

# Supporting Homeless Families and Youth



## *A Summary of All Wilder Family Supportive Housing Services Programs in Fiscal Year 2018*

*Wilder helps families and youth achieve their full potential with supportive housing services. Participants get help finding safe and affordable housing along with flexible and responsive services that help them address and overcome challenges.<sup>1</sup>*

Wilder Foundation Family Supportive Housing Services (FSHS) works with homeless youth, single adults, and families to assist them in finding and maintaining housing, establishing a stable source of income, and connecting to needed health services. If there are school-age children in the household, staff also work on improving students' school engagement.

Each fiscal year, Wilder Research writes a series of reports on the data collected from FSHS programs. This year, Wilder Research produced three reports that detail findings from: 1) all FSHS programs combined, 2) Prior Crossing (in future years, this will become a broader “youth housing” report), and 3) site-based permanent supportive housing programs in which Wilder partners with specific developers (together these are referred to as “services with others” programs). The summary below highlights evaluation findings from 10 programs during fiscal year 2018 (July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018). These programs include:

- Jackson Street Village
- Jamestown Homes
- Minnesota Place Apartments
- Prior Crossing
- Project Quest
- ROOF Project
- ROOF – Housing Trust Fund
- St. Alban’s Park
- St. Philip’s Gardens
- Western U Plaza

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.wilder.org/what-we-offer/supportive-housing-services>

FSHS also provided services to the following initiatives: Family Independence Initiative, Kofi Rental Assistance, and Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood; however, data from these initiatives are not included in this summary, either because data were not collected or because a separate evaluation is being conducted.

## Summary of housing programs

During the reporting period, Family Supportive Housing Services collected data<sup>2</sup> on individuals and families in 10 programs. Figure 1 illustrates the target population of each program, as well as the number of those served. The ROOF Project, including the Housing Trust Fund, served the most clients (40%), followed by Project Quest (29%), and Jackson Street Village (16%; Figure 1). The majority of FSHS programs are targeted toward families (7 out of 10 programs), and these family programs served 651 individuals in 165 family units.

### 1. Numbers served, by FSHS program

Family programs	Target population	Clients served (N=728)		Families served (N=242)	
		N	%	N	%
ROOF Project	Homeless families	260	36%	66	27%
Project Quest	Long-term homeless families, including eligible parenting youth	212	29%	52	21%
Jackson Street Village	Previously homeless families Families who experience chemical and mental health challenges	117	16%	25	10%
ROOF Project: Housing Trust Fund	Homeless families	29	4%	8	3%
Jamestown Homes	Long-term homeless families	15	2%	6	2%
St. Alban's Park	Long-term homeless families	10	1%	4	2%
St. Philip's Gardens	Previously homeless families At least one family member has a disability	8	1%	4	2%
<b>Total served by family programs</b>		<b>651</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>68%</b>
Singles programs	Target population	N	%	N	%
Prior Crossing	Long-term homeless youth	57	8%	57	24%
Minnesota Place Apartments	Long-term homeless single adults Disabled single adults	11	2%	11	5%
Western U Plaza	Long-term homeless single adults	9	1%	9	4%
<b>Total served by singles programs</b>		<b>77</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>32%</b>

<sup>2</sup> The data reported here (and in the client characteristics and outcomes sections) were pulled from Minnesota's Homeless Management and Information System by FSHS staff who sent the data in Excel spreadsheets to Wilder Research for review and interpretation.

## Client characteristics

Between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018, Family Supportive Housing Services served **728 unduplicated individuals** from **242 households**; 182 clients entered an FSHS program and 222 exited during the reporting year (Figure 2).

### 2. Individuals and households served by FSHS programs

	Number of individuals	Number of households
First day of reporting period (July 1, 2017)	550	179
New intakes during reporting period	182	63
Exited program during reporting period	222	67
Cases open at the end of the year (June 30, 2018)	510	175
<b>Total served during reporting period</b>	<b>732<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>242</b>

<sup>a</sup> While a total of 732 clients were served, clients may have been able to participate in more than one program. The unduplicated number of clients served was N=728.

