



# Neighborhood House East Side Housing Trust Fund Evaluation Report

*Results for the 2012-13 school year*

**N O V E M B E R 2 0 1 3**

Prepared by:  
Stephanie Nelson-Dusek

# Contents

Introduction.....	1
Program overview.....	3
Family Housing Plans.....	3
Services to families who rent.....	3
Working with landlords.....	3
Life Skills.....	3
Summary of progress on goals.....	4
Client satisfaction.....	7
Key findings.....	7
Participant demographics.....	8
Household situation.....	9
Program participation.....	11
Client satisfaction.....	14
Program impact.....	16
Issues for consideration.....	19
Client self-reliance.....	20
Key findings.....	20
Demographics.....	21
Community credentials.....	22
Employment, education, and financial issues.....	22
Housing issues.....	27
Health care coverage.....	30
Child well-being.....	30
Other issues.....	35
Status at program exit.....	37
Issues for consideration.....	39
Student success.....	40
Student attendance.....	40
Reading levels.....	40
Issues for consideration.....	41

# Contents (continued)

Student stability .....	42
Results.....	42
Issues for consideration.....	43
Appendix.....	44
Additional data tables: Participant survey .....	44
Client satisfaction survey instrument.....	49
Self-reliance instrument.....	61

# Figures

1.	Respondent demographics .....	8
2.	Current housing.....	10
3.	Rent costs .....	10
4.	Number times moved in past 3 years .....	11
5.	Mobility.....	11
6.	Reasons for seeking help from the HTF program.....	12
7.	Help with housing-related needs.....	12
8.	Help with other needs .....	13
9.	Attendance at HTF classes.....	14
10.	Rating the HTF program .....	15
11.	Most helpful services of the HTF program .....	15
12.	Improving the HTF program.....	16
13.	Ways housing situation has improved .....	17
14.	Helpfulness of mental health referrals .....	17
15.	Helpfulness of children’s mental health referrals .....	18
16.	Ways clients are more prepared to solve housing problems.....	19
17.	Ways life has improved .....	19
18.	Respondent demographics .....	21
19.	Community credentials at first assessment .....	22
20.	Employment status.....	23
21.	Job retention and stability .....	23
22.	Change in employment status .....	24
23.	Change in job retention status.....	24
24.	Education .....	24
25.	Change in education status.....	25
26.	Income source .....	25
27.	Change in income source status.....	26
28.	Adequacy of income for food and shelter .....	26
29.	Change in income adequacy status .....	26
30.	Quality of credit .....	27
31.	Change in quality of credit status.....	27
32.	Housing stability .....	28
33.	Change in housing status .....	28
34.	Housing affordability .....	28

## Figures (continued)

35.	Change in housing affordability status .....	29
36.	Tenant/landlord relationship .....	29
37.	Change in tenant/landlord relationship status .....	29
38.	Household health care coverage .....	30
39.	Change in household healthcare coverage status .....	30
40.	Child protection .....	31
41.	Change in child protection status .....	31
42.	Enrollment in pre-school programs .....	31
43.	Change in preschool enrollment status .....	32
44.	School attendance .....	32
45.	Change in school attendance status .....	32
46.	Child support income .....	33
47.	Change in child support income status .....	33
48.	Child care .....	33
49.	Change in child care status .....	34
50.	Child immunizations .....	34
51.	Change in child immunizations status .....	34
52.	Child's medical needs .....	35
53.	Change in child medical needs status .....	35
54.	Transportation .....	35
55.	Change in transportation status .....	36
56.	Social support .....	36
57.	Change in social support status .....	36
58.	Supportive services at exit .....	37
59.	Change in self-reliance status for all indicators .....	38
60.	Average number of tardies and absences by student .....	40
61.	Reading level (Wright Group McGraw Hill assessment) .....	41
62.	Johnson Elementary School stability index .....	42
63.	Student stability during the school year: Saint Paul Public Schools .....	43

# Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank the staff of the East Side Housing Trust Fund program and the East Side Family Center (ESFC) for their extensive work (including data collection) and guidance in preparation of this report. ESFC staff members who contributed to this report include:

Joan Schlecht  
Malena Vang  
Talia Gildner  
Judy Davis

Wilder Research staff who contributed to the data collection, analysis, and production of this report include:

Mark Anton  
Jenny Bohlke  
Jackie Campeau  
Marilyn Conrad  
Monica Idzelis Rothe  
Amy Leite Bennett  
Nam Nguyen  
Miguel Salazar  
Lue Thao

# Introduction

## Program information

The East Side Housing Trust Fund (HTF) program takes a community-wide approach to increasing housing stability. A venture of the East Side Family Center (ESFC) of Neighborhood House, the program works to demonstrate that neighborhoods, foundations, landlords, schools, businesses, government, private investors, and nonprofit developers and service organizations can work together to create family and neighborhood stability and vitality. The program is housed at John A. Johnson Achievement Plus Elementary School with the primary goal of increasing the number of students who stay at the school throughout the school year and from year to year.

Program services include case management and housing placement for families with children at Johnson Elementary School. Program staff help families find and maintain decent, safe, and affordable rental and owner-occupied housing. Staff members also provide supportive services, resources, and referrals for a variety of issues that may pose challenges to self-reliance, addressing employment, mental health, transportation, child care, school attendance, and other concerns faced by clients. The program's Life Skills Education Program provides Johnson and other neighborhood families with training aimed at strengthening families and providing them with tools for stabilizing their housing situation. To achieve its goals, the program partners with school staff, neighbors, landlords, and community agencies.

## Research methods

Since 2008, the East Side Family Center, Neighborhood House has contracted with Wilder Research to conduct an independent, annual evaluation of the HTF program. The evaluation assesses program implementation, including: progress toward goals established by program staff; clients' satisfaction with program services; and program and participant outcomes, including changes in clients' self-reliance and student stability at Johnson Elementary School. Client satisfaction is measured using a telephone interview conducted by Wilder. Changes in participants' self-reliance are tracked through a self-reliance assessment that program staff complete for clients receiving case management services. Data on student stability at Johnson Elementary School are provided by Saint Paul Public Schools.

This year, 11 participants completed the client satisfaction survey and 17 completed the self-reliance assessment. There was attendance data for 19 children and reading level data for 17 children.

## Contents of the report

This report summarizes program results for the 2012-13 school year. It begins with a description of HTF program services. Results are then presented in four main sections: 1) a “client satisfaction” section outlining results from the telephone interviews; 2) a “client self-reliance” section assessing results from case manager assessments; 3) a “student success” section examining student attendance and reading levels throughout the school year; and 4) a “student stability” section providing data on student retention at Johnson Elementary School and other elementary schools. Most sections open with a summary of key findings and conclude with a description of issues staff can consider as they plan future program services.



# Program overview

The Housing Trust Fund's case management and housing placement services include developing Family Housing Plans, helping families who rent to stabilize their housing, working with landlords, and providing rental subsidies through the HTF. The Life Skills Education Program provides homeownership education as well as a variety of classes supporting family and housing stability.

## Family Housing Plans

HTF staff request that each client who wants to improve their housing situation complete a Family Housing Plan. The Housing Plan form includes questions regarding family financial information and current housing concerns. Families with children attending Johnson Elementary School complete this form as the first step toward receiving services from the program.

## Services to families who rent

HTF works to reduce the mobility of families who rent. Program staff address issues of rental housing quality, affordability, availability, and landlord and tenant issues. After receiving a Family Housing Plan, the case manager completes an intake and the client receives information and referral or case management assistance. Program staff then work with families to improve the quality and affordability of their rental situations and provide training to help tenants understand their rights and responsibilities.

## Working with landlords

Program staff also work directly with landlords in the local area. Landlords who are supportive of the program are asked to help place program clients in stable and positive housing situations. In situations where tenants are having difficulties with their landlords, program staff work to resolve the issue through direct communication with the landlords, code enforcement, legal remedies, and also through encouraging other, more supportive landlords to purchase the properties in question.

## Life Skills

Program staff encourage families to attend Life Skills education classes that provide tools for strengthening families and help them stabilize their housing situations.

# Summary of progress on goals

This report focuses on HTF program services provided during the 2012-13 school year and explores progress toward goals identified by the HTF program advisory committee. The Housing Trust Fund program was successful in achieving most of its goals established for the period of 2009-2012; therefore, new goals and benchmarks were established for 2012-2016, including:

- Continue to track overall academic achievement and attendance for children served through the program.
- Improve clients' self-reliance related to negotiating landlord/tenant relationships.
- Monitor progress toward increased employment and stability of income.
- Continue to work with families to become connected socially, perhaps through empowerment training.
- Continue to monitor student stability at Johnson Elementary School.

The remainder of this section summarizes the progress made on each of these goals over the past year. Progress is measured using the self-reliance assessment and academic and attendance data; more detailed information can be found in those sections of the report.

## ***Continue to track overall academic achievement and attendance for children served through the program.***

On average, students experienced fewer tardies in May 2013 than May 2012, and tardies have been generally declining since 2009, with the exception of 2011 when the average number went up to 8.8 days. The average number of excused and unexcused absences in the month of May went up slightly. In the self-assessment survey, most families (82%) reported maintaining regular school attendance from baseline to last assessment. One family improved in this area; however, one family maintained low levels of self-reliance and one family declined.

While attendance seemed to improve, reading levels dropped for most of the 17 students. At the end of the 2012-13 school year, only two students were reading at their grade level. Seven students were one grade or less delayed, and eight students were two or more grade levels delayed. On the up side, every student with multiple screenings increased his or her reading level between the beginning and end of the year. The HTF program should continue to monitor reading levels and work towards making improvements.

***Improve clients' self-reliance related to negotiating landlord/tenant relationships.***

Among other factors, the self-reliance assessment indicates and tracks a client's relationship with her landlord. Assessments for 17 clients who received services during the 2012-13 school year indicate that, at baseline, over half (53%) reported low levels of self-reliance related to tenant/landlord relationships, meaning the relationship failed (tenant was evicted or lease not renewed), the program needed to resolve an issue more than once, or the program needed to prevent or resolve an issue once since the last assessment.

As of their last assessment, seven clients had improved their self-reliance and three had maintained high levels of self-reliance. However, two maintained low levels of self-reliance and five showed a decline in their tenant/landlord relationship, indicating the need for more work in this area.

***Monitor progress toward increased employment and stability of income.***

While some clients experienced improvements in their employment status between first and last assessment, the majority (59%) remained unemployed. In looking at the change over time, six clients improved their employment situation, and four improved their job retention status; however, six maintained low levels of employment and job retention, and three experienced a decline in these areas.

While the self-assessment survey does not currently measure the stability of income, it does track income from first to last assessment, as well as the adequacy of income for food and shelter. At the time of the first assessment, only one in three clients (29%) was able to meet both their food and housing expenses. However, 11 clients (65%) showed improvement in the adequacy of their income for food and shelter by the last assessment and 18 percent maintained high levels of self-reliance in this area.

