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Dear reader,

Slingshot Memphis aims to create a demonstrable reduction in poverty by promoting a results-driven poverty-fighting ecosystem. To accomplish this mission, Slingshot performs three critical functions.

First, Slingshot helps identify which nonprofit organizations have the evidence or potential to create the most poverty-fighting impact. Some of these organizations, like Hope House, become Affiliate Partners of Slingshot.

Second, Slingshot supports its Affiliate Partners as they maximize their poverty-fighting impact. We use the Slingshot Impact Assessment to evaluate Affiliates’ performance on four dimensions: benefit-cost ratio, use of best practices, measurement infrastructure, and systems-level change.

In addition to determining a partner’s poverty-fighting impact, the Slingshot Impact Assessment identifies core strengths and opportunities for growth. **The purpose of this report is to share the results of the Slingshot Impact Assessment for Hope House.**

When we identify what works, we celebrate it. When we discover what isn’t working, or what could work better, we provide concrete recommendations on ways to increase effectiveness and impact.

Third, Slingshot invests in its high-impact partners. Slingshot’s funding decisions are based on a partner’s poverty-fighting impact, the needs of the partner organization, the emergence of promising new partner organizations who compete for limited funding, and the overall availability of capital.

Slingshot is not a silver bullet. There isn’t one. Our team does not have all the answers. Although we strive to assess, support, and fund our partners with the utmost objectivity, we are still developing and testing our evidence-based approach. Thus, we need your feedback. Over time, this will enable us to reduce our margin of error.

**The following report is not the end of our work with Hope House - it is really just the beginning.** Its willingness to be transparent is something to celebrate. Over time, this transparency will help other organizations maximize their poverty-fighting impact. In order to create a better quality of life for our under-resourced neighbors, it is incumbent upon all of us - funders and fighters - to maximize our poverty-fighting impact.

Together, we can address the systems and structures that impair the quality of life for our under-resourced neighbors. Together, we can help promote a results-driven poverty-fighting ecosystem.

Respectfully,

Team Slingshot
Executive Summary

- Hope House aims to **improve the quality of life for under-resourced individuals and families affected by HIV** by providing high quality early childhood education and social services.
- Slingshot **defines impact on poverty as an improvement in future earnings and/or health.**
- The Slingshot Impact Assessment evaluated Hope House on four dimensions: benefit-cost ratio, use of best practices, measurement infrastructure, and systems-level change.
  - Hope House’s **benefit-cost ratio is at least strong**, meaning it creates benefits for its clients that exceed the costs to provide its programs and services.
  - Hope House’s **use of best practices is at least strong**, indicating there is some evidence for the use of best practices across Hope House’s education programs, counseling services, and housing support.
  - Hope House’s **measurement infrastructure is at least strong**. The organization employs a measurement system that collects comprehensive information on its clients.
  - Hope House’s **systems-level change is at least strong**. Hope House creates systems-level change by supporting its clients in their interactions with healthcare providers and law enforcement.
- This assessment serves as a baseline from which to build. Hope House **creates substantial impact on individuals and families affected by HIV.**
- Slingshot **encourages Hope House to build on its measurement infrastructure**, enabling more powerful analyses that help the organization understand and grow its impact.
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Introduction

Slingshot Impact Assessment overview

This report is Slingshot Memphis’ objective third-party impact assessment of Hope House. The Slingshot Impact Assessment provides a perspective on a nonprofit’s poverty-fighting impact.

Comprised of four dimensions – benefit-cost ratio, use of best practices, measurement infrastructure, and systems-level change (detailed in Figure 1) – this evidence-based assessment estimates nonprofit impact by evaluating the breadth of an organization’s capabilities and results. Slingshot Memphis defines “impact on poverty” as an improvement in a person’s future earnings and/or health.

There are several purposes and uses of the assessment:

- **Objectively assess** the quality and impact of partners’ poverty-fighting work
- **Enhance understanding** of partners’ impact across multiple dimensions
- **Establish context and a basis for conversation** with Slingshot partners about the impact of their work
- **Identify potential opportunities for growth** and areas for collaboration between Slingshot and its partners
- **Assess partners over time** with regular updates to the assessment

Report roadmap

This report proceeds in seven parts. The introduction provides an overview of the Memphis poverty landscape and Hope House’s services, including a theoretical model of how Hope House creates impact. We synthesize Hope House’s performance on the assessment into a ratings overview. The ratings overview is followed by an in-depth discussion of Hope House’s performance on each of the four dimensions. The report concludes with opportunities for growth.
Landscape

There are 1.1 million people living with HIV in the United States as of 2017.¹ This amounts to an infection rate of 300 per 100,000 people aged 15 to 49. There were 38,700 new cases of HIV infections in 2017.² HIV does not, however, afflict evenly across the country. The HIV infection rate for people living in poverty in U.S. metro areas is estimated at 2,100 per 100,000 people aged 15 to 49.³ Moreover, 52 percent of new HIV infections in 2017 occurred in the South.⁴ The HIV epidemic is concentrated in under-resourced populations in southern states. While HIV rates do not differ by race and ethnicity when controlling for socioeconomic background, the concentration of cases in under-resourced communities in Southern metro areas means that African Americans are disproportionately affected by the virus.⁵

While the annual rate of new HIV diagnoses is declining throughout the North and Midwest, it remains flat throughout the South. The HIV infection rate in Shelby County is 716 per 100,000 people, more than double the national average.⁶ Sixty-eight percent of people living with HIV in Shelby County are male, and 83 percent are African American.⁷ Shelby County’s HIV infection rate far exceeds both the state and national averages.

Public stigma creates barriers to preventing HIV, accounts for low testing rates, and results in low patient adherence to medication regimens. Poverty adds to and further complicates the challenges posed by HIV. The Center for American Progress argues, “unstable housing, food insecurity, and a lack of consistent access to quality health care make it very difficult to manage what has increasingly become a manageable disease for those with higher incomes and more resources.”⁸ The factors common to living in poverty can lead to suboptimal control of the HIV virus, which has immediate adverse health outcomes and can lead to the onset of AIDS.⁹

There is a robust infrastructure of government services to support individuals affected by HIV and mitigate some of the challenges posed by both poverty and HIV. The Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) administers the Ryan White HIV/AIDS program. The program is intended to provide “a comprehensive system of HIV primary medical care, essential support services, and medications for low-income people living with HIV who are uninsured and underserved. The program funds grants to states, cities/counties, and local community-based organizations to provide care and treatment services to people living with HIV. [The services] improve health outcomes and reduce HIV transmission among hard-to-reach populations.”¹⁰ HRSA reports over 50 percent of newly diagnosed patients with HIV receive some Ryan White services.

¹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2017.
² Ibid.
⁴ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2017.
⁶ Ibid.
⁹ Ibid.
¹⁰ Health Resources and Services Administration
Local municipalities and nonprofits are crucial to the delivery of Ryan White services. In Memphis, the Department of Health is a major provider of services and funding. Hope House, Friends for Life, OUTMemphis, and other community organizations support people affected by HIV. Local health systems play a large role in coordinating and providing care to patients diagnosed with the disease. While there are a number of organizations who provide support to people affected by HIV, Hope House is one of the only full service organizations completely dedicated to supporting HIV affected individuals and families.