The following bullets outline several demographic characteristics for those served by FSHS programs.

- **Age:** Wilder's supportive housing programs served every age group; however, the largest group served was youth age 17 and younger (61%; Figure 3).

### 3. Age of clients served

<b>N=728</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Under 1 year old	27	4%
1 to 5 years old	129	18%
6 to 12 years old	178	24%
13 to 17 years old	108	15%
18 to 21 years old	62	9%
22 to 50 years old	197	27%
51 years and older	27	4%

Note. Percentages do not equal 100% due to rounding.

- **Gender:** The majority of adult<sup>3</sup> clients served (n=286) were women (72%), while the gender distribution among children age 17 and younger (n=442) was more equal (52% male, 48% female). Single mothers headed the majority of households (52%).
- **Race and ethnicity:** The majority of supportive housing clients were people of color (83%), with over 6 in 10 identifying as African American or black (62%). In addition, 8 percent identified as Hispanic.
- **Disability:** Over half (53%) of heads of household had at least one disability of long duration. Of those clients, the most common disability reported was mental illness (81%), followed by a physical disability (23%), a chronic health condition (16%), a developmental disability (12%), and alcohol abuse (9%), drug abuse (8%), and HIV/AIDS (1%). Clients could report more than one disability.
- **Domestic violence:** At program entry, 43 percent of adults reported being domestic violence survivors. Of those adults (N=123), 43 percent had experienced domestic violence within the last year and 29 percent were currently fleeing.
- **History of homelessness, by household:** Prior to their involvement in an FSHS program, the majority of households (58%) were living in an emergency shelter. The next most common living arrangement was with friends or family members (20%). At program entry, 69 percent of heads of household were considered long-term homeless.<sup>4</sup>

## Client outcomes

Wilder staff collect and report on client outcomes through three primary sources: the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS; as footnoted above), a Resource Assessment (developed by Wilder Research), and a survey of program participants (also developed by Wilder Research). The sections below highlight findings from these three data sources.

### HMIS outcomes

Most of the findings reported in this summary come from HMIS. FSHS staff enter client data into HMIS when an individual or family enters or exits their program. FSHS staff then send the data to Wilder Research each year for reporting.

---

<sup>3</sup> An “adult” is any person who is age 18 or older. Therefore, throughout these findings, it should be noted that “adult” also includes unaccompanied youth, who are youth (up to age 24) on their own.

<sup>4</sup> Minnesota definition of long-term homelessness: Individuals, unaccompanied youth, or families with children who lack a permanent place to live continuously for a year or more or at least four times in the past three years. Any period of institutionalization or incarceration is excluded when determining the length of time a household has been homeless.

## Stable housing

- The majority (85%) of households served during this reporting period had stable housing for at least six months after program entry, and 68 percent had stable housing for more than one year.
- Of the 67 households that exited their housing program during the reporting period, nearly all (96%) had stable housing for at least six months after program entry, and 73 percent had stable housing for more than 12 months after program entry.
- The most common destination for exited households was a rental property, either with or without an ongoing subsidy (49%). Over two in ten clients exited to live with friends or family, either temporarily (13%) or permanently (9%). The percentage of clients who exited into a permanent living situation with friends or family is lower than in previous years; however, data were missing for 10 households (Figure 4).

### 4. Destination for households that exited FSHS programs

<b>N=67</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Permanent housing</b>		
Rental housing without subsidy	23	34%
Rental housing with subsidy	10	15%
Friends or family, permanently	6	9%
Permanent housing (other than RRH) for formerly homeless persons	2	3%
<b>Temporary housing</b>		
Friends or family, temporarily	9	13%
Emergency shelter, including hotel with voucher	3	4%
Transitional housing	1	1%
Place not meant for habitation	1	1%
<b>Other</b>		
No exit interview completed	10	15%
Deceased	2	3%

Note. Percentages do not equal 100% due to rounding.