***Continue to work with families to become connected socially, perhaps through empowerment training.***

Getting families connected socially is still an area that requires some attention. In the self-reliance assessment, most clients (83%) initially reported having little or no support from family, friends, or community support groups, or they had some support, but they felt it was inadequate. By last assessment, 41 percent of clients reported improvement in social support, but 47 percent continued to report inadequate social support.

***Continue to monitor student stability at John A. Johnson.***

For the 2012-13 school year, the student stability rate was 86 percent. This rate has fluctuated slightly over the past several years, but stayed largely within the same range.

The stability rate for Johnson is slightly lower than other Saint Paul elementary schools, which have an average of 92 percent. However, Johnson is comparable to many other schools on the East Side, such as Dayton's Bluff (85%), Bruce F. Vento (87%), and Eastern Heights (86%).

# Client satisfaction

In June 2013, current Housing Trust Fund recipients were asked to participate in a telephone interview regarding their experiences with the HTF program. Interviewers from Wilder Research conducted telephone interviews with clients, asking questions about program participation, satisfaction with services, and the impact of these services. Eleven out of 13 eligible participants completed the interview, for a response rate of 85 percent. It should be noted that two of the respondents were from the same household. Below are key findings from the satisfaction survey. A copy of the survey instrument is provided in the appendix.

## Key findings

Telephone interview results indicated Housing Trust Fund participants were generally very satisfied with the services they received from the HTF program, and they perceived those services as positively impacting their situation. Result highlights include the following:

- The majority of participants rated their overall satisfaction with services provided by the HTF program as “outstanding.”
- All participants were satisfied with how quickly they were able to get help from the HTF program.
- All participants reported that their housing situation had improved since they first sought help from the program, and all felt that the services or referrals they received from the HTF program helped them to improve their housing situation. The most common areas of improvement were that housing is closer to public transportation and in better condition.
- All participants indicated they would be better prepared to solve a housing problem in the future because of the services or referrals they received from the HTF program.
- Six of 11 adult clients enrolled in the program had received referrals for mental health supports, and four participants reported that their children had received mental health referrals. Participants generally felt these referrals were helpful.
- All participants indicated that things had improved for them or their families in other ways besides housing because of the help or referrals they received from the HTF program. Participants noted happier and more stable families and improved mental health for their children.

## Participant demographics

Respondents, the majority of whom were women, had an average age of 34 years old. Four of the 11 respondents identified themselves as Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano; three identified as Black, African-American, or African; and three identified themselves as Asian or Pacific Islander. One respondent was biracial or multiracial. Most were either married or living in a marriage-like relationship, and the rest of the respondents had never been married (Figure 1).

Five participants had graduated from high school, and three had either some college or graduated with a four-year degree; three people had less than a high school education. Four respondents were employed (either part- or full-time). Five were unemployed, but were looking for work; another five were at home full-time, three were in school, and one participant was unable to work. (Note that the numbers add up to more than 100%, since respondents were able to select more than one response.) All respondents had a household income of less than \$40,000 per year (Figure 1). The average number of family members supported by this income was nearly five people (Appendix A1).

---

### 1. Respondent demographics

<b>Gender</b>	<b>N=11</b>	<b>%</b>
Female	10	91%
Male	1	9%
<b>Age</b>		
<25 years old	1	9%
25-29 years old	2	18%
30-39 years old	5	45%
40-49 years old	3	27%
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>		
Latino, Hispanic, or Chicano	4	36%
Asian or Pacific Islander	3	27%
Black, African-American, or African	3	27%
American Indian or Native American	0	0%
White or Caucasian	0	0%
Biracial or multicultural	1	9%
<b>Marital status</b>		
Married	6	55%
Living with someone in a marriage-like relationship	1	9%
Never been married	4	36%

---

## 1. Respondent demographics (continued)

<b>Education</b>	<b>N=11</b>	<b>%</b>
Less than high school graduate	3	27%
High school graduate or GED	5	45%
Some college (including 2-year degrees)	2	18%
Four-year college degree (BA, BS)	1	9%
Post-graduate degree (masters, doctorate, MD, etc.)	0	0%
<b>Employment status*</b>		
Employed full time	3	27%
Employed part time	1	9%
Unemployed and looking for work	5	45%
On layoff from a job	0	0%
Going to school	3	27%
At home full time (raising children, homemaker, etc.)	5	45%
Unable to work or disabled	1	9%
<b>Household income</b>		
Less than \$10,000	4	36%
\$10,000 to \$20,000	3	27%
\$20,001 to \$30,000	3	27%
\$30,001 to \$40,000	1	9%
More than \$40,000	0	0%

**Note:** For “employment status,” percentages equal more than 100% as respondents were able to give multiple responses.

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

## Household situation

At the time of the survey, about half of participants lived in subsidized housing using a voucher (45%). Those who did not live in subsidized housing (55%) either lived in a single family home, duplex, or with other family members (Figure 2). Participants paid an average of \$546 per month for rent (Figure 3). For most (73%), this did not include energy costs (Appendix A2). The average monthly energy bill payment was \$120 and 73% of respondents reported that they pay the entire energy bill, as opposed to only a portion each month (Appendix A3 and A4).

---

## 2. Current housing

<b>Do you live in subsidized housing?</b>	<b>N=11</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	5	45%
[Do you live in public housing or have a voucher?]		
Voucher	5	100%
Public housing	0	0%
No	6	55%
[What type of living arrangement do you have?]		
Single family home	2	33%
Duplex	1	17%
Staying with family	1	17%
No response	2	33%

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

---

## 3. Rent costs

<b>How much rent do you pay?</b>	<b>N=11</b>	<b>%</b>
<\$100/month	2	18%
\$100-\$499/month	4	36%
\$500-\$999/month	3	27%
\$1,000+/month	2	18%
Average	\$546.09	

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

**Note:** Open-ended responses to the questions were coded into the above categories.

Five participants reported that they were the only adult in the home, and six said that there were two adults in the home; the average number of children per household was just over three (Appendix A5 and A6). All but one respondent reported that she had a child attending Johnson Elementary School (Appendix A7).

When asked how many times they had moved in the past three years, the majority of clients (64%) reported that they had not moved. Three people had moved one or two times, and one person had moved nine times in the past three years (Figure 4). Five survey participants reported having moved since they sought help from the program; their reasons for moving included foreclosure, conflict with their landlord, escaping homelessness or an abusive relationship, and needing more space (Figure 5).



---

#### 4. Number times moved in past 3 years

How many times have you moved into different housing in the past 3 years – that is, since June 2010?

	N=11	%
0 times	7	64%
1 time	1	9%
2 times	2	18%
9 times	1	9%

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

**Note:** Open-ended responses to the questions were coded into the above categories.

---

#### 5. Mobility

Have you moved into different housing since you sought help from HTF?

	N=11	%
Yes [Why?]	5	45%
Previous home faced foreclosure	2	40%
Had a bad landlord	2	40%
Previously homeless	1	20%
Previously in an abusive relationship	1	20%
Needed more bedrooms	1	20%
No	6	55%

**Note:** Percentages equal more than 100% as respondents were able to give multiple reasons; Open-ended responses to the questions were coded into the above categories.

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

### Program participation

Participants were asked about the initial concerns or issues that brought them to the HTF program, and were allowed to indicate more than one reason for seeking help from the program. The most common responses were credit issues, homelessness, eviction, landlord-tenant problems, and their rent was too high (Figure 6).

## 6. Reasons for seeking help from the HTF program

Please tell me whether this issue was a reason you sought help from the program.	% saying "yes"	
	N=11	%
Credit issues	10	91%
Homelessness	7	64%
Eviction	6	55%
Landlord-tenant problems	6	55%
Rent that was too high	6	55%
Domestic conflict	5	45%
Poor quality housing	5	45%
Housing code violations	4	36%
Housing foreclosure	3	27%
Home improvement loan	1	9%
Other	2	18%

**Note:** "Other" includes the following responses: "We lived too far from the school" and "No job, many kids, and not enough money to support them."

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

After joining the HTF program, participants received a variety of housing-related services, particularly landlord-tenant mediation, locating different housing, help paying for first month's rent or the security deposit, and help paying utilities (Figure 7). (Respondents were able to choose all needs that applied; therefore, percentages equal more than 100%.)

## 7. Help with housing-related needs

Did you get help with...?	% saying "yes"	
	N=11	%
Landlord-tenant mediation	9	82%
Locating different housing	9	82%
Paying for first month's rent or security deposit	9	82%
Paying utilities (telephone, heat, or electric bills)	7	64%
Paying rent application fee	4	36%
Moving your things to a different location	1	9%
Paying home-buyer workshop fees	1	9%
Other	2	18%

**Note:** "Other" includes the following responses: "Homeowner classes" and "If I had the heat shut off, they put me and the kids into a hotel for an emergency kind of thing."

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

Participants were also asked about non-housing related services they received from the program, and again were allowed to indicate all that applied. Their responses indicated that they received a variety of other services from the HTF program. The most common types of non-housing related assistance included education or schooling for their children, help with parenting issues, getting children connected to activities, and assistance with employment, food, and school attendance for children (Figure 8).

## 8. Help with other needs

Did you get help with...?	% saying "yes"	
	N=11	%
Education or schooling for your children	8	73%
Parenting issues	8	73%
Getting your child(ren) connected to activities	7	64%
Employment	6	55%
Food	6	55%
School attendance for children	6	55%
Domestic abuse problems	5	45%
Clothing	4	36%
Transportation	4	36%
Child care	3	27%
Education or schooling for yourself	3	27%
Legal assistance	3	27%
Medical care	2	18%
Other	2	18%

**Note:** "Other" includes the following responses: "[Referrals] to a counselor for my...daughter; they referred us to Wilder," and "[Referrals] to workers through Ramsey County and social security."

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

Through its Life Skills Education Program, the HTF program offered clients a variety of classes aimed at promoting healthy families and providing tools for stabilizing housing. All 11 respondents took at least one of the classes offered by the program. Figure 9 provides a list of the classes offered during the 2012-13 school year and the number of respondents attending each one. One respondent suggested that the program do a class on health and safety, including how to do the Heimlich maneuver and CPR.

---

## 9. Attendance at HTF classes

Did you attend any of the following classes sponsored by HTF?	% saying “yes”	
	N=11	%
Community Safety and Youth Summer Programming	9	82%
Holiday Planning and Budgeting	9	82%
Stress Release and Self Defense	9	82%
Transportation	9	82%
Weatherization and Energy Assistance	9	82%
Family Fun Roller Skating Holiday Party	8	73%
Financial Literacy	8	73%
Green Homes	8	73%
Other	2	18%

**Note:** “Other” includes the following responses: “Recycling; How to use coupons; and Nutrition,” and “Advisory classes, what’s going on in your neighborhood (Neighborhood Awareness).”

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

## Client satisfaction

Overall, participants were satisfied with the services they received from the HTF program, with the majority (73%) saying the services were “outstanding.” The survey also asked about individual aspects of the program and participants generally rated each one as “outstanding” or “good.” Although, three people rated the knowledge and skills of staff as “fair,” and one person each gave a “poor” rating to how well their housing needs were being met and the ease of working with program staff. While fewer respondents rated their ability to quickly get help as “outstanding,” it was the only item with no ratings of “fair” or “poor” (Figure 10).