Hope House overview

Hope House provides high quality early childhood education and social services to HIV-affected individuals and families in Memphis. The organization operates a daycare and pre-kindergarten that enrolls eligible students from HIV-affected families. Hope House’s social services include wraparound case management, individual and group counseling services, and housing support.

Hope House is a single source of human services for individuals affected by HIV. As such, the organization is able to provide intensive, personalized support to all of its clients. In a given year, the organization works with over 400 individuals affected by HIV. It provides intensive support to a smaller client base across each of its services. Because of the nature of its work, Hope House tends to support its clients over long periods of time. This enables the organization to build powerful, lasting relationships with its clients. Hope House plays a vital role in Memphis’ human services ecosystem.
Introduction: Impact Tree Methodology

What is an impact tree?
An impact tree is a tool to help us understand the potential poverty-fighting impact of a nonprofit organization’s program(s) and how that impact is achieved.

Components of an impact tree include:
- **Programs**: activities and services provided to participants by the organization
- **Outputs**: direct results of program activities
- **Outcomes**: benefits or changes that result from the program
- **Impact**: the change that happened solely due to the program(s) in question

At Slingshot, we consider only poverty-related outcomes.

How should one read an impact tree?
Start with the column labeled “Programs.” This shows how outputs are transformed into outcomes that then lead to impact.

Why is an impact tree useful?
- Helps us break down and comprehend Hope House’s potential impact on poverty in simpler terms
- Ensures that we understand all of Hope House’s programs, outputs, and outcomes
- Equips us to appreciate the potential poverty-fighting impact of various programs

How can Hope House use its impact tree?
- **Communication**: Provide guidance and structure for communications with stakeholders like funders, partners, and the broader community
- **Strategic planning**: Define the specific, measurable pathways through which Hope House impacts its participants
- **Impact growth**: Provide a guide for the variables Hope House could measure and track, and potentially which methods to prioritize
Introduction: Impact Tree and Research Overview

Impact tree overview

The impact trees prepared for Hope House’s programs and services are intended to show the poverty-fighting impact that the organization could create in the community. The impact tree is a theoretical model of how an organization could create poverty-fighting impact by improving earnings and/or health.

The specific outcomes attributed to Hope House’s programs are based on third-party research about identical or similar programs, as well as the stated goals of the programs themselves.

In order to make the jump from a theoretical appreciation of impact to an actual estimation of it, it is necessary to identify specific impact chains, or individual branches of the impact tree, where there is sufficient partner data or third-party research to estimate impact.

Slingshot developed two impact trees for Hope House: education programs and social services. The education impact tree covers Hope House’s daycare and pre-kindergarten programs. The social services impact tree includes Hope House’s wraparound case management, housing support, counseling support, and food pantry. The subsequent sections will detail the theoretical outcomes and impact created by Hope House’s programs and services.

Education programs

Hope House’s early childhood education programs include daycare and pre-k. High quality daycare and pre-k are known to have a myriad of short-term and long-term benefits for children and parents.

In terms of student outcomes, high quality daycare and pre-k improve literacy and kindergarten readiness, which are associated with higher levels of high school graduation and educational attainment.\(^{11}\) High quality daycare and pre-k prevent gaps in proficiency for students. Historically, better-resourced families pay out of pocket for their children to attend high quality early childhood education programs, while under-resourced families often lack the financial means to send their children to similar programs. As a result, a proficiency gap develops. This educational gap creates major barriers for under-resourced students who lack access to high quality daycare and pre-k. Hope House is preventing this gap from forming through its education programs.

High quality daycare and pre-k are also associated with improved long-term health outcomes. Hope House offers play therapy as a form of mental healthcare. Research indicates play therapy can enable students to work through traumatic experiences, improving their mental health.\(^{12}\) There are also observable health benefits associated with earning a high school diploma.\(^{13}\) High quality daycare and pre-k play help put students on an early path to graduate, enabling important physical and mental health benefits.

Hope House’s education programs also create benefits for parents. Access to free daycare and pre-k provides parents with free


using a Housing-First model. Housing stability is the foundation of broader life stability for an individual or family. **This program improves clients’ earnings (or lowers costs) by providing housing subsidies and preventing job loss.** The housing program also confers physical and mental health benefits by helping clients avoid homelessness. Hope House supports children by preventing families from experiencing homelessness. Like for adults, preventing homelessness has substantial physical and mental health benefits for children. **Hope House’s housing support can also prevent children from being placed in foster care.** While necessary in some situations, foster care is associated with a number of adverse earnings and health outcomes for children. Avoiding homelessness helps mitigate this risk.

**Conclusion**

Hope House’s programs can create impact along a number of dimensions. In the subsequent benefit-cost ratio section, Slingshot monetizes these benefits to construct a benefit-cost ratio for Hope House. **This takes the theoretical impact trees and breaks them down branch by branch into specific impact chains that are assigned a monetary value.**

Introduction: Education Programs Impact Tree

**Impact:**
- Raising Living Standards of Memphians
  - Earnings

**Outcomes:**
- Parent labor market outcomes
- childcare costs
- Kindergarten Readiness
- Literacy
- Nutrition/meals
- Child physical health
- Child mental health
- Parent mental and physical health

**Programs:**
- Daycare
- Preschool

**Outputs:**
- # of students
- # of parents
- Dosage

---
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Introduction: Social Services Impact Tree

- **Impact:** Earnings
  - Raising Living Standards of Memphians
  - Non-earnings including health

- **Outcomes:**
  - ↑ Clothing/basic provisions
  - ↓ Homelessness
  - ↑ Nutrition/meals
  - ↑ Mental Health
  - ↑ Physical health
  - ↑ Disease management

- **Programs:** Social services

- **Outputs:**
  - # of individuals/families served
  - Dosage
# Ratings Overview: Hope House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>At least neutral</th>
<th>At least strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit-cost ratio</td>
<td>Lack of sufficient research in focus area to support confident estimation of benefit</td>
<td>Costs exceed estimated benefits</td>
<td>Estimated benefits and costs similar</td>
<td>Estimated benefits exceed costs</td>
<td>Estimated benefits substantially exceed costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of best practices</td>
<td>Indiscernible best practices or insufficient data on partner’s practices</td>
<td>Practices considered problematic or damaging</td>
<td>Limited or no evidence for use of best practices</td>
<td>Some evidence for use of best practices and better practices are developing</td>
<td>Current best practices are consistently followed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement infrastructure</td>
<td>Unclear what measurement infrastructure is most relevant for area of focus</td>
<td>Measurement practices considered problematic or damaging</td>
<td>Limited or no measurement infrastructure; limited or no use to improve impact</td>
<td>Sufficient aspects of measurement infrastructure exist</td>
<td>Robust measurement system used to understand and improve impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems-level change</td>
<td>Insufficient data to determine systems-level change</td>
<td>Systems-level change considered problematic or damaging</td>
<td>Limited or no evidence for creation of systems-level change</td>
<td>Some evidence for the creation of systems-level change</td>
<td>Compelling evidence of systems-level change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ratings Overview: Hope House

**Benefit-cost ratio**
**Rating: at least strong – Estimated benefits exceed costs**

Slingshot is confident the benefits created by Hope House exceed its costs. Hope House creates substantial benefits for clients through its counseling and case management support. The organization's daycare and pre-k create strong impact for parents and children on a per-person basis.

