

WASHINGTON FAMILIES FUND HIGH-NEEDS FAMILY PROGRAM

Baseline Evaluation Summary



Prepared by Westat for Building Changes
January 2010

Introduction

The Washington Families Fund (WFF) High-Needs Family (HNF) program is intended to improve the permanent supportive housing structure for homeless families that have been classified as “high needs.” The program incorporates a case management team approach that includes mental health, chemical dependency and trauma treatment; targeted children’s activities; and wrap-around services with a greater degree of intensity and specificity than has been possible with other WFF housing models for families.

The HNF program is based on the underlying assumption that permanent housing and intensive services lead to better outcomes for children and families who have complex needs and significant barriers to stability and well-being, and that stable housing increases the likelihood that families will remain intact. Therefore, this model places a strong emphasis on family stability, which includes addressing mental health, chemical dependency, and family reunification concerns. Additional goals of the program include stability in permanent housing, increased safety and economic well-being, increased access to benefits and mainstream services, and improved physical and behavioral health for high-needs children, families, and adults.

The HNF program is intended to serve families with children under 18 who are currently homeless and at-risk for chronic homelessness. More specifically, it is designed to serve families that are experiencing co-occurring barriers including: serious and persistent mental illness, chemical dependency, domestic violence/trauma from violence and dislocation, HIV/AIDS or other chronic illness, Child Protective Services (CPS) involvement, and/or serious criminal histories.

As of year-end 2009, eight providers have been funded to implement the HNF program, for a total of 81 units. From September 2008 through September 2009, a total of 166 families have been screened for eligibility for the housing, and 60 percent (N=99) have been found eligible. Most of these families (70%) have been enrolled in the program, although 10 percent of those who enrolled exited the program. Another 18 percent have been placed on the waiting list. and the remaining families (12%) who were eligible for the study found alternate housing after screening.

A total of 69 families have been served by the HNF program through September 2009. This includes 78 adults and 105 children¹.

An evaluation is funded as part of the HNF program, providing detailed baseline and follow-up assessment data on each family enrolled through the program. To date, data has been collected through baseline assessments conducted with the providers on 57 families. Basic descriptive findings on this pool of families is provided in the sections to follow.

Among the 57 families who completed a baseline assessment, there were 66 adults and 88 children living in the household at the time of enrollment. For the remaining families (12 out of 69), the number of adults and children living in the household was obtained from the screenings. Five of the 12 families, including 5 adults and 7 children living in the family, refused to participate in the baseline assessment. The remaining 7 families, including 7 adults and 10 children, were enrolled in the program, but had not yet completed a baseline assessment at the time of this report.

¹ This includes 88 children whose head of household had completed a baseline assessment by September 2009 and 17 children who had been enrolled in the program by September 2009 but whose head of household had not yet completed a baseline assessment. This number does not include the 35 children who were living apart from the head of household enrolled in the HNF program.

Agency	# of units funded	# of families screened	# of families ineligible for participation	# of families enrolled*	# of families exited	# of families on waitlist
Abused Deaf Women's Advocacy Services	10	6	0	6	0	0
Community Services Northwest	10	46	28	12	2	4
Drug Abuse Prevention Center	20	30	3	16	3	10
Serenity House	5	10	1	5	0	1
Sound Mental Health	15	26	11	14	2	0
Catholic Charities of Spokane	10	14	4	4	0	2
Volunteers of America	5	22	15	6	1	0
Women's Resource Center	7	12	5	6	1	1
TOTAL	81	166	77	69	9	18

*Includes families who enrolled, but have since exited.

Barriers

Minimum eligibility criteria for participation in the HNF program include having at least two service needs in addition to a history of homelessness. Consequently, nearly 85 percent of the families have three or more barriers. Thirteen percent have two barriers, and only one family screened has one problem².

Co-occurrence of Barriers ¹ (N=57)	
Family has one barrier	1.9%
Family has two barriers	13.2%
Family has three barriers	30.2%
Family has more than three barriers	54.7%

¹ Barriers include CPS involvement; disability or long-term chronic health problem; positive mental health indicator; positive substance abuse screening; and criminal history or current legal problems.

