



Wilder  
Research



# East Side Housing Opportunity Program evaluation report

*Results for the 2009 calendar year*



MARCH 2010



# **East Side Housing Opportunity Program evaluation report**

*Results for the 2009 calendar year*

**March 2010**

**Prepared by:**

Amy Leite

Wilder Research

451 Lexington Parkway North

Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104

651-280-2700

[www.wilderresearch.org](http://www.wilderresearch.org)

# Contents

Introduction.....	1
Program information.....	1
Program goals .....	1
Research methods .....	2
Contents of the report.....	2
Program overview.....	3
Family Housing Plans .....	3
Services to families who rent.....	3
Working with landlords .....	3
Life Skills.....	4
Program goals .....	5
Service volume.....	7
Key findings.....	7
Family Housing Plans .....	7
Services to families who rent.....	8
Working with landlords .....	8
Life Skills.....	9
Anger regulation .....	10
Issues for consideration.....	14
Client satisfaction.....	15
Key findings.....	15
Participant demographics.....	16
Household situation .....	17
Program participation.....	18
Client satisfaction.....	21
Program impact.....	23
Issues for consideration.....	24

# Contents (continued)

Client self-reliance .....	25
Key findings.....	25
Demographics .....	26
Community credentials .....	27
Employment, education, and financial issues .....	27
Housing issues .....	32
Physical and mental health issues .....	35
Child well-being.....	36
Other issues .....	42
Status at program exit .....	44
Issues for consideration.....	45
Student success .....	47
Issues for consideration.....	47
Student stability .....	48
Results.....	48
Issues for consideration.....	50
Appendix.....	51
Open-ended comments.....	53
Self-reliance instrument .....	55

# Figures

1. Family Housing Plans .....	7
2. Services to Johnson families .....	8
3. Working with landlords .....	8
4. Life Skills Education Program attendance, 2009 .....	9
5. Source of information about anger regulation workshop .....	11
6. Attendance at other Life Skills workshops .....	11
7. Perceptions of anger regulation, mean scores pre – post .....	12
8. Helpfulness of workshop topics .....	12
9. Satisfaction with workshop and workshop presenter .....	13
10. Overall usefulness of workshop .....	13
11. Open-ended question: Participants’ perceptions of what they found most helpful .....	14
12. Respondent demographics .....	16
13. Household costs and members .....	17
14. Mobility .....	18
15. Clients’ reasons for seeking help from EHOP .....	19
16. Housing-related services provided to clients .....	19
17. Other program services (non-housing related) .....	20
18. Attendance at Life Skills Education Programs .....	21
19. Client ratings of services .....	21
20. Open-ended question: Clients’ perceptions of what has been of most help .....	22
21. Open-ended question: Clients’ suggestions for improvement .....	23
22. Ways in which the client’s housing situation was improved .....	24
23. Respondent demographics .....	26
24. Community credentials at first assessment .....	27
25. Employment status .....	28
26. Job retention and stability .....	28
27. Change in employment status .....	29
28. Change in job retention status .....	29
29. Education .....	29
30. Change in education status .....	30

## Figures (continued)

31. Income source .....	30
32. Change in income source status .....	31
33. Adequacy of income for food and shelter .....	31
34. Change in income adequacy status .....	31
35. Quality of credit .....	32
36. Change in quality of credit status .....	32
37. Housing stability .....	33
38. Change in housing status .....	33
39. Housing affordability .....	33
40. Change in housing affordability status .....	34
41. Tenant/landlord relationship .....	34
42. Change in tenant/landlord relationship status .....	34
43. Household health care coverage .....	35
44. Change in household healthcare coverage status .....	36
45. Child protection .....	36
46. Change in child protection status .....	36
47. Enrollment in preschool programs .....	37
48. Change in preschool enrollment status .....	37
49. School attendance .....	38
50. Change in school attendance status .....	38
51. Child support income .....	39
52. Change in child support income status .....	39
53. Child care .....	40
54. Change in child care status .....	40
55. Child immunizations .....	41
56. Change in child immunizations status .....	41
57. Child's medical needs .....	42
58. Change in child medical needs status .....	42
59. Transportation .....	43
60. Change in transportation status .....	43
61. Social support .....	44

## Figures (continued)

62. Change in social support status .....	44
63. Change in self-reliance status for all indicators .....	45
64. Attendance for students served by EHOP .....	47
65. Johnson Elementary School stability index .....	48
66. Student stability during the school year: Saint Paul Public Schools .....	49

# Acknowledgments

We wish to thank staff of the East Side Housing Opportunity Program (EHOP) and the East Side Family Center (ESFC) for the extensive information and support, including data collection, they provided in the preparation of this report. EHOP and ESFC staff who contributed to this report include the following:

Joan Schlecht, ESFC Director  
Mike Czarnik  
Leslie Myles

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

Mark Anton  
Jacqueline Campeau  
Marilyn Conrad  
Paul Devereaux  
Louann Graham  
Dan Mueller  
Miguel Salazar  
Lue Thao



# Introduction

## *Program information*

The East Side Housing Opportunity Program (EHOP) takes a community-wide approach to increasing housing stability. A venture of the East Side Neighborhood Development Company (ESNDC), the program works to demonstrate that neighborhoods, foundations, landlords, schools, businesses, government, private investors, and non-profit developers and service organizations can work together to create family and neighborhood stability and vitality (ESNDC website). The program is part of the East Side Family Center (ESFC), which is operated by the ESNDC. It is housed at John A. Johnson Achievement Plus Elementary School with the primary goal of increasing the number of students who stay at Johnson 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 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. In working toward its goals, the program partners with school staff, neighbors, landlords, and community agencies.

## *Program goals*

The EHOP advisory committee considered recommendations from the 2008 evaluation report and established the following goals for 2009 – 2012. This report focuses on EHOP services during the 2009 calendar year, and explores progress toward goals identified by the EHOP Advisory Committee.

### **Goals for 2009**

- Increase the income of 50 percent of HTF clients through stabilized employment or access to public benefits.
- Half of HTF clients report accessing community resources and advocate for themselves without the assistance of EHOP staff.

- Half of the younger children participating in EHOP are enrolled in a formal early childhood program.
- Three-quarters (75%) of school-aged children in HTF show improved attendance and academics.

### **Long-term goal**

- Increase student stability at John A. Johnson Elementary to 90 percent, the goal of the Saint Paul Public School District.

## ***Research methods***

The ESNDC contracted with Wilder Research to conduct an independent evaluation of EHOP. Wilder Research 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. Program records provide information on program implementation and progress toward program goals. Client satisfaction is measured using a telephone interview conducted by Wilder Research. 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 is provided by Saint Paul Public Schools.

## ***Contents of the report***

This report summarizes program results for the 2009 calendar year, including the program's progress toward annual goals. The report begins with a description of EHOP services. Results are then presented in four sections: 1) a section on "Service volume" describing program implementation; 2) a "Client satisfaction" section presenting results from the telephone interviews; 3) a "Client self-reliance" section assessing results from case manager assessments; and 4) a "Student stability" section providing data on student stability at Johnson 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

Following are descriptions of EHOP's major program areas. The program'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 Housing Trust Fund. The Life Skills Education Program provides homeownership education as well as a variety of classes supporting family and housing stability.

