CONSTELLATION FUND

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: Metrics allow for the weighting of similar and dissimilar programs.	**The Only Criteria for Making Grant Decisions:** Observations and qualitative information also play important roles in our grantmaking.
A Tool for Achieving Transparency: Constellation welcomes outside voices to examine, criticize, and improve the metrics.	**Report Cards on Potential Grantees:** A nonprofit can fulfill its own mission without scoring high on Constellation's metrics.
A Diagnostic Device: What do highest-scoring organizations have in common? Lowest?	**Exact and Unchanging:** Neither the data captured nor the calculations applied are perfect and, with additional research and refinement, our metrics are designed to evolve.
A Method for Assessing Constellation: We measure our own impact the same way we measure other organizations: how much poverty-fighting good we do with each dollar we spend.	**The Only Approach to Smart Philanthropy:** Other funding organizations may employ different but useful standards.

CONSTELLATION FUND

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS REPORT

Organization Name:

Ujamaa Place

Impact Area:	Employment	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**

Organization Name	Ujamaa Place	
Program Name	Gen Ops	
Grant Round	Q4-2022	
Fiscal Year (ending year and month)	Calendar Year	
Data Year (ending year and month)	2021	
	BCR	4.22
	Total Benefits	$9,092,753
	Relevant Costs	$2,156,964
	Estimated Number of Unique Individuals Served	

Benefits Summary

Metric #	Area	Metric ID	Metrics	Benefits
1	Employment	ECO001	ECO001 - Employment programs leading to increased earnings	$1,707,821
2	Education	EDU005	EDU005 - High school equivalence leading to improved health	$4,781,250
3	Education	EDU004	EDU004 - High school equivalence leading to lifetime earnings	$1,944,375
5	Housing	HOU001	HOU001 - Supportive housing leading to increased earnings by population of interest	$94,920
6	Housing	HOU002	HOU002 - Supportive housing leading to increased cash assistance by population of interest	$63,224
7	Housing	HOU029	HOU029 - Rental assistance or subsidies providing immediate economic value	$100,902
8	Housing	HOU001	HOU001 - Supportive housing leading to increased earnings by population of interest	$22,906
9	Housing	HOU002	HOU002 - Supportive housing leading to increased cash assistance by population of interest	$2,330
10	Housing	HOU029	HOU029 - Rental assistance or subsidies providing immediate economic value	$5,446
11	Health	HEA020	HEA020 - Mental health care for mental illness leading to increased QALYs	$67,260
12	Housing	HOU001	HOU001 - Supportive housing leading to increased earnings by population of interest	$23,330
13	Housing	HOU002	HOU002 - Supportive housing leading to increased cash assistance by population of interest	$6,435
14	Employment	ECO002	ECO002 - Reduced recidivism leading to increased earnings	$54,139
15	Education	EDU018	EDU018 - Scholarships leading to academic credential (2-year/Associate degree)	$189,958
16	Health	HEA021	HEA021 - Mental health care for serious mental illness leading to increased earnings	$28,456

Metric 1

ECO001	ECO001 - Employment programs leading to increased earnings		
Equation	(# participants who find employment due to the program) x (# total time of paid work) x ($ net increase in earnings)		
Metric Description	This is a generic metric. The actual estimation depends on availability of outcome data from the program. Employment programs may include: Job training programs, job placement programs, programs who provide direct employment to participants.		
	Year 1 benefits		
	Wages from part-time eployment: (26 weeks working 20hrs/week at $15 for 65% of the 42 participants who found part-time jobs and retained jobs for 6 months) + (52 weeks working 20hrs/week at $15 for 35% of the 42 participants who found part-time jobs and retained jobs for one year)	$442,260	
	Wages from full-time eployment: 52 weeks working 35hrs/week at $13 for the 84 participants who found part-time jobs.	$1,533,168	
	Counterfactual annual wages: Employment rate pre-program x Work time x Wages pre-program	$4,044	
	Total counterfactual wages	$849,160	
	At 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)	0.34	
	Total net benefits from wages - year 1	**$1,126,268**	
	Year 2 and 3 benefits		
	Assumptions		
	For years 2 and 3 we assume that the program increases chances of employment based on Card, etal., (2017).		
	From 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.	0.044	
	Wages in year 2: (# participants)*(Average # hours worked, 30 assumed)*(ave wage, $15 assumed)*(Impact of program on prob of eployment from Card)	$203,804	
	Wages in year 3: Same as above but Card's impact is 0.04 for after second year over the impact in year 2.	$377,749	
	Net wages year 2 and 3	**$581,553**	
	Total wage benefits	**$1,707,821**	
		Benefit	**$1,707,821**
PV Tool			