Demographic Background

The baseline assessment interview was conducted with the head of the household, who in the majority of cases (86%) was female. This is consistent with most programs serving homeless families. The parent completing the interview ranged in age from 19 to 50 years and was on average in his or her early 30s. On average, the parents reflect the average age of parents in most homeless families' studies, though they are considerably younger than

² This respondent has both mental health indicators and was arrested last year. These barriers qualified her for the program. Our current measures of criminal history do not capture this arrest.

families involved in supportive housing programs sponsored by Heartland in Illinois (average age 42), Minnesota's Hearth Connection (38 years), and the Schwab Foundation (36 years).

Demographic Characteristics (N=57)	
Gender	
Male	14.0%
Female	86.0%
Age, in years	32.8 (8.6)
Race (N=56)	
White	73.2%
Black	14.3%
Hispanic	7.0%
Other Race	5.4%
US Citizenship	75.4%
Legal Resident among non-Citizens (N=14)	85.7%

¹ Standard deviation in parentheses.

Nearly three-fourths of the responding parents were white, following by African American (14.3%), Hispanic (7%) and other race (5.4%). This sample is disproportionately white compared with state-wide statistics, which indicate that only about 12 percent of those living in poverty in Washington are white, while 25 percent are African American and 27 percent are Hispanic. Three-fourths of High-Needs Families are U.S. citizens. Among those who are not U.S. Citizens (N=14), 85.7 percent are legal residents of the U.S.

Family Composition

Fewer than 10 percent of heads of household completing the assessment were married, with the majority having never been married (52.6%). Others were reportedly separated or divorced (38.6%); one head of household was widowed. In the supportive housing studies reviewed, as well as the broader set of studies on homeless families, the vast majority of families are headed by single females, as found here.

Family Composition (N=57)	
Marital status	
Married	7.0%
Single/Never married	52.6%
Separated/Divorced	38.6%
Widowed	1.8%
# of children under 18 years	2.4 (1.4)
# of children under 6 years	0.9 (0.8)
% with another adult in household	17.5%
# of other adults in household	0.2 (0.4)
Child living away	42.1%
Open CPS plan	24.6%

¹ Standard deviation in parentheses.

A slightly higher percentage of families had another adult living in the household (17.5%). Of these, three live with a parent and the remaining live with a spouse or partner.

To be eligible for the housing, families had to have at least one child living with them or have high level prospects of having a child reunited. The number of children ranged from one to seven, with an average of 2.4 children. About one-third of families (31.6%) had only one child, and another 29.8 percent had two. 8.8 percent of families had five or more children under the age of 18. Nearly half of the families (45.6%) had a child two years old or younger, and 68.4 percent had a child under the age of six. On average, the number of children in a HNF family is comparable to the number of children in families served through other supportive housing programs evaluated.

Nearly half of the families (42.1%) had at least one child living away, and 15.8 percent had more than one child living away. Five families (8.8%) had all of their children living away at the time of the baseline assessment. For the majority of families with children living away, the children are living with their other parent. The remaining children are living with grandparents or other relatives and two families have children living in foster care. The percentage of families having at least one child separated from them at the time they enter housing is much larger than what is seen in other programs with comparable data. In the Sound Families Initiative, for example, 25 percent had one or more children living away from the family, and in the Schwab Foundation Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative, 26 percent of the families had one or more children living away.

At least one-quarter of the families (24.6%) have an open CPS plan. The baseline assessment only asks about CPS plans for those families who have at least one child living away. It may be that a higher percentage of families have a CPS plan and we did not capture that information.

Education and Employment History

Nearly half of the parents (47.6%) completing the assessment had less than a high school diploma. One-fifth had a high school diploma or GED, and about one-third had greater than a high school diploma. The education level of the HNF program enrollees is considerably lower than generally found in homeless family studies at large; especially with respect to families in housing. For example, in the Sound Families Initiative, 30 percent of heads of household had less than a high school degree; similarly, 29 percent in both the Illinois Supportive Housing Program and the Schwab Family Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative had less than a high school degree. In the Bridges to Housing program, it is even lower with 23 percent lacking a high school diploma or GED.