## ***Family Housing Plans***

EHOP 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 complete this form as the first step toward receiving services from the program.

## ***Services to families who rent***

EHOP works to reduce 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 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***

EHOP staff encourage families to attend Life Skills education classes that provide tools for strengthening families and to help families stabilize their housing situations. Program goals in this area focus on educating participants and stabilizing their housing situations while working with EHOP.

# Program goals

The EHOP advisory committee established the following goals for 2009. The following identifies progress toward these goals.

## **Increase the income of 50 percent of HTF clients through stabilized employment or access to public benefits**

Self-reliance assessments indicates 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. Baseline and last assessments for 17 clients who received services in 2009 indicate that, at baseline, 35 percent of clients reported high levels of self-reliance. As of the last follow-up, 53 percent of clients were demonstrating high levels of self-reliance related to income. Fifty-three percent of clients improved or maintained high levels of self-reliance between baseline and last assessment, exceeding the goal of 50 percent in 2009.

## **Half of HTF clients report accessing community resources and advocate for themselves without the assistance of EHOP staff**

Asked if they would be better prepared to solve a housing problem in the future because of the services or referrals they received from EHOP, 9 of the 10 participants answered "yes", exceeding the goal of 50 percent in 2009. When asked in an open-ended question to describe how they were better prepared, responses addressed having the skills and knowledge to resolve landlord/tenant problems, improved money management skills, and more knowledge and resources for assistance

## **Half of the younger children participating in EHOP are enrolled in a formal early childhood program**

At baseline, two-thirds of clients reported that none or only some of their eligible children were enrolled in preschool programs. At follow-up, 70 percent of eligible children were enrolled in preschool, exceeding the 2009 program goal. Two-thirds of families demonstrated improvement in preschool enrollment from baseline to the last assessment.

## **Three-quarters (75%) of school-aged children in HTF show improved attendance and academics**

Most students experienced a decline in student attendance between October 2008 and June 2009, not reaching the 2009 goal. Children missed between zero and four days of

school in October 2008, between zero and 13 days of school in January, and between one and 13 days of school in June 2009. On average, children missed one day of school in October, nearly four days of school in January, and close to five days of school in June.

Most students (9 of 11, or 82%) demonstrated improvement on a standardized reading assessment from October 2009 to January 2010, exceeding the 2009 goal. Two students did not demonstrate improvement during this time.

**Long-term goal: Increase student stability at John A. Johnson Elementary to 90 percent, the goal of the Saint Paul Public School District**

The student stability rate of 88 percent in 2008-2009 is at the highest level in the previous five years. While it is difficult to establish whether the stability rates for 2007-08 and 2008-09 represent a long-term upward trend for John A. Johnson, it is encouraging to see that the rate is increasing.

# Service volume

## *Key findings*

Program accomplishments for the year 2009 include the following:

- Forty-seven new Johnson families developed housing plans in 2009. Between 2005 and 2009, 274 new Johnson families developed housing plans.
- Program staff helped to place or stabilize housing for 33 Johnson families in 2009, and a total of 113 Johnson families from 2005 to 2009.
- Thirty-four Johnson families received case management services, and an additional 140 received moderate assistance or information and referral services in 2009.
- The housing specialist maintained active working relationships with 47 landlords in the Johnson area in 2009.
- Life Skills were provided to 144 Johnson and other neighborhood families in 2009. Overall, participants indicated they were very satisfied with the program.

## *Family Housing Plans*

Families in the Johnson neighborhood have the opportunity to complete a Family Housing Plan form as the first step toward receiving services from EHOP. Only a small number of participants in the past few years owned their own homes. In 2009, 47 Johnson families developed new housing plans, more families than developed such plans in 2008.

---

### 1. Family Housing Plans

	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
Johnson families who developed new housing plans	47	36	50	51	90

**Source:** Program records.

## *Services to families who rent*

Since mobility is common among low-income renters, program staff work with families who rent to help stabilize their living situations.

In 2009, 140 Johnson families received resource and referral services; however, this count of families served may identify families who received services on more than one occasion during 2009. Forty-eight families received assistance through EHOP in 2009 (Figure 2).

Thirty-four Johnson families received case management in 2009, representing slightly fewer families served compared to previous years. In addition, 33 families were stabilized or placed in housing in 2009 (Figure 2).

---

### **2. Services to Johnson families**

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2005</b>
Families who received assistance	48	85	214	175	69
Families who received resource and referral services	140 <sup>a</sup>	60	76	54	33
Families who received case management services	34	52	45	40	36
Families who were stabilized or placed in housing	33	18	16	28	18

<sup>a</sup> Count of families who received resource and referral services in 2009 is duplicated

**Source:** Program records.

## *Working with landlords*

Program staff worked with landlords to help them identify resources to improve the quality of their housing and make more housing available to families with students who attend Johnson. In 2009 program staff worked with 47 landlords (Figure 3).

---

### **3. Working with landlords**

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2005</b>
Maintained active relationship with area landlords	47	73	92	70	47

**Source:** Program records.



## *Life Skills*

In addition to working with families who rent, program staff also worked to help families own and maintain their homes. As previously described, current goals focus on attendance at Life Skills programs. Whereas EHOP services in other areas target families with children attending Johnson, Life Skills classes are open to all families in the community. In 2009, 144 Johnson and other neighborhood families attended a homeownership or Life Skills Education Program.

The Life Skills Education Program partners with the case manager and the housing specialist to present educational trainings that promote healthy families and provide clients with tools to stabilize their housing. Topics offered in 2009 included an employment workshop, domestic violence prevention, anger management, fire safety, spring cleaning, Healthy Homes for Healthy Children, Weatherize Your home, and budgeting. In addition, the program offered a roller-skating party in December attended by 226 people (Figure 4).

---

#### **4. Life Skills Education Program attendance, 2009**

<b>Workshops offered</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Number of sessions</b>	<b>Attendance<sup>a</sup></b>
Employment Workshop	January 2009	4 sessions	6 families
Anger Management	February 2009	6 sessions	11 adults 12 children
Domestic Violence Prevention	March 2009	1 session	11 adults 16 children
Fire Safety	April 2009	1 session	17 adults 28 children
Spring Cleaning	May 2009	1 session	14 adults 29 children
Healthy Homes for Healthy Children	September 2009	1 session	16 adults 14 children
Weatherize your home	October 2009	1 session	20 adults 23 children
How to stretch a budget	November 2009	3 sessions	17 adults
Roller Skating Holiday Party	December 2009	1 session	100 adults 126 children

<sup>a</sup> Life Skills Education Programs are attended by families who have children at Johnson Elementary as well as by other neighborhood families.

**Source:** Program records.

At the end of each workshop, participants were asked to complete a short questionnaire. The questionnaire asked participants to indicate how they found out about the workshop. The most commonly reported sources of recruitment included the ESFC and EHOP staff members and their child's school. Other sources of recruitment also included flyers, pamphlets, and newsletters.

Participants were also asked how useful they found the workshop. Nearly all participants rated the workshops as "somewhat" or "very" useful, with most providing ratings of "very useful."

As part of the evaluation, Wilder Research evaluates select Life Skills classes. An evaluation of the Anger Regulation workshop is presented below.

### ***Anger regulation***

In February 2009, the ESFC offered an anger regulation workshop through its Life Skills Education Program. Wilder Research developed a pre- and post-test that participants completed at the first (pre-test) and last (post-test) workshop sessions.