Third-party outcomes Factor Tool			
Strength of Evidence			
Measure	**Rating**	**Explanation**	Footnote required?
Program match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Population match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Quality of data (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Footnotes, if required			Rating Rubric

Return to the top

Metric 2		
EDU005	EDU005 - High school equivalence leading to improved health	
Equation		(# participants) x (# participants who pass the high school equivalence test) x (QALY increase) x ($ QALY) x (% Referral factor)
Metric Description		This metric estimates the impacts of obtaining a high school diploma equivalent on lifetime health, estimated in terms of quality-adjusted life years (QALY).
Metric Components		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 students by 5.1 QALYs at age 85, 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 test takers are known, “highly involved” may be appropriate. If the number of takers is not known, select a lower referral factor.

Metric Notes		Use the number of participants and the estimated number of GED earners using EDU004 instructions. Apply the appropriate referral factor ONLY to programs that don't provide preparation for the test. Benefits should then be discounted to present value. Type of Program: Test preparation provided. → No referral adjustment required No test preparation provided → Select appropriate referral adjustment Participant Data: Test passers known → Q = 1 Test takers only → Q = appropriate counterfactual passing rate		
	Metric Components			
1	Number of participants			25
2	% of participants who receive their GED			0.75
3	QALY increase			5.1
4	$ value per QALY			50000
5	Referral factor			1
6				
7				
8				
Adjustment for third-party outcome			Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	
Need to discount to PV?			No	1.00
			Benefit	**$4,781,250**
	PV Tool			
	Third-party outcomes Factor Tool			
	Strength of Evidence			
Measure		**Rating**	**Explanation**	Footnote required?
Program match (good/sufficient/insufficient)		Good		No

Population match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Quality of data (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Footnotes, if required			Rating Rubric

Return to the top

Metric 3

EDU004	EDU004 - High school equivalence leading to lifetime earnings		
Equation		(# participants) x (Q1: % participants who receive their GED) x ($ difference in lifetime earnings of an individual with a high school equivalence and expected higher education achievement vs. no high school completion) x (% Referral factor)	
Metric Description		This metric estimates the impact of receiving a GED certificate on lifetime earnings. It also allows for the estimation of benefits from the subsequent increased chance of enrolling in college or earning a higher educational degree.	

Metric Components		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. Q: % of participants who receive their GED: [SELECT] When the program provides the number of passers, Q = 1. When only the number of takers is known, estimate the number of passers as: Q = % Counterfactual rate of passing GED tests. 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 Asian: 0.86 Pacific Islander: 0.93 White: 0.93 All races: 0.75 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. 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.
Metric Notes		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.

	Metric Components	
1	Number of participants	25
2	Q: % of participants who receive their GED	0.75
3	Difference in lifetime earnings of an individual with a high school equivalence and expected higher education achievement vs. no high school completion	103700
4	Referral factor	1
5		
6		

7			
8			
Adjustment for third-party outcome		Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	
Need to discount to PV?		No	1.00
		Benefit	**$1,944,375**

PV Tool

Third-party outcomes Factor Tool

Strength of Evidence

Measure	**Rating**	**Explanation**	Footnote required?
Program match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Population match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Quality of data (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Footnotes, if required			Rating Rubric

Metric 5

HOU001	HOU001 - Supportive housing leading to increased earnings by population 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 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 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 year 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 (under 21), and families with children. No discounting is needed. This metric can be applied to permanent or transitional supportive housing programs.

	Metric Components	
1	Number of participants	56
2	Net increase in wages one year after entering supportive housing by population	1695
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
Adjustment for third-party outcome	Direct Outcome	100%
Need to discount to PV?	No	1.00

			Benefit	**$94,920**

PV Tool

Third-party outcomes Factor Tool

Strength of Evidence			
Measure	**Rating**	**Explanation**	Footnote required?
Program match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Population match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Quality of data (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Footnotes, if required			Rating Rubric

Return to the top

Metric 6		
HOU002	HOU002 - Supportive housing leading to increased cash assistance by population of interest	
Equation		(# participants receiving services) x ($ average increase in cash assistance)
Metric Description		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 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 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. Single adults: $1,129 Adults with children: $1,053 Unaccompanied youths: $1,165 Average all groups: $1,115
Metric Notes		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.

