



Wilder Foundation Family Supportive Housing Services: All Programs

A Summary of Evaluation Findings from Fiscal Year 2015-16

A total of 9,312 homeless adults, youth, and children were counted during the 2015 Minnesota Homeless Study. Over one-third of that group were children with their parents (35%).¹

Wilder Foundation Family Supportive Housing Services (FSHS) works with homeless individuals 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. In fiscal year 2016, FSHS staff provided services through the following programs:

- Jackson Street Village
- Northgate Woods
- Project Quest
- St. Alban's Place
- ROOF Project
- ROOF – Housing Trust Fund
- Minnesota Place Apartments
- St. Philip's Gardens
- Western U Plaza

The following summary highlights evaluation findings from all programs combined between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016.

¹ News release: Wilder study finds 9,312 people in Minnesota are homeless; down 9 percent from 2012. Wilder Research, March 14, 2016.

In fiscal year 2016, FSHS also provided services to the following programs: Family Independence Initiative, Saint Paul Promise Neighborhood, and Wilder Square; however, data from these programs are not included in this summary, either because data were not collected or because a separate evaluation is being conducted.

Program description

During the reporting period, Family Supportive Housing Services (FSHS) collected data on individuals and families in nine programs. Figure 1 illustrates the target population of each program, as well as those served between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016.

The ROOF Project, including the Housing Trust Fund, served the most clients (43%), followed by Project Quest (29%), and Jackson Street Village (20%) (Figure 1).

1. FSHS programs, including numbers served

Name of program	Target population	Clients served		Families served	
		#	% (N=652)	#	% (N=202)
ROOF Project	Homeless families	249	38%	85	42%
ROOF – Housing Trust Fund	Homeless families	32	5%	9	4%
Project Quest	Long-term homeless families, including eligible parenting youth	187	29%	48	24%
Jackson Street Village	Previously homeless families Families who experience chemical and mental health challenges	128	20%	29	14%
Northgate Woods	Long-term homeless families in Anoka County	15	2%	4	2%
St. Alban's Place	Long-term homeless families in Saint Paul	13	2%	5	2%
Minnesota Place Apartments	Long-term homeless single adults Disabled single adults	11	2%	11	5%
St. Philip's Gardens	Previously homeless families in Saint Paul At least one family member has a disability	10	2%	4	2%
Western U Plaza	Long-term homeless single adults	7	1%	7	3%
Total number served		652	100%	202	100%

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

Client characteristics

Between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016, FSHS served **652 unduplicated individuals**, including **202 households** (Figure 2).

2. Individuals and households in FSHS programs

	Number of individuals	Number of households
In program on first day of reporting period (July 1, 2015)	497	154
Entered program during reporting period	155	48
Exited program during reporting period	179	58
In program on last day of reporting period (June 30, 2016)	473	144
Total served during reporting period	652	202

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

- **Gender:** The majority of adult clients (n=253) served were women (81%) and the majority of households (N=202) were headed by single mothers (79%).
- **Age:** Wilder's supportive housing programs served every age group; however, the largest group served was youth 17 years and younger (61%) (Figure 3).

3. Age of clients served (N=652)

	N	%
Under 1 year old	35	5%
1 to 5 years old	130	20%
6 to 12 years old	150	23%
13 to 17 years old	84	13%
18 to 25 years old	77	12%
26 to 50 years old	157	24%
51 years and older	19	3%

- **Race and ethnicity:** The vast majority of supportive housing clients were people of color (81%), with nearly three-quarters identifying as African American or black (73%). In addition, 5 percent identified as Hispanic.
- **Disability:** Half (51%) of heads of household had at least one disability of long duration. Of those clients, the most common disability reported was mental illness (77%), followed by physical disability (21%), chronic health condition (16%), alcohol abuse (13%), and developmental disability (13%); clients could report more than one disability.
- **Domestic violence:** At program entry, 47 percent of adults had experienced domestic violence within the past year.
- **History of homelessness, by household:** Prior to their involvement in an FSHS program, the majority of households (74%) were living in an emergency shelter. The next most common living arrangement was transitional housing (8%). At program entry, over half (53%) of adults were considered long-term homeless.²

Client outcomes

Wilder staff also collect outcome information for clients served. The section below highlights selected outcomes for clients served between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016.

Stable housing

- Nearly nine in ten households (87%) served during this reporting period had stable housing for at least six months after program entry, and nearly three-quarters (74%) had stable housing for more than one year.
- Of the 58 households that exited their housing program during the reporting period, 83 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 (53%). Twenty percent of clients exited to live with friends or family, either permanently (10%) or temporarily (10%); however, the destination for 12 percent of clients was unknown (Figure 4).

² 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.