#### **Survey completion**

A total of 11 adults and 12 children attended the workshop. Seven adults completed the pre-test, six completed the post-test, and five completed both the pre- and post-test.

Several questions were asked at both pre- and post-test to allow for an analysis of change experienced by participants over the course of the workshop. Results for these questions are presented for only those five participants completing both the pre- and post-test. Results for other questions that were asked only at pre-test or only at post-test are presented for all participants to the question. Participants who completed the pre- and post-tests attended between four and six of the six sessions.

#### **Workshop attendance**

At pre-test participants were asked how they found out about the workshop. Five of seven participants reported they found out about it from the ESFC or ESFC staff. Other sources of information about the workshop included pamphlets and flyers and Dayton Bluff Elementary staff (Figure 5).

---

## 5. Source of information about anger regulation workshop (N=8)

How did you find out about this workshop?	Number of participants
East Side Family Center (ESFC) or ESFC staff	5
John A. Johnson Elementary School	1
Previous Life Skills workshop	0
Flyers/pamphlets	1
Family/friends	0
Other	1

**Source:** Life Skills Anger Regulation Workshop initial evaluation, February 2009.

Other responses included Dayton's Bluff Elementary School staff.

The pre-test also asked participants whether they had attended other Life Skills workshops in the past. Two participants indicated they had (Figure 6).

---

## 6. Attendance at other Life Skills workshops (N=7)

Have you attended other Life Skills workshops?	Number of participants
Yes	2
No	5

**Source:** Life Skills Anger Regulation Workshop initial evaluation, February 2009.

## Perception of current anger regulation

To assess the program's impact, participants were asked to indicate their understanding of anger issues and resolution skills at both pre- and post-test. Participants were presented with a series of six statements, and were asked to indicate whether they "strongly agree" (5), "agree" (4), "neither agree nor disagree" (3), "disagree" (2), or "strongly disagree" (1) with each statement.

On average, improvement was seen from pre- to post-test for each of the six statements (Figure 7). In particular, more participants "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that they understood that acting out on their anger could be problematic.

## 7. Perceptions of anger regulation, mean scores pre – post (N=5)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:	Mean score at pre-test	Mean score at post-test
I understand that acting out on my anger can be problematic.	4.2	4.8
I feel confident that I can control my own emotions.	3.8	4.2
I have skills to solve personal and relationships problems in a safe way.	3.6	4.4
I understand that verbal abuse can lead to more intense violence.	4.4	4.6
I feel like I know how to take care of myself physically and emotionally.	3.6	4.4
I know about and can access resources in my community to help keep me and my family safe.	4.2	4.6

**Notes:** Mean scores reflect only those who answered the question at both pre- and post-test. Responses were scored as follows: “strongly agree” (5), “agree” (4), “neither agree nor disagree” (3), “disagree” (2), and “strongly disagree” (1).

**Source:** Life Skills Anger Regulation Workshop initial evaluation, February 2009. Life Skills Anger Regulation Workshop follow-up evaluation, February 2009.

## Participant satisfaction

Participants were also asked at post-test to indicate their satisfaction with the workshop overall, the presenter, and different topics covered in the workshop.

Participants generally found the workshop topics to be “very helpful.” All participants felt that the workshop components of “Understanding the different components of anger,” “Learning about the HELP skills,” “Understanding different types of abuse and relationship control”, and “Increasing understanding of the importance of self-care” were “very helpful” (Figure 8).

## 8. Helpfulness of workshop topics (N=6)

Please rate the helpfulness of the following topics covered in this workshop:	Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	Not helpful	Was not present for topic
Understanding the different components of anger (physical, cognitive, behavioral, psychological)	6	0	0	0
Purpose and practice of Time Out skills	5	1	0	0
Learning about the HELP skills	6	0	0	0
Learning about different relationship dynamics	6	0	0	0
Understanding different types of abuse and relationship control	5	0	0	0
Increasing understanding of the importance of self-care	5	0	0	0

**Source:** Life Skills Anger Regulation Workshop follow-up evaluation, February 2009.

Participants also provided high satisfaction ratings when asked about the workshop presenter. All participants indicated they “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that the workshop presenter was knowledgeable and skilled, that the workshop provided them with resources to better manage their anger, and that the workshop provided ideas for helping them understand and solve conflicts (Figure 9).

## 9. Satisfaction with workshop and workshop presenter (N=6)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
The workshop presenter was knowledgeable and skilled.	5	1	0	0	0	0
The workshop provided me with resources that helped or will help me to better manage my anger.	2	4	0	0	0	0
The workshop gave me new techniques and ideas to help me understand and solve personal and relationship conflicts.	3	3	0	0	0	0

**Source:** Life Skills Anger Regulation Workshop follow-up evaluation, February 2009.

Asked how useful they found the workshop overall, all participants indicated “very useful” (Figure 10).

## 10. Overall usefulness of workshop (N=6)

Overall, how useful did you find this workshop?	Number of participants
Very useful	6
Somewhat useful	0
Not at all useful	0

**Source:** Life Skills Anger Regulation follow-up evaluation, February 2009.

In open-ended questions, the post-test also asked participants to describe what they found most helpful about the workshop, anything that could have been improved, and their suggestions for future workshop topics. Four participants specifically requested additional workshops with the presenter. One participant requested a workshop on parenting.

Figure 11 presents participants’ answers to the question asking what they found most helpful about the workshop. No participants provided suggestions for improving the workshops.

---

**11. Open-ended question: Participants' perceptions of what they found most helpful**

---

**What did you find most helpful about the workshop? (N=4)**

---

How to avoid a hostile situation and get safely away without incident.

---

It helped me understand myself a little better.

---

How to control myself.

---

Talking to people.

---

**Source:** Life Skills Anger Regulation Workshop follow-up evaluation, February 2009.

### ***Issues for consideration***

The program reached similar numbers of families in 2009 as compared to previous years despite cuts and changes to program budgets and staff time. The program's staff and advisory board can use the results provided in this report to develop goals that can guide work in 2010 and beyond. Staff can also use feedback provided on the Life Skills Education Program survey to inform future programming efforts.

# Client satisfaction

This section presents satisfaction results for clients participating in the Housing Trust Fund program. In fall 2009, current Housing Trust Fund recipients were asked to complete a telephone interview regarding their experiences with EHOP. Interviewers from Wilder Research conducted the phone interviews, asking clients several questions about their program participation, their satisfaction with services, and the impact of the services. There were 12 recipients eligible to participate; two clients had disconnected telephone numbers. Therefore, interviews were completed with 10 recipients in October and November 2009.

## *Key findings*

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

- All participants rated their overall satisfaction with the services provided as “good” or “outstanding.”
- Asked how well their housing needs are getting met now and how quickly they were able to get help most provided ratings of “good” or “outstanding” for each item.
- All but one participant reported that their housing situation had improved since they first sought help from the program, and of those, all felt that the services or referrals they received from EHOP helped them to improve their housing situation.
- Nine of ten participants indicated they would be better prepared to solve a housing problem in the future because of the services or referrals they received from EHOP.
- Almost all participants also indicated things had improved for them or their families in other ways besides housing because of the help or referrals they received from EHOP. Participants identified greater family involvement and relationships, increased family stability, improved mental health and well-being, and improvements in conditions for their children as ways in which things had improved.