## Employment and income

- Of the 75 adults (67 households) that exited during the reporting period, one-third (34%) had a monthly income of \$600 or less when they entered their housing program (Figure 5).
- Over the course of their involvement in an FSHS program, the median income of exited clients increased (\$783 to \$966); however, the proportion of clients reporting “no income” also increased by program exit (9% to 15%; Figure 5).

### 5. Monthly income for clients who exited during the reporting period

N=75	Income at program entry		Income at program exit	
	N	%	N	%
No income	7	9%	11	15%
\$1 – 200	2	3%	0	0%
\$201 – 400	7	9%	3	4%
\$401 – 600	10	13%	7	9%
\$601 – 800	16	21%	8	11%
\$801- 1,000	11	15%	11	15%
\$1,001 – 1,200	6	8%	6	8%
\$1,201 – 1,400	4	5%	5	7%
\$1,401 – 1,600	1	1%	4	5%
\$1,601 or more	11	15%	20	27%
Average monthly income	\$919		\$1,213	
Median monthly income	\$783		\$966	

Note. This table is based on 75 adults in the 67 households that left during the reporting period. Cases with “no income” reported are excluded from the calculations of average and median income.

- Monthly income increased for 49 percent of exited adults; the median increase was +\$800 per month. Income stayed the same for 32 percent and decreased for 8 percent of exited adults; the median decrease was -\$247 per month; information was missing for the remaining 11 percent of clients.
- The proportion of households with earned income increased between program entry and the most recent assessment, for both exited (31% to 43%) and all households (30% to 41%; Figure 6).
- Sources for income assistance remained fairly consistent between program entry and a client’s most recent assessment. However, there were larger decreases in the proportion of clients receiving Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) and food stamps (Figure 6).

## 6. Income sources between program entry and most recent assessment

	<u>Exited</u> households (N=75)		<u>All</u> households (N=242)	
	Program entry	Program exit	Program entry	Most recent assessment
<b>Earned income</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>41%</b>
<b>Cash assistance</b>				
MFIP (a.k.a. TANF)	51%	44%	47%	42%
SSI	17%	17%	19%	20%
Child support	11%	12%	8%	9%
General Assistance	7%	5%	7%	7%
Minnesota Supplemental Aid (MSA)	3%	3%	2%	2%
SSDI	1%	4%	2%	5%
Unemployment insurance	0	0%	1%	<1%
Retirement income	1%	1%	1%	1%
Worker's compensation	0	0%	<1%	<1%
Other	3%	3%	1%	1%
<b>Non-cash assistance</b>				
Food stamps/SNAP	83%	76%	79%	76%
Section 8 or other rental assistance	19%	20%	16%	17%
WIC	16%	15%	9%	9%
MFIP child care services	4%	4%	2%	2%
Temporary rental assistance	1%	1%	1%	1%
Other	0	0%	1%	1%

## Resource Assessment data

In addition to the data reported above, FSHS program staff collect client-level data on a form developed by Wilder Research, called the Resource Assessment. This assessment examines client changes on key indicators, including financial accounts, employment, education, housing, health provider connections, and for those with school-age children, school stability (e.g., what percentage of clients “improved” by gaining employment or opening a bank account). Program staff implement the Resource Assessment on an annual basis with heads of households and adults age 18 and older.

Resource Assessment data were available at two time points for 169 FSHS clients in fiscal year 2018. Key findings are highlighted below, and additional data tables can be found in the Appendix.

## Finances

- The proportion of clients who had a debit card, checking account, or savings account increased from the initial to most recent assessment (Figure 7).