Although nearly all respondents (94.7%) had worked at some time in their lives, only 12.3 percent were working at the time of the assessment interview and nearly half (44.6%) reported that they were unable to work. Of those (N=25), 64 percent reported they were unable to work because of a physical or mental disability; 20 percent were unable to work in order to meet treatment program requirements; and 8 percent cited transportation issues. This percentage is somewhat comparable to what is generally reflected in homeless studies when families arrive at shelter or while they are homeless (typically around 14%), but lower than is seen in other housing studies ranging from 33 percent employed either full or part time in the Connecticut Supportive Housing Program to 21 percent employed in the Illinois Supportive Housing Program.

Education Level	
Less than high school diploma	47.4%
Finished high school/Completed GED	21.1%
More than high school diploma	31.6%
Current Employment Status (at time of interview)	
Currently employed	12.3%
Unable to work (N=56)	44.6%
Employment Histories	
Ever employed	94.7%

Housing History

Eligibility for the HNF program required that families are living in a homeless situation at the time of program screening and were previously homeless at least once in the last three years or that the current episode of homelessness has been at least three years in length. Homeless living situations are limited to circumstances such as families sleeping in a place not meant for human habitation; spending a short time in an institutionalized setting but ordinarily sleeping in a place not meant for human habitation; exiting an institutional setting without an appropriate housing destination; being evicted within a week and having no subsequent residence secured; or staying in an emergency shelter or motel.

Last Played Stayed (N=55)	
Stayed in own place	10.9%
Stayed in parent's place	3.6%
Stayed in doubled up place	16.4%
Stayed in hospital/detox	3.6%
Stayed in jail	1.8%
Stayed in shelter	21.8%
Stayed in another program (i.e. crisis or respite program, transitional housing program, etc.)	9.1%
Homeless prior to entering shelter (i.e. living on the street, in a car, or in an abandoned building, etc.)	27.3%
Stayed some other place	5.5%
Residential History	
Previously homeless in lifetime	100.0%
# of times homeless in lifetime ¹	9.9 (19.9)
Previously homeless in last 2 years (N=55)	98.2%
# of times homeless in last 2 years ¹	2.5 (3.6)
Previously living doubled up in lifetime (N=56)	89.3%
# of times living doubled up in lifetime ¹	16.4 (24.9)
Previously living doubled up in last 2 years	80.4%
# of times living doubled up in last 2 years ¹	4.4 (12.2)
Experienced conflicts in last household (N=55)	29.1%

¹ Statistics presented are the mean and standard deviation (in parentheses).

Families reported a great deal of housing instability over their lifetime and in recent years, considerably more than is seen in general homeless studies and in the Sound Families Initiative. All families had been homeless in the past and all but one respondent had reportedly been homeless in the past two years. The mean number of times families report being homeless in the last two years is 2.5 times. The median is 2.0. Most families (91%) report being homeless fewer than three times in the past two years. A few cases report very high number of episodes (6 to 25) which distorts the mean. This is similarly true for the number of times heads of households report being homeless in their lifetimes (median = 4 times). Most heads of household (90%) report being homeless between 1 and 15 times. A few cases report being homeless as many as 100 times in their lifetime.

Most (89.3%) also reported living doubled up at least once in their lifetime and 80 percent reported living doubled up at least once in the last two years. Eighty percent of families indicate they lived doubled up fewer than 10 times in their life, while the remaining 20 percent say they have lived doubled up too many times to count.

Twenty-nine percent noted that conflicts in their household or with others made it impossible to stay where they were living.

Health Problems and Access to Care

The majority of parents completing the assessment have a chronic or ongoing medical problem (63.0%) and/or a disability (43.9%). 36.8 percent of respondents report having both a chronic illness and a disability. The SF8 is an eight-item health survey used to assess both physical and mental health functioning. Possible scores range from 0 to 100, and a score of 50 indicates the norm. The average score for this sample is 53.4. However, 15.8 percent of respondents have SF8 physical health summary scores of 40 or below, which indicates poor health functioning. One female respondent reported being pregnant at the time of the assessment. None of the male respondents indicated they were living with a female partner who was pregnant.