## ***Participant demographics***

Participants' self-reported demographics are presented in Figure 12. Seven respondents identified themselves as female, three as male. Three identified themselves as Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano; two as Black, African-American, or African; two participants identified as Asian or Pacific Islander; two as biracial; and one as White or Caucasian. Six participants reported that they had never been married; three were married. The average age of the respondents was 30 years old.

Four of the respondents were high school graduates or had a GED, and two had attended some college. Four were not high school graduates. Four participants reported an annual household income of less than \$10,000, and four reported an income of between \$10,000 and \$20,000. Two participants reported an income of between \$20,000 and \$30,000. The number of people in the household supported by the income reported ranged from three to nine people, with an average of five people supported. Six participants reported that they were at home full-time, and five were unemployed. Three participants were attending classes, and two were working part-time. Participants may have indicated more than one response (Figure 12).

---

### **12. Respondent demographics (N=10)**

<b>Characteristics</b>		<b>Number</b>
Age	20-24	2
	25-29	4
	30-34	2
	35-39	1
	40-44	1
	Average	30
Gender	Female	9
	Male	1
Race/ethnicity	Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano	3
	Black, African-American, or African	2
	Asian or Pacific Islander	2
	Biracial or multiracial	2
	White or Caucasian	1
Education	Less than high school graduate	4
	High school graduate or GED	4
	Some college	2



---

**12. Respondent demographics (N=10) (continued)**

Characteristics		Number
Marital status	Never been married	6
	Married	3
	Living with someone (marriage-like)	1
Employment status <sup>a</sup>	At home full-time	6
	Unemployed and looking for work	5
	Going to school	3
	Working part-time	2
	Disabled	1
Total household income	Less than \$10,000	4
	\$10,000 to \$20,000	4
	\$20,001 to \$30,000	2

<sup>a</sup> Participants could respond "yes" to more than one category.

**Source:** EHOP Participant Survey, 2009.

### ***Household situation***

All 10 participants reported living in a rental situation. Participants paid an average of \$259 of their total monthly rent. Participants reported that they paid all or a portion of the bill for energy costs, paying an average of \$107 a month for energy costs (Figure 13).

---

**13. Household costs and members (N=9-10)**

	Range	Mean
Amount of rent respondent pays	\$5 - \$645	\$259
Monthly energy costs (if not included in rent payment)	\$20 - \$300	\$107

**Source:** EHOP Participant Survey, 2009.

Five participants reported that they were the only adult in the home, and five reported that there were two adults in the home. The average number of children per household was three. All reported that they had children age 17 or younger in the household, and all those with children reported they had children attending Johnson Elementary. When asked about how many times they had moved in the past three years, responses ranged from one to five times, with an average of about three times.

Four respondents reported having moved since they sought help from the program. Their reasons for moving included lack of affordable housing, insufficient size, and poor housing conditions (Figure 14).

---

#### 14. Mobility

	Yes	No
<b>Have you moved into different housing since you sought help from the program? (N=10)</b>	4	6
<b>Why did you move? (N=4)</b>		
We have no place to stay – we stayed with our parent because we could not afford housing.		
I was taken off the program because I did not do my part. I have depression that I suffer from and that's the reason I moved.		
Because my old apartment was too small so I moved to a three bedroom apartment. And also my income changed.		
The house we were renting was not in good condition. The kitchen floor was sinking to the basement. Our energy bill was very high because of this.		

**Source:** EHOP Participant Survey, 2009.

### *Program participation*

Participants were asked about the initial concerns or issues that brought them to EHOP, and were allowed to indicate more than one reason for seeking help from the program (Figure 15). The most common responses were rent that was too high, homelessness, credit issues, landlord-tenant problems, poor quality housing, and domestic conflict between one and three participants also indicated eviction and housing code violations as reasons for seeking help from the program.

---

**15. Clients' reasons for seeking help from EHOP (N=10)**

<b>Reason for seeking help</b>	<b>N<sup>a</sup></b>
Rent that was too high	8
Homelessness	8
Credit issues	7
Landlord-tenant problems	7
Poor quality housing	4
Domestic conflict	4
Eviction	3
Housing code violations	1
Home improvement loan	0
Housing foreclosure	0
Other <sup>b</sup>	2

<sup>a</sup> Respondents were asked to indicate more than one reason.

<sup>b</sup> Other reasons for seeking help from EHOP included assistance paying rent and stabilizing housing.

**Source:** EHOP Participant Survey, 2009.

Participants were also asked what housing-related services they received from the program, and were allowed to indicate all that applied. They most commonly reported that they received help with paying for first months' rent or security deposit, locating different housing, paying rent application fees, and landlord-tenant mediation. Other services reported included help with paying utilities and moving possessions to a different location (Figure 16).

---

**16. Housing-related services provided to clients (N=10)**

<b>Did you get help with:</b>	<b>N</b>
Paying for first month's rent or security deposit	9
Locating different housing	8
Paying rent application fees	7
Landlord-tenant mediation	5
Paying utilities (telephone, heat, or electric bills)	4
Moving possessions to a different location	1

**Source:** EHOP Participant Survey, 2009.

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 they received a variety of other services from EHOP. Most reported receiving help with clothing and employment. Six of 10 reported receiving help with education for themselves, for their children, food assistance, and help with parenting issues. Other program services they received included help with child care, domestic abuse problems, school attendance for children, transportation, and legal assistance and medical care (Figure 17).

---

**17. Other program services (non-housing related) (N=10)**

<b>Did you get help with:</b>	<b>N</b>
Clothing	9
Employment	8
Education or schooling for yourself	6
Education or schooling for your children	6
Parenting issues	6
Food	6
Child care	5
Domestic abuse problems	5
School attendance for children	4
Transportation	3
Legal assistance	3
Medical care	3

**Source:** EHOP Participant Survey, 2009.

Through its Life Skills Education Program, EHOP offered clients a variety of classes aimed at promoting healthy families and providing tools for stabilizing housing. All 10 respondents took one or more of the classes offered by the program. Figure 18 provides a list of the classes offered during 2009 and the number of respondents attending each one.

---

**18. Attendance at Life Skills Education Programs (N=10)**

<b>Did you attend any of the following classes:</b>	<b>N</b>
Spring cleaning	9
Financial planning	8
Winterize your home	8
RentWise	7
Holiday budgeting	7
Employment	7
Simply good eating	7
Take charge of your money	5
Self defense	4
Other classes <sup>a</sup>	5

<sup>a</sup> Other classes included classes on computer class, domestic class, fire and safety, yoga and stress management, and anger management.

**Source:** EHOP Participant Survey, 2009.

## ***Client satisfaction***

Participants were asked several questions about their satisfaction with EHOP services. All participants rated their overall satisfaction with the services provided as “good” or “outstanding.” Asked how well their housing needs are getting met now, about the knowledge and skills of program staff, how quickly they were able to get help, and the ease of working with program staff, most (9-10) provided ratings of “good” or “outstanding” for each item (Figure 19).