	Metric Components	
1	Number of participants	56
2	Net increase in cash assistance (public programs) one year after entering supportive housing by population	1129
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
Adjustment for third-party outcome	Direct Outcome	100%
Need to discount to PV?	No	1.00
	Benefit	**$63,224**

PV Tool

Third-party outcomes Factor Tool

Strength of Evidence

Measure	Rating	Explanation	Footnote required?
Program match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Population match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Quality of data (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Footnotes, if required			Rating Rubric

Return to the top

Metric 7

HOU029	HOU029 - Rental assistance or subsidies providing immediate economic value
Equation	($ Total value of cash or subsidies given to or used by participants)
Metric Description	Many housing programs include some sort of housing stipend, rent subsidy, or cash rental assistance to reduce the amount of rent participants pay. These subsidies may be permanent and constant, or participants may be weaned off of them over time. While housing programs often have down-stream impacts on future earnings and health, this metric captures the immediate economic value to participants of reduced price rent. Wherever possible, the benefit should be the exact monetary value of subsidies or rental assistance provided to participants. If this data is not carefully tracked, it may be possible to calculate the value from available data, or make reasonable assumptions; options for doing so are included below. Note that in cases where participants receive a government housing subsidy and the program is not instrumental in connecting the participant to that subsidy - that is, in cases where the participant enters the program with the subsidy in hand - this metric should not be used, as the program is not meaningfully responsible for the economic value the participant receives. If the program is instrumental in making the connection, this will be treated as a referral.

Metric Components

1	Value of rental assistance or subsidies	$265,531.27
2		
3		

4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
Adjustment for third-party outcome		Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	38%
Need to discount to PV?		No	1.00
		Benefit	**$100,902**

PV Tool

Third-party outcomes Factor Tool

For outcomes generated thru third-party providers. Select the level of involvment of referring organization and type of data available.	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	38%
	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 tracking of any sort is not made. This is the baseline we assume as counterfactual.	

Strength of Evidence

Measure	**Rating**	**Explanation**	Footnote required?
Program match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Population match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Quality of data (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Footnotes, if required			Rating Rubric

Return to the top

Metric 8

HOU001	HOU001 - Supportive housing leading to increased earnings by population 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 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 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 year 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 (under 21), and families with children. No discounting is needed. This metric can be applied to permanent or transitional supportive housing programs.

	Metric Components	
1	Number of participants	2
2	Net increase in wages one year after entering supportive housing by population	11453
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		

Adjustment for third-party outcome		Direct Outcome	100%
Need to discount to PV?		No	1.00
		Benefit	**$22,906**

PV Tool

Third-party outcomes Factor Tool

Strength of Evidence

Measure	**Rating**	**Explanation**	Footnote required?
Program match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Population match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Quality of data (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Footnotes, if required			Rating Rubric

Return to the top

Metric 9

HOU002	HOU002 - Supportive housing leading to increased cash assistance by population of interest	
Equation	(# participants receiving services) x ($ average increase in cash assistance)	

Metric Description		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 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 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. Single adults: $1,129 Adults with children: $1,053 Unaccompanied youths: $1,165 Average all groups: $1,115
Metric Notes		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.

	Metric Components	
1	Number of participants	2
2	Net increase in cash assistance (public programs) one year after entering supportive housing by population	1165
3		

4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
Adjustment for third-party outcome		Direct Outcome	100%
Need to discount to PV?		No	1.00
		Benefit	**$2,330**
PV Tool			
Third-party outcomes Factor Tool			
Strength of Evidence			
	Return to the top		
Metric 10			
HOU029	HOU029 - Rental assistance or subsidies providing immediate economic value		
Equation	($ Total value of cash or subsidies given to or used by participants)		
Metric Description	Many housing programs include some sort of housing stipend, rent subsidy, or cash rental assistance to reduce the amount of rent participants pay. These subsidies may be permanent and constant, or participants may be weaned off of them over time. While housing programs often have down-stream impacts on future earnings and health, this metric captures the immediate economic value to participants of reduced price rent. Wherever possible, the benefit should be the exact monetary value of subsidies or rental assistance provided to participants. If this data is not carefully tracked, it may be possible to calculate the value from available data, or make reasonable assumptions; options for doing so are included below. Note that in cases where participants receive a government housing subsidy and the program is not instrumental in connecting the participant to that subsidy - that is, in cases where the participant enters the program with the subsidy in hand - this metric should not be used, as the program is not meaningfully responsible for the economic value the participant receives. If the program is instrumental in making the connection, this will be treated as a referral.		
	Metric Components		

1	Value of rental assistance or subsidies		14332.18
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
Adjustment for third-party outcome		Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	38.00%
Need to discount to PV?		No	1.00
		Benefit	**$5,446**

PV Tool

Third-party outcomes Factor Tool

For outcomes generated thru third-party providers. Select the level of involvment of referring organization and type of data available.	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	38%
	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 tracking of any sort is not made. This is the baseline we assume as counterfactual.	

