separately for each group in the evaluation template.
		Net increase in wages one year after entering supportive housing by population: [SELECT] Net increase in wages one year after entering supportive housing by population: [SELECT]. These are the net increases in wages associated with receiving at least a y of supportive housing services. This impact is estimated controlling for pre-post wage trends and other covariates, (Chase, et al., 2012). We assume one year of additional income. Single adults: \$1,695 Adults with children: \$4,172 Unaccompanied youths: \$11,453 Average all groups: \$4,093
Metric Notes		This metric can be applied to programs serving the following household compositions: Single adults, unaccompanied youths (und 21), and families with children. No discounting is needed. This metric can be applied to permanent or transitional supportive hous programs.
		Metric Components
_	Number of par	licipants
2	Net increase in	wages one year after entering supportive housing by population 11
З		
4		
ъ		
o		
7		
8		

Equation	HOU002 HOU002 -			Footnotes, if required	Quality of data (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Population match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Program match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Measure					Need to discount to PV?	Adjustment for third-party outco
(# participant	Supportive hous				Good	Good	Good	Good	Rating	-					ome
s receiving services) x (\$ average increase in cash assistance)	sing leading to increased cash assistance by population of interest	Metric 9	Return to the top						Explanation	Strength of Evidence	Third-party outcomes Factor Tool	PV Tool	Benefit	No	Direct Outcome
				Rating Rubric	No	No	No	No	Footnote required?				\$22,906	1.00	100%

				Metric N			Metric Compor	Metric Descrip
ω	N	_		lotes			nents	tion
	Net increase in	Number of parti						
	cash assistance (public programs) one year after entering supportive housing by population 1165	cipants 2	Metric Components	This metric can be applied to programs serving the following household compositions: Single adults, unaccompanied youths (under 21), and families with children. No discounting is needed. This metric can be applied to permanent or transitional supportive housing programs.	Single adults: \$1,129 Adults with children: \$1,053 Unaccompanied youths: \$1,165 Average all groups: \$1,115	Net increase in cash assistance (public programs) one year after entering supportive housing by population: [SELECT] These are the net increases in cash assistance associated with receiving at least a year of supportive housing services. This impact is estimated controlling for pre-post cash assistance trends and other covariates (Chase, et al., 2012). The impact is the combination of MFIP cash increases, emergency assistance, and general assistance, which are reported in Chase, et al. as an average value for all participants, plus the value of food support payments, which are reported with some demographic granularity. The totals below include the general rates of MFIP cash, emergency and general assistance plus specific rates of food support. We assume one year of additional benefits.	Number of participants: This metric can be used for the following household compositions: Single adults, unaccompanied youths (under 21), and families with children. Request participation data for all the groups that apply for the program at hand. Then, estimate the metric separately for each group in the evaluation template.	This metric estimates the impact of supportive housing programs on increased cash assistance. Supportive housing is a direct service that helps adults, families, or youth who are homeless, low-income and at risk of homelessness, or disabled identify and secure long-term, affordable housing. Programs may include rental subsidies or entirely free housing, either in property managed by the organization or in private properties in the community. Individuals participating in supportive housing generally have access to ongoing case management services that are designed to preserve tenancy and address their current needs. Services may include job placement support, health support/treatment including substance abuse and mental health, life skills, parental skills, among other types of services. Supportive housing programs may be permanent - allowing participants to remain indefinitely - or transitional, encouraging participants to move into market housing eventually. This metric applies equally to permanent or transitional housing programs; many other metrics apply to one type or the other.

	Metric Description	Equation	HOU029							Need to discount t	Adjustment for thir	œ	7	D	IJ	4
			HOU029 - Re							o PV?	rd-party outcome					
	Many housing participants par housing progra value to particil Wherever poss data is not care for doing so are Note that in care participant to the not be used, as instrumental in	(\$ Total value c	ntal assistance													
Metric Components	programs include some sort of housing stipend, rent subsidy, or cash rental assistance to reduce th y. These subsidies may be permanent and constant, or participants may be weaned off of them ove tims often have down-stream impacts on future earnings and health, this metric captures the immed pants of reduced price rent. sible, the benefit should be the exact monetary value of subsidies or rental assistance provided to p afully tracked, it may be possible to calculate the value from available data, or make reasonable ass e included below. ses where participants receive a government housing subsidy and the program is not instrumental is nat subsidy - that is, in cases where the participant enters the program with the subsidy in hand - th s the program is not meaningfully responsible for the economic value the participant receives. If the making the connection, this will be treated as a referral.	of cash or subsidies given to or used by participants)	or subsidies providing immediate economic value	Metric 10	Return to the top	Strength of Evidence	Third-party outcomes Factor Tool	PV Tool	Benefit	No	Direct Outcome					
	he amount of rent artime. While liate economic articipants. If this sumptions; options in connecting the is metric should program is								\$2,330	1.00	100%					