---

**19. Client ratings of services (N=10)**

<b>How would you rate:</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>
How quickly you were able to get help?	0	1	2	7
The ease of working with program staff?	0	1	0	9
The knowledge and skills of program staff?	0	0	3	7
How well your housing needs are getting met now?	0	0	2	8
Your overall satisfaction with the services provided?	0	0	3	7

**Source:** EHOP Participant Survey, 2009.

When asked to describe which services were of most help, the most frequent responses were assistance with housing-related finances, including help with energy costs, and other services such as employment, mental health support, and financial classes (Figure 20).

---

**20. Open-ended question: Clients' perceptions of what has been of most help**

**Of the services or assistance you have received from the program, what is the one thing that has been of most help? (N=10)**

---

**Housing-specific services**

---

Cheaper rent, being able to call [staff] with issues about my landlord, and working on goals with [staff].

---

Help pay rent.

---

How to save energy and lower costs during the winter – very good class.

---

Providing housing, helping me locate, pay for housing. That they are just so helpful. They are wonderful people.

---

The Rent Wise class. They made me aware of resources to contact when you have a legal problem or a problem with your landlords.

---

They help me with the rent. They helped me pay portions of my rent to get me started or on my feet.

---

**Other services**

---

The computer classes.

---

The job search.

---

The mental health program and the parenting classes.

---

The money/finances part of it.

---

**Source:** EHOP Participant Survey, 2009.

Respondents were also asked to describe how the program could improve its services. Six respondents had no suggestions for improvement. Some of the suggestions for improvement included specific Life Skills classes, providing interpretation, and greater flexibility in choosing neighborhoods (Figure 21).

---

## 21. Open-ended question: Clients' suggestions for improvement

**In what ways could the program have improved its services to you? (N=10)**

---

### **Nothing**

---

Everything was great. Nothing I can think of.

---

I don't know.

---

None. They do a great job, there's nothing to improve.

---

Nothing, I can't think of anything.

---

They can't. They have gone above and beyond. They rescued me and my family from the streets. I love them!

---

They did a very good job overall.

---

### **Suggestions for improvement**

---

Having a first aid class to teach us how to respond to a family emergency.

---

Not being able to move. I have concerns about the safety of my neighborhood and I am unable to relocate.

---

Having a Spanish interpreter. I understand some English, but not the technical, hard words for these classes.

---

More staff to assist them.

---

**Source:** EHOP Participant Survey, 2009.

## ***Program impact***

Participants were asked if their housing situation is better now, compared to when they first sought help from the program. Nine of 10 participants indicated that their housing had improved. Of those who indicated that their housing situation had improved, all indicated that the services or referrals they received from EHOP helped them to improve their housing situation. Interpreted together, these results indicate that 9 of the 10 participants reported improvements in their housing situation due in part to the services they received from EHOP.

Asked how their housing situation had improved, participants most frequently indicated their current home has more bedrooms, is more secure, and is more affordable (Figure 22).

---

**22. Ways in which the client's housing situation was improved (N=8-9)**

	Yes	No
Do you have more bedrooms?	9	0
Is your current home more secure?	8	1
Is it more affordable?	8	1
Is it in better condition or were some repairs made?	7	2
Is your housing more convenient to public transportation?	7	2
Do you have a better landlord?	6	2

**Source:** EHOP Participant Survey, 2009.

Asked if they would be better prepared to solve a housing problem in the future because of the services or referrals they received from EHOP, 9 of the 10 respondents answered “yes.” When asked in an open-ended question to describe how they were better prepared, responses addressed having the skills and knowledge to resolve landlord/tenant problems, improved money management skills, and more knowledge and resources for assistance (Figure A1).

Asked if things had improved for them or their families in other ways besides housing because of the help or referrals they received from EHOP, 9 of 10 respondents answered “yes.” When asked in what ways things had improved, respondents indicated greater family involvement and relationships, increased family stability, improved mental health and well-being, and improvements in conditions for their children (Figure A2).

### ***Issues for consideration***

Overall, Housing Trust Fund participants rated their satisfaction with EHOP services highly. Asked for suggestions for improving the program, clients suggested specific Life Skills classes, providing interpretation, and greater flexibility in choosing neighborhoods.



# Client self-reliance

This section presents findings from a self-reliance assessment that program staff complete with case management clients. Clients self-report their progress on the scale; the case manager notes that some clients may inaccurately report their current status based on her knowledge of the family's current functioning. The scale was created by Wilder Research and helps to assess several key components of clients' self-reliance, including housing, employment, income, education, child care, physical and mental health needs, and other areas. The assessment was designed to be completed at program entry, with follow-up assessments every six months. A copy of the self-reliance assessment form is provided in the Appendix.

The case manager completed assessments with 51 clients over the past five years, including 17 clients who received services in 2009.

This section describes the demographics and community credentials, baseline self-reliance scores, and an analysis of change in self-reliance experienced by the 17 clients who received services in 2009. It is important to note that "last assessment" is used here to refer to a client's last assessment, which in most cases will not be their final assessment with the program. Seventeen clients received services in 2009. The following describes the baseline self-reliance of each client upon intake into the EHOP program for clients who received services in 2009. Participants served in 2009 have been enrolled in EHOP for between 5 and 63 months, with an average of 26 months.

## *Key findings*

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

- At the time of their baseline assessment, two-thirds of EHOP clients were unemployed. As of the last assessment, fewer than one-third remained unemployed.
- Eight of 17 clients improved their employment and job stability from baseline to last assessment, and two maintained high self-reliance in this area.
- The percentage of clients whose current education was adequate for current employment increased from 47 percent at baseline to 71 percent as of the last assessment.

- Increases were seen in the percentage of EHOP clients who were able to meet both food and housing expenses in the previous month.
- Clients were more likely to have some earned income rather than rely solely on public cash benefits at the last assessment compared to the initial assessment.
- As of the last assessment, 94 percent of EHOP clients had high levels of self-reliance related to housing. Nearly 90 percent reported paying less than or equal to 30 percent of income for housing.
- As of the last assessment, 95 percent of EHOP clients reported having public health insurance for all members of their household.
- Some important improvements were also seen in conditions for children living in clients' households, including the percentages of clients enrolling eligible children in preschool, having all children up-to-date on immunizations, and having a regular pediatrician or clinic for all children. As of the last assessment, all school-aged children were attending school on a regular basis.

## ***Demographics***

Of the 18 clients served in 2009, most identified as female (78%). Seven clients identified as African American, six as Hispanic or Latino, and three as Asian (Figure 23).

---

### **23. Respondent demographics (N=18)**

<b>Demographics</b>		<b>Number</b>
Gender	Female	14
	Male	4
Race/ethnicity	Black, African-American, or African	7
	Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano	6
	Asian or Pacific Islander	3
	Biracial or multiracial	5
	White or Caucasian	1

<sup>a</sup> Participants may have indicated more than one racial/ethnic background

Twelve households had a single adult, and six had two adults. The number of children in the household ranged from one to six, with an average of three children per household at the time of their last assessment.

## ***Community credentials***

Program staff asked participants about a variety of community credentials, such as identification cards, phone access, and voter registration. At first assessment, most clients had a social security card (67%); only about 40 percent had a Minnesota driver's license (39%). Most clients had telephone or voice mail access (78%) and a medical ID card. Slightly fewer clients had an open bank account or library card (39%) (Figure 24).