## 10. Rating the HTF program

Next, I'm going to ask you to rate some aspects of the services you have received so far from the program. How would you rate...?

	Outstanding		Good		Fair		Poor	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Your overall satisfaction with the services provided (N=11)	8	73%	1	9%	2	18%	0	0%
How well your housing needs are getting met now (N=11)	8	73%	1	9%	1	9%	1	9%
The ease of working with program staff (N=11)	7	64%	2	18%	1	9%	1	9%
The knowledge and skills of program staff (N=11)	7	64%	1	9%	3	27%	0	0%
How quickly you were able to get help (N=11)	6	55%	5	45%	0	0%	0	0%

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

When asked to describe which services were the *most* helpful, in an open-ended question, respondents were most likely to mention getting help with managing money or learning how to budget (36%). Other responses included learning about domestic abuse assistance and resources, parenting support, rent assistance, and general support through the HTF program (Figure 11).

## 11. Most helpful services of the HTF program

**Of the services or assistance you have received from HTF, what is the one thing that has been of most help to you?**

	N=11	%
Help managing money/learning how to budget	4	36%
Domestic abuse assistance and resources	2	18%
Parenting support	2	18%
Rent assistance	2	18%
General support	1	9%

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

**Note:** Open-ended responses to the questions were coded into the above categories.

Participants were also asked to describe how the program could improve its services. Most had no suggestions for improvement; however, a few suggestions included getting more or longer-term help for participants (such as following up with them after they leave the program), having a Spanish-speaking worker available, and having a better understanding of mental health disorders (Figure 12).

---

## 12. Improving the HTF program

In what ways could the program have improved its services to you?	N=11	%
No improvement needed	6	55%
More help/longer-term help from staff	3	27%
Have a Spanish-speaking worker	1	9%
Better understanding of mental health disorders	1	9%

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

**Note:** Open-ended responses to the questions were coded into the above categories.

## Program impact

### *Housing services and referrals*

Participants were asked if their housing situation is better now, compared to when they first sought help from the program. Each of the 11 participants indicated that their housing had improved, and each said that the services or referrals they received from the HTF program helped them to improve their housing situation (Appendix A8 and A9).

Respondents reported a variety of ways in which their housing had improved. The most common ways were that it is closer to public transportation (100%) and in better overall condition (91%). Eight in ten each said that they have a better landlord and that their housing is more secure, and six in ten each indicated that they have more bedrooms and their housing is more affordable (Figure 13).

### 13. Ways housing situation has improved

I'm going to read some ways your housing may have improved. For each one, please answer "yes" or "no" for your situation today.	% saying "yes"	
	N=11	%
Is your housing more convenient to public transportation?	11	100%
Is it in better condition or were some repairs made?	10	91%
Do you have a better landlord?	9	82%
Is your current home more secure?	9	82%
Do you have more bedrooms?	7	64%
Is it more affordable?	7	64%
Are there other ways your housing situation is better?	3	27%
It's convenient to the school	1	33%
Having two doors; an entry and an exit door	1	33%
It's simple, cozy, peaceful, comfortable, clean	1	33%

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

### *Mental health services and referrals*

Six of eleven respondents reported that they had received referrals for mental health services or supports from the program (Appendix A10). Of those, five found the services helpful. Specifically, participants noted that the mental health services have connected them to therapists and medication and have helped them deal with depression issues. One respondent said the services were not helpful because she has not heard back from the person she contacted (Figure 14).

### 14. Helpfulness of mental health referrals

Have the mental health service referrals been helpful?	N=6	%
Yes	5	83%
[Describe how the referrals have been helpful]		
I/my kids are seeing a therapist	3	60%
I/my kids have needed medication	2	40%
Helped me with depression issues	1	20%
No	1	17%
[Describe how the referrals have <i>not</i> been helpful]		
Have not heard back from referral	1	100%

**Note:** Percentages equal more than 100% as respondents were able to give multiple reasons.

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

Four of eleven respondents reported that they had received referral for mental health services for their child or children in the previous year (Appendix A11). Of those, all found the referrals helpful. Parents reported that their children’s mental health issues are being addressed through medication and that their children seem more sociable and better able to control their anger (Figure 15).

---

## 15. Helpfulness of children’s mental health referrals

Have the mental health service referrals been helpful?	N=4	%
Yes	4	100%
[Describe how the referrals have been helpful]		
Helped them get needed medication/services	2	50%
Helped them be more sociable	1	25%
They learned how to manage their anger	1	25%
No	0	0%

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

### *Other services and referrals*

Eight respondents also indicated that their children had received referrals for other services (Appendix A12). All eight found these referrals helpful, particularly in getting their children into out-of-school activities, such as YMCA summer camp (50%). Parents also said that their children received help with tutoring, getting school supplies, making friends, and teaching them to speak English (Appendix A13).

### *Overall impact of services and referrals*

Asked if they would be better prepared to solve housing problems in the future because of the services or referrals they received from the HTF program, each of the 11 respondents answered “yes” (Appendix A14). Most respondents said this was because they had learned how to communicate with their landlord (73%). Nearly four in ten (36%) also said they felt they had the resources for managing their finances or budget. Several also mentioned that, because of the services or referrals they received, they knew how to do research before choosing a place to live, knew their responsibilities as a renter, and had learned about various legal issues and how to handle them (Figure 16).



---

## 16. Ways clients are more prepared to solve housing problems

In what ways would you say you are better prepared to solve your housing problems?	N=11	%
Learned how to communicate with my landlord	8	73%
Have resources for managing finances/budgeting	4	36%
Know how to do research before choosing a neighborhood/place to live	2	18%
Know my responsibilities as a renter	1	9%
Learned about legal issues and how to handle them	1	9%

**Note:** Percentages equal more than 100% as respondents were able to give multiple reasons; Open-ended responses to the questions were coded into the above categories.

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

When asked if things had improved for them or their families in other ways besides housing because of the help or referrals they received from the HTF program, each respondent answered “yes” (Appendix A15). Participants indicated that they had happier and more stable families, improved well-being for children, and progress in their own education, nutrition, and knowledge of resources (Figure 17).

---

## 17. Ways life has improved

In what other ways have things improved?	N=11	%
Family is more stable and happy	5	45%
Children are better off (e.g., school, mental health)	3	27%
Went to/finished school	2	18%
Got stable employment	1	9%
Learned how to cook healthy food	1	9%
More knowledgeable about resources	1	9%

**Note:** Percentages equal more than 100% as respondents were able to give multiple reasons.

**Source:** HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

## Issues for consideration

Overall, HTF program participants rated their satisfaction with program services highly. When asked how they might improve the program, clients suggested providing more or longer-term help for participants (even after they leave the program), having a Spanish-speaking worker available, and having a better understanding of mental health disorders.

# Client self-reliance

This section presents findings from a self-reliance assessment that program staff complete with case management clients. Progress is reported on a scale created by Wilder Research that helps to assess several key components of clients' self-reliance including housing, employment, income, education, child care, and physical and mental health needs. The assessment was designed to be completed at program entry, with follow-up assessments every six months. Each component is divided into "low" versus "high" levels of self-reliance; for example, if a client has no credit or poor credit, they are considered to have low levels of self-reliance, whereas restoring credit/beginning to establish credit and good credit/credit restored are considered higher levels of self-reliance. A copy of the self-reliance assessment form is provided in the appendix.

The case manager completed assessments with 17 clients who received services at some point during the 2012-13 school year. At the time of this report, 13 families were still engaged in case management services and four had been discharged from the program.

This section describes participant demographics and community credentials (meaning identification cards, a telephone, and voter registration, etc.), baseline self-reliance scores, and an analysis of change in self-reliance experienced by the 17 clients who received services during the 2012-13 school year. It is important to note that "last assessment" is used here to refer to a client's most recent assessment, which, in most cases, will not be their final assessment with the program.

## Key findings

Results from self-reliance assessments completed by the case manager indicate clients experienced a number of improvements between their baseline and last assessments. Clients also continued to face challenges to their self-reliance; these challenges are summarized under "issues for consideration" at the end of this section. Overall improvements between the initial and last assessment include the following:

- The percentage of clients whose current education was adequate for current employment increased from 59 percent at baseline to 95 percent as of the last assessment.
- As of the last assessment, 82 percent of HTF clients were able to meet both food and housing expenses in a given month, compared to 29 percent at baseline.
- A majority of clients (71%) were paying more than 30 percent of their income for housing at baseline. As of their last assessment, however, all were paying less than or

equal to 30 percent. Twelve clients had experienced improvement in housing affordability and five had maintained high levels of self-reliance.

- At baseline, nearly all clients (94%) reported poor or no credit. As of the most recent assessment, nine clients (53%) had begun to restore or establish good credit.
- Most clients (77%) reported inadequate transportation at baseline. As of the most recent assessment, however, 88 percent reported transportation adequate to meet their daily needs.
- Overall, clients either maintained or improved their already high levels of health care coverage, so that 65 percent had public health insurance benefits for all members of their household and 12 percent had private health insurance for some or all members.
- At baseline, nearly half of clients (47%) reported that none of their eligible children were enrolled in preschool programs. Of those families, only one still had a child who was not enrolled in services by last assessment.

## Demographics

Of the 17 clients for whom data was available, nearly two-thirds were female (65%). Thirty-five percent identified as African-American, one-quarter as Asian or Pacific Islander, and 12 percent as multiracial. Thirty-five percent considered themselves Hispanic. The race and ethnicity of five participants was unknown (Figure 18).

---

### 18. Respondent demographics

Demographics		N=17	%
<b>Gender</b>	Female	11	65%
	Male	6	35%
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>	Black, African-American, or African	6	35%
	Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano	6	35%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	4	24%
	Multiracial	2	12%
	White or Caucasian	0	0%
	Unknown	5	29%

**Note:** Participants may have indicated more than one racial/ethnic background.

**Source:** Self-Reliance Progress Form

## Community credentials

Program staff asked participants about their access to a variety of community credentials, such as identification cards, a telephone, and voter registration. At first assessment, all clients had telephone or voicemail access and most had a Social Security card (71%). Just over half (57%) had a medical ID card, and only 50 percent had a Minnesota driver's license. Less than half of clients had an open bank account (43%), library card (43%), voter registration (36%), or Minnesota identification card (29%) (Figure 19).

---

### 19. Community credentials at first assessment (N=13-14)

At first assessment does participant have:	Yes	No	Don't know	Not needed or obtainable
Telephone or voicemail access	100%	0%	0%	0%
Social Security card	71%	21%	0%	7%
Medical ID card	57%	29%	14%	0%
Minnesota driver's license	50%	50%	0%	0%
Alien registration card (green card)	50%	14%	0%	36%
Birth certificate	46%	31%	23%	0%
Library card	43%	57%	0%	0%
Bank account	43%	50%	0%	7%
Voter registration	36%	43%	14%	7%
Minnesota identification card	29%	64%	0%	7%

**Source:** *Self-Reliance Progress Form*

## Employment, education, and financial issues

At baseline, 65 percent of HTF clients were unemployed. As of their most recent assessment, 59 percent of clients remained unemployed (Figure 20).