	(# participants) x (QALY gains from treatments of mental illness) x (\$QALY)		Equation
	ental health care for mental illness leading to increased QALYs	HEA020 - M	HEA020
	Metric 11		
	Return to the top		
	Strength of Evidence		
	not made. This is the baseline we assume as counterfactual.	vpe of data	organization and t available.
acking of any sort is	Participants would not achieve outcomes from the third-party provider but for the referring organization. An example of this case is when information about third-party services is made available to all participants, but tri	rs. Select the t of referring	third-party provide level of involvmen
38%	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	erated thru	For outcomes gen
	Third-party outcomes Factor Tool		
	PV Tool		
\$5,446	Benefit		
1.00	No	o PV?	Need to discount t
38.00%	ne Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	d-party outcom	Adjustment for thir
			8
			7
			6
			უ
			4
			3
			2
14332.18	l assistance or subsidies	Value of renta	-

38%	lighly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	For outcomes generated thru
	Third-party outcomes Factor Tool	
	PV Tool	
\$67,260	Benefit	
1.00	No	Need to discount to PV?
38%	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	Adjustment for third-party outcome
		Ø
		7
		D
		J
		4
50000		3 \$ value per QAL
0.03	treatments of mental illness	2 QALY gains from
118	pants	1 Number of partic
	Metric Components	
	his metric can be used in conjunction with HEA021.	Metric Notes
	value per QALY: [50000]	
leasuring health nd dosage of	ALY gains from treatments of mental illness: [0.03] This is the median QALY gain from a collection of studies me npact of treatments for mental illnesses (Wisløff, et al., 2014). This statistic has broad scope in terms of types ar eatments, types of illnesses and severity, and age and duration of treatments.	
	lumber of participants:	Metric I
ic covers a variety of orogram refers mation about the itermine the	his metric estimates the average impact of a variety treatments of mental health illnesses on QALYs. The metric eatments and mental illness and levels of severity. This metric is more appropriate for situations where the p atients to third party providers to receive treatment. In these cases, it is common that there is not sufficient inforr pecific number of patients suffering a particular illness or receiving a particular treatment. Therefore, IO must de ppropriate referral factor using Constellation's standard criteria for this purpose.	Metric Description

Metric C	Metric Notes This metric can be applied to programs serving the follow 21), and families with children. No discounting is needed programs.	Net increase in wages one year after entering supportive entering supportive housing by population: [SELECT]. Th of supportive housing services. This impact is estimated (2012). We assume one year of additional income. Single adults: \$1,695 Adults with children: \$4,172 Unaccompanied youths: \$11,453 Average all groups: \$4,093	MetricNumber of participants: This metric can be used for the for (under 21), and families with children. Request participati estimate the metric separately for each group in the evalue	Metric This metric estimates the impact of supportive housing properties Description helps adults, families, or youth who are homeless, low-inclused to reganization or in private properties in the community. Include rental supportive by programs may include rental support, health support/treatment including types of services. Supportive housing programs may be programs; many other metrics apply to one type or the other services.	Equation (# participants receiving services) x (\$ average increase i	HOU001 - Supportive housing leading to increased earnings by po	Metric 12	Return to the top	Strength of Evider	organization and type of data not made. This is the baseline we assume as counterfact available.
omponents	ving household compositions: Single adults, unaccompanied youths (under d. This metric can be applied to permanent or transitional supportive housing	housing by population: [SELECT] Net increase in wages one year after nese are the net increases in wages associated with receiving at least a year controlling for pre-post wage trends and other covariates, (Chase, et al.,	ollowing household compositions: Single adults, unaccompanied youths ion data for all the groups that apply for the program at hand. Then, uation template.	trograms on increased wages. Supportive housing is a direct service that income and at risk of homelessness, or disabled identify and secure long- ubsidies or entirely free housing, either in property managed by the dividuals participating in supportive housing generally have access to preserve tenancy and address their current needs. Services may include g substance abuse and mental health, life skills, parental skills, among other permanent, allowing participants to remain indefinitely, or transitional, entually. This metric applies equally to permanent or transitional housing ther.	in wages)	opulation of interest			nce	tual.