---

### **24. Community credentials at first assessment (N=18)**

<b>At first assessment does participant have:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Credential not needed or obtainable</b>
Social Security Card	67%	28%	0%	6%
Minnesota driver's license	39%	61%	0%	0%
Minnesota identification card	28%	67%	0%	6%
Voter registration	39%	33%	22%	6%
Birth certificate	59%	24%	18%	0%
Medical ID card	67%	22%	11%	0%
Telephone or voice mail access	78%	17%	6%	0%
Library card	39%	57%	6%	0%
Bank account	39%	56%	0%	6%
Alien registration card (green card)	28%	17%	0%	56%

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

## ***Employment, education, and financial issues***

At baseline, more than two-thirds of EHOP clients were unemployed. Of those who were employed, four had worked at their current job for more than six months (Figures 25-26).

Analyses of change indicates that eight clients improved their employment and job stability status, and two maintained high self-reliance with employment and job stability. Three clients maintained low self-reliance with employment and job stability, and two showed declines in self-reliance (Figures 27-28).

---

**25. Employment status (N=17-18)**

<b>Employment status</b>	<b>Baseline assessment N (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment N (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Unemployed	12 (71%)	5 (29%)
Working < 15 hours per week	1 (6%)	-
Working 15-19 hours per week	-	1 (6%)
Working 20-24 hours per week	-	1 (6%)
Working 25-29 hours per week	-	2 (12%)
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Working 30 – 34 hours per week	3 (18%)	3 (18%)
Working 35 – 40 hour per week	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
<b>Other</b>		
Unable to work/retired	-	4 (24%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>

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

---

**26. Job retention and stability (N=18)**

<b>Job retention and stability</b>	<b>Baseline assessment N (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment N (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Unemployed	12 (71%)	5 (29%)
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Worked three months but less than six months at current job	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
Worked six months or longer at current job	4 (24%)	7 (41%)
<b>Other</b>		
Unable to work or retired	-	4 (24%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>

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

---

**27. Change in employment status (N=15)**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	8	62%
Maintained – high	2	15%
Maintained – low	3	23%
Declined	2	15%

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

---

**28. Change in job retention status (N=15)**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	6	46%
Maintained – high	2	15%
Maintained – low	3	23%
Declined	2	15%

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

Overall, one-third of clients showed improvement in the adequacy of their education during the time they received case management services. At the time of the first assessment, 53 percent of clients assessed did not have enough formal education to meet their employment needs. Five clients improved their education, and seven maintained high levels of self-reliance. No clients declined in this area (Figures 29-30).

---

**29. Education (N=18)**

	<b>Baseline assessment N (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment N (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Formal education not adequate to meet employment needs	9 (53%)	5 (29%)
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Formal education adequate for current employment but not for work advancement	7 (41%)	8 (47%)
Formal education adequate for current employment and advancement	1 (6%)	4 (24%)
Total	17	17

---

### 30. Change in education status (N=17)

	N	%
Improved	5	29%
Maintained – high	7	41%
Maintained – low	5	29%
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, nearly two-thirds (65%) of clients reported low levels of self-reliance. Six clients reported improvement in income self-reliance scores, and three maintained high levels of self-reliance. Five clients reported decline in self-reliance from baseline assessment (Figures 31-32).

---

### 31. Income source (N=18)

Income source	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
No income	-	1 (6%)
Public cash benefits/no earned income	8 (47%)	7 (41%)
More than 50% public cash benefits/some earned income	3 (18%)	-
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Earned income/no public cash benefits	6 (35%)	9 (53%)
Total	17	17

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

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

---

**32. Change in income source status (N=17)**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	6	35%
Maintained – high	3	18%
Maintained – low	3	18%
Declined	5	29%

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

Financial concerns were a serious issue for many clients. At the time of the first assessment, only 35 percent of the clients were able to meet both their food and housing expenses. Nearly half (47%) of clients showed improvement in the adequacy of their income for food and shelter while receiving services from EHOP. Of concern, nearly one-third (29%) of clients reported declines in self-reliance scores in this domain from baseline to last assessment (Figures 33-34).

---

**33. Adequacy of income for food and shelter (N=18)**

<b>Adequacy of income for food and shelter</b>	<b>Baseline assessment N (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment N (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Unable to meet food AND housing expenses during the last month	3 (18%)	2 (12%)
Able to meet food OR housing expenses during the last month	8 (47%)	6 (35%)
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Able to meet BOTH food and housing expenses during the last month	6 (35%)	9 (53%)
Total	17	17

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

---

**34. Change in income adequacy status (N=17)**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	8	47%
Maintained – high	2	12%
Maintained – low	2	12%
Declined	5	29%

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

Some improvements were seen in the quality of clients' credit from baseline to last assessment. At baseline, nearly all (95%) clients reported poor or no credit. Five clients demonstrated improvements in their credit self-reliance, while most (71%) maintained low levels of self-reliance (Figures 35-36).

---

### 35. Quality of credit (N=18)

Quality of credit	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
No credit	7 (39%)	6 (35%)
Poor credit	10 (56%)	6 (35%)
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Restoring credit or beginning to establish credit	-	4 (24%)
Good credit or credit restored	-	1 (6%)
Total	17	17

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

---

### 36. Change in quality of credit status (N=17)

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

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

## *Housing issues*

Only one client had a Section 8 voucher at either their initial or subsequent assessment. No clients experienced any change in Section 8 status from baseline to last assessment.

At baseline, one-third of clients served in 2009 were homeless. Six clients (35%) improved their housing stability while in EHOP, and four maintained high levels of housing stability self-reliance. Of concern, more than one-third (35%) of clients have experienced declines in housing stability since baseline assessment, although most maintained high levels of self-reliance (Figures 37-38).



---

**37. Housing stability (N=18)**

<b>Housing stability</b>	<b>Baseline assessment N (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment N (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Homeless	6 (35%)	1 (6%)
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Subsidized rental housing	5 (29%)	15 (88%)
Market rate rental housing	6 (35%)	1 (6%)
Total	17	17

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

---

**38. Change in housing status (N=17)**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	6	35%
Maintained – high	4	24%
Maintained – low	1	6%
Declined	6	35%

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

At baseline, two-thirds (65%) of clients reported paying more than 50 percent of their income for housing. As of their last assessment, 88 percent of clients were paying less than or equal to 30 percent of their income for housing; 11 clients had experience improvement in housing affordability, and four had maintained high levels of self-reliance (Figures 39-40).

---

**39. Housing affordability (N=18)**

<b>Housing affordability</b>	<b>Baseline assessment N (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment N (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Pays more than 50% of income for housing	10 (59%)	2 (12%)
Pays less than 50% but more than 30% for housing	1 (6%)	-
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Pays less than or equal to 30% of income for housing	6 (35%)	15 (88%)
Total	17	17

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

---

**40. Change in housing affordability status (N=17)**

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

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

At baseline, half of clients reported low levels of self-reliance related to tenant/landlord relationships. As of their last assessment, four clients had improved their self-reliance, and six had maintained high levels of self-reliance. Program staff noted that families may not respond to this scale based on their current housing status; caution is warranted in interpretation of this scale (Figures 41-42).