When examining these data in the context of other evaluations of supportive housing programs for homeless families, the families served in this program appear to have the same or higher needs for health services. In the Minnesota Supportive Housing Program, for example, more than 40 percent of the women had at least one health condition, and 38 percent had impaired physical functioning. In the Illinois Supportive Housing Program, 34 percent of heads of household had a chronic health condition, and 30 percent had a physical disability.

Overall, at the time of the assessment, the vast majority of families have a source of medical insurance, and more than three-fourths (78.6%) have a routine source of care.

Health	
Pregnant	1.8%
Poor physical health functioning (SF8) ¹	15.8%
Has a disability	43.9%
Has a disability and receives either SSI or SSDI	12.3%
Has HIV/AIDS (N=54)	0.0%
Has another chronic or on-going medical problem (N=54)	63.0%
Has a routine source of care (N=56)	78.6%
Has a source of medical insurance (N=56)	91.1%

¹ 8-item Short-Form Health Survey

Mental Health, Substance Abuse, and Trauma

The majority of families (70.2%) have one or more current indicators of mental health conditions needing more assessment and possible intervention, including anxiety (60.7%), moderate or severe depression (46.4%), and impaired mental health functioning (33.3%). One-fourth of the respondents also report having been hospitalized at least once in the past for a mental health condition. As with physical health, the indicators for mental health treatment for High-Needs Families signal the same or greater need as families served in other supportive housing programs. The difference in measurement precludes easy comparison, but those referenced as “In Need of Service” or “Having Mental Health Indicators” range from 36 to 81 percent in the evaluations reviewed.

Nearly one-fourth (24.5%) screened positive for substance abuse, the vast majority screening positive for drug use and a small percent screening positive for alcohol abuse. The majority of respondents (78.6%) report that they never have a drink containing alcohol; however, over half (63.2%) reported having received substance abuse treatment in the past. In other supportive housing studies, those in need of substance abuse treatment ranged from 26 to 40 percent. The rate of treatment is comparable to the rate of past issues, as measured in the Schwab Foundation Supportive Housing Program (61%).

Mental Health Indicators	
Hospitalized for mental health (N=56)	25.0%
Moderate or severe depression score (PHQ) ¹ (N=56)	46.4%
Moderate or severe anxiety score (GAD) ² (N=56)	60.7%
Poor mental health functioning (SF8) (N=53)	33.3%
One or more mental health indicators	70.2%
Substance Abuse	
Positive screen for alcohol abuse (AUDIT) ³ (N=56)	3.5%
Positive screen for drug abuse (DAST-10) ⁴ (N=56)	23.2%
Positive screen for alcohol or drug abuse (N=56)	24.5%
Ever received substance abuse treatment	63.2%
Trauma	
Ever experienced physical or sexual violence	93.0%
Experienced physical or sexual violence in past 6 months	15.8%
Ever experienced other traumatic events	80.7%
Experienced other traumatic events in past 6 months	8.8%

¹ Depression Scale: Spitzer, R.L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J.B. Patient Health Questionnaire Primary Care Study Group, 1999. Validation and Utility of a Self-Report Version of PRIME-MD: the PHQ primary care study. JAMA 282, 1737-1744.

² GAD: Spitzer, R.L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J.B., Lowe, B. A Brief Measure for Assessing Generalized Anxiety Disorder: The GAD-7. Arch Intern Med. 2006; 66(10):1092-7

³ AUDIT: Saunders, J.B., Aasland, O.G., Babor, T.F., De La Fuente, J.R., Grant, M. 1993. Development of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO Collaborative project on early detection of persons with harmful alcohol consumption- II.

⁴ DAST-10: Skinner HA. The Drug Abuse Screening Test. Addict Behav 1982;7(4):363-367.

Almost all families (93%) reported having experienced physical and/or sexual violence in the past, more than 15 percent having experienced it in the past six months. Similarly, more than 80 percent experienced other traumatic events in their lifetime, with nearly 9 percent in the past six months. The rates are comparable to those obtained in general homeless families studies.