**Use of best practices**
**Rating: at least strong – Some evidence for use of best practices and better practices are developing**

Slingshot found strong evidence that Hope House employs best practices to the greatest extent possible where best practices exist. In particular, Hope House's counseling services and play therapy stand out as adhering to best practices. Often Hope House must adopt practices dictated by a government agency or program. Hope House consistently ensures these programs are implemented with fidelity.

**Measurement infrastructure**
**Rating: at least strong – Sufficient aspects of measurement infrastructure exist**

Hope House's measurement infrastructure is robust and meets its current needs. The organization’s measurement objectives are clear, and its data collection is comprehensive. Hope House could improve its analytical capabilities by digitizing important data stored in paper files and improving the interoperability of its data across programs.

**Systems-level change**
**Rating: at least strong – Some evidence for the creation of systems-level change**

Slingshot found evidence that Hope House creates systems-level change by partnering with law enforcement and healthcare providers to improve the level of services provided to clients affected by HIV. Hope House aims to influence the broader community’s knowledge and perception of HIV.
### Benefit-cost Ratio: Summary of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>At least neutral</th>
<th>At least strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit-cost ratio</td>
<td>Lack of sufficient research in focus area to support confident estimation of benefit</td>
<td>Costs exceed estimated benefits</td>
<td>Estimated benefits and costs similar</td>
<td>Estimated benefits exceed costs</td>
<td>Estimated benefits substantially exceed costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Overview

The benefit-cost ratio estimates the benefits created by a partner organization for the people it serves relative to the cost of creating those benefits. The benefits described here accrue to an individual or family in the form of improved future earnings and/or health.

Our estimates consider only private benefits to the individuals affected, not any societal benefits like cost savings to taxpayers. While we do not yet include societal benefits in our estimates, we recognize the importance and magnitude of them.

#### Summary of evidence

Slingshot estimates Hope House’s benefit-cost ratio as **at least strong**, indicating benefits created by the organization for its clients exceed the cost of creating those benefits.

*Hope House’s social services create approximately 84 to 88 percent of estimated benefits.* The majority of these benefits are created by its counseling and case management services. Counseling services create impact for clients by addressing depression and trauma. Case management support helps clients gain access to healthcare and reduce hospitalizations. Hope House’s housing support also creates substantial benefits by providing rental assistance to clients who qualify.

*Hope House’s education programs – daycare and pre-k – create approximately 12 to 16 percent of estimated benefits.* While relative to its social services, Hope House’s education programs serve a smaller set of families and individuals, the per person impact of these programs is substantial. High quality daycare and pre-k help set students up for success throughout their academic careers. These programs also provide parents with free childcare and open up additional hours for parents to pursue employment.

Slingshot’s estimate of Hope House’s benefit-cost ratio serves as a baseline upon which to build. Over time, we will refine and add to our estimates. Hope House can also take action to improve its benefit-cost ratio. For example, Hope House could identify opportunities to augment its case management and wraparound support to maximize the share of clients who are virally suppressed.
Benefit-cost Ratio: Description of Evidence

Introduction

In this section we detail the methodology underlying our impact estimates for Hope House’s programs. We use the impact tree described in the assessment’s introduction to guide our quantitative estimation of Hope House’s impact.

Generally speaking, our estimates begin with collecting individual, program, and output data from our partner. We then divide the impact tree into individual branches called impact chains. Each impact chain connects the number of people who participate in a program, to those successfully treated, to the outcomes achieved, to how those outcomes affect earnings and/or health.

We also apply discounts to account for various counterfactuals. Slingshot defines a counterfactual situation as what would have occurred in the absence of our partner’s programs. These discounts include the percent of participants who could have achieved an outcome on their own (i.e., without assistance) or through some other program, as well as the state of earnings or health that would have existed were it not for the intervention. Further, we take into account ecosystem discounts, based on the extent to which other organizations or interventions contributed to the desired outcome. If benefits accrue in the future, we make adjustments to calculate the present day value of these future benefits.

We apply the above discounts and adjustments in order to estimate the actual impact on participants that occurs solely due to Hope House’s programs and not due to other factors, like individual characteristics, expected outcomes, and other programs.

Slingshot’s estimates are based on data from Hope House’s 2017 and 2018 fiscal years. We use an average of two years of data to smooth out annual fluctuations.

Hope House’s at least strong benefit-cost ratio is indicative of the organization’s substantial impact on its clients across all of its programs. Slingshot breaks down its estimation into two parts: Hope House’s education programs and its social services. Hope House’s education programs account for approximately 12 to 16 percent of Hope House’s estimated benefits. The organization’s social services, including counseling/case management and housing, account for approximately 84 to 88 percent of Hope House’s estimated benefits.

Two factors influence the benefit-cost ratio: the number of individuals who receive the benefit and the magnitude of the benefit per person. Some programs, like Hope House’s education programs, support fewer individuals. Despite creating significant benefit on a per person basis, Hope House’s education programs account for a relatively small share of total benefits because they, by design, serve fewer clients. Keeping in mind both factors – number of clients served and the magnitude of benefit per person – is vital to an accurate interpretation of an organization’s benefit-cost ratio.

Education programs

Slingshot estimates Hope House’s education programs (daycare and pre-k) create approximately 12 to 16 percent of total benefit. These benefits accrue to both children and parents.

The majority of benefits, however, accrue to children who attend
Hope House’s daycare or pre-k. We estimate the benefits to children using two impact chains. First, daycare and pre-k increase kindergarten readiness, which is associated with higher high school graduation rates. High school graduation is linked to higher earnings over an individual’s career. To estimate this benefit for pre-k students, we take the average of 30 pre-k students, multiply by a 15 percent boost in likelihood of graduation, and then multiply by an increase in income associated with graduating from high school.\(^{15}\) We apply this benefit across an individual’s 35-year career, but delay the gains from the benefit by 14 years to account for the full schooling timeline of an average pre-k student. We use these parameters and several other counterfactual discounts to calculate the present value of this education benefit.

We use the same methodology for daycare students, but we discount this calculation by 75 percent to account for the fact that most students who receive high quality daycare also attend pre-k after moving on from daycare. We use this discount to avoid double counting across years and programs.

The high school graduation boost that results from high quality daycare and pre-k is also linked to improved health outcomes for students.\(^{16}\) Slingshot uses the quality-adjusted life year (QALY) metric to calculate health benefits. One QALY is equivalent to one healthy year of life. Slingshot values one QALY at $50,000. We acknowledge the challenges of putting a monetary value on health, but we feel it is important to attempt an estimate in order to develop an understanding of how programs and services influence a person’s health. We assume the same 15 percent high school graduation boost for the average of 30 pre-k students. Research provides sufficient evidence to assume a 0.1 QALY benefit per year.\(^{17}\) This translates to a $5,000 health benefit. We apply the same 35 year time horizon and present value calculations as we did in the previous impact estimate for the earnings boost due to high school graduation. We also apply this benefit to daycare students with the same 75 percent discount used above.