### 7. Financial assessment

% of clients with a...	Initial assessment (N=169)		Most recent assessment (N=169)	
	N	%	N	%
Debit card	79	47%	94	56%
Checking account	42	25%	56	33%
Savings account	30	18%	36	21%
IDA account	3	2%	3	2%

- According to their most recent assessment, a small proportion of clients improved their financial status by securing a debit card (14%), checking account (13%), savings account (8%), or Individual Development Account (IDA; 1%). At the same time, financial status declined for several clients who no longer have these types of accounts, and the majority did not have a checking or savings account at either time point (Figure 8).
- Of the 119 people who had one of these accounts at their most recent assessment, roughly three in 10 had more funds (31%) or the same amount (28%) as they did 12 months ago. A quarter of clients had fewer funds in their account than 12 months ago, and this information was missing for 16% of clients.

### 8. Accounts, change from initial to most recent assessment

N=169	Improved	No change (both yes)	No change (both no)	Declined	Missing
Debit card	14%	42%	38%	5%	2%
Checking account	13%	20%	62%	5%	1%
Saving account	8%	14%	75%	4%	0%
IDA account	1%	1%	93%	1%	4%

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.



- In a series of questions about finances, 47 percent of clients had improved in filing their taxes, meaning that they had not filed taxes at their initial assessment, but had filed taxes by their most recent assessment. However, the remaining clients had declined in this area (Figure 9).
- Four in ten clients had improved in checking their credit report in the past year; however, 60 percent had not done it at either time point. Similarly, 20 percent had worked on repairing their credit, but the majority (80%) had not done it at either their initial or follow-up assessment (Figure 9).

## 9. Additional financial indicators, change from initial to most recent assessment

In the past 12 months, have you... N=169	Improved	No change (both yes)	No change (both no)	Declined	Missing
Filed your taxes	47%	0%	0%	53%	0%
Checked your credit report or credit score	40%	0%	60%	0%	0%
Worked on repairing your credit	20%	0%	80%	0%	0%

### Employment and education

- By their most recent assessment, 15 percent of clients became employed, 28 percent remained employed, 51 percent remained unemployed, and 5 percent became unemployed.
- In the past 12 months (since their most recent assessment), clients were most likely to have attended a job readiness class (32%); financial literacy class (21%); vocational, technical, or community college (21%); or high school classes (14%). A small percentage had attended GED classes, a four-year college, or other classes in the past 12 months (Figure 10).

## 10. Educational assessment

In the past 12 months, have you attended... N=169	Yes	No	Already completed	Missing
Job readiness class	32%	60%	8%	1%
Financial literacy class	21%	74%	5%	0%
Vocational/technical/ community college	21%	67%	0%	12%
High school classes	14%	31%	46%	10%
GED classes	7%	56%	17%	20%
A four-year college	3%	80%	0%	17%
Other classes (ESL, Community Education, etc.)	2%	80%	0%	18%

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

## Health

- The most recent assessment shows only a slight change in the proportion of clients who have a regular place to go to the doctor (7% improved) or to receive mental health services (5% improved); Figure 11). However, in the case of the former, this is likely because the majority of clients already had a regular place to go to the doctor (73% said yes at both assessments).

### 11. Health, change from initial to most recent assessment

<b>N=169</b>	<b>Improved</b>	<b>No change (both yes)</b>	<b>No change (both no)</b>	<b>Declined</b>	<b>Missing/ NA</b>
Regular place to go to the doctor	7%	73%	16%	1%	3%
Regular place to go to get mental health services	5%	32%	22%	5%	36%*

\* In the question, "Do you have a regular place that you go to get mental health services," 36% of respondents marked "N/A – no mental health issues."

- Three in ten clients showed improvement in reduced emergency room (ER) visits, meaning that by their most recent assessment clients had either zero visits or fewer visits than at their initial assessment. Another 62 percent reported the same number of ER visits at both time points, and 8 percent had increased their number of visits. The average number of ER visits decreased slightly between clients' initial assessments (3.8 times) and follow-up assessments (3.4 times).

## Survey of participants

In order to hear from clients themselves, FSHS program staff distribute a voluntary self-administered questionnaire to all clients age 18 and older, either at exit or annually (if a client has not exited a program). The survey includes questions about services received, program staff, and overall satisfaction.