4. Destination for households that exited FSHS programs

N=58	N	%
Rental housing without subsidy	20	34%
Rental housing with subsidy	11	19%
Destination not known	7	12%
Friends or family, permanently	6	10%
Friends or family, temporarily	6	10%
Emergency shelter	3	5%
Permanent supportive housing	2	3%
Jail	1	2%
Deceased	1	2%
Hotel – no voucher	1	2%

Employment and income

- Of the households that exited during the reporting period, 58 percent had a monthly income of \$600 or less at program entry (Figure 5).
- Over the course of their involvement in an FSHS program, the median income of exited clients increased (\$532 to \$695); however, a slightly higher proportion of these clients reported having no income at program exit (3% to 11%) (Figure 5).

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

N=62	Income at program entry		Income at program exit	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No income	2	3%	7	11%
\$1 – 200	1	2%	0	0%
\$201 – 400	7	11%	4	6%
\$401 – 600	26	42%	16	26%
\$601 – 800	10	16%	4	6%
\$801- 1,000	4	6%	3	5%
\$1,001 – 1,200	3	5%	4	6%
\$1,201 – 1,400	3	5%	5	8%
\$1,401 – 1,600	3	5%	1	2%
\$1,601 or more	3	5%	9	15%
Average monthly income (N=54-58)	\$712		\$1,147	
Median monthly income (N=54-58)	\$532		\$695	

Note. This table is based on 62 adults in the 58 households that left during the reporting period. Cases with “no income” reported are excluded from the calculations of average and median income.

- Of the 62 adults that exited during the reporting period, monthly income increased for 37 percent; the median increase for these adults was +\$984 per month. Income stayed the same for 44 percent of adults and decreased for 15 percent; the median decrease was -\$347 per month.
- The proportion of households with earned income increased between intake and the most recent assessment, for both exited (23% to 44%) and all households (26% to 37%) (Figure 6).
- Sources for income assistance remained fairly consistent between program entry and a client's most recent assessment. However, there was a decrease 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

	# of exited households receiving income source (N=62)*		# of all households receiving income source (N=202)	
	Program entry	Program exit	Program entry	Most recent assessment
Earned income	23%	44%	26%	37%
Cash assistance				
MFIP (a.k.a. TANF)	61%	44%	62%	56%
SSI	11%	16%	17%	19%
Child support	23%	23%	16%	16%
General Assistance	5%	5%	6%	6%
Minnesota Supplemental Aid (MSA)	2%	2%	3%	2%
SSDI	3%	3%	5%	8%
Unemployment insurance	0%	0%	1%	1%
VA Service Connected Disability Compensation	0%	0%	1%	1%
Other	0%	0%	1%	1%
Non-cash assistance				
Food stamps/SNAP	92%	82%	93%	91%
WIC	8%	8%	6%	7%
Section 8 or other rental assistance	0%	0%	2%	2%
MFIP child care services	10%	13%	5%	6%
MN Care for adults	0%	0%	1%	1%
Temporary rental assistance	0%	0%	1%	2%
MFIP transportation services	2%	2%	1%	1%

* These columns are based on 62 adults in the 58 households that left during the reporting period.

Survey of participants

In addition to characteristics and outcome data collected from Minnesota’s Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), FSHS program staff also distribute a self-administered questionnaire to all clients 18 years and older, either at exit or annually (if a client has not exited a program). The survey includes questions about services received and overall satisfaction. A total of 32 clients completed a “Survey of participants” between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016. This includes 23 from ROOF, 5 from Jackson Street Village, 3 from Project Quest, and 1 from a program marked as “other”.

Researchers cannot calculate an exact response rate since we do not know how many clients have been in each program for at least one year. Also, there were not enough surveys completed in each program to report results at a site-specific level; therefore, aggregated findings are reported below. A full set of data tables is appended to this report.

- **Services received:** Survey participants were most likely to have received services related to transportation (84%) and finding a permanent place to live (74%). When asked about other types of support they had received from Wilder staff, the most common response was “personal support” or “moral support” (41%).
- **Satisfaction with services:** The majority (81%) of survey participants “strongly agreed” that they were satisfied with the services they had received, and 93 percent said these services helped their family “a lot.” Even higher numbers felt strongly that their input was considered in making decisions (97%), staff respected their family’s cultural and ethnic background (94%), they were generally treated with respect (94%), and staff worked well with their family (84%).
- **Hopefulness for the future:** Nearly all of the 29 respondents who answered the question said that they felt hopeful for the future, and 93 percent said they were “very” hopeful. In a series of questions about personal changes over the past year, respondents most often said they felt “a lot better” about doing something to improve their children’s lives (if they were a parent) (77%), their knowledge about housing (74%), and their ability to handle life (68%) (Figure 7).