For parents, we estimate earnings increases or cost reductions due to additional opportunities for employment and lower childcare costs. We estimate the earnings benefits by multiplying the number of families with children attending daycare or pre-k (42) by an assumption of 135 additional work hours per year per parent. We then multiply this number by a wage of $7.25. We then apply relevant counterfactual discounts. We arrive at our assumption of 135 additional work hours per year by assuming parents use 15 percent of the 900 hours per student per year of daycare and pre-k programming to seek out additional employment.

To calculate cost savings from childcare for parents of daycare and pre-k students, we use a similar process. We multiply the 42 heads of household by 900 total hours of programming. We then multiply by a $7.25 per hour price of childcare. We discount the total by 50 percent, assuming half of parents take advantage of this benefit. We also apply relevant counterfactual discounts to arrive at our final estimation.

Hope House’s education programs support a small number of clients relative to the organization’s social services. On a per person or per family basis, the benefit from Hope House’s daycare and pre-k are substantial.

Social services

Hope House’s social services account for approximately 84 to 88 percent of benefits conferred to Hope House’s clients. Slingshot split Hope House’s social services into counseling/case

---

17 Ibid.
management and housing. **We developed 14 distinct impact chains that, taken together, create substantial benefits for Hope House’s clients.** Three counseling/case management impact chains and three housing impact chains create the vast majority of benefit. They are detailed below.

**Counseling and case management**

Hope House creates approximately 58 to 62 percent of total estimated client benefits through its counseling and case management programs. These benefits are achieved primarily through intensive case management, individual and group counseling, and specific support for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. Clients benefit from these programs in the form of improved mental and physical health.

Hope House provides case management support to its clients that enables them to achieve or maintain viral suppression. **Hope House’s support should reduce avoidable hospitalizations and improve clients’ access to physician medical care.** Little research exists that quantifies the health benefits of case management for people affected by HIV. We conservatively estimate the QALY improvement associated with reduced hospitalizations and increased access to healthcare providers. We assume patients receive a QALY benefit of 0.07 over a one year period for improved healthcare access and an additional 0.07 QALY benefit for avoiding hospitalizations.\(^{18}\) Using conventional QALY estimates, each benefit is worth $3,500 over a one year period. We assume Hope House helps avoid hospitalizations for 10 percent of clients and improves healthcare access overall for 60 percent of clients. We also apply relevant counterfactual discounts similar to other impact chains.

Hope House provides several different types of individual and group counseling support administered by qualified therapists. **Slingshot relies on external research to estimate the health benefits associated with counseling services. We identify benefits specific to basic counseling support as well as counseling specifically tailored to individuals who experience depression or PTSD.** Basic mental health support has an estimated QALY value of 0.04, which we monetize at $2,000 in health benefits. Support for depression and PTSD is valued at 0.15 QALYs, which we monetize at $7,500 in health benefits.\(^{19}\) To estimate the total benefit of these services, we multiply the number of patients by the QALY estimate for the applicable service. We monetize this benefit over a single year and apply several discounts based on the availability of these services outside of Hope House. Hope House’s mental health services create substantial benefits for clients on a per person or per family basis.

Hope House also has a specific focus on supporting victims of crime, specifically domestic violence and sexual abuse. **Research indicates these services, if implemented with fidelity, can prevent revictimization and intimate partner homicide.**\(^{20}\) The reduction in intimate partner homicide provides the largest estimated benefit to clients who are victims of domestic violence. We estimate this benefit by assuming a counterfactual intimate partner homicide rate of one percent. While this rate is high for the overall population, given the vulnerability of Hope House’s clients and their previous experiences, we feel this higher rate is reasonable. We assume Hope House can reduce the rate of intimate partner homicide for its client base by about a third. We multiply the total number of clients who are victims of domestic violence by approximately 0.3

---

percent. We multiply the result by $4,000,000, which is our assumption for the statistical value of a human life. While there is no just way to quantify the monetary value of an individual’s life, we use this as a rough approximation based on available research.

Hope House’s counseling services create both broad and substantial impact for its clients. This is a testament to the quality of mental healthcare and support provided by Hope House’s team of social workers and therapists. There are additional benefits, like the health impact of achieving viral suppression, that we were not able to monetize. With better data, we aim to improve these estimations over time.

Housing

Hope House’s housing support accounts for approximately 23 to 27 percent of benefits created by the organization. Hope House provides two forms of housing support. First, Hope House administers government grants (e.g., HOPWA) that provide permanent supportive housing assistance. Second, Hope House provides temporary housing support by administering a second set of government grants. Slingshot monetizes the benefits of this housing support by multiplying the number of households receiving support by the average subsidy provided to the client. This is an estimation of savings as a result of the subsidy that we classify as an implicit improvement in earnings. As with other impact chains, we apply relevant counterfactual discounts to finalize our estimates.

In addition to housing subsidies, Hope House also prevents homelessness. Homelessness prevention is both a major health and earnings benefit for families, particularly children. We estimate avoiding homelessness creates $14,000 in benefits per child and $5,000 per adult.21 Using data provided by Hope House and external research, we conservatively estimate five percent of individuals supported through Hope House’s housing programs avoid homelessness in a given year. We multiply the number of individuals – adults and children – by the corresponding benefit value and apply relevant discounts to estimate total benefit.

Conclusions and opportunities for growth

Slingshot is struck by the breadth and magnitude of Hope House’s benefits across multiple program areas given Hope House’s size. The organization’s benefit-cost ratio is at the upper end of the at least strong rating. This assessment serves as a baseline for Hope House. There is ample opportunity for the organization to improve upon its already strong ratio.

Hope House should consider how to best deploy future investments to maximize impact on its clients. Hope House currently operates a number of programs at very low cost relying on a combination of government funding and small grants. Hope House can work with Slingshot to determine which programs create the largest benefits on a per participant basis. This could help inform future strategy and decision making in the event Hope House pursues and receives additional, more fungible capital.

Hope House can also investigate ways to improve the impact of its case management as it relates to healthcare outcomes. Access to healthcare is vital to Hope House’s client base. It is also where Slingshot finds a substantial amount of Hope House’s impact. The organization can consider ways to incorporate cutting edge care coordination and case management methodologies to ensure its healthcare benefits continue to come to fruition.

Hope House can also work with Slingshot to identify additional data collection opportunities that can improve the accuracy of our benefit-cost estimates.

# Use of Best Practices: Summary of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>At least neutral</th>
<th>At least strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of best practices</td>
<td>Indiscernible best practices or insufficient data on partner’s practices</td>
<td>Practices considered problematic or damaging</td>
<td>Limited or no evidence for use of best practices</td>
<td>Some evidence for use of best practices and better practices are developing</td>
<td>Current best practices are consistently followed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Overview

The use of best practices assessment is intended to help Slingshot determine the extent to which best practices exist in the area(s) served by a particular partner and if that partner is adhering to those practices. Best practices are determined by independent research, ideally by comparing the outcomes produced by a given program or model to those produced by similar models.

In the absence of researched best practices, other considerations within this dimension include the extent to which a partner follows an existing model with fidelity, offers training and professional development opportunities to its staff, and is itself evaluated by an outside organization.