In fiscal year 2018, 23 clients – across all FSHS programs – completed a "survey of participants." Researchers cannot calculate an exact response rate since we do not know how many clients have been in their program for at least one year; however, it would have been possible for at least 222 clients to have taken the survey, since that is the number that exited this fiscal year. Given the very low response rate, and knowing that 83% of the surveys came from ROOF, it is important to note that the survey data may not be representative of the entire population of FSHS clients. Some findings are reported below and additional data tables can be found in the Appendix.

- **Services received:** Survey participants were most likely to have received services related to finding a permanent place to live (83%) and transportation (78%).
- **Satisfaction with services:** The majority (83%) of survey participants “strongly agreed” that they were satisfied with the services they had received, and 90 percent said these services helped their family “a lot.” All survey participants felt strongly that program staff respected their family’s cultural and ethnic background, worked well with their family, and treated them with respect.
- **Hopefulness for the future:** Nearly all (95%) respondents said that they felt hopeful for the future, and 76 percent said they were very hopeful. In a series of questions about personal changes over the past year, respondents most often said that they felt a lot better about improving their children’s lives (if they were a parent; 86%), improving their knowledge of housing-related issues (65%), their ability to handle daily life (65%), and their children’s behavior at school (if they were a parent; 64%; Figure 12).

**12. Life changes after program entry**

Since entering your Wilder housing program, how have the following things changed...? N=23	Better		Same	Worse	
	A lot	A little		A little	A lot
Your feeling that you have done something to improve your children’s lives (asked only of parents, N=21)	86%	5%	10%	0%	0%
Your knowledge about housing costs, your lease, and your responsibilities as a tenant	65%	26%	9%	0%	0%
Your ability to handle daily life	65%	26%	4%	4%	0%
Your child’s behavior at school (asked only of parents, N=22)	64%	5%	27%	0%	5%
Your knowledge about where to go in the community for help	61%	17%	22%	0%	0%
Your ability to finish what you start	61%	13%	26%	0%	0%
Your child’s attendance at school (asked only of parents, N=22)	59%	14%	18%	9%	0%
Your confidence that you can handle stressful situations	57%	30%	9%	4%	0%
Your communication with family members	48%	35%	13%	0%	4%
Your relationship with family members	48%	30%	17%	0%	4%

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

## Conclusions

In fiscal year 2018, FSHS served 728 individual clients from 242 households. The ROOF Project, including the Housing Trust Fund, served the most clients (40%); the majority of FSHS programs are targeted toward families.

Six in 10 supportive housing clients were youth age 17 or younger. The majority identified as people of color (83%), with over 6 in 10 identifying as African American or black (62%). Most adult clients were women (72%) and over half of households were headed by single mothers (52%). Many clients have complex and co-occurring issues, such as poor physical and mental health, a history of domestic violence, and a history of long-term homelessness.

Clients improved in several key areas. Of the 67 households that exited during the reporting period, nearly all (96%) had stable housing for at least six months after program entry, and 73 percent had stable housing for more than 12 months after program entry. The most common destination for exited households was a rental property, either with or without an ongoing subsidy (49%). The proportion of households with earned income increased between program entry and the most recent assessment, for both exited (31% to 43%) and all households (30% to 41%), and median monthly income increased among those who had exited an FSHS program (\$783 at entry to \$966 at exit).

According to the Resource Assessment data (N=169), clients made improvements in several areas related to finances: 47 percent improved in filing taxes (although, 53% also declined in this area); 40 percent began checking their credit report and 20 percent began repairing their credit. A small proportion of clients gained debit cards (14%), checking accounts (13%), and savings accounts (8%); although it is important to note that the majority of clients with Resource Assessment data did not have a savings (75%) or checking account (62%) at their initial or follow-up assessment.

Overall, clients who took the Survey of Participants were very satisfied with the services they received and felt hopeful about their future; although it is important to note that only a small portion of clients served by FSHS programs took the survey and the majority of respondents came from one program. Wilder Research will continue to work with FSHS program staff on improving the survey response rate.