Legal and Criminal History

The majority of parents completing the assessment have a criminal history. More than 60 percent of heads of household have spent time in jail or prison because of a conviction, and nearly half (50%) have been convicted of a felony in the past. Over one-fifth (22.6%) are on probation or parole. These percentages of past criminal involvement are higher than what is generally seen in homeless family studies.

Fewer than 10 percent were dealing with housing-related legal problems, and less than one-fifth were dealing with other legal problems at the time of the assessment.

Legal and Criminal History	
Convicted of a felony (N=56)	46.4%
Spent time in jail or prison because of a conviction (N=56)	62.5%
Currently on probation or parole (N=53)	22.6%
Dealing with current housing-related legal problems	8.8%
Dealing with current other legal problems	17.5%

Debt, Income, and Benefits

More than 80 percent of the families have debt, with a median amount of \$5,300. About 35 percent of families have more than \$10,000 of debt, and 10 percent have more than \$20,000 of debt. On average, the income level of the High-Needs Families appears to be lower than comparable data in other studies.

Just over half of the families have housing-related debt. The majority of families (80%) have less than \$1,000 of housing related debt.

Debt	
Has debt	80.7%
Amount of debt ¹	\$8,053.5 (9,006.8)
Has housing-related debt	50.9%
Amount of housing-related debt ¹	\$1,110.0 (2,323.9)
Income	
Amount of income in past 30 days ¹	\$604.0 (466.2)
Has no income	15.8%
Benefits	
Has a housing subsidy	45.6%
On a waitlist for a housing subsidy (N=53)	30.2%
Receives TANF ² (N=56)	73.2%
Receives food stamps/SNAP ³	91.2%
Food stamps/SNAP, pending	1.8%
Receives WIC ⁴	44.2%
WIC, pending	1.9%
Receives school lunch	36.0%
School lunch, pending	4.0%
Receives daycare vouchers	28.9%

¹ Statistics presented are the mean and standard deviation (in parentheses).

² TANF is Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, a federal assistance program.

³ SNAP is Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, a federal food stamp program.

⁴ WIC is Women, Infants, and Children supplemental nutrition program.

Summary

These data, though on a subset of the families that will eventually be served in the Washington Families Fund High-Needs Family program, suggest that the screening efforts of the providers to date have identified families with higher needs than were obtained in more general studies of homeless families and, to some extent, higher than previous studies of supportive and transitional housing for families. On average, the families in the HNF program have:

- low levels of educational attainment,
- substantial histories of homelessness and residential instability,
- significant rate of child separation upon entry in to the program,
- high rate of past criminal involvement, and
- high rates of physical and mental health issues, substance abuse and trauma needs.

Eighty-five percent of HNF heads of households have three or more of these barriers. Such great service needs suggest that the population to date is indeed a high service need group and would be most appropriate for the model of service delivery intended by the HNF program.

Appendix

The following supportive housing programs are similar to the Washington Families Fund High-Needs Family program. Table 1 (on page 12) outlines some similarities and differences between the programs on several key measures.

Sound Families Initiative

<http://www.soundfamilies.org/>

A \$40 million commitment from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation launched the Sound Families Initiative, a program to develop new housing with support services for homeless families, or families in danger of becoming homeless, in King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties. The Sound Families Initiative is now complete and our comprehensive evaluation reports show that the program helped homeless families in ways far beyond putting roofs over their heads. The legacy of Sound Families lives on in the Washington Families Fund, a unique public-private partnership created by the Washington State Legislature in 2004 to provide long-term funding for supportive services for families across the state. The fund was inspired in part by promising evaluation results from Sound Families, and it has already funded projects that will serve roughly 5,000 families over the lifetime of its 5 and 10-year grants.

Minnesota Supportive Housing and Managed Care Pilot

<http://www.hearthconnection.org>

The Minnesota Supportive Housing and Managed Care Pilot is the result of a multi-year, public/private planning effort begun in 1996. In 2000, the Minnesota Legislature appropriated funds to serve homeless families in the Pilot. In 2001, it appropriated additional funds to serve homeless, single adults. A total of \$10 million was invested from 2000 to 2007. Through contracts with the Minnesota Department of Human Services, appropriations were distributed to two Minnesota counties: Blue Earth (a rural county including the city of Mankato and its environs) and Ramsey (an urban county including the city of Saint Paul and its suburbs). The counties contracted with Hearth Connection, a nonprofit agency created to lead the Pilot. Hearth Connection then maintained contracts with four organizations to provide direct services in the two counties.