---

**41. Tenant/landlord relationship (N=18)**

<b>Tenant/landlord relationship</b>	<b>Baseline assessment N (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment N (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Last tenant/landlord relationship failed – tenant evicted or lease not renewed	4 (24%)	5 (29%)
Program needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord dispute more than once in current quarter	1 (6%)	3 (18%)
Program needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord dispute only once in current quarter	3 (18%)	-
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Program not needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord dispute in current quarter	9 (53%)	8 (47%)
Total	17	17

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

---

**42. Change in tenant/landlord relationship status (N=17)**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	4	24%
Maintained – high	6	35%
Maintained – low	3	18%
Declined	4	24%

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

At baseline, only one client had completed tenant training, and the training was recommended for the other 17 clients. As of the last assessment, no additional clients had completed the recommended tenant training.

### ***Physical and mental health issues***

At the time of their initial self-reliance assessment, seven clients were identified by the case manager as either needing a mental health assessment or currently receiving mental health service. As of the last assessment, five clients had improved their mental health self-reliance, and seven had maintained high self-reliance.

Additionally, three clients had an identified domestic abuse issue at the time of baseline assessment. One client was receiving services. Three clients improved their self-reliance, and 11 maintained high levels of self-reliance.

No clients presented with chemical dependency issues at baseline. As of the last assessment four clients had declined in their chemical dependency self-reliance.

Most case management clients had public health insurance at both their baseline and last assessments. At the last assessment, only one client had experienced a decline in self-reliance related to health insurance coverage (Figures 43-44).

---

#### **43. Household health care coverage (N=18)**

<b>Household health care coverage</b>	<b>Baseline assessment N (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment N (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
No insurance for any household members	2 (12%)	1 (6%)
Public health insurance benefits for some household members	1 (6%)	
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Public health insurance benefits for all household members	14 (82%)	13 (77%)
Mix of public and private health insurance for all in household	-	3 (18%)
Total	17	17

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

---

**44. Change in household healthcare coverage status (N=17)**

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

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

### ***Child well-being***

The case manager assessed several aspects of child well-being. At baseline and as of the last assessment, no families reported any open child protection cases (Figures 45-46).

---

**45. Child protection (N=18)**

<b>Child protection</b>	<b>Baseline assessment N (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment N (%)</b>
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Child protection case closed	2 (12%)	3 (18%)
Family does not have a child protection case (open or closed)	15 (88%)	14 (83%)
Total	17	17

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

---

**46. Change in child protection status (N=17)**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	1	6%
Maintained – high	14	82%
Maintained – low	0	0%
Declined	2	12%

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

At baseline, two-thirds of clients reported that none or only some of their eligible children were enrolled in preschool programs. Two-thirds of families demonstrated improvement in preschool enrollment from baseline to the last assessment. Two families continued to maintain low levels of self-reliance (Figures 47-48).

---

#### 47. Enrollment in preschool programs (N=18)

Preschool	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
None of the eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services	11 (61%)	3 (18%)
Some but not all of the eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
All eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services	1 (6%)	7 (41%)
<b>Other</b>		
No children in need of pre-school services	4 (23%)	5 (29%)
Total	17	17

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

---

#### 48. Change in preschool enrollment status (N=9)

	N	%
Improved	6	67%
Maintained – high	1	11%
Maintained – low	2	22%
Declined	0	0%

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

At baseline most families (88%) had children attending school on a regular basis. As of the last assessment, all families either maintained regular school attendance or improved the attendance of children (Figures 49-50).

#### 49. School attendance (N=18)

School attendance	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
None of the school-age children attending school on a regular basis	1 (6%)	-
Some but not all school-age children attending school on a regular basis	1 (6%)	-
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
All school-age children attending school on a regular basis	15 (88%)	17 (100%)
Total	18	18

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

#### 50. Change in school attendance status (N=17)

	N	%
Improved	2	12%
Maintained – high	15	88%
Maintained – low	0	0%
Declined	0	0%

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

At baseline, more than half (53%) of clients reported that they were eligible for child support but were not receiving full benefit. As of the last assessment, one client reported improvement in child support income and two maintained high levels of self-reliance. Most (70%) reported no positive change in child support income (Figures 51-52).

---

**51. Child support income (N=18)**

<b>Child support income</b>	<b>Baseline assessment N (%)</b>	<b>Last assessment N (%)</b>
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Eligible for child support, no income benefit	7 (41%)	7 (41%)
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Eligible for child support, partial benefit	2 (12%)	2 (12%)
Eligible for child support, full benefit	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
<b>Other</b>		
Not applicable	7 (59%)	7 (59%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>

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

---

**52. Change in child support income status (N=10)**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Improved	1	10%
Maintained – high	2	20%
Maintained – low	6	60%
Declined	1	10%

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

At baseline, 41 percent of clients reported low levels of child care self-reliance. Most clients (6 of 7) maintained their current child care situations, and one experienced an improvement in child care self-reliance (Figures 53-54).

### 53. Child care (N=18)

Child care	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
No child care available	5 (29%)	3 (18%)
Child care available but inadequate to meet need	2 (12%)	1 (6%)
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Child care is available and adequate with subsidy	2 (12%)	3 (18%)
Child care is available and adequate without subsidy	3 (18%)	4 (24%)
<b>Other</b>		
No child care needed	5 (29%)	6 (35%)
Total	17	17

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

### 54. Change in child care status (N=8)

	N	%
Improved	1	13%
Maintained – high	4	50%
Maintained – low	3	38%
Declined	0	0%

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



All families who reported that immunizations were up-to-date for some but not all children in the household improved from baseline to last assessment (Figures 55-56).

---

#### 55. Child immunizations (N=18)

	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
<b>Child immunizations</b>		
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Immunizations are up-to-date for some but not all of the children in the household	4 (24%)	-
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Immunizations are up-to-date for all of the children in the household	13 (77%)	17 (100%)
Total	17	17

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

---

#### 56. Change in child immunizations status (N=17)

	N	%
Improved	4	24%
Maintained – high	13	77%
Maintained – low	0	0%
Declined	0	0%

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

Three clients reported that either none or some but not all children had a regular pediatrician or clinic at baseline. Two clients reported improvements in children having a regular pediatrician or clinic from baseline to last assessment (Figures 57-58).

#### 57. Child's medical needs (N=18)

Child's medical needs	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
None of the children in the household have a regular pediatrician or clinic	3 (18%)	1 (6%)
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
All children in the household have a regular pediatrician or clinic	14 (82%)	16 (94%)
Total	17	17

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

#### 58. Change in child medical needs status (N=17)

	N	%
Improved	2	12%
Maintained – high	14	82%
Maintained – low	1	6%
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 (77%) clients reported inadequate transportation at baseline. As of the last assessment, four clients experienced improvements in transportation adequacy, while five reported continued inadequate transportation and more than one-third (35%) reported declines in the adequacy of their transportation. Declines in adequacy of transportation may be partially explained by a family's involvement in the program. Program staff discourage families from driving without adequate insurance or valid driver's licenses. Families relying on their own

vehicles for transportation may discontinue this form of transportation once they become involve with EHOP (Figures 59-60).

---

#### 59. Transportation (N=18)

Transportation	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Transportation not adequate to meet daily needs	2 (12%)	7 (41%)
Transportation adequate to meet some but not all daily needs	11 (65%)	4 (24%)
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Transportation adequate to meet daily needs	4 (24%)	6 (35%)
Total	17	17

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

---

#### 60. Change in transportation status (N=17)

	N	%
Improved	4	24%
Maintained – high	2	12%
Maintained – low	5	29%
Declined	6	35%

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

At baseline most clients (89%) reported inadequate social support. Forty-one percent of clients reported improvement in social support at last assessment, while 53 percent continued to report inadequate social support (Figures 61-62).