# Appendix

## Additional Resource Assessment data tables

### A1. Available funds

In these accounts [checking, debit, IDA, or savings], compared to 12 months ago do you have...	Initial assessment (N=95)		Most recent assessment (N=119)	
	N	%	N	%
More funds	19	20%	37	31%
The same amount of funds	27	28%	33	28%
Less funds	24	25%	30	25%
Missing	25	26%	19	16%

Note. 74 people are reported as having “no accounts” at the initial assessment period and 50 people are reported as having “no accounts” at the most recent assessment period. The numbers reported in this table are taken out of the total number of people *with* accounts (N=95 and N=119).

### A2. Employment assessment

% of clients saying “yes”	Initial assessment (N=169)		Most recent assessment (N=169)	
	N	%	N	%
Currently employed*	58	33%	74	44%
Employed full time	13	8%	33	20%
Employed part time	31	18%	32	19%
Have more than one job	6	4%	8	5%
Enrolled in supportive work or sheltered workshop program	19	11%	14	8%
Volunteering	12	7%	10	6%
Working and/or volunteering	76	45%	88	52%

\*Number of hours worked per week is missing for 14 households on the initial assessment and 10 households on the most recent assessment.

### A3. Employment, change from initial to most recent assessment

N=169	Improved	No change (both yes)	No change (both no)	Declined	Missing
Currently employed	15%	28%	51%	5%	1%

#### A4. Housing-related indicators

In the past 12 months, have you... N=169	Yes	No	Not applicable	Missing
Received tenant or other education about how to keep or maintain housing	31%	66%	0%	2%
Received help with expunging an unlawful detainer	7%	58%	34%	1%

#### A5. Emergency Room visits, change from initial to most recent assessment

N=169	No or fewer ER visits	Same number of ER visits	More ER visits	Missing
Number of Emergency Room visit in past 12 months	30%	62%	8%	0%

#### A6. Emergency Room visits in past 12 months

	Initial assessment (N=169)		Most recent assessment (N=169)	
	N	%	N	%
0 times	23	14%	35	21%
1 time	27	16%	28	17%
2 times	25	15%	32	19%
3 times	20	12%	19	11%
4 times	9	5%	7	4%
5 – 9 times	20	12%	17	10%
10 or more times	6	4%	6	4%
Missing	39	23%	24	14%
Average # of visits	3.8		3.4	

#### A7. Children's school

% of clients saying "yes"	Initial assessment (N=169)		Most recent assessment (N=169)	
	N	%	N	%
Do you have any children in school?	72	43%	79	47%
Have you attended a Parent-Teacher conference in the past year?	54	32%	63	37%
Have your children been absent more than 10 times in the past school year?	20	12%	21	12%
Did your child attend more than one school in the past school year?	19	11%	21	12%

## A8. Children's school, change from initial to most recent assessment

<b>N=169</b>	<b>Improved</b>	<b>Decline</b>	<b>Missing/ Not applicable</b>
Child attended more than one school in the past school year	39%	12%	49%
Children absent more than 10 times in past school year	38%	12%	49%
Attended a Parent-Teacher conference	37%	14%	49%

## Survey of participants data tables

### B1. Program name

<b>N=23</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
ROOF	19	83%
Maya Transitional Housing	1	4%
Minnesota Place Apartments	1	4%
St. Alban's Park	1	4%
Missing	1	4%

Note. Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.

### B2. Time survey was taken

<b>N=23</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Exit	10	44%
1-year follow-up (still in program)	3	13%
Missing	10	44%

Note. Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.