Strength of Evidence

Return to the top

Metric 11

HEA020	HEA020 - Mental health care for mental illness leading to increased QALYs	
Equation	(# participants) x (QALY gains from treatments of mental illness) x ($QALY)	

Metric Description		This metric estimates the average impact of a variety treatments of mental health illnesses on QALYs. The metric covers a variety of treatments and mental illness and levels of severity. This metric is more appropriate for situations where the program refers patients to third party providers to receive treatment. In these cases, it is common that there is not sufficient information about the specific number of patients suffering a particular illness or receiving a particular treatment. Therefore, IO must determine the appropriate referral factor using Constellation's standard criteria for this purpose.
Metric Components		Number of participants: QALY gains from treatments of mental illness: [0.03] This is the median QALY gain from a collection of studies measuring health impact of treatments for mental illnesses (Wisløff, et al., 2014). This statistic has broad scope in terms of types and dosage of treatments, types of illnesses and severity, and age and duration of treatments. $ value per QALY: [50000]
Metric Notes		This metric can be used in conjunction with HEA021.

Metric Components

1	Number of participants	118
2	QALY gains from treatments of mental illness	0.03
3	$ value per QALY	50000
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
Adjustment for third-party outcome	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	38%
Need to discount to PV?	No	1.00
	Benefit	**$67,260**

PV Tool

Third-party outcomes Factor Tool

For outcomes generated thru	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	38%

third-party providers. Select the level of involvment of referring organization and type of data available.	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 tracking of any sort is not made. This is the baseline we assume as counterfactual.

Strength of Evidence

Return to the top

Metric 12

HOU001	HOU001 - Supportive housing leading to increased earnings by population 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 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 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 year 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 (under 21), and families with children. No discounting is needed. This metric can be applied to permanent or transitional supportive housing programs.

Metric Components

1	Number of participants		15
2	Net increase in wages one year after entering supportive housing by population		4093
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
Adjustment for third-party outcome		Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	38%
Need to discount to PV?		No	1.00
		Benefit	**$23,330**

PV Tool

Third-party outcomes Factor Tool

For outcomes generated thru third-party providers. Select the level of involvment of referring organization and type of data available.	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	38%
	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 tracking of any sort is not made. This is the baseline we assume as counterfactual.	

Strength of Evidence

Return to the top

Metric 13

HOU002	HOU002 - Supportive housing leading to increased cash assistance by population of interest	
Equation	(# participants receiving services) x ($ average increase in cash assistance)	

Metric Description		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 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 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. Single adults: $1,129 Adults with children: $1,053 Unaccompanied youths: $1,165 Average all groups: $1,115
Metric Notes		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.

	Metric Components	
1	Number of participants	15
2	Net increase in cash assistance (public programs) one year after entering supportive housing by population	1129
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		

Adjustment for third-party outcome	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	38%
Need to discount to PV?	No	1.00
	Benefit	**$6,435**

PV Tool

Third-party outcomes Factor Tool

For outcomes generated thru third-party providers. Select the level of involvment of referring organization and type of data available.	Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	38%
	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 tracking of any sort is not made. This is the baseline we assume as counterfactual.	

Strength of Evidence

Measure	**Rating**	**Explanation**	Footnote required?
Program match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Population match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Quality of data (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Footnotes, if required			Rating Rubric

Return to the top

Metric 14

ECO002	ECO002 - Reduced recidivism leading to increased earnings	
Equation	(# Participants) x [(counterfactual recidivism rate) - (% Participants who are re-incarcerated after program)] x (Impact of re-incarceration on earnings) x ($ Average annual earnings of formerly incarcerated individuals)	
Metric Description	This metric estimates the impact of reduced recidivism on short-term earnings. To use this metric, the program must capture and be able to report a 3-year recidivism rate.	