Connecticut Supportive Housing for Families

<http://documents.csh.org/documents/ct/PilotsFactSheet.pdf>

The Connecticut Supportive Housing for Families program provides families served by the Connecticut Department of Children and Families (DCF) throughout the state with support services and access to safe, quality, affordable and permanent housing. Connecticut Supportive Housing for Families' mission is to help DCF families thrive by finding homes in safe, nurturing neighborhoods, achieving economic independence, developing healthy relationships, and providing their children with a stable and caring home environment. Supportive Housing for Families is located throughout the state, with offices in New Haven, Groton, Middletown, Hartford, Waterbury, and Bridgeport. The program helps families become reunited with children who have been placed in foster care, or prevents the placement children in foster care from happening by providing adequate housing.

Beyond Shelter

<http://www.beyondshelter.org/home.html>

Beyond Shelter's "Housing First" Program for Homeless Families is an innovative, cost-effective approach to ending and preventing family homelessness. Since its inception in 1988, the housing first methodology has helped thousands of homeless families—primarily single mothers with children—to rebuild their lives in permanent rental housing throughout Los Angeles County. The "Housing First" Program was designed as the next step for homeless families in the emergency shelter system in L.A. County. The program helps homeless families move as quickly as possible into permanent, affordable rental housing in residential neighborhoods and provides families with six months to one full year of individualized case management and social services to enable improved social and economic well-being. From 1989 to 2008 the program helped over 4,000 homeless families, more than 12,000 adults and children, rebuild their lives in permanent housing. Over the years, the "housing first" approach has

become widely recognized as a model for ending family homelessness. The methodology has been adapted by other agencies throughout the country through Beyond Shelter's Institute for Research, Training and Technical Assistance and the National Alliance to End Homelessness' Housing First Network.

Bridges to Housing

<http://bridgestohousing.org/>

Bridges to Housing is a regional initiative aimed at assisting high-needs homeless families by providing permanent housing and intensive case management for up to two years with flexible funds available to meet immediate or emerging child and family needs. The goals of Bridges to Housing are to stabilize families in housing, stabilize children in childcare and education settings, attend to physical, mental, and behavioral health concerns of children and adults, and help families begin to move towards greater self-sufficiency and well-being. Bridges to Housing aims to realign the homeless family housing and service system in a four-county metropolitan area: Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas Counties in Oregon and Clark County in Washington State.

Bridges to Housing began enrolling families in Clark County in September of 2006. As of the end of July 2009, when data were extracted from the state's Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) for this report, 266 families had entered the program across four counties that comprise the region. All were without permanent or stable housing at the time of enrollment. In addition to homelessness, families entering the program had many challenges and virtually all came into Bridges to Housing without resources or supports to sustain themselves and their children.

Family Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative

<http://www.urban.org/publications/411220.html>

Permanent supportive housing for families is a relatively new undertaking throughout the country. FPSH grew from the recognition that some adults have both disabilities that render them unable to maintain stable housing on their own as well as children they are trying to raise. Without substantial help, these parents have not been able to provide a stable residence for themselves or their children. FPSH addresses these difficulties by providing these distressed families with affordable housing and access to the same types of supportive services that have proven effective at helping disabled single homeless people achieve housing stability.

In March 2003, the Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation, the Urban Institute, and Harder+Company launched an evaluation of the Family Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative (FPSHI). This evaluation was designed to assess the impact of FPSHI's innovative approach to meeting the long-term needs of formerly homeless families in permanent supportive housing. This report presents findings from interviews with 100 families that were conducted between November 2003 and April 2004, as well as descriptions of the seven FPSH programs from which the study sample was drawn.