### B3. Length of time in current housing

<b>How long have you lived at your current housing? N=23</b>	<b>Months</b>
Minimum	4
Maximum	54
Mean	16
Median	15

#### B4. Services received from Wilder staff

Did Wilder housing staff help you get any of the following? N=23	Yes	No	No, but didn't need this
Finding a permanent place to live	83%	17%	0%
Transportation, like a bus card, gas card, taxi, or other transportation help	78%	13%	9%
Getting counseling or support for <u>you</u>	57%	26%	17%
Getting counseling or support for <u>your children</u>	57%	22%	22%
Food for your family, like free groceries, food shelf assistance, or food stamps (SNAP)	52%	26%	22%
Helping with your child's school or teachers	44%	30%	26%
Getting on medical insurance or Medical Assistance or Minnesota Care (N=23)	39%	35%	26%
Getting medical care or dental care	35%	44%	22%
Financial benefits, like MFIP or GA or SSI	35%	39%	26%
Finding child care or getting child care paid for	30%	39%	30%

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

#### B5. Satisfaction with services

N=23	Agree		Disagree	
	Strongly	Somewhat	Somewhat	Strongly
Staff respected my family's cultural/ethnic background.	100%	0%	0%	0%
Staff treated me with respect.	100%	0%	0%	0%
Staff worked well with my family.	100%	0%	0%	0%
My input was considered when making decisions about my family's services.	91%	9%	0%	0%
Overall, I am satisfied with the services my family received.	83%	13%	4%	0%

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

#### B6. Helpfulness of services

Overall, do you believe the services your family received have helped you? N=20	N	%
Yes, a lot	18	90%
Yes, a little	1	5%
No, they have not helped	0	0%
It's too early to tell	1	5%

Note. Responses were missing for 3 cases.



## B7. Life changes after program entry

Since entering your Wilder housing program, how have the following things changed...? N=23	Better		Same	Worse	
	A lot	A little		A little	A lot
Your feeling that you have done something to improve your children's lives (asked only of parents, N=21)	86%	5%	10%	0%	0%
Your knowledge about housing costs, your lease, and your responsibilities as a tenant	65%	26%	9%	0%	0%
Your ability to handle daily life	65%	26%	4%	4%	0%
Your child's behavior at school (asked only of parents, N=22)	64%	5%	27%	0%	5%
Your knowledge about where to go in the community for help	61%	17%	22%	0%	0%
Your ability to finish what you start	61%	13%	26%	0%	0%
Your child's attendance at school (asked only of parents, N=22)	59%	14%	18%	9%	0%
Your confidence that you can handle stressful situations	57%	30%	9%	4%	0%
Your communication with family members	48%	35%	13%	0%	4%
Your relationship with family members	48%	30%	17%	0%	4%

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

## B8. Hopefulness for the future

N=21	N	%
Very hopeful	16	76%
Somewhat hopeful	4	19%
Not very hopeful	1	5%
Not at all hopeful	0	0%

Note. Responses were missing for 2 cases.

## B9. Most important change

**What is the most important change you have noticed in your life or your family since you began receiving services from Wilder housing staff? [verbatim responses] N=18**

Being organized and saving money

Better housing

Everything is great

Getting the help for my daughter

Got good advice and found a job

I've noticed the contentment with my life. I have learned the concept of living in my own space.

Job my daughter school

Money management

Much happier

Not being homeless and taking everything that Wilder has gave me and used it

Self-esteem

Stability

Stability and peace

That family is everything and moving forward is always good

That we became a closer family

The boys are happy

More responsible

Knowing that we have a home

Note. 5 respondents skipped this question.

## B9. Changes to improve Wilder services

**What changes would you make to improve the services you received from Wilder? [verbatim responses] N=4**

Gas cards and bus cards

Longer program for those in need, cleaner apartments/housing – my place as a bad mouse problem

Stay more in contact with tenants

Talking more to my advocate

Note. 2 respondents skipped this question, 4 wrote a response that did not apply to the question, and 13 replied “none”.

## Wilder Research®

Information. Insight. Impact.

451 Lexington Parkway North  
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104  
651-280-2700  
www.wilderresearch.org

### For more information

For more information about this report, contact  
Stephanie Nelson-Dusek at Wilder Research, 651-280-2675.

March 2019