	sipants receiving services) x (\$ average increase in cash assistance)	(# part	Equation
	housing leading to increased cash assistance by population of interest	OU002 - Supportiv	HOU002 Ho
	Mottio 43		
	Return to the top		
	Strength of Evidence	-	
	te. This is the baseline we assume as counterfactual.) of data not ma	organization and type available.
cking of any sort is	ants would not achieve outcomes from the third-party provider but for the referring organization. nple of this case is when information about third-party services is made available to all participants, but tra	Select the Partici referring An exa	third-party providers. level of involvment of
38%	nvolved & Number of participants who receive service is known	ited thru Highly	For outcomes genera
	Third-party outcomes Factor Tool	-	
	PV Tool	-	-
\$23,330	Benefit		
1.00	No	ςΛ	Need to discount to F
38%	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	arty outcome	Adjustment for third-p
			8
			7
			Ø
			СЛ
			4
			ω
4093	ne year after entering supportive housing by population	et increase in wages	2 Ne
15		umber of participants	1 N

									Metric Not			Metric Componer	Metric Descriptio
œ	7	თ	ഗ	4	ω	N	_		S			its	2
						Net increase in	Number of parti						
						cash assistance (public programs) one year after entering supportive housing by population	ticipants	Metric Components	This metric can be applied to programs serving the following household compositions: Single adults, unaccompanied youths 21), and families with children. No discounting is needed. This metric can be applied to permanent or transitional supportive programs.	Single adults: \$1,129 Adults with children: \$1,053 Unaccompanied youths: \$1,165 Average all groups: \$1,115	Net increase in cash assistance (public programs) one year after entering supportive housing by population: [SELECT] Thes the net increases in cash assistance associated with receiving at least a year of supportive housing services. This impact is estimated controlling for pre-post cash assistance trends and other covariates (Chase, et al., 2012). The impact is the combi MFIP cash increases, emergency assistance, and general assistance, which are reported in Chase, et al. as an average val participants, plus the value of food support payments, which are reported with some demographic granularity. The totals belo include the general rates of MFIP cash, emergency and general assistance plus specific rates of food support. We assume of additional benefits.	Number of participants: This metric can be used for the following household compositions: Single adults, unaccompanied yo (under 21), and families with children. Request participation data for all the groups that apply for the program at hand. Then estimate the metric separately for each group in the evaluation template.	This metric estimates the impact of supportive housing programs on increased cash assistance. Supportive housing is a dire service that helps adults, families, or youth who are homeless, low-income and at risk of homelessness, or disabled identify secure long-term, affordable housing. Programs may include rental subsidies or entirely free housing, either in property man the organization or in private properties in the community. Individuals participating in supportive housing generally have accere ongoing case management services that are designed to preserve tenancy and address their current needs. Services may including substance abuse and mental health, life skills, parental skills, among types of services. Supportive housing programs may be permanent - allowing participants to remain indefinitely - or transition encouraging participants to move into market housing eventually. This metric applies equally to permanent or transitional hop programs; many other metrics apply to one type or the other.
						1129	15		(under housing		e are nation of ue for all w ne year	uths	and aged by sss to nclude ng other nal, using

ust capture and be	This metric estimates the impact of reduced recidivism on short-term earnings. To use this metric, the program m able to report a 3-year recidivism rate.		Metric Description
pact of re-	(# Participants) x [(counterfactual recidivism rate) - (% Participants who are re-incarcerated after program)] x (Im incarceration on earnings) x (Average annual earnings of formerly incarcerated individuals)		Equation
	luced recidivism leading to increased earnings	FC0002 - Rec	EC0002
	Metric 14		
	Return to the top		
Rating Rubric		quired	Footnotes, if re
No	Good	insufficient)	Quality of data (good/sufficient/i
No	Good	natch insufficient)	Counterfactual n (good/sufficient/i
No	Good	h insufficient)	Population matc. (good/sufficient/i
No	Good	insufficient)	Program match (good/sufficient/i
Footnote required?	Rating Explanation		Measure
	Strength of Evidence		
acking of any sort is	Participants would not achieve outcomes from the third-party provider but for the referring organization. An example of this case is when information about third-party services is made available to all participants, but tranot made. This is the baseline we assume as counterfactual.	ders. Select the ent of referring I type of data	third-party provic level of involvme organization and available.
38%	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	enerated thru	For outcomes ge
	Third-party outcomes Factor Tool		
	PV Tool		
\$6,435	Benefit		
1.00	No	t to PV?	Need to discoun
38%	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	hird-party outcome	Adjustment for th