Table 1. Other Supportive Housing Programs

	Sound Families Initiative	Supportive Housing in Illinois for Individuals & Families	Minnesota Supportive Housing & Managed Care Pilot	Connecticut Supportive Housing for Families	Beyond Shelter "Housing First"	Bridges to Housing	Family Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative
STUDY DESIGN							
Dates	2001-2003	2004-2006	2000-2007	1998-2008	1997-2001	2006-2009	2002-2004
Sponsor/ Funder	Gates Foundation Sound Families University of Washington School of Social Work	The Heartland Alliance Institute on Poverty	Hearth Connection Robert Wood Johnson National Center on Family Homelessness	The Connection Inc. University of Connecticut Research Team	Beyond Shelter Seaver Institute	Portland State University	Urban Institute Harder+Co The Schwab Foundation
Location # Counties # Providers	Washington 3 counties 9 providers	Illinois 11 counties 26 providers	Minnesota 2 counties 4 providers	Connecticut 5 providers	Los Angeles 60+ providers	Oregon 4 counties	San Francisco 7 providers
Recruitment Eligibility		Homeless or at risk; mentally ill or formerly incarcerated, at site at least 1 yr	Not helped by other program, and/or had been homeless for long periods		Previously homeless families, 6 mos of program, 6 mos of sobriety	High-needs families	
Population (families)	N = 1487	N = 476			N = 1600		
Study Sample (families)	n =203	n =177	n = 56	n = 757	n = 200	n = 196	n = 100
Attrition	31% Attrition		10% Attrition	42% Attrition			

	Sound Families Initiative	Supportive Housing in Illinois for Individuals & Families	Minnesota Supportive Housing & Managed Care Pilot	Connecticut Supportive Housing for Families	Beyond Shelter "Housing First"	Bridges to Housing	Family Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative
POPULATION: ADULTS							
Demographics Age Race Sex Education Employment Income	47% White 27% Black 7% Native American 7% Multi-racial 6% Latino 3% Asian 3% Hawaiian 85% Female 29% Some HS 32% HS 21% Some College 13% Tech/Voc 5% BA 42% have incomes less than \$500/mo	Mean age: 42 yrs 26% White 69% Black 4% Latino 1% Other 48% Female 71% GED Unemployed 70%	Mean age: 38 yrs 57% White Mean years of schooling completed: 11.2 yrs Unemployed 60% 33% have incomes less than \$5,000/yr	Mean age: 32 yrs 38% White 23% Black 34% Latino 93% Female Mean years of schooling completed: 10.9 yrs Unemployed 59% 18% FT 15% PT Mean income: \$10,400/yr	Mean age: 38 yrs 8% White 65% Black 22% Latino 3% Other 92% Female Mean income: \$12,000/yr	70% White 17% Black 11% Latino 7% Indian 5% Other 23% do not have a GED Unemployed 29% Mean wage: \$8.30/hr	Mean age: 36yrs 10% White 56% Black 19% Latino 8% Multi-racial 3% Native American 2% Asian 100% Female 71% have high school degree Unemployed 70% Mean income: \$10,680/yr
Homeless History	45% homeless for 1 st time		Mean length: 5 years	15% homeless for 20 + months	Moved 11+ in times past 2 years	Mean length: 4 years Mean # of homeless episodes: 4	96% homeless in past
# Kids	42% 1 Kid 20% 2 Kids 19% 3 Kids 29% 4+ Kids		Mean: 2.53 children	Mean: 2.5 children			Mean: 2.3 children

	Sound Families Initiative	Supportive Housing in Illinois for Individuals & Families	Minnesota Supportive Housing & Managed Care Pilot	Connecticut Supportive Housing for Families	Beyond Shelter "Housing First"	Bridges to Housing	Family Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative
Separation From Children	25% had 1+ kids not living with them		60% had been separated from their kids in the past	61% lived with all kids 11% families with some kids in foster care 21% families with all kids in foster care 40% had been separated from their kids in the past		25% had 1+ kids returned or awaiting return from foster care	74% lived with all kids 40% had been separated from their kids in the past
POPULATION: CHILDREN							
Demographics Age Race Sex Education			Mean age: 11 years 42% White				50% are 5 yrs or younger 73% are 10 yrs or older
Trauma			50% experienced death of friend/family 50% experienced 3 or more violent events				
School # Schools Suspensions Disabilities					98% attend school	16% have a learning disability 40% families have 1+ kids w/social emotional or behavioral problems	96% attend school