## Summary of evidence

Slingshot rates Hope House as **at least strong** in its use of best practices. Some of Hope House’s program/service models are not considered best practice but they operate in accordance with the model dictated by a funder or government program. Slingshot acknowledges Hope House’s limitations in this regard. We also did not uncover any problematic or damaging practices.

Hope House’s education programs use curricula that has been research validated or built based on high quality research. The daycare and pre-k are staffed by well-trained, qualified instructors. Hope House’s education programs are NAEYC accredited. This accreditation is considered the gold standard for early childhood centers.

Hope House’s social services include its counseling and case management services and its housing support. **Hope House’s counseling and case management services adhere to best practices.** Therapists follow established, research-backed clinical models. There is strong oversight of social services staff through informal feedback, formal professional development plans, and frequent chart reviews.

**Hope House’s housing-first housing support is similar to a rapid rehousing model which is endorsed by HUD.** Research demonstrates the efficacy of this model. Hope House also provides substantial wraparound support to housing clients.

Slingshot found some opportunities for growth for Hope House’s use of best practices. Hope House’s largest opportunity is its potential to develop a system to identify and target high and rising risk housing clients in order to prevent adverse medical or life events.
Use of Best Practices: Description of Evidence

Context and overview
Slingshot assessed the use of best practices across Hope House’s programs and services. For this dimension, we split Hope House’s services into two segments: education programs and social services. Education programs are comprised of Hope House’s daycare and pre-kindergarten. Hope House’s social services include counseling and case management and housing.

Two conditions are necessary for Slingshot to designate a program or program element as adhering to best practices. First, a best practice standard must exist for the program. We determine best practice standards by identifying high-quality academic research that demonstrates a program model is as effective or more effective than other similar researched models. Second, an organization must implement the program with fidelity, such that we have confidence Hope House’s clients are benefiting from the effective elements of the program.

We also assess an organization’s performance management and improvement process, which could influence its rating in either direction. Finally, if a program is innovating on top of an established program model, and doing so with rigor and objectivity, the program can still conform to best practices despite some modifications to the original design.

Education programs
Hope House’s education programs generally adhere to best practices. While Slingshot cannot designate either of Hope House’s education curricula as best practice models, this is primarily due to the lack of rigorous external research on these curricula. Hope House’s education programs exhibit a number of other best practice characteristics that provide compelling evidence Hope House is continuously improving its practices.

Hope House’s daycare uses the Creative Curriculum that is also used by Early Head Start. Slingshot recognizes the use of this curriculum as a good practice but cannot establish it as best in class. The Department of Education’s What Works Clearinghouse assessed the Creative Curriculum and found limited evidence for effects on oral language, print knowledge, phonological processing, and math relative to teacher-developed comparison curricula. This does not mean the Creative Curriculum is a subpar curriculum. The research merely concludes there is insufficient evidence the curriculum is superior to various teacher-developed curricula on the domains investigated. Hope House’s use of the Creative Curriculum could have many benefits not investigated in the study. For example, the curriculum is consistent with what other students are receiving across Early Head Start programs.

Hope House uses the Big Day for Pre-k curriculum for its pre-kindergarten. This curriculum is also used by Shelby County Schools and mandated for Hope House’s pre-k. Similar to its daycare curriculum, Slingshot recognizes the Big Day curriculum as a good practice but not a best practice. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) promotes an evidence-driven approach to curriculum development. Under ESSA’s evaluation model, Big Day receives the 4th highest commendation: “Based on rationale.” The Big Day curriculum has not been rigorously evaluated, but its design was informed by research.

22 Department of Education. What Works Clearinghouse.
23 Center for Research and Reform in Education. Evidence for ESSA, 2019.
Hope House is accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). Through its accreditation process, NAEYC ensures early childhood education programs provide high quality services and operate in accordance with best practices. Hope House’s daycare and pre-k are also subject to external evaluations by Shelby County on which they have performed well.

Slingshot acknowledges that the success of education programs is heavily influenced by the quality and skill of instructors. Hope House employs education experts to manage and operate its programs. Hope House’s Executive Director holds a doctorate degree in education and is involved in the day-to-day operation of Hope House’s daycare and pre-k. The organization also employs a Director of Early Childhood Services who spends the vast majority of each workday in the classroom with students. Hope House’s leadership provides instructors with regular informal feedback. The organization also employs a formal feedback and review process to help instructors improve.

Hope House’s daycare and pre-k are buttressed by two additional elements that give Slingshot confidence in the quality of its practices. First, student progress is consistently tracked through a number of research-backed tests and evaluations. Instructors tailor support to students based on evaluation results. Second, Hope House incorporates social services into its education programming. Specifically, Hope House offers play therapy to address students’ mental health needs. Play therapy is an established clinical best practice and an important supplement to Hope House’s service offerings.

In sum, while Hope House’s curricula do not meet Slingshot’s strict standards for best practices, the intentional program design, national accreditation, strong feedback loop, and high quality instruction offered by Hope House gives Slingshot confidence in the quality of Hope House’s education programs.

Social services

Slingshot segments Hope House’s social services into counseling/case management services and housing support. Slingshot uncovered some evidence that both elements of Hope House’s social services adhere to best practices while there is also evidence that suggests practices are improving.

Counseling and case management

Given the complexity of treatments and expertise required to evaluate their efficacy, Slingshot does not aim to evaluate and validate clinical best practices used in mental health counseling. Instead we look for evidence that suggests the program as a whole is well designed and managed.

Slingshot uncovered evidence that indicates Hope House’s counseling and case management services are adhering to best practices. The program is led by Hope House’s Director of Social Services who is a licensed clinical social worker. Hope House employs a number of therapists who work directly with its clients. Hope House has one of the highest proportions of licensed therapists in Memphis, largely due to Hope House’s willingness to fund licensure for its staff. Each therapist is either licensed or practicing under someone with a license.

The counseling program is designed and tailored to client needs by the social work team. Therapists are trusted to develop groups and therapies that adhere to clinical best practices and meet client
needs. When clients indicate sufficient interest in a particular type of group therapy (e.g., substance abuse, domestic violence, etc.), a member of the social work team puts together a group. Hope House provides intake screening for specific groups where it is deemed necessary. Many of these groups and individual therapies are built on common therapeutic models and trauma-informed practices that are tailored to clients’ needs.

The Director of Social Services provides regular oversight through chart audits, formal professional development plans, and informal feedback. This ensures the quality of care remains high and best practices are used.

Housing

Hope House provides housing support using a housing-first model recommended by HUD. Hope House’s housing support is provided through federally administered housing support programs specifically targeted at individuals affected by HIV and broader means-tested HUD funded programs.

Research suggests rapid rehousing, the housing model most similar to the one employed by Hope House, is as effective at achieving some outcomes and more effective at achieving others than transitional supportive housing. Published in 2016, the Family Options Study compared outcomes generated by several housing models, including community-based rapid rehousing (CBRR) and project-based transitional housing (PBTH), by randomly assigning families to one of those models of treatment. The authors found that three years after families were assigned, there were no significant differences in measures of housing success, independence, or quality between the CBRR and PBTH groups. Further, it found that families assigned to CBRR experienced lower rates of psychological distress and food insecurity compared to those assigned to PBTH.24

Rapid rehousing and housing-first models achieve these results at a lower cost than transitional housing. While Slingshot cannot officially designate rapid rehousing as a best practice because its research-tested outcomes are not shown to be substantially superior to transitional housing, Hope House’s adoption of a housing-first model is appropriate and certainly a good practice. Additionally, Hope House is required to use this model as a part of the government programs in which it participates.