\$54,139	Benefit		
1.00	No	PV?	Need to discount to
100%	Direct Outcome	d-party outcome	Adjustment for third
			8
			7
			S
\$4,044	ormerly incarcerated individuals	Average annual earnings of f	сл
0.98	earnings	Impact of re-incarceration on	4
0.08		Counterfactual recidivism rat	ω
0.014	to are re-incarcerated after program	Percentage of participants with the second	2
207		Number of participants	_
	Metric Components		
	computed for one year of additional earnings after program participation.	Benefits are	Metric Notes
, use the average 016).	ual earnings of formerly incarcerated individuals: [PROGDATA] Data provide by program. Otherwise ngs of formerly incarcerated individuals [\$2,000], computed using ACS data (U.S. Census Bureau, 2	Average ann annual earni	
ated individuals earn	incarceration on earnings: [0.98] Re-incarcerated individuals earn just 2% of what formerly incarcera ar of re-incarceration. Estimated from Western and Sirois (2017).	Impact of re- during the ye	
JI data from	al recidivism rate: [SELECT] Select counterfactual recidivism rate to match the timeframe of the pro r example, if the program provides 1-year re-incarceration rates, select 1-year counterfactual rate. <i>A</i> epartment of Corrections (2020). /ism rate - Re-incarceration = 8% /ism rate - Re-incarceration = 18%	Counterfactu available. Fo Minnesota D 1-year recidi 2-year recidi 3-year recidi	
	of participants who are re-incarcerated after program: [PROGDATA] Provided by grantee if available	Percentage (
articipation. The sle. this would ve would need to tric adjustment.	articipants: Adults who participate in the program and for whom there is re-incarceration data after p te could be for 1, 2, or 3 years after program participation. We may request data by gender if availal g out recidivism rates by gender in the MDC report. If the program has data only on re-conviction, v expected probability of incarceration. In this case, consult with the evaluation officer or CIO for a me	Number of p recidivism ra require pullin estimate the	Metric Components

Metric Notes					Metric Components	Metric Description	Equation	EDU018						
7	<u>ت</u> م ب ا	е <u>-160</u> № -1 - П	0	50	Z	(V æ) ≕ ⊣	t)	EDU018 - Scho						
to discounting necessary. In addition to this metric, scholarship dollar amounts should be counted as a benefit as well.	or single mothers: Q = 0.142 The ES [0.51] is the effect size from meta-analysis of higher education scholarship programs on the rate of graduation for female tudents (Bartik, et al., 2019). The effect size is measured as a percent increase. The base percentage [28%] is the average raduation rate for 2-year and 4 year institutions of single mothers from IWPR (2017).	or general population of students: Q = 0.08 The ES [0.28] is the effect size of a higher education scholarship program on the rate of graduation with any degree (as proxy for a -year degree). (Bartik, et al., 2019). The effect size is measured as a percent increase. The base percentage [29%] is the average raduation rate of low-income students at 2-year institutions estimated using data from the National Student Clearinghouse (2016). The base rate could potentially be adjusted if most or all of the participants are attending a school with a known grad rate for Pell- ligible students.	p= ES * Base%	2: Percentage earning a higher education degree due to the intervention: [SELECT] This is estimated by Constellation Fund staff sing the following formula:	lumber of participants: Number of students receiving scholarships.	This metric estimates the impact of education scholarships on the likelihood of receiving an associate degree, leading to increased fetime earnings. In addition to general low-income students, the metric can be used to estimate the specific impact of scholarships warded to female single mothers. The evidence this metric is based on considers a scholarship of roughly \$1,000 per semester. Scholarships of considerably different amounts should not use this metric.	# students receiving scholarship) x (Q: % earning a higher education degree due to the intervention) x (\$ additional lifetime earnings om a 2-year degree vs. high school completion) x (Duration factor)	larships leading to academic credential (2-year/Associate degree)	Metric 15	Return to the top	Strength of Evidence	Third-party outcomes Factor Tool	PV Tool	

	Footnotes, if required	Quality of data (good/sufficient/insufficient) Good	Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insufficient) Good	Population match (good/sufficient/insufficient) Good	Program match (good/sufficient/insufficient) Good	Measure					Need to discount to PV?	Adjustment for third-party outcome	8	7	σ	5 Cash Value of Tuition	4 Additional lifetime ear	3 Duration factor	2 Q: Percentage earnin	1 Number of participant		
Return to the top						ng Explanation	Strength of Evidence	Third-party outcomes Factor Tool	PV Tool		No	Direct Outcome					mings from a 2-year post-secondary degree or associate's vs. high school completion		ig a higher education degree due to the intervention	.8	 Metric Components	
	Rating Rubric	No	No	No	Zo	Footnote require				Benefit \$189,		10				\$20,520	51					

Quality of data (good/sufficient/insufficient) Goo	Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insufficient) Goo	Population match (good/sufficient/insufficient) Goo	Program match (good/sufficient/insufficient) Goo	Measure	
ğ	ğ	ă	ă	ing	
				Explanation	Strength of Evidence
No	No	No	No	Footnote required?	