An analysis of change over time indicates that six clients improved their employment status and four improved their job retention status as of their last assessment. Six clients maintained low levels of employment and job retention and three experienced a decline in these areas (Figures 22-23).

---

## 20. Employment status (N=17)

<b>Employment status</b>	<b>Baseline assessment (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Unemployed	65%	59%
Working <15 hours per week	6%	6%
Working 15-19 hours per week	0%	0%
Working 20-24 hours per week	0%	0%
Working 25-29 hours per week	0%	6%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Working 30-34 hours per week	18%	0%
Working 35-40 hours per week	6%	18%
Working 40+ hours per week	0%	6%
<b>Other</b>		
Unable to work/retired	6%	6%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

## 21. Job retention and stability (N=17)

<b>Job retention and stability</b>	<b>Baseline assessment (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Unemployed	65%	59%
Worked less than one month at current job	0%	0%
Worked one month but less than three months at current job	0%	0%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Worked three months but less than six months at current job	12%	0%
Worked six months or longer at current job	18%	35%
<b>Other</b>		
Unable to work or retired	6%	6%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

---

## 22. Change in employment status

	<b>N=15</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	6	40%
Maintained – high	0	0%
Maintained – low	6	40%
Declined	3	20%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

## 23. Change in job retention status

	<b>N=15</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	4	27%
Maintained – high	2	13%
Maintained – low	6	40%
Declined	3	20%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

Overall, more than half of clients (53%) showed improvement in the adequacy of their education during the time they received case management services. Initially, 41 percent of clients did not have enough formal education to meet their employment needs, compared to just six percent who said the same at their last assessment. As of their most recent assessment, 77 percent had adequate education for their current employment but not advancement, and 18 percent had adequate education for advancement (Figures 24-25).

---

## 24. Education (N=17)

	<b>Baseline assessment (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Formal education not adequate to meet employment needs	41%	6%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Formal education adequate for current employment but not for work advancement	59%	77%
Formal education adequate for current employment and advancement	0%	18%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

## 25. Change in education status

	N=17	%
Improved	9	53%
Maintained – high	7	41%
Maintained – low	1	6%
Declined	0	0%

**Source:** *Self-Reliance Progress Form*

Self-reliance assessments also ask the case manager to indicate clients' sources of income, including whether they receive no income, only public cash benefits, a combination of public cash benefits and earned income, or only earned income. At baseline assessment, just over half (53%) reported having less than 50 percent earned income (low levels of self-reliance). However, five clients reported improvements in their income source, and another five maintained high levels of self-reliance. Four clients reported a decline in their self-reliance from baseline assessment (Figures 26-27).

---

## 26. Income source (N=17)

Income source	Baseline assessment (%)	Last assessment (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
No income	6%	18%
Public cash benefits/no earned income	35%	24%
More than 50% public cash benefits/some earned income	12%	0%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
More than 50% earned income/some public cash benefits	6%	6%
Earned income/no public cash benefits	41%	53%

**Note:** *Public cash benefits include benefits from the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP), General Assistance (GA), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and child support. Earned income includes employment income, Social Security, Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI), veterans' benefits, and retirement benefits.*

**Source:** *Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

## 27. Change in income source status

	N=17	%
Improved	5	29%
Maintained – high	5	29%
Maintained – low	3	18%
Declined	4	24%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

Financial concerns were a serious issue for many clients. At the time of the first assessment, only one in three clients (29%) was able to meet both their food and housing expenses. However, 11 clients (65%) showed improvement in the adequacy of their income for food and shelter, and 18 percent maintained high levels of self-reliance in this area (Figures 28-29).

---

## 28. Adequacy of income for food and shelter (N=17)

Adequacy of income for food and shelter	Baseline assessment (%)	Last assessment (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Unable to meet food AND housing expenses during the last month	18%	0%
Able to meet food OR housing expenses during the last month	53%	18%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Able to meet BOTH food and housing expenses during the last month	29%	82%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

## 29. Change in income adequacy status

	N=17	%
Improved	11	65%
Maintained – high	3	18%
Maintained – low	1	6%
Declined	2	12%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*



Nearly half of clients (47%) were able to improve the quality of their credit from baseline to last assessment. At baseline, nearly all (94%) reported poor or no credit. As of the most recent assessment, nine clients (53%) had begun to restore or establish good credit. However, credit remained a challenge for another 47 percent of clients (Figures 30-31).

### 30. Quality of credit (N=17)

Quality of credit	Baseline assessment (%)	Last assessment (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
No credit	35%	29%
Poor credit	59%	18%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Restoring credit or beginning to establish credit	6%	53%
Good credit or credit restored	0%	0%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

### 31. Change in quality of credit status

	N=17	%
Improved	8	47%
Maintained – high	1	6%
Maintained – low	8	47%
Declined	0	0%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

## Housing issues

At baseline, 35 percent of clients served during the 2012-13 school year were homeless. Six clients (35%) improved their housing stability while in HTF, and another five (29%) maintained high levels of housing stability self-reliance (Figures 32-33).

---

### 32. Housing stability (N=17)

Housing stability	Baseline assessment (%)	Last assessment (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Homeless	35%	0%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Subsidized rental housing	29%	100%
Market rate rental housing	35%	0%

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form

---

### 33. Change in housing status

	N=17	%
Improved	6	35%
Maintained – high	5	29%
Maintained – low	0	0%
Declined	6	35%

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form

At baseline, 71 percent of clients reported paying more than 30 percent of their income for housing. As of their last assessment, 100 percent of clients were paying less than or equal to 30 percent of their income for housing; 12 clients had experienced improvement in housing affordability, and five had maintained high levels of self-reliance (Figures 34-35).

---

### 34. Housing affordability (N=17)

Housing affordability	Baseline assessment (%)	Last assessment (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Pays more than 50% of income for housing	65%	0%
Pays less than 50% but more than 30% for housing	6%	0%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Pays less than or equal to 30% of income for housing	29%	100%

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form

---

### 35. Change in housing affordability status

	N=17	%
Improved	12	71%
Maintained – high	5	29%
Maintained – low	0	0%
Declined	0	0%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

At baseline, over half of clients (53%) reported low levels of self-reliance related to tenant/landlord relationships. As of their last assessment, seven clients had improved their self-reliance, and three had maintained high levels of self-reliance. On the other hand, five clients showed a decline in their tenant/landlord relationship (Figures 36-37).

---

### 36. Tenant/landlord relationship (N=17)

Tenant/landlord relationship	Baseline assessment (%)	Last assessment (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Last tenant/landlord relationship failed – tenant evicted or lease not renewed	35%	0%
Program needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue more than once since last assessment	6%	18%
Program needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue only once since last assessment	12%	41%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Program not needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue since last assessment	47%	41%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

### 37. Change in tenant/landlord relationship status

	N=17	%
Improved	7	41%
Maintained – high	3	18%
Maintained – low	2	12%
Declined	5	29%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

## Health care coverage

In terms of health care coverage, self-reliance was generally high to begin with; most case management clients had public health insurance benefits for all of their household members at their baseline assessment. Three clients improved by their last assessment, so that 65 percent had public health insurance benefits for all members of their household and 12 percent had private health insurance for some or all members of their households. At the last assessment, one-quarter (24%) had public health insurance for some household members (Figures 38-39).

---

### 38. Household health care coverage (N=17)

Household health care coverage	Baseline assessment (%)	Last assessment (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
No insurance for any household members	12%	0%
Public health insurance benefits for some household members	12%	24%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Public health insurance benefits for all household members	77%	65%
Private insurance for all household members	0%	12%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

### 39. Change in household healthcare coverage status

	N=17	%
Improved	3	18%
Maintained – high	11	65%
Maintained – low	2	12%
Declined	1	6%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

## Child well-being

At both baseline and last assessments, the majority of families reported that they did not have a child protection case, either open or closed. For those who did have a child protection case, most maintained their high level of self-reliance (Figures 40-41).

---

#### 40. Child protection (N=17)

	Baseline assessment (%)	Last assessment (%)
<b>Child protection</b>		
<b>Lower levels of self-reliance</b>		
Child protection case open – child/children not with parent	0%	0%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Child protection case closed	6%	12%
Family does not have a child protection case (open or closed)	94%	88%

**Source:** *Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

#### 41. Change in child protection status

	N=17	%
Improved	0	0%
Maintained – high	16	94%
Maintained – low	0	0%
Declined	1	6%

**Source:** *Self-Reliance Progress Form*

At baseline, nearly half of clients (47%) reported that none of their eligible children were enrolled in preschool programs. Of those families, only one still had a child who was not enrolled in services by last assessment; however, 71 percent reported that they had no children in need of preschool services (Figures 42-43).

---

#### 42. Enrollment in preschool programs (N=17)

	Baseline assessment (%)	Last assessment (%)
<b>Preschool</b>		
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
None of the eligible children are enrolled in preschool services	47%	6%
Some but not all of the eligible children are enrolled in preschool services	0%	0%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
All eligible children are enrolled in preschool services	6%	24%
<b>Other</b>		
No children in need of preschool services	47%	71%

**Source:** *Self-Reliance Progress Form*

**Note:** *Preschool programs include ECFE, Head Start, and center-based child care.*

---

#### 43. Change in preschool enrollment status

	<b>N=4</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	2	50%
Maintained – high	1	25%
Maintained – low	1	25%
Declined	0	0%

**Source:** *Self-Reliance Progress Form*

Most families (82%) maintained regular school attendance from baseline to last assessment. One family improved in this area; however, one family maintained low-levels of self-reliance and one family declined (Figures 44-45).

---

#### 44. School attendance (N=17)

<b>School attendance</b>	<b>Baseline assessment (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
None of the school-age children attending school on a regular basis	12%	12%
Some but not all school-age children attending school on a regular basis	0%	0%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
All school-age children attending school on a regular basis	88%	88%

**Source:** *Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

#### 45. Change in school attendance status

	<b>N=17</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	1	6%
Maintained – high	14	82%
Maintained – low	1	6%
Declined	1	6%

**Source:** *Self-Reliance Progress Form*

At baseline, 41 percent of clients reported they were eligible for child support but were not receiving full benefits; at last assessment, 53 percent reported the same (Figures 46-47).

---

**46. Child support income (N=17)**

<b>Child support income</b>	<b>Baseline assessment (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Eligible for child support, no income benefit	41%	53%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Eligible for child support, partial benefit	6%	0%
Eligible for child support, full benefit	6%	0%
<b>Other</b>		
Not applicable	47%	47%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

**47. Change in child support income status**

	<b>N=8</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	0	0%
Maintained – high	0	0%
Maintained – low	6	75%
Declined	2	25%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

At baseline, 41 percent of clients reported inadequate access to child care. As of the most recent assessment, no families were experiencing inadequate child care, but most said that no child care was needed (Figures 48-49).