Metric Components		Number of participants: Adults who participate in the program and for whom there is re-incarceration data after participation. The recidivism rate could be for 1, 2, or 3 years after program participation. We may request data by gender if available. this would require pulling out recidivism rates by gender in the MDC report. If the program has data only on re-conviction, we would need to estimate the expected probability of incarceration. In this case, consult with the evaluation officer or CIO for a metric adjustment. Percentage of participants who are re-incarcerated after program: [PROGDATA] Provided by grantee if available. Counterfactual recidivism rate: [SELECT] Select counterfactual recidivism rate to match the timeframe of the program data available. For example, if the program provides 1-year re-incarceration rates, select 1-year counterfactual rate. All data from Minnesota Department of Corrections (2020). 1-year recidivism rate - Re-incarceration = 8% 2-year recidivism rate - Re-incarceration = 18% 3-year recidivism rate - Re-incarceration = 25% Impact of re-incarceration on earnings: [0.98] Re-incarcerated individuals earn just 2% of what formerly incarcerated individuals earn during the year of re-incarceration. Estimated from Western and Sirois (2017). Average annual earnings of formerly incarcerated individuals: [PROGDATA] Data provide by program. Otherwise, use the average annual earnings of formerly incarcerated individuals [$2,000], computed using ACS data (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016).
Metric Notes		Benefits are computed for one year of additional earnings after program participation.

	Metric Components	
1	Number of participants	207
2	Percentage of participants who are re-incarcerated after program	0.014
3	Counterfactual recidivism rate	0.08
4	Impact of re-incarceration on earnings	0.98
5	Average annual earnings of formerly incarcerated individuals	$4,044
6		
7		
8		

Adjustment for third-party outcome	Direct Outcome	100%
Need to discount to PV?	No	1.00
	Benefit	**$54,139**

PV Tool			
Third-party outcomes Factor Tool			
Strength of Evidence			
	Return to the top		
Metric 15			
EDU018	EDU018 - Scholarships leading to academic credential (2-year/Associate degree)		
Equation		(# students receiving scholarship) x (Q: % earning a higher education degree due to the intervention) x ($ additional lifetime earnings from a 2-year degree vs. high school completion) x (Duration factor)	
Metric Description		This metric estimates the impact of education scholarships on the likelihood of receiving an associate degree, leading to increased lifetime earnings. In addition to general low-income students, the metric can be used to estimate the specific impact of scholarships awarded 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.	
Metric Components		Number of participants: Number of students receiving scholarships. Q: Percentage earning a higher education degree due to the intervention: [SELECT] This is estimated by Constellation Fund staff using the following formula: Q= ES * Base% For 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 2-year degree). (Bartik, et al., 2019). The effect size is measured as a percent increase. The base percentage [29%] is the average graduation 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-eligible students. For 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 students (Bartik, et al., 2019). The effect size is measured as a percent increase. The base percentage [28%] is the average graduation rate for 2-year and 4 year institutions of single mothers from IWPR (2017).	
Metric Notes		No discounting necessary. In addition to this metric, scholarship dollar amounts should be counted as a benefit as well.	

	Metric Components	
1	Number of participants	41
2	Q: Percentage earning a higher education degree due to the intervention	0.08
3	Duration factor	1
4	Additional lifetime earnings from a 2-year post-secondary degree or associate's vs. high school completion	51658
5	Cash Value of Tuition	$20,520.00
6		
7		
8		
Adjustment for third-party outcome	Direct Outcome	100%
Need to discount to PV?	No	1.00
	Benefit	**$189,958**

PV Tool

Third-party outcomes Factor Tool

Strength of Evidence

Measure	**Rating**	**Explanation**	Footnote required?
Program match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Population match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Quality of data (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Footnotes, if required			Rating Rubric

Return to the top

Metric 16				
HEA021	HEA021 - Mental health care for serious mental illness leading to increased earnings			
Equation		(# participants) x (Q-linked: effectiveness of treatments on serious mental illness and earnings) x ($SD Annual earnings of low income)		
Metric Description		This metric estimates the impact of the most common and effective treatments of serious mental illnesses on earnings. The metric focuses on the following serious mental illness: non-affective psychosis (including schizophrenia), bipolar disorder and severe forms of panic disorder, and depression, but it can be used for many other mental illnesses of similar severity. Because studies rarely		
		Metric Components		
1	Number of participants			118
2	Q-linked: effectiveness of treatments on mental illness and earnings			0.0635
3	$SD Annual earnings of low income			9994
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
Adjustment for third-party outcome			Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known	38%
Need to discount to PV?			No	1.00
			Benefit	**$28,456**
PV Tool				
Third-party outcomes Factor Tool				
For outcomes generated thru third-party providers. Select the level of involvment of referring organization and type of data available.		Highly involved & Number of participants who receive service is known		38%
		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 tracking of any sort is not made. This is the baseline we assume as counterfactual.		

Strength of Evidence			
Measure	**Rating**	**Explanation**	Footnote required?
Program match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Population match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Counterfactual match (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No
Quality of data (good/sufficient/insufficient)	Good		No