7. Personal changes in the past year

Thinking about the last 12 months, how would you rate the following items?	A lot better	A little better	About the same	A little worse	A lot worse
(Parents only) Your feeling that you have done something to improve your children's lives (N=26)	77%	15%	8%	0%	0%
Your knowledge about housing costs, your lease, and your responsibilities as a tenant (N=31)	74%	16%	7%	0%	3%
Your ability to handle life (N=31)	68%	23%	10%	0%	0%
Your knowledge about where to go in the community if you need help (N=31)	61%	26%	10%	3%	0%
Your ability to finish what you start (N=31)	58%	26%	13%	3%	0%
Your relationships with family members (N=31)	58%	16%	19%	0%	7%
Your communication with family members (N=30)	50%	23%	20%	3%	3%
Your confidence that you can handle stressful situations (N=31)	48%	39%	10%	3%	0%
(Parents only) Your child's attendance at school (N=22)	41%	23%	36%	0%	0%
(Parents only) Your child's behavior at school (N=22)	27%	18%	55%	0%	0%

Note. Percentages may not equal 100, due to rounding.

Issues to consider

Results of the analysis show that FSHS programs served a total of 652 individual, unduplicated clients (202 families). Clients were most commonly served through the ROOF Project. The majority of those served were women and clients who came from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds.

Many clients have complex and co-occurring issues, such as poor physical and mental health, a history of domestic violence, and a history of homelessness. Despite these challenges, clients of FSHS experienced improvements in several outcome areas. The majority of those who exited had stable housing for more than one year, and clients most often exited into their own rental property. A larger proportion of clients were also receiving earned income by their most recent assessment, and the median income among exited clients increased from intake (\$532) to program exit (\$695).

In moving forward, one of the main issues to consider is the long-term impact of the Rapid Rehousing model on families, and whether clients remain in stable housing after program exit. Wilder Research is currently working with FSHS staff to compare the outcomes of clients pre- and post-Rapid Rehousing; those data should be available later this year. Another issue, as mentioned in last year's report, is having more consistent data collection, particularly for the participant survey. Wilder Foundation staff have been working to conduct regular data collection with clients, and it appears that the number of completed surveys is increasing.

**Wilder
Research**
Information. Insight. Impact.

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



AMHERST H
WILDER
FOUNDATION
ESTABLISHED 1906

Here for good.

For more information

This summary presents highlights from the Wilder Foundation's Family Supportive Housing Services evaluation.

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

March 2017

Appendix: Data tables for participant survey

A1. Program name

N=32	N	%
ROOF	23	72%
Jackson Street Village	5	16%
Project Quest	3	9%
Other (not specified)	1	3%

A2. Length of time in current housing

N=32	Months
Minimum	6
Maximum	90
Mean	24
Median	17

A3. Services received from Wilder staff

N=29-31	Yes	No	No, but didn't need this
Transportation, like a bus card, gas card, taxi, or other transportation help	84%	10%	7%
Finding a permanent place to live	74%	19%	7%
Food for your family, like free groceries, food shelf assistance, or Food Stamps (SNAP)	55%	28%	17%
Getting counseling or support for <u>you</u>	45%	23%	32%
Getting counseling or support for <u>your children</u>	39%	23%	39%
Helping with your child's school or teachers	39%	29%	32%
Finding child care or getting child care paid for	32%	29%	39%
Financial benefits, like MFIP or GA or SSI	23%	39%	39%
Getting on medical insurance or Medical Assistance or Minnesota Care	16%	45%	39%
Getting medical care or dental care	13%	39%	48%

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

A4. Other support received

N=22	N	%
Personal or moral support	9	41%
Clothing	6	27%
Household goods and supplies	6	27%
Housing support/workshop on housing	4	18%
Employment	3	14%
Other	9	41%

Note. Responses were coded into the above categories. Percentages do not total 100%, as responses may have been coded into multiple categories. "Other" responses include: Helped me support my family; tenant training; helped children with homework; activities and events; communication with child's school; provided structure; school supplies and uniforms.

A5. Additional support needed?

N=26	N	%
Yes	3	12%
No	23	89%

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

A6. Received job or employment training

N=31	N	%
Yes	12	39%
No	19	61%

A7. Currently employed

N=31	N	%
Yes	19	61%
No	12	39%

A8. Satisfaction with services

Thinking about the past 12 months...	Agree		Disagree	
	Strongly	Somewhat	Strongly	Somewhat
My input was considered when making decisions about my family's services. (N=31)	97%	0%	0%	3%
Staff respected my family's cultural/ethnic background. (N=31)	94%	7%	0%	0%
Staff treated me with respect. (N=31)	94%	3%	3%	0%
Staff worked well with my family. (N=31)	84%	16%	0%	0%
Overall, I am satisfied with the services my family received. (N=31)	81%	13%	7%	0%

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

A9. Services you and your family received helped

N=30	N	%
Yes, a lot	28	93%
Yes, a little	2	7%
No, they have not helped	0	0%
It's too early to tell	0	0%

A10. Hopefulness for the future

N=29	N	%
Very hopeful	27	93%
Somewhat hopeful	1	3%
Not very hopeful	0	0%
Not at all hopeful	1	3%

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