---

**48. Child care (N=17)**

<b>Child care</b>	<b>Baseline assessment (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
No child care available	29%	0%
Child care available but inadequate to meet need	12%	0%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Child care is available and adequate with subsidy	12%	6%
Child care is available and adequate without subsidy	6%	0%
<b>Other</b>		
No child care needed	41%	94%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

**49. Change in child care status**

	<b>N=1</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	6%	100%
Maintained – high	0	0%
Maintained – low	0	0%
Declined	0	0%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

While most families (94%) reported that immunizations were up-to-date for all children in the household at last assessment, one family declined in this area (Figures 50-51).

---

**50. Child immunizations (N=17)**

<b>Child immunizations</b>	<b>Baseline assessment (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Immunizations are not up-to-date for any of the children in the household	0%	0%
Immunizations are up-to-date for some but not all of the children in the household	18%	6%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Immunizations are up-to-date for all of the children in the household	82%	94%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

**51. Change in child immunizations status**

	<b>N=17</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	3	18%
Maintained – high	13	77%
Maintained – low	0	0%
Declined	1	6%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

Three clients reported that none or only some of their children had a regular pediatrician or clinic at baseline. By last assessment, however, all three of those clients had found a regular doctor or clinic for all of their children (Figures 52-53).



---

## 52. Child's medical needs (N=17)

Child's medical needs	Baseline assessment (%)	Last assessment (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
None of the children in the household have a regular pediatrician or clinic	12%	0%
Some of the children have a regular pediatrician or clinic	6%	0%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
All children in the household have a regular pediatrician or clinic	82%	100%

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form

---

## 53. Change in child medical needs status

	N=17	%
Improved	3	18%
Maintained – high	14	82%
Maintained – low	0	0%
Declined	0	0%

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form

## Other issues

In addition to the other issues they faced, many case management clients also had limited access to both transportation and social support. Most clients (77%) reported inadequate transportation at baseline. As of the last assessment, 11 clients experienced improvements in transportation adequacy, and only two reported continued inadequate transportation (Figures 54-55).

---

## 54. Transportation (N=17)

Transportation	Baseline assessment (%)	Last assessment (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Transportation not adequate to meet daily needs	18%	0%
Transportation adequate to meet some but not all daily needs	59%	12%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Transportation adequate to meet daily needs	24%	88%

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form

---

## 55. Change in transportation status

	<b>N=17</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	11	65%
Maintained – high	4	24%
Maintained – low	2	12%
Declined	0	0%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

At baseline, most clients (83%) reported inadequate social support. By last assessment, 41 percent of clients reported improvement in social support, although 47 percent continued to report inadequate social support (Figures 56-57).

---

## 56. Social support (N=17)

<b>Social support</b>	<b>Baseline assessment (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Little or no support from family, friends, or community support groups	24%	6%
Some social support, not usually adequate	59%	41%
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Adequate social support	18%	53%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

---

## 57. Change in social support status

	<b>N=17</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	7	41%
Maintained – high	3	18%
Maintained – low	7	41%
Declined	0	0%

*Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form*

## Status at program exit

Upon a client's exit from the program, the self-reliance assessment also asks the case manager to assess clients' need for and access to supportive services. At the time of this report, four clients had exited the HTF program in the 2012-13 school year.

Of those four clients, the most needed services at exit were related to education, health care, life skills, case management, and housing placement. For the most part, clients received these services from the HTF program. Some were also referred to other agencies, which then provided the needed service. Below is a table outlining how many people needed and received services, or were referred elsewhere (Figure 58).

### 58. Supportive services at exit

Number saying "yes"	Needed this service	Received HTF service	Referred to other agency	Received service from other agency
Education	4	4	4	4
Health care services	4	4	4	4
Life skills (not case management)	4	4	2	2
Case management	4	4	--	--
Housing placement	4	4	--	--
Employment assistance	3	2	1	1
Mental health services	2	2	2	2
Legal	2	2	2	2
Alcohol or drug services	--	--	--	--
Domestic abuse services	--	--	--	--
Child care	--	--	--	--
Transportation	--	--	--	--
Child protection	--	--	--	--

**Source:** *Self-Reliance Progress Form*

Figure 59 identifies the change in self-reliance for clients served during the 2012-13 school year for all indicators. Readers should bear in mind that smaller numbers of clients responded to some indicators, particularly those related to children; for example, while child care was 100 percent improved, only one client responded to that question (the rest said it did not apply).

---

**59. Change in self-reliance status for all indicators (N=1-17)**

	<b>% Improved</b>	<b>% Maintained high</b>	<b>% Maintained low</b>	<b>% Declined</b>
Child care	100%	0%	0%	0%
Housing affordability	71%	29%	0%	0%
Transportation	65%	24%	12%	0%
Income adequacy	65%	18%	6%	12%
Education status	53%	41%	6%	0%
Mental health	50%	50%	0%	0%
Enrollment in preschool	50%	25%	25%	0%
Quality of credit	47%	6%	47%	0%
Social support	41%	18%	41%	0%
Tenant/landlord relationship	41%	18%	12%	29%
Employment	40%	0%	40%	20%
Housing stability	35%	29%	0%	25%
Income source	29%	29%	18%	24%
Job retention	27%	13%	40%	20%
Child's medical needs	18%	82%	0%	0%
Child immunizations	18%	77%	0%	6%
Household healthcare coverage	18%	65%	12%	6%
School attendance	6%	82%	6%	6%
Child protection	0%	94%	0%	6%
Child support income	0%	0%	75%	25%

**Source:** *Self-Reliance Progress Form*

## Issues for consideration

Thirteen of 17 clients included in the analysis of changes from baseline to last assessment were continuing to receive services from the HTF program at the time of this report. Despite overall improvements in a number of areas, clients continued to face challenges to their self-reliance. As they plan future program services, staff should consider how to address the following barriers to self-reliance that clients continue to face at exit:

- **Employment.** Although there were overall improvements in clients' employment status, 59 percent remained unemployed at the last assessment. Program staff may want to continue to explore ways to help clients obtain employment, and sustain employment once they have found a job.
- **Income.** While the majority of clients either improved or maintained high self-reliance in the area of income (meaning they earned at least 50 percent of their income), three clients reported maintaining low-levels of self-reliance and four clients declined in self-reliance.
- **Child support.** At the most recent assessment, about half of clients (53%) were eligible for child support but were not receiving income benefits. Continue to encourage clients to pursue child support benefits, perhaps through Life Skills classes or one-on-one skill building.
- **Quality of credit.** Nearly half of clients (47%) were able to improve the quality of their credit from baseline to last assessment. However, credit remains a challenge for another 47 percent of clients. Continue to provide training and support to improve credit histories of clients.
- **Tenant/landlord relationship.** At last assessment, nearly six in ten clients (59%) reported low levels of self-reliance related to landlord/tenant issues, meaning that program staff needed to intervene at least once in the previous six months. Continue to build confidence and skills among clients to work directly with their landlords to resolve conflicts.
- **Social support.** Although there were improvements, nearly half (47%) of the clients still did not have adequate social support at last assessment. The ESFC offers a variety of activities aimed at connecting neighborhood families with each other, and these results suggest this is an important service. Staff can continue encouraging HTF clients to attend these activities and supporting other ways of improving clients' informal support systems.

# Student success

## Student attendance

As of the end of the 2012-13 school year, 19 children whose families participated in the HTF program were enrolled at John A. Johnson Elementary School. Children were enrolled in kindergarten through 6<sup>th</sup> grade.

On average, these students experienced fewer tardies in May 2013 (1.3) than May 2012 (3.3), and tardies have been generally declining since May 2009, with the exception of 2011 when the average number jumped up to 8.8 days. The average number of excused and unexcused absences went up slightly in May 2013, compared to the previous year. Few, if any, participating students have been suspended since 2009. Student attendance is tracked by program staff (Figure 60).

---

### 60. Average number of tardies and absences by student

	May 2009 (N=16)	May 2010 (N=16)	May 2011 (N=21)	May 2012 (N=16)	May 2013 (N=19)
Tardy (to class and school)	11.1	7.6	8.8	3.3	1.3
Excused absences	1.1	5.2	4.3	<1.0	1.2
Unexcused absences	3.1	1.6	1.8	<1.0	1.1
Suspended	0	<1.0	<1.0	0	0

## Reading levels

In addition to student attendance, ESFC program staff also track the reading levels of students whose families are enrolled in the housing program. For the 2012-13 school year, there was reading level data available for 17 students. Four HTF students are receiving Special Education Services and have Individualized Education Plans (IEP).

At the end of the school year, only two students were reading at their grade level. Seven students were one grade or less delayed, and eight students were two or more grade levels delayed at the end of the school year (Figure 61). Yet, every student with multiple screenings increased his or her reading level between the beginning and end of the year. Reading scores for students are assessed by the Wright Group McGraw Hill reading assessment.

---

**61. Reading level (Wright Group McGraw Hill assessment)**

	<b>October 2012 (N=14)</b>	<b>March 2013 (N=16)</b>	<b>June 2013 (N=17)</b>
At grade level	1	2	2
One grade or less delayed	4	5	7
Two or more grade levels delayed	9	9	8

**Source:** John A. Johnson records.

**Note:** Reading levels were not reported for 4 students in October, 3 students in March, and 2 students in June.

### Issues for consideration

Improving child attendance and reading levels were goals for this school year. While the attendance of children enrolled in the housing program did improve, reading levels generally declined. It is important to keep in mind, however, that when children are significantly behind (one or two full grade levels), it will take longer for them to catch up. Program staff should explore barriers to improved reading levels, but also consider using more finely tuned measurement for tracking the progress of children throughout the school year.

# Student stability

Another goal of the HTF program is to increase the number of students who stay at Johnson throughout the school year (and year to year). The program is using the stability index used by the Saint Paul Public Schools as the broadest measure of its impact. The stability index is defined as the number of students enrolled at the school for 160 days or more during the school year, divided by the official enrollment count at the school on October 1. This is essentially a measure of the proportion of students who stay at the school for the whole school year. Higher percentages indicate greater stability, and the goal is to achieve a 90 percent stability rate.

## Results

Figure 62 shows that stability at Johnson Elementary School has fluctuated over the years. During the 2010-11 school year, stability was at a high point of 91 percent, but dropped to 83 percent from 2011 to 2012. For the most recent school year, the stability rate was 86 percent.

---

### 62. Johnson Elementary School stability index

Indicator	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Enrollment (October 1 official count)	300	303	330	263	301	349
Stability index <sup>a</sup>	86%	88%	86%	91%	83%	86%

<sup>a</sup> Stability index: Students enrolled 160 or more days divided by enrollment on October 1.

**Source:** Data provided by Saint Paul Public Schools.

For comparison purposes, Figure 63 shows the stability rates over the past five years for selected Saint Paul elementary schools, as well as the average for all elementary schools district-wide. Selected elementary schools displayed here include other Achievement Plus schools, other East Side neighborhood schools, some other neighborhood schools, and some magnet schools.