In addition to Hope House’s housing model, the organization provides wraparound support to its clients who take advantage of housing benefits. Hope House case managers work with 27 to 29 households per full time employee. They track their clients’ medical data through a shared database and offer supportive services as necessary. This often includes referrals to Hope House’s counseling and case management support. Hope House’s wraparound support improves the probability that clients reap the full benefits of Hope House’s housing support and is consistent with best practices.

Conclusions and opportunities for growth

Hope House demonstrates that it employs the best practices available or is continuing to adopt better practices across its education programs and social services. Many of Hope House’s practices are required or prescribed by a funder or government program. This limits Hope House’s choice as it pertains to program models and program changes.
Slingshot identified two potential opportunities for growth.

First, Hope House can consider identifying a process to target support to housing clients who might be at high or rising risk for medical complications or other challenges. This might help prevent adverse outcomes for clients who benefit from Hope House’s housing support.

Second, Hope House can continue to attempt to integrate best practice pre- and post-tests for its therapy work to better understand the effects of counseling on its patients.
### Measurement Infrastructure: Summary of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>At least neutral</th>
<th>At least strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurement infrastructure</td>
<td>Unclear what measurement infrastructure is most relevant for area of focus</td>
<td>Measurement practices considered problematic or damaging</td>
<td>Limited or no measurement infrastructure; limited or no use to improve impact</td>
<td>Sufficient aspects of measurement infrastructure exist</td>
<td>Robust measurement system used to understand and improve impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview**

The goal of this assessment is to help Slingshot better understand the extent to which a partner has sound practices and processes for collecting, storing, and analyzing program and outcomes data as it relates to fighting poverty.

**Purpose and uses of the measurement infrastructure assessment:**

- Build a shared understanding of a partner’s current measurement practices as they relate to poverty alleviation
- Identify opportunities to improve measurement practices, with an eye towards a better understanding of participants, outcomes, and potential impact on poverty alleviation
- Develop a future vision for a partner’s measurement strategy that is aligned with the poverty-fighting aspects of its mission

**Summary of evidence**

Slingshot rates Hope House’s measurement infrastructure as **at least strong**. Hope House’s measurement infrastructure is well equipped to meet the organization’s day-to-day needs, improve its programs, and elucidate Hope House’s impact.

Hope House’s measurement infrastructure is guided by a set of **clear measurement goals and policies**. The organization’s measurement design is primarily focused on tracking participants, and data is regularly used at the client-level to guide decision making that improves program quality.

**Hope House collects comprehensive data on its clients.** Because Hope House works with its clients over the long term, it collects a substantial amount of comprehensive outcomes data over time (e.g., income, housing status, health status, etc.).

**Hope House deploys an adequate, organized set of data collection tools.** Hope House’s data collection primarily occurs on paper forms. The forms are well designed and there are clear policies in place to collect information.

**Data storage represents Hope House’s largest opportunity for growth.** The organization stores client data securely in multiple online storage systems operated by funders and government entities (e.g., CareWare, HMIS, and VOCA). Much of Hope House’s data is also stored on paper in locked filing cabinets. Hope House can explore options to improve the interoperability of its data, and identify specific analyses that can be conducted to improve its programs.
## Measurement Infrastructure: Rating and Sub-ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>At least neutral</th>
<th>At least strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Unclear what measurement infrastructure is most relevant for area of focus</td>
<td>Measurement practices considered problematic or damaging</td>
<td>Limited or no measurement infrastructure; limited or no use to improve impact</td>
<td>Sufficient aspects of measurement infrastructure exist</td>
<td>Robust measurement system used to understand and improve impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement goals, policies, and data use</strong></td>
<td>Insufficient access to systems and/or information to support evaluation</td>
<td>Problematic measurement objectives; data use could result in harmful decisions</td>
<td>Limited or weak measurement objectives; data are rarely used to inform decisions</td>
<td>Clear measurement objectives; data are often used to inform decisions</td>
<td>Clear measurement objectives; data are consistently used to inform decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collected</strong></td>
<td>Insufficient access to systems and/or information to support evaluation</td>
<td>Some data collected could be harmful to clients; several metrics are irrelevant and time consuming</td>
<td>Limited tracking of participant/program data; limited to no tracking of outcomes data</td>
<td>Most participant/program data are tracked; some outcomes data are tracked</td>
<td>Data tracked comprehensively; clear data definitions exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection methods and measurement instruments</strong></td>
<td>Insufficient access to systems and/or information to support evaluation</td>
<td>Poor collection instruments and methods; results could be erroneous and mislead analysis</td>
<td>Insufficient collection instruments and methods; data quality is limited</td>
<td>Sufficient collection instruments and methods; data is mostly high quality</td>
<td>Excellent collection instruments and methods; data is consistently high quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data storage, security, and analytics</strong></td>
<td>Insufficient access to systems and/or information to support evaluation</td>
<td>Data storage is reckless and insecure; analytics could result in harm</td>
<td>Data storage provides basic security; analytics are limited or basic</td>
<td>Data storage provides robust security; analytics are high quality</td>
<td>Data storage provides robust security; analytics are research-grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measurement Infrastructure: Description of Evidence

Measurement goals, policies, and data use: at least strong – Clear measurement objectives; data are often used to inform decisions

The measurement goals, policies, and data use subdimension of the Measurement Infrastructure assessment is designed to assess a partner’s data strategy as it relates to understanding and improving the poverty-fighting impact of its programs. Slingshot rates Hope House as at least strong on this subdimension.

Hope House has a clearly defined set of measurement objectives that enable it to ensure the quality of its programs and shed light on its impact. Hope House focuses on five primary measurement goals:

- Comply with funder requirements
- Understand immediate effects of programs
- Ensure services meet client needs
- Enable clients to access available benefits
- Share Hope House’s story with the community

These goals represent a nearly comprehensive set of measurement objectives. Hope House could also consider explicitly defining objectives to understand the long-term effects of its programs on clients. Nevertheless, these objectives form a formidable foundation for Hope House’s programs and measurement infrastructure.

Hope House uses data regularly to guide its decision-making. The organization’s delivery of social services is influenced by client need. Hope House’s staff determines a client’s needs by collecting and aggregating information to build a treatment plan. Hope House also uses this information to identify outside services a client might need (e.g., doctor’s appointments).

Hope House’s education programs use regular assessments and teacher observations to influence future lessons and learning for students. Hope House’s social services are integrated with its daycare and pre-k. Instructors often share information with the social services team that helps guide additional support like play therapy.

Data driven decision-making at Hope House is highly individualized, which is appropriate for Hope House given the small, manageable set of clients. Hope House can consider ways to look at its programming at a systemic level, too. This could improve the efficiency of program management and could yield new insights on ways to improve Hope House’s programming.