	Sound Families Initiative	Supportive Housing in Illinois for Individuals & Families	Minnesota Supportive Housing & Managed Care Pilot	Connecticut Supportive Housing for Families	Beyond Shelter "Housing First"	Bridges to Housing	Family Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative
NEEDS/USAGE OF SERVICES BY FAMILIES							
Physical/ Medical	50% received health care services 4% have developmental delays 11% have a physical disability 4% are pregnant 50% need dental services	34% have chronic health conditions 10% have a developmental disability 30% have a physical disability	40% have at least 1 health condition Mean # conditions:2 28% have a physical disability		49% have medical needs 21% have more than 1 condition	23% have medical needs	82% have medical needs 50% of mothers reported need for health services for children
Mental Health/ Trauma	20% need mental health services 46% used mental health services 59% need counseling 31% have a domestic violence history	42% need mental health services	81% report being depressed 50% report high parent stress 60% have had 3+ traumatic events 16% of kids have PTSD	57% need mental health services	40% have a history of domestic violence	36% need mental health services	41% need mental health services

	Sound Families Initiative	Supportive Housing in Illinois for Individuals & Families	Minnesota Supportive Housing & Managed Care Pilot	Connecticut Supportive Housing for Families	Beyond Shelter "Housing First"	Bridges to Housing	Family Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative
	26% need substance abuse services	40% need substance abuse services	66% have been substance abusers for 3+ years	30% need substance abuse services 50% used substance abuse services	27% need substance abuse services	36% need substance abuse services 46% used substance abuse services	61% have past issues with substance abuse
Employment	47% need job training 76% used employment services			59% need employment services		29% need employment services	54% need employment services
Criminal Justice	47% need legal services	22% were formerly incarcerated					
REPORTED OUTCOMES							
Length of Stay	Mean: 12 mos	Mean: 38 mos	Mean: 18 mos	Mean: 20 mos		35% positive exit after 2 year program	
Housing	89% in permanent housing 7% live with family 4% live in a shelter		# of days at home increased from 64 to 144 out of 180		90% had housing stability 73% received housing services		

	<i>Sound Families Initiative</i>	<i>Supportive Housing in Illinois for Individuals & Families</i>	<i>Minnesota Supportive Housing & Managed Care Pilot</i>	<i>Connecticut Supportive Housing for Families</i>	<i>Beyond Shelter "Housing First"</i>	<i>Bridges to Housing</i>	<i>Family Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative</i>
Income	Rent increased from \$116 to \$400/mo after 3 years Those with no income decreased from 42% to 5% # of families with incomes of \$1,000+/mo doubled				98% had a budget		
Medical		Inpatient services reduced 38% Nursing home services decreased 97%	Inpatient use decreased 83% Outpatient services increased Emergency room use decreased 40%	80% improved their medical condition	82% had insurance		
Mental Health		Medicaid inpatient services decreased 66%	Fewer symptoms reported				
Substance Abuse			Substance use declined	85% were sober at exit	93% were sober at exit		
Education	15% received education services # kids attending 2 or more schools decreased from 53% to 17%				24% received education services 48% of youth in after school programs	21% received education services	

	<i>Sound Families Initiative</i>	<i>Supportive Housing in Illinois for Individuals & Families</i>	<i>Minnesota Supportive Housing & Managed Care Pilot</i>	<i>Connecticut Supportive Housing for Families</i>	<i>Beyond Shelter "Housing First"</i>	<i>Bridges to Housing</i>	<i>Family Permanent Supportive Housing Initiative</i>
Employment	15% increase in employment			Employment significantly increased	40% received job training 59% received employment services	14% received job training 45% received employment services	
Cost Savings		39% cost reduction \$854,477 in savings Saved \$2,414 person/yr	Cost decreased from \$6,290 person/yr to \$4,239 person/yr				

*Based on risk level as defined by the Rapid Exit Program Model.