Johnson Elementary School has a stability rate that is slightly below the average of all Saint Paul elementary schools (92%); however, it is in line with several other East Side neighborhood schools, such as Dayton's Bluff (85%), Bruce F. Vento (87%), and Eastern Heights (86%).



### 63. Student stability during the school year: Saint Paul Public Schools

	School	Stability Index <sup>a</sup>					
		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
<b>Achievement Plus</b>	John A. Johnson	86%	88%	86%	91%	83%	86%
	Dayton's Bluff	78%	82%	86%	85%	81%	85%
	St. Paul Music Academy	86%	86%	89%	84%	92%	95%
<b>East Side neighborhood schools</b>	Bruce F. Vento	81%	87%	87%	88%	87%	87%
	Eastern Heights	87%	86%	90%	88%	86%	86%
	Frost Lake	93%	91%	95%	95%	97%	95%
	Highwood Hills	88%	84%	87%	87%	87%	90%
	Phalen Lake Hmong	88%	89%	91%	92%	96%	94%
<b>Other neighborhood schools</b>	Chelsea Heights	93%	93%	91%	93%	94%	93%
	Como Park	85%	83%	83%	86%	88%	87%
	Groveland Park	91%	92%	93%	92%	95%	95%
	Hamline	94%	95%	95%	92%	95%	94%
	Horace Mann	96%	98%	97%	96%	98%	95%
<b>Magnet schools</b>	Battle Creek	94%	95%	96%	93%	97%	93%
	Farnsworth Aerospace	97%	96%	95%	96%	95%	95%
	Jackson Preparatory	92%	91%	94%	94%	96%	97%
	Nokomis (North)	96%	97%	96%	98%	98%	97%
	Capitol Hill	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	97%
<b>All elementary schools</b>		91%	92%	92%	92%	93%	92%

<sup>a</sup> Stability index: Students enrolled 160 or more days divided by enrollment on October 1.

**Source:** Data provided by Saint Paul Public Schools.

### Issues for consideration

After increasing between 2007 and 2011, the student stability rate at Johnson Elementary School decreased to 83 percent. While it rose to 86 percent during the most recent school year, the stability rate still did not meet the previously determined goal of 90 percent. It remains important to assess stability over time and to think about what factors directly impact this outcome.

# Appendix

## Additional data tables: Participant survey

---

### A1. Number of family members supported by income

How many people were supported by that income?	N=11	%
1 person	0	0%
2 people	1	9%
3 people	2	18%
4 people	3	27%
5 people	0	0%
6 people	3	27%
7 people	0	0%
8 people	2	18%
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.91 people</b>	

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

---

### A2. Energy costs included in rent

Does your rent payment include energy costs?	N=11	%
Yes	3	27%
No	8	73%

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

---

### A3. Energy costs

On average, how much do you pay monthly for energy costs?	N=11	%
<\$100/month	1	9%
\$100-149/month	6	55%
\$150-200/month	2	18%
Don't know/No answer	2	18%
<b>Average</b>	<b>\$120.44</b>	

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

---

#### A4. Energy bill

Is the amount you pay monthly for energy costs the entire bill or a portion of the bill?	N=11	%
Entire bill	8	73%
Portion of the bill	2	18%
No answer	1	9%

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

---

#### A5. Number of adults in household

Including yourself, how many adults age 18 or older live in your household?	N=11	%
1 adult	5	45%
2 adults	6	55%

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

---

#### A6. Number of children in household

How many children age 17 or younger live in your household?	N=11	%
1 child	1	9%
2 children	4	36%
3 children	1	9%
4 children	2	18%
5 children	1	9%
6 children	2	18%
<b>Average</b>	<b>3.36 children</b>	

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

---

## A7. Number of children attending John A. Johnson Elementary School

How many of your children attend John A. Johnson Elementary School?

	N=11	%
0 children	1	9%
1 child	5	45%
2 children	2	18%
3 children	2	18%
4 children	1	9%

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

---

## A8. Improved housing situation because of the HTF program

Is your housing situation better now than it was when you sought help from HTF?

	N=11	%
Yes	11	100%
No	0	0%

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

---

## A9. HTF services helped improve housing situation

Did the services or referrals you received from HTF help you to improve your housing situation?

	N=11	%
Yes	11	100%
No	0	0%

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

---

## A10. Mental health referrals

Have you received any referrals for mental health services or supports, such as Goodwill Easter Seals or Wilder, from East Side Family Center in the last year?

	N=11	%
Yes	6	55%
No	5	45%

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012

---

---

### A11. Children's mental health referrals

**Have your children received any referrals for mental health services or supports, such as Goodwill Easter Seals or Wilder, from East Side Family Center in the last year?**

	<b>N=11</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	4	36%
No	7	64%

*Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012*

---

### A12. Children's other referrals

**Have your children received any referrals for other services, such as after school activities or summer activities from the East Side Family Center, in the last year?**

	<b>N=11</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	8	73%
No	3	27%

*Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012*

---

### A13. Helpfulness of children's other referrals

**Have the activity referrals been helpful?**

	<b>N=8</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	8	100%
[Describe how the referrals have been helpful]		
Getting them into out-of-school activities (e.g., YMCA summer camp)	4	50%
Tutoring	2	25%
Getting school supplies	1	13%
Helped them make friends	1	13%
Teaching them to speak English	1	13%
I don't know yet	2	25%
No	0	0%

*Note: Percents equal more than 100% as respondents were able to give multiple reasons.*

*Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012*

---

---

#### **A14. Prepared to solve housing problems**

**If you had a housing problem again, would you be better prepared to solve it because of the services or referrals you received from HTF?**

	<b>N=11</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	11	100%
No	0	0%

*Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012*

---

#### **A15. Other improvements because of the HTF program**

**Have things improved for you or your family in other ways, besides housing, because of the help or referrals you received from HTF?**

	<b>N=11</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	11	100%
No	0	0%

*Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012*

## Client satisfaction survey instrument

### John A. Johnson Elementary School's Eastside Housing Program Participant Survey

Activity Code: 70891

#### INTRODUCTION:

May I speak to  [R] ? This is  [Interviewer]  calling from Wilder Research in St. Paul.

- **IF R IS NOT HOME, ASK:** When would be the best time to reach  [R] ?
- **IF R NO LONGER LIVES THERE, ASK:** Do you know how we can reach  [R] ?
- **IF INFORMANT KNOWS R, BUT CANNOT OR WILL NOT GIVE INFORMATION ON HOW TO REACH R, ASK:**

Can you give  [R]  a message to call us? Ask  [R]  to call us at 651-280-2800 or 1-888-328-2972 and ask for  [Code Name] .  [R]  will receive a \$25 Rainbow gift card for talking with us.

**WHEN  [R]  IS ON THE PHONE:** This is  [Interviewer]  from Wilder Research in St. Paul. I am calling about a letter we sent you recently\* regarding your involvement with the housing program through John A. Johnson elementary school– the program that Malena and Talia work with. We would like to do a telephone interview with you about your experiences with the program. When we are done with the interview, we will send you a \$25 Rainbow gift certificate for your time. The interview is voluntary, takes about 15 minutes, and whatever you tell me during our interview will be confidential. Your name will not be attached to any of your comments. If this is a good time for you, we can do the interview right now.

#### IF YES, PROCEED.

**IF NOT A GOOD TIME, ASK:** When would be a better time to call?  
(RECORD DATE AND TIME ON FACE SHEET)

**IF REFUSED:** Is there any particular reason why you would prefer not to be part of this study? → FILL OUT REFUSAL REPORT

\* IF R SAYS SHE DID NOT RECEIVE A LETTER, OFFER TO READ THE LETTER OVER THE PHONE, OR VERIFY/CHANGE THE ADDRESS ON THE FACE SHEET AND TELL R WE WILL SEND ANOTHER LETTER. IF POSSIBLE, HAVE R DO THE INTERVIEW NOW RATHER THAN WAITING FOR THE LETTER.

**John A. Johnson Elementary School's Eastside Housing Program  
Participant Survey**

1. First, I'm going to read a list of concerns or issues that people sometimes bring to the housing program at John A. Johnson elementary school. Please tell me whether that issue was a reason **you** sought help from the program.

(How about...)	Yes	No	REF	DK
a. Rent that was too high?	1	2	7	8
b. Landlord-tenant problems?	1	2	7	8
c. Poor quality housing?	1	2	7	8
d. Credit issues?	1	2	7	8
e. Housing code violations?	1	2	7	8
f. Domestic conflict?	1	2	7	8
g. Home improvement loan?	1	2	7	8
h. Housing foreclosure?	1	2	7	8
i. Eviction?	1	2	7	8
j. Homelessness?	1	2	7	8
k. Other reason? (SPECIFY: _____ _____)	1	2	7	8

2. Now, I am going to ask about some housing-related needs or issues. For each one, please tell me if HTF (the Housing Trust Fund) helped you with that issue. They could have helped you by providing services to you directly, or by referring you to another program or organization.

(Did you get help with...)	Yes	No	REF	DK
a. Locating different housing?	1	2	7	8
b. Landlord-tenant mediation?	1	2	7	8
c. Paying for first month's rent or security deposit?	1	2	7	8
d. Paying rent application fee?	1	2	7	8
e. Paying utilities (telephone, heat, or electric bills)?	1	2	7	8
f. Moving your things to a different location?	1	2	7	8
g. Paying home-buyer workshop fees?	1	2	7	8
h. Other issues? (SPECIFY: _____ _____)	1	2	7	8



3. Next, I would like to know if the housing program helped you meet your needs in the any of the following areas. Again, they could have helped you by providing services to you directly, or by referring you to another program or organization.

(Did you get help with...)	Yes	No	REF	DK
a. Food?	1	2	7	8
b. Clothing?	1	2	7	8
c. Medical care?	1	2	7	8
d. Employment?	1	2	7	8
e. Child care?	1	2	7	8
f. Education or schooling for yourself?	1	2	7	8
g. Education or schooling for your children?	1	2	7	8
h. Transportation?	1	2	7	8
i. Legal assistance?	1	2	7	8
j. Domestic abuse problems?	1	2	7	8
k. School attendance for children?	1	2	7	8
l. Getting your child(ren) connected to activities?	1	2	7	8
m. Parenting issues?	1	2	7	8
n. Other needs? (SPECIFY: _____ _____ )	1	2	7	8

4. HTF sponsors several classes each year. Did you attend any of the following classes sponsored by HTF?

a. Weatherization and Energy Assistance	1	2	7	8
b. Holiday Planning and Budgeting	1	2	7	8
c. Family Fun Roller Skating Holiday Party	1	2	7	8
d. Stress Release and Self Defense	1	2	7	8
e. Financial Literacy	1	2	7	8
f. Transportation	1	2	7	8
g. Green Homes	1	2	7	8
h. Community Safety and Youth Summer Programming	1	2	7	8
i. Other classes sponsored by the program? (SPECIFY: _____ )	1	2	7	8

5. Next, I'm going to ask you to rate some aspects of the services you have received so far from the program.

(How would you rate...)	Would you say...					
	Poor,	Fair,	Good, or	Outstanding?	REF	DK
a. How quickly you were able to get help?	1	2	3	4	7	8
b. The ease of working with program staff?	1	2	3	4	7	8
c. The knowledge and skills of program staff?	1	2	3	4	7	8
d. How well your housing needs are getting met now?	1	2	3	4	7	8
e. Your overall satisfaction with the services provided?	1	2	3	4	7	8

6. Of the services or assistance you have received from HTF, what is the one thing that has been of most help to you?

---



---

7. In what ways could the program have improved its services to you?

---



---



---

8A. Have you moved into different housing since you sought help from HTF?