Data collected: very strong – Data tracked comprehensively; clear data definitions exist

The data collected subdimension assesses the ability of an organization to collect sufficient metrics to be used to improve the poverty-fighting impact of its programs. Slingshot rates Hope House as very strong on this subdimension.

Hope House collects an abundance of data on its clients and programs. Hope House works with many of its clients over a long period of time, enabling substantial data collection and tracking. Slingshot examines data collection in four parts: participant data, program data, outcomes data, and control data.

Hope House collects comprehensive participant data at intake. This includes personal information, basic health information, and demographic information. The intake data is updated frequently to check clients’ eligibility for government benefits.
Hope House tracks program data across all services. Daycare and pre-k data is rigorously tracked by monitoring attendance, conducting frequent assessments, and collecting instructor observations. Hope House regularly collects data on social services, including participation data and session notes.

Hope House tracks substantial outcomes data on its clients. For daycare and pre-k students, Hope House monitors assessment results and specific developmental milestones. The organization can track kindergarten readiness. For its broader client base, Hope House’s tracking of income and health data can also serve as long-term outcomes data. As health or income improves over time, Hope House might be able to attribute or associate these positive outcomes with its programs.

While Hope House does not collect specific control data, it has a strong understanding of the baseline conditions for people affected by HIV in Memphis. It was not clear to Slingshot if Hope House’s understanding of baseline conditions could be systematized or operationalized into complex analysis. Nevertheless, a familiarity with this data enables substantial future analysis.

Hope House has clear data definitions for all of its data types and has strong systems to support the collection of its metrics.

Data collection methods and measurement instruments: at least strong – Sufficient collection instruments and methods; data is mostly high quality

The data collection methods and measurement instruments subdimension assesses the quality of an organization’s data collection tools and the methods it uses to collect and track data. Slingshot rates Hope House as at least strong on the data collection methods and measurement instruments subdimension.

Hope House uses sound collection methods and measurement tools to collect data. Most of Hope House’s data collection is conducted using paper forms. These paper forms are highly managed by staff to ensure they are administered appropriately. The forms ask for comprehensive but data could require cleaning before use. In many cases, it must be directly entered into a computer system. Much of the data collected by Hope House remains in hard copy form.

Across its education programs and social services, Hope House aims to adopt measurement tools that reflect industry best practices. Hope House deploys research validated assessments to track and monitor its daycare and pre-k students’ progress. Hope House uses clinically validated instruments for many of its counseling assessments, too. Hope House also experiments with new ways to collect information from its clients through new forms and tools.

Slingshot has every indication Hope House’s data is reliable and accurate. Hope House’s adherence to research validated measurement tools supports this conclusion. Slingshot did not, however, uncover a systematic quality assurance process with Hope House’s data collection. Much of the quality assurance is done through ad hoc oversight by Hope House’s leadership. This approach is reasonable given Hope House’s size. If the organization’s client base grows or its staff turns over, it would be important for Hope House to institute a systematized quality assurance process. Currently, Hope House’s data collection methods and instruments are well suited to meet the organization’s needs.
Data storage, security, and analytics: at least neutral – Data storage provides basic security; analytics are limited or basic

The data storage, security, and analytics subdimension assesses the quality of an organization’s data storing practices, security policies, and reporting practices. Slingshot rates Hope House as at least neutral on this subdimension.

Hope House uses two primary data systems to store its data: CAREWare and the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). Hope House uploads data to these platforms to track outcomes and manage compliance. CAREWare is a central system used by other service providers working with individuals affected by HIV. Hope House can use this system to access information about services provided to a client by another service provider. HMIS is a system used by the federal government to track housing grants and outcomes. Both CAREWare and HMIS are secure data systems.

In addition to uploading data to online databases, much of Hope House’s data is stored in paper form in locked filing cabinets in its office. While the data is secure in an interior, locked room, there is no back-up for the paper files. This is a risk for Hope House.

Hope House’s storage system enables the organization to meet its obligations, but the system limits Hope House’s ability to analyze its data and track its impact across the organization. Hope House’s data systems are highly manual and generally aren’t interoperable. This prevents Hope House from easily analyzing holistic education outcomes across students. It could also prevent the organization from connecting data points collected on the social services side of the organization to data collected through its education programs.

Hope House goes to great lengths to protect the sensitivity of its clients’ information. The organization works with some of the most vulnerable individuals and families in Memphis. For this reason, Hope House aggressively protects its clients’ information.

Hope House can explore ways to digitize information kept on paper forms to enable additional cross-program analysis. This would also back-up valuable information that is currently stored in a single place, mitigating the risk of information loss. The organization can also explore ways to create interoperability across data storage systems to enable more powerful analysis.

Conclusions and opportunities for growth

Hope House’s measurement infrastructure is well suited to support the organization’s day-to-day needs. Hope House has a strong set of goals, a comprehensive approach to data collection, and high quality measurement instruments. While Hope House uses adequate online databases to store information, the storage systems lack interoperability and substantial data is stored on paper, rendering cross-program analysis difficult and presenting opportunities for improvement.

We identify three opportunities for growth in Hope House’s measurement infrastructure. First, Hope House can digitize the highest-priority data stored on paper forms. This will improve its analytics and mitigate the risk of data-loss.

Second, Hope House can improve the interoperability of its multiple data storage systems to enable cross-program analysis. For example, with interoperable data, Hope House can conduct cross-program analysis that links education outcomes with social services outcomes.
Third, Hope House can identify and conduct three to five systemic analyses that shed light on Hope House’s impact across clients. This will help Hope House build on its individual-level program improvement and analysis. Slingshot is eager to partner with Hope House to tackle these opportunities for growth.
Overview

The systems-level change assessment is used to determine the extent to which a partner organization is able to create poverty-fighting change in the community beyond the individuals and families that it directly serves. We conceptualize systems-level change as happening through two broad spheres: pathways and policy.

Pathways refers to the local network of peer and partner organizations and how participants in those programs pass through and between them, sometimes in tandem, other times in sequence. It is both quantitative and qualitative and can reflect program capacity, quality, or alignment.

Policy captures the ability of a partner to change the broader system itself. This can happen by affecting public policy, funding flows, social norms, and so on.

Summary of evidence

Slingshot rates Hope House’s systems-level change as at least strong. Hope House’s rating is driven by two concrete examples of systems-level change. It is further supported by several encouraging examples of systems-level change that are more difficult to substantiate but are worthy of mention.

First, Hope House helps facilitate its clients’ interactions with law enforcement. This includes helping clients file police reports and enabling clients to obtain representation in domestic violence cases. Hope House educates and builds trust with law enforcement that more easily enables its clients to participate in the justice system.

Second, Hope House had 12 clients facing difficulty with being recognized as transgender. Hope House worked with partner agencies and leaders at Ryan White to increase inclusion in the community. This decreased barriers for transgender clients and enabled access to healthcare and other benefits.

Hope House also engages in a variety of community education, outreach, and advocacy. Given the broad nature of this work, it is difficult to assess the systems-level change associated with these efforts.

Hope House can attempt to further define the goals of its community education and outreach efforts. This will enable Hope House to better target its limited resources and substantiate additional systems-level change.
Systems-level Change: Description of Evidence

Overview

Slingshot arrived at its at least strong rating because of two examples of systems-level change with a clear impact on Hope House’s beneficiaries and the broader Memphis poverty-fighting ecosystem. First, Hope House supports its clients in their interactions with law enforcement and more broadly builds trust with law enforcement. Second, Hope House advocates on behalf of its transgender clients’ healthcare needs.

