|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Category | Lines | Description | Recommendation | GT Notes/replies |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Specification Issue/Question | N/A | When specs for 7a1 step #3 say “completely excluded from entire measure” – does that mean excluded from ALL of measure 7 or just metric 7a1?    In the measure’s general programming instructions it says that each one has a “different universe of clients and corresponding universe of data” – so I don’t think the intention is for cross-metric filtering. BUT then the next line reiterates the exclusion rule. My \*hunch\* is that there may have been some ambiguity in the original specs and that this reflects TA interpretation. | We should confirm and make the language more explicit around the scope of the exclusion. | I agree. I interpreted this as there are exclusions “per metric” and not the entire universe/measure. |
| 2 | Specification Issue/Question | N/A | 7a.1 step 5 is confusing because it treats the 200:399 exit destinations as if they all either have a [check] or [x], but value 207 (jail) falls into neither category. | The instructions should be clarified so that folks with 'x' are excluded AT step #3, then the instructions for 7 can be simplified to just saying "ones with checks" | I saw this as well for measure 3. It wasn’t clear how to treat exit destinations in appendix A that do not have a [check] or [x]. |
| 3 | Possible Issue | 365 | Temporary destinations is supposed to be inclusive of Institutional. So it should be 200:399 && !207 instead of 300:399. |  | Made the change to be 200:399. This is a label to help with the client detail csv file and not used in any filter or calculation. |
| 4 | Performance Consideration | 359:367 | Right now you filter the df down after performing some mutations, but I think you can actually do the filtering first, which I think is better for performance. THIS IS VERY MINOR. | Filter to Project type 4 before creating new columns in this df. | Made the change to have the filtering happen first. |
| 5 | Observation | 372:375 | This is a different way to go about finding the most recent / earliest record than I employed. It utilizes group\_by(), a rank field, and slice().  Curious if this is better practice or just a diff way to do it! | N/A | Went through and added ungroup() here I felt it was needed.  Rank field was added for checking the code. Should be removed before finalized.  Slice is just another way of doing it. Slice to my understanding focuses more so on the location of a row vs a logical condition. It might be worth reviewing slice to see if a filter would be more efficient. |
| 6 | Possible Issue | 369:371 | For df\_7a1\_sliced.detail, I think that the exclusion of persons with (206,329,24) exit destination happens too early! Exclusions should be based on the max Exit, and right now it's happening before max exit is determined.  HOWEVER, note that this depends on my interpretation of the order of operations in the specs. | Split out filtering into two steps: existing filter that precedes max exit slicing should retain Leavers; filter for excluded exit destinations should happen post-slicing.  Consider modifying the [leaver.stayer] calculated column in df\_7a1\_clientDetail so that it performs the additional check for ExitDate > report\_end\_date; that was can more easily limit to Leavers in that first filter. | I agree. Interpreted the guidance as if this exit exists for any enrollment remove the client(s) from the entire metric.  Modified 7a1 to reflect that change. |
| 7 | Possible Issue | 369:371 | 409:414 | 431:433 | 462:464 | Does there need to be an ungroup() at the end of these?    I haven’t gotten to test these myself, but I know that not having ungroup() can create issues. I’m wondering if this is why you needed to add the {} to some of your calculations that follow these to get correct outputs. |  | Added ungroup to code chunk.  By changing the script to better match the order of operations for SPM 7 I de-duplicated and don’t even need n\_distinct, but count() could do it. Need to test this some more to see if ungroup solved the issue. |
| 8 | Possible Issue | 424-426 | Repeat of #6, but for 7b1. | See #6 | I looked at the order of operations and I re-organized the entire script. I created a stayer and leaver universe to remove the disqualifying enrollments and clients. Then I did a rbind() to bring everything back together for the final calculations. |
| 9 | Spec Issue/Question | N/A | 7a.1 step 1 -- what is meant by "not active" (e.g., if exit date matches report end date, are they included?) | As previously discussed, I think we need to explicitly clarify which Active Client methodologies are being used for each metric. | General assumption is to use Method 1 or 2 unless specifically called out in the specs.  I do agree that we should be more explicit about what method to use. I noticed in the measures programming instructions they often describe the method of selecting active clients vs. just calling out the method. |
| 10 | Consideration | 383 | Not an issue, but may be easier to have this list be created as a separate object for readability / code management. | I'm thinking we may want to create these kinds of lists as objects (possibly for storage in our list subscript?). | Need further clarification on this. What do you mean by saving the lists? |
| 11 | Question | 365:366 | 422 | 459 | How is the Destination\_category column used? I didn’t see them referenced, so perhaps they are leftover? |  | Created it to be added into the client detail spreadsheets. |
| 12 | Spec Issue/Question | 412:414 | These steps generalize the HoH HMID to other clients, but the specs don't actually provide instructions to do this. I'm assuming this comes from the Glossary, but I think it's important that there's an explicit reference if it's not going to be part of the instructions.    Related question: Do we need to address expectations for data quality (e.g., HMID within EE range; Exit is after Entry?) |  | Great point. I got this code from Gwen. I believe Gwen mentioned that there was a note somewhere in either the SPMs or Glossary about this. I will need to find it.  Related Question:  I think this might only be a problem with RRH. In the PH project types (3,9,10) They would fall under the stayer category. Will follow up with Gwen. |
| 13 | Spec Issue/Question | 466 | Noted note on line 466 about ties for is.na(ExitDate) for measure 7b2 stayers.    The specs say to evaluate the LATEST stayer, but how that is determined isn't defined. So if there are two open housing enrollments but one is missing HMID by chance, that could cause exclusion. |  | Still looking into this. The specs also mention the latest stay (7b.1 line 3).  How would you interpret latest stay? Would that be the most recent entry date? |
|  | Spec Issue/Question |  | 7b.1 line 3 the specs mention latest exit and 7b.2 line 3 mention the latest stay.  What does latest stay mean? Are we referring to the earliest entrydate or the most recent entry date? |  | For 7b.1 the metric is only focused on the leavers. So, each stay should have an exit date and we can use that to identify the latest exit.  7b.2 the metric is focused on leavers and stayers. So, sometimes the latest stay will have no exit date. I interpreted latest stay as either the entry with the latest exit date or is.na(ExitDate). |