- Yes ..... 1
- No ..... (GO TO Q. 9A) ..... 2
- Refused ..... (GO TO Q. 9A) ..... 7
- Don't know ..... (GO TO Q. 9A) ..... 8

8B. Why did you move?

---



---



---

9A. Is your housing situation better now than it was when you sought help from HTF?

- Yes ..... 1
- No ..... (GO TO Q. 10A) ..... 2
- Refused ..... (GO TO Q. 10A) ..... 7
- Don't know ..... (GO TO Q. 10A) ..... 8

9B. I'm going to read some ways your housing may have improved. For each one, please answer "yes" or "no" for your housing situation today.

	Yes	No	REF	DK
a. Is your current home more secure?	1	2	7	8
b. Is it in better condition or were some repairs made?	1	2	7	8
c. Do you have more bedrooms?	1	2	7	8
d. Do you have a better landlord?	1	2	7	8
e. Is your housing more convenient to public transportation?	1	2	7	8
f. Is it more affordable?	1	2	7	8
g. Are there other ways your housing situation is better? (SPECIFY: _____ _____)	1	2	7	8

9C. Did the services or referrals you received from HTF help you to improve your housing situation?

- Yes ..... 1
- No ..... 2
- Refused ..... 7
- Don't know ..... 8

10A. If you had a housing problem again, would you be better prepared to solve it **because** of the services or referrals you received from HTF?

- Yes ..... 1
- No ..... (GO TO Q. 11A) ..... 2
- Refused ..... (GO TO Q. 11A) ..... 7
- Don't know ..... (GO TO Q. 11A) ..... 8

10B. In what ways would you say you are better prepared to solve your housing problems?

---



---



---

11A. Have things improved for you or your family in other ways, besides housing, **because** of the help or referrals you received from HTF?

- Yes ..... 1
- No ..... (GO TO Q. 12) ..... 2
- Refused ..... (GO TO Q. 12) ..... 7
- Don't know ..... (GO TO Q. 12) ..... 8

11B. In what other ways have things improved?

---

---

---

12. Have **you** received any referrals for mental health services or supports, such as Goodwill Easter Seals or Wilder, from East Side Family Center in the last year?

- Yes ..... 1
- No..... (GO TO Q. 13) ..... 2
- Refused..... (GO TO Q. 13) ..... 7
- Don't know..... (GO TO Q. 13) ..... 8

12A. Have the mental health service referrals been helpful?

- Yes ..... 1
- No ..... 2
- Refused ..... 7
- Don't know ..... 8

12B. Please describe how the referrals (have/ have not) been helpful.

---

---

---

13. Have **your children** received any referrals for mental health services or supports, such as Goodwill Easter Seals or Wilder, from East Side Family Center in the last year?

- Yes ..... 1
- No..... (GO TO Q. 14) ..... 2
- Refused..... (GO TO Q. 14) ..... 7
- Don't know..... (GO TO Q. 14) ..... 8

13A. Have the mental health service referrals been helpful?

- Yes, ..... 1
- No ..... 2

Refused .....	7
Don't know .....	8

13B. Please describe how the referrals (have/ have not) been helpful.

---



---



---

14. Have **your children** received any referrals for other services, such as after school activities or summer activities from the East Side Family Center, in the last year?

Yes .....	1
No..... (GO TO Q. 15) .....	2
Refused..... (GO TO Q. 15) .....	7
Don't know..... (GO TO Q. 15) .....	8

14A. Have the activity referrals been helpful?

Yes .....	1
No .....	2
Refused .....	7
Don't know .....	8

14B. Please describe how the referrals (have/ have not) been helpful.

---



---



---

Now, I have a few questions about your current housing.

15. Do you live in subsidized housing?

Yes..... (GO TO Q. 15A).....	1
No..... (GO TO Q. 15B).....	2
Refused..... (GO TO Q. 15B).....	7
Don't know..... (GO TO Q. 15B).....	8

15A. If YES: Do you live in public housing or have a voucher?

Public housing .....	1
Voucher.....	2
Refused .....	7
Don't know .....	8

15B. IF NO: What type of living arrangement do you have?

15 C. How much rent do you pay? \_\_\_\_\_

15D. Does your rent payment include energy costs (IF NEEDED: energy costs include electricity, gas, heat, air conditioning, etc.)?

Yes.....(GO TO Q. 16).....	1
No .....	2
Refused.....(GO TO Q. 16).....	7
Don't know.....(GO TO Q. 16).....	8

15E. On average, how much do you pay monthly for energy costs?

\_\_\_\_\_ Monthly energy costs

15F. Is the amount you pay monthly for energy costs the entire bill or a portion of the bill?

Entire bill .....	1
Portion of the bill .....	2
Refused .....	7
Don't know .....	8

16. Including yourself, how many adults age 18 or older live in your household?

\_\_\_\_\_ Adults

17. How many children age 17 or younger live in your household?

\_\_\_\_\_ Children

18. How many of your children attend John A. Johnson Elementary school?

\_\_\_\_\_ Number of children

19. How many times have you moved into different housing in the past 3 years – that is, since June 2010?

\_\_\_\_\_ Number of times moved

These last few questions are about you.

20. Please answer “Yes” or “No” for the following.

INTERVIEWER: IF **R** SAYS THAT MORE THAN ONE CATEGORY APPLIES, CIRCLE “Yes” FOR EACH THAT **R** MENTIONS.

Are you currently...	Yes	No	REF	DK
a. working part-time,	1	2	7	8
b. working full-time,				
c. unemployed and looking for work,	1	2	7	8
d. on layoff from a job,	1	2	7	8
e. going to school,	1	2	7	8
f. at home full time (raising children, homemaker, et cetera),	1	2	7	8
g. unable to work or disabled, or	1	2	7	8
h. something else? (SPECIFY: _____ _____ _____)	1	2	7	8

21. If I may ask, what is your age?

\_\_\_\_\_ Age

22. What is the highest level of education you have completed? Is it...

- Less than high school graduate,..... 1
- High school graduate or GED,..... 2
- Some college (including 2-year degrees),..... 3
- Four-year college degree (BA, BS), or ..... 4
- Post-graduate degree (masters, doctorate, MD, et cetera)?..... 5
- Refused ..... 7
- Don't know ..... 8

23. Are you currently...

Married, .....	1
Living with someone in a marriage-like relationship, .....	2
Separated,.....	3
Divorced, .....	4
Widowed, or .....	5
Have you never been married? .....	6
Refused .....	7
Don't know .....	8

24A. How do you describe your race or ethnic background? (READ LIST AND CIRCLE ONE) Would you say...

Black, African-American, or African, .....(GO TO Q. 25).....	1
Latino, Hispanic or Chicano, .....(GO TO Q. 25).....	2
Asian or Pacific Islander,.....(GO TO Q. 25).....	3
American Indian or Native American,.....(GO TO Q. 25).....	4
White or Caucasian,.....(GO TO Q. 25).....	5
Biracial or multicultural, or ..... (GO TO Q. 24B).....	6
Other? .....(GO TO Q. 24C).....	7
Refused .....(GO TO Q. 25).....	-7
Don't know .....(GO TO Q. 25).....	-8

24B. IF BIRACIAL OR multicultural: What races are you?

\_\_\_\_\_

24C. IF OTHER RACE OR ETHNIC BACKGROUND: What race or ethnicity are you?

\_\_\_\_\_ )



25. And finally, for statistical purposes, it would be helpful to know which income group your total household income came closest to **in the past 12 months** – including income from all sources and all members of your household. I’m going to read a list of income ranges. Please stop me when I mention the income group that best describes your total household income, before taxes, from all sources. Was it...

Less than \$10,000,.....	1
\$10,000 to \$20,000 .....	2
\$20,001 to \$30,000 .....	3
\$30,001 to \$40,000 .....	4
\$40,001 to \$50,000 .....	5
\$50,001 to \$75,000 .....	6
More than \$75,000.....	7
Refused .....	-7
Don’t know .....	-8

26. How many people were supported by that income?

\_\_\_\_\_ People supported

27. What is your gender?

Male.....	1
Female.....	2
Other .....	3
Refused .....	-7
Don’t know .....	-8

28. Those are all of the questions I have. Thanks for taking the time to be interviewed today. We really appreciate your help and your time. I have a \$25 Rainbow gift certificate to send to you. We have your address as (FACE SHEET ADDRESS). Is this correct?

Yes .....	(GO TO Q. 30).....	1
No.....		2

29. What is your correct address?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

30. Your gift certificate will be sent by certified mail within the next week or two. This means that the mail carrier will bring it to your door for a signature, to ensure that it isn't lost or stolen. INTERVIEWER; IF CERTIFIED MAIL IS A PROBLEM, GIVE R A CHOICE OF HAVING IT SENT ELSEWHERE OR HAVING IT SENT BY REGULAR MAIL AT THEIR OWN RISK. THIS MEANS THAT IF THEY DON'T RECEIVE IT, WE WILL NOT REPLACE IT.