Law enforcement advocacy

Hope House supports and facilitates its clients’ interactions with law enforcement. Many of Hope House’s clients are both victims of domestic violence and members of the LGBTQ community in addition to being affected by HIV. Many of these vulnerable clients distrust law enforcement for a variety of reasons and are uncomfortable interacting with law enforcement on their own. Hope House creates systems-level change by helping clients interface with law enforcement.

Hope House’s social workers often accompany clients to the police station to file police reports. They often alternatively create a safe space at Hope House for police to meet with a client to file a police report. Hope House supports victims of domestic violence in finding legal representation as they seek orders of protection against their abusers.

In addition to directly supporting its clients with law enforcement, Hope House builds trust with and influences law enforcement through education and research. **Hope House provides informal education to law enforcement about the needs of the community of individuals affected by HIV, particularly those who are victims of domestic violence.** Hope House is also contributing to a University of Memphis study about individuals with HIV who are arrested and charged with aggravated prostitution.

**Hope House’s efforts with law enforcement facilitate a smoother pathway for its clients to seek justice and participate in the legal system, creating substantial systems-level change.**

Healthcare advocacy

Hope House creates systems-level change by advocating for the healthcare needs of its transgender clients affected by HIV. Many transgender individuals face discrimination because they may not dress or act in ways consistent with traditional gender norms. This presents many barriers for these individuals to receive comprehensive medical care. Often there are health risks associated with overlapping medication regimens.

Hope House advocates for clients to receive fair treatment. In many cases, these clients are able to access additional government benefits. This support provided by Hope House improves its client earnings and health, consistent with Slingshot’s definition of impact on poverty. There is evidence to suggest this change extends beyond Hope House’s clients to help protect the rights of other transgender patients.

Additional examples of systems-level change

Slingshot identified three other areas where Hope House could be creating systems-level change. The evidence for these three areas is not as concrete as its law enforcement and healthcare work, but they should not be overlooked.
First, Hope House has a position dedicated to community outreach and education. This role attends community events and also leads social media campaigns to provide community education on HIV. Second, Hope House actively aims to influence Memphians’ perception of people affected by HIV and promote HIV testing. Third, Hope House partners with local government and private funders to help all institutions better meet the needs of its HIV affected clients.

**Conclusions and opportunities for growth**

For its size and reach, Hope House creates substantial systems-level change. The change created by Hope House is unique in that the magnitude of the change on an individual-level is quite large. For Hope House to achieve a very strong rating in systems-level change, it would have to broaden its efforts and show impact beyond its client base. Slingshot identified a few opportunities for growth.

**First, Hope House can further define the outcomes it intends to create through broader education and outreach.** Defining specific education and advocacy goals for this position could enable Hope House to better assess the impact created by the role. Hope House could do this by tracking and reporting on social media engagement and in-person engagement at outreach events.

**Second, Hope House can expand its efforts to influence contract payment timing by the city.** Given the inefficiencies created by the delay in payment, Hope House can make a strong case for improvement. Slingshot acknowledges aggressive advocacy that is critical of government institutions can have unintended consequences. We encourage Hope House to identify a coalition of partners with whom to undertake this effort.

Finally, Hope House can continue to formalize and expand its law enforcement and healthcare advocacy. Hope House’s work with the University of Memphis on aggravated prostitution charges represents a great place to start.

There is enormous potential for Hope House to grow its systems-level change for the benefit of its clients and all Memphians living with HIV.
Opportunities for Growth

Expand data storage and analytics capabilities
- Digitize high-priority metrics across all programs and services
- Identify and implement a storage solution that can track data across programs in a single location
- Develop and test a set of analyses that cut across programs and provide insights across clients

Define goals and outcomes of broader education and outreach efforts
- Define specific, measurable goals for Hope House’s outreach efforts
- Investigate the efficacy of education and outreach efforts
- Develop an internal dashboard to track outputs and outcomes

Identify approaches to tailor wraparound case management support
- Incorporate best practice care coordination and case management practices (where applicable)
- Develop approaches to stratify high and rising risk clients
- Identify and test methods to target case management support to high and rising risk clients across all services
This assessment is the beginning of a deeper partnership. Slingshot will provide ongoing, customized support and thought partnership to Hope House following the assessment.
Slingshot Memphis, Inc.
Slingshot Impact Assessment:
Hope House:
Appendix
**Slingshot’s Approach**

Slingshot Memphis works alongside Affiliate partners to understand, measure, and communicate their impact on poverty alleviation. Slingshot’s Impact Assessment aims to understand the potential impact an Affiliate is creating by assessing the partner across four dimensions of impact. We then share our conclusions in a way that is helpful to the Affiliate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Impact Tree, Literature Review, and Program Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slingshot meets with the Affiliate Partner to better understand its programs and create an impact tree. In creating the tree, Slingshot conducts a brief literature review to identify relevant research that might provide evidence for the impact of a partner’s model. Slingshot also creates a program map that lays out the programs offered by the partner organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2: Impact Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Slingshot collaborates with the Affiliate Partner to assess the partner on four dimensions:  
  • Benefit-cost ratio  
  • Use of best practices  
  • Measurement infrastructure  
  • Systems-level change  
The assessment process involves several meetings, questionnaires, and data requests. It lasts approximately 2-3 months. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3: Synthesis and Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slingshot compiles the information it learned in previous phases to provide the Affiliate Partner with a report. The report presents the partner’s impact tree, program map, as well as the full Slingshot Impact Assessment. The report concludes with opportunities for improvement, followed by continued engagement by Slingshot as a thought partner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Maps

What is a program map?
A program map is a tool to help us understand the programs offered by Hope House from the perspective of its participants. It shows us how Hope House’s clients experience the organization’s programs and services.

How should one read a program map?
These maps can be arranged in numerous ways, depending on the program they are depicting. For the following program maps, start on the far left side, as participants first engage with the specific program at Hope House.

Why is a program map useful?
- Helps us understand the experience of someone participating in Hope House’s programs
- Depicts every stage of a program, beginning with entry, through various decision points and potential bottle necks, all the way to program exit
- Clearly shows the programs’ desired outcomes and where participants might not achieve them

How can Hope House use its program maps?
- **Participant experience**: Demonstrate how Hope House’s programs are experienced from the beneficiary’s perspective
- **Organizational structure**: Help identify key junctures and potential leakages from programs
- **Resource acquisition**: Communicate with current and potential stakeholders about how Hope House’s programs operate and add value to participants’ lives
Program Map: Hope House

**Education programs**

- Parent
  - SCS screening
  - Hope House Pre-K (3 to 4)
  - Hope House Daycare (6 months to 3)
  - SCS Kindergarten

**Social services**

- Referring organization
  - Central Hope House Intake
    - Individual counseling
    - Group counseling
    - Housing support (emergency and permanent)
    - Food pantry
    - Additional wraparound support
Slingshot Memphis aims to create a demonstrable reduction in poverty by promoting a results-driven poverty-fighting ecosystem.