Certified .....1  
Regular mail.....2

Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer Employee #: \_\_\_\_\_

## Self-reliance instrument

### Self-Reliance Progress Form

<b>Program Name</b>			
<b>Participant Information</b>			
<b>Last name, First Name, MI</b>		<b>Participant ID#</b>	<b>Intake Date</b> / /
<b>Racial/Ethnic Background:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. White or Caucasian <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Black or African American <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Asian <input type="checkbox"/> 4. American Indian <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Multi-racial			
<b>Hispanic origin?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No	<b>Gender</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Male <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Female	<b>Number of adults in household (18 +)</b>	<b>Number of children in household (17 or younger)</b>
<p><b>INSTRUCTIONS:</b> The self-reliance progress form is designed to record a participant's progress up to six times while receiving program services. The time period between ratings should be a minimum of 30 days. The last entry should be at program exit (regardless of the length of time from previous entry).  <b>Read</b> each item in the scale to determine the level that best describes this participant's situation. <b>Enter</b> the corresponding <b>number</b> in the box on the right, (in the column marked "<b>score</b>"). <b>Enter</b> the <b>date</b> of the rating in order to provide an accurate measure of the time interval between ratings.</p>			
<b>Employment Status</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>Employment Status Scale</b>		<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Unemployed		<b>1</b> ____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Working < 15 hours per week		<b>2</b> ____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Working 15 – 19 hours per week		<b>3</b> ____ / ____ / ____
	4 = Working 20 – 24 hours a week		<b>4</b> ____ / ____ / ____
	5 = Working 25 – 29 hours per week		<b>5</b> ____ / ____ / ____
	6 = Working 30 – 34 hours per week		<b>6</b> ____ / ____ / ____
	7 = Working 35 – 40 hour per week		<b>7</b> ____ / ____ / ____
	8 = Working > 40 hours per week		<b>8</b> ____ / ____ / ____
	9 = Unable to work/retired		<b>9</b> ____ / ____ / ____
<b>Job Retention and Stability</b>			
<b>2</b>	<b>Job Retention and Stability Scale</b>		<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Unemployed		<b>1</b> ____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Worked less than one month at current job		<b>2</b> ____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Worked one month but less than three months at current job		<b>3</b> ____ / ____ / ____
	4 = Worked three months but less than six months at current job		<b>4</b> ____ / ____ / ____
	5 = Worked six months or longer at current job		<b>5</b> ____ / ____ / ____
	9 = Unable to work or retired		<b>9</b> ____ / ____ / ____

<b>Income Source</b>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Income Sources Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = No income	1    ___ / ___ / ___
	2 = Public cash benefits/no earned income	2    ___ / ___ / ___
	3 = More than 50% public cash benefits/some earned income	3    ___ / ___ / ___
	4 = More than 50% earned income/some public cash benefits	4    ___ / ___ / ___
	5 = Earned income/no public cash benefits	5    ___ / ___ / ___
		6    ___ / ___ / ___
<p><i>NOTE: Public cash benefits include MFIP, GA &amp; SSI.  Earned income includes employment income, SSDI, Veterans benefits, Retirement benefits, Social Security.</i></p>		
<b>Child Support Income</b>		
<b>4</b>	<b>Child Support Income Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Eligible for child support, no income benefit	1    ___ / ___ / ___
	2 = Eligible for child support, partial benefit	2    ___ / ___ / ___
	3 = Eligible for child support, full benefit	3    ___ / ___ / ___
	9 = Not applicable	4    ___ / ___ / ___
		5    ___ / ___ / ___
		6    ___ / ___ / ___
<b>Adequacy of Income for Food and Shelter</b>		
<b>5</b>	<b>Adequacy of Income for Food and Shelter Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Unable to meet food AND housing expenses during the last month	1    ___ / ___ / ___
	2 = Able to meet food OR housing expenses during last month	2    ___ / ___ / ___
	3 = Able to meet BOTH food and housing expenses during the last month	3    ___ / ___ / ___
		4    ___ / ___ / ___
		5    ___ / ___ / ___
		6    ___ / ___ / ___
<b>Quality of Credit</b>		
<b>6</b>	<b>Quality of Credit Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = No credit	1    ___ / ___ / ___
	2 = Poor credit	2    ___ / ___ / ___
	3 = Restoring credit or beginning to establish credit	3    ___ / ___ / ___
	4 = Good credit or credit restored	4    ___ / ___ / ___
		5    ___ / ___ / ___
		6    ___ / ___ / ___

<b>Housing Stability</b>		
<b>7</b>	<b>Housing Stability Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Homeless	1 _____ / ___ / ___
	2 = Emergency shelter, doubled up, or notice of eviction or foreclosure	2 _____ / ___ / ___
	3 = Transitional housing (time limited)	3 _____ / ___ / ___
	4 = Subsidized rental housing	4 _____ / ___ / ___
	5 = Market rate rental housing	5 _____ / ___ / ___
	6 = Home ownership	6 _____ / ___ / ___
<b>Section 8 Status</b>		
<b>8</b>	<b>Section 8 Status Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Has Section 8 Voucher but can't find housing	1 _____ / ___ / ___
	2 = Has Section 8 Voucher but needs to move because of inappropriate housing for example substandard conditions, not large enough, safety concerns, etc.	2 _____ / ___ / ___
	3 = Has Section 8 Voucher but needs to move because tenant/landlord issues	3 _____ / ___ / ___
	4 = Has Section 8 Voucher and no need to move from the housing	4 _____ / ___ / ___
	9 = Does not have a Section 8 Voucher	5 _____ / ___ / ___
		6 _____ / ___ / ___
<b>Housing Affordability</b>		
<b>9</b>	<b>Housing Affordability Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Pays more than 50% of income for housing	1 _____ / ___ / ___
	2 = Pays less than 50% but > 30% of income for housing	2 _____ / ___ / ___
	3 = Pays ≤ 30% of income for housing	3 _____ / ___ / ___
		4 _____ / ___ / ___
		5 _____ / ___ / ___
		6 _____ / ___ / ___
<b>Household Health Care Coverage</b>		
<b>10</b>	<b>Household Health Care Coverage Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = No insurance for any household members	1 _____ / ___ / ___
	2 = Public health insurance benefits for some household members	2 _____ / ___ / ___
	3 = Public health insurance benefits for all household members	3 _____ / ___ / ___
	4 = Mix of public and private insurance for some household members	4 _____ / ___ / ___
	5 = Mix of public and private insurance all household members	5 _____ / ___ / ___
	6 = Private insurance benefits for some household members	6 _____ / ___ / ___
	7 = Private insurance for all household members	6 _____ / ___ / ___
<b>NOTE: Public insurance includes Medicaid (MA), Minnesota Care, Medicare, etc</b>		

<b>Child Care</b>		
11	<b>Child Care Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = No child care available	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Child care available but inadequate to meet need	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Child care is available & adequate with subsidy	3 _____ / ____ / ____
	4 = Child care is available & adequate without subsidy	4 _____ / ____ / ____
	9 = No child care needed	5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____
<b>Education</b>		
12	<b>Education Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Formal education not adequate to meet employment needs	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Formal education adequate for current employment but not for work advancement	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Formal education adequate for current employment and advancement	3 _____ / ____ / ____
		4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____
<b>Transportation</b>		
13	<b>Transportation Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Transportation not adequate to meet daily needs	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Transportation adequate to meet some but not all daily needs	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Transportation adequate to meet daily needs	3 _____ / ____ / ____
		4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____
<b>Social Support</b>		
14	<b>Social Support Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Little or no support from family, friends, or community support groups	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Some social support, not usually adequate	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Adequate social support	3 _____ / ____ / ____
		4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____

<b>Tenant/Landlord Relationship</b>		
<b>15</b>	<b>Tenant/Landlord Relationship Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Most recent tenant/landlord relationship failed – tenant evicted or lease not renewed	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Program needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue more than once since last assessment	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Program needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue only once since last assessment	3 _____ / ____ / ____
	4 = Program not needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue since last assessment	4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____
<b>Child Protection Case</b>		
<b>16</b>	<b>Child Protection Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Child protection case open-child/children not with parent	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Child protection case open-child/children with parent	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Child protection case closed	3 _____ / ____ / ____
	4 = Family does not have a child protection case (open or closed)	4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____
<b>Child's Immunization Scale</b>		
<b>17</b>	<b>Child's Immunization Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Immunizations (age appropriate) are not up-to-date for any of the children in the household	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Immunizations (age appropriate) are up-to-date for some but not all of the children in the household	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Immunizations (age appropriate) are up-to-date for all of the children in the household	3 _____ / ____ / ____
		4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____
<b>Child's Medical Needs</b>		
<b>18</b>	<b>Child's Medical Needs Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = None of the children in the household have a regular pediatrician or clinic	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Some but not all of the children in the household have a regular pediatrician or clinic	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = All of the children in the household have a regular pediatrician or clinic	3 _____ / ____ / ____
		4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____

<b>Enrollment in Pre-school programs</b>		
19	<b>Enrollment in Pre-school Programs Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = None of the eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Some but not all of the eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = All eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services	3 _____ / ____ / ____
	9 = No children in need of pre-school services	4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____

**NOTE: Pre-school programs include ECFE, Head Start, and center-based child care. Home-based child care does not qualify as pre-school programs.**

<b>School attendance</b>		
20	<b>School Attendance Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = None of the school-age children attending school on a regular basis *	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Some but not all of the school-age children attending school on a regular basis *	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = All of the school age children attending school on a regular basis *	3 _____ / ____ / ____
	9 = No school-aged children	4 _____ / ____ / ____
	<b><i>“Regular basis” is defined as school attendance on at least 85% of the eligible school days</i></b>	5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____

## **ASSESSMENT SECTION**

<b>Mental Health Assessment</b>		
21	<b>Mental Health Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Mental health assessment recommended	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Mental health assessment completed and appropriate referral made	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Mental health services being provided	3 _____ / ____ / ____
	9 = No mental health services needed	4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____

<b>Chemical Dependency Assessment</b>		
22	<b>Chemical Dependency Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Chemical dependency assessment recommended	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Chemical dependency assessment completed and appropriate referral made	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Chemical dependency support services being provided	3 _____ / ____ / ____
	9 = No chemical dependency support services needed	4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____



<b>Domestic Abuse</b>		
23	<b>Domestic Abuse Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Domestic abuse issues present in family – not currently addressed	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Referral made for supportive services	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Domestic abuse services being provided	3 _____ / ____ / ____
	9 = No domestic abuse services are needed	4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____
<b>Tenant Training</b>		
24	<b>Tenant Training Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Participant not attending recommended tenant training classes	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Participant attended some but not all recommended tenant training classes since last assessment	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Participant attended all recommended tenant training classes since last assessment	3 _____ / ____ / ____
		4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____

**This page is to be completed at program INTAKE and program EXIT ONLY**

<b>Community Credentials</b>		
<b>Does participant have:</b>	<b>Status at intake</b>	<b>Status at exit</b>
Social Security Card	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> In process <sub>3</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>
Minnesota driver's license	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> In process <sub>3</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>
Minnesota identification card	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> In process <sub>3</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>
Voter registration	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> In process <sub>3</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>
Birth certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> In process <sub>3</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>
Medical ID card	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> In process <sub>3</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>
Telephone or voice mail access	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> In process <sub>3</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>
Library card	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> In process <sub>3</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>
Bank account	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> In process <sub>3</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>
Alien registration card (green card)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> In process <sub>3</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Credential not needed or obtainable <sub>9</sub>

**This page is to be completed ONLY at program exit.**

<b>Supportive Services</b>				
<b>Did the participant receive or get a referral to support services for:</b>	<b>RATING SCALE</b>			
	<b>1 = Participant needed this service</b> (if yes, continue to column 2)	<b>2 = Participant received EHOP program services</b> (continue to column 3)	<b>3 = Participant was referred to other agency for services</b> (if yes, continue to column 4)	<b>4 = Participant received services from other agency</b>
Case management	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>
Life skills (not case management)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>
Alcohol or drug services	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>
Mental health services	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>
Health care services	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>
Domestic abuse services	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>
Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>
Housing placement	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>
Employment assistance	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>
Child care	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>
Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>
Legal	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>
Child protection	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>
Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <sub>1</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> No <sub>2</sub> <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know <sub>8</sub>