#### 61. Social support (N=18)

Social support	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
<b>Low levels of self-reliance</b>		
Little or no support from family, friends, or community support groups	2 (12%)	2 (12%)
Some social support, not usually adequate	13 (77%)	7 (41%)
<b>Higher levels of self-reliance</b>		
Adequate social support	2 (12%)	8 (47%)
Total	17	17

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

#### 62. Change in social support status (N=17)

	N	%
Improved	7	41%
Maintained – high	2	12%
Maintained – low	6	35%
Declined	2	12%

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

### *Status at program exit*

Upon a client's exit from the program, the self-reliance assessment asks the case manager to complete two additional sections: 1) a community credentials section, and 2) a supportive services section. The community credentials section is completed by the case manager at both first assessment and exit, and the supportive services section is completed at exit only. As of the end of 2009, three clients exited the EHOP program. Exit questions were recorded for one client; due to this small sample size, results are not reported here.

## *Issues for consideration*

Figure 63 identifies the change in self-reliance for clients served in 2009 for all indicators.

### **63. Change in self-reliance status for all indicators (N=8-17)**

	<b>% Improved</b>	<b>% Maintained high</b>	<b>% Maintained low</b>	<b>% Declined</b>
Employment	62%	15%	23%	15%
Job retention	46%	15%	23%	15%
Education status	29%	41%	29%	0%
Income source	35%	18%	18%	29%
Income adequacy	47%	12%	12%	29%
Quality of credit	29%	0%	71%	0%
Housing stability	35%	24%	6%	3%
Housing affordability	65%	24%	0%	12%
Tenant/landlord relationship	24%	35%	18%	24%
Household healthcare coverage	18%	77%	0%	6%
Child protection	6%	82%	0%	12%
Enrollment in pre-school	67%	11%	22%	0%
School attendance	12%	88%	0%	0%
Child support income	10%	20%	60%	10%
Child care	13%	50%	38%	0%
Child immunizations	24%	77%	0%	0%
Child's medical needs	12%	82%	6%	0%
Transportation	24%	12%	29%	35%
Social support	41%	12%	35%	12%

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

Most clients included in the analysis of changes from baseline to last assessment were continuing to receive services from EHOP 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 can take into consideration the following barriers to self-reliance that clients continued to face:

- *Employment.* Although there were overall improvements in clients' employment status, 29 percent remained unemployed at the last assessment. Program staff can

continue to explore ways to help clients obtain employment, and sustain employment once they have found a job.

- *Income.* Financial concerns were a serious issue for many clients. While overall improvements were seen in the adequacy of clients' incomes for food and shelter, nearly half were unable to meet both expenses during the previous month.
- *Preschool enrollment.* While the percentage of eligible children were enrolled in preschool increased from only 8 percent to 64 percent, more than one-third of families with children eligible for preschool had all children enrolled. Program staff should continue to work with families to identify barriers to enrolling all eligible children into preschool.
- *Transportation.* As of the last assessment, just over one-third of clients reported that their current transportation was adequate to meet all of their daily needs. Program staff may consider identifying transportation barriers for families, and providing options for improving the transportation.
- *Social support.* Although there were improvements, nearly half of the clients still did not have adequate social support. 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 EHOP clients to attend these activities and supporting other ways of improving clients' informal support systems.

# Student success

One of the program goals established for 2009 stated that three-quarters (75%) of school-aged children in HTF show improved attendance and academics. As of the end of February, 2010, 15 children whose families participated in EHOP were enrolled at John A. Johnson Elementary School. Children were enrolled in 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> grade.

Student attendance is tracked by EHOP program staff. Most students experienced a decline in student attendance between October 2008 and June 2009 (Figure 64). Children missed between zero and four days of school in October 2008, between zero and 13 days of school in January, and between one and 13 days of school in June 2009. On average, children missed one day of school in October, nearly four days of school in January, and close to five days of school in June.

---

## 64. Attendance for students served by EHOP (N=15)

	October 2008	January 2009	June 2009
Dismissed	1	1	1
Excused absences	6	6	17
Unexcused absences	8	51	49
Tardy	55	120	177

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

In addition to student attendance, EHOP program staff also track academic achievement of students whose families are enrolled in EHOP and the Housing Trust Fund. Most students (9 of 11) demonstrated improvement on a standardized reading assessment from October 2009 to January 2010. Two students did not demonstrate improvement during this time. Academic achievement is assessed by the Wright Group McGraw Hill reading assessment.

## *Issues for consideration*

Improving child attendance and academic achievement is a goal for this program year. While academic achievement of children enrolled in EHOP did improve, attendance declined during the 2008-2009 school year. Program staff should explore barriers to children attending school on a regular basis and should work with families to ensure that children have the opportunity to attend school.

# Student stability

The primary goal of EHOP 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 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 the whole school year. Higher percentages indicate greater stability. The original goal set for Johnson was to increase the stability index score to 88 percent by the 2005-06 school year. At the end of 2004, a new goal was set to increase the student stability index at Johnson to 91 percent by the end of 2008.

## Results

Figure 65 shows that the Johnson stability index has fluctuated in individual years, the index has increased for the past two school years. While the index fell during the 2006-07 school year, the index for 2008-09 is at the highest level in five years. This percentage, however, remains below the goal of attaining a student stability index of 91 percent by the end of 2008 (Figure 65).

---

### 65. Johnson Elementary School stability index

Indicator	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Enrollment (October 1 official count)	265	299	314	299	297
Students enrolled 160 days or more	221	259	259	256	260
Stability index <sup>a</sup>	83.4%	86.6%	82.5%	85.6%	88%

<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 66 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. The stability rate for all elementary schools rose slightly from 90 percent for school years 2004-05 through 2005-06 to 91 percent in 2006-07 and 2008-09. Among the selected schools presented here, most either stayed the same or improved



from 2007-08 to 2008-09, especially Bruce Vento and Dayton's Bluff. A few schools experienced decline in the stability index (Figure 66).

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

		Stability Index <sup>a</sup>				
	School	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
<b>Achievement Plus</b>	John A. Johnson	83%	87%	82%	86%	88%
	Dayton's Bluff	80%	78%	81%	78%	82%
<b>East Side neighborhood schools</b>	Bruce Vento	78%	80%	83%	81%	87%
	Phalen Lake	85%	85%	85%	88%	89%
	Ames	82%	82%	86%	82%	81%
	Parkway	83%	86%	-	-	-
	Sheridan	89%	84%	87%	88%	90%
	Hayden Heights	90%	88%	89%	88%	85%
	Eastern Heights	83%	92%	84%	87%	86%
	Prosperity Heights	91%	88%	90%	87%	89%
<b>Some other neighborhood schools</b>	North End	76%	76%	81%	79%	77%
	Como Park	80%	78%	82%	85%	83%
	Chelsea Heights	92%	91%	91%	93%	93%
	Groveland Park	91%	90%	92%	91%	92%
	Mann	96%	97%	97%	96%	98%
	Hancock-Hamline	93%	93%	95%	94%	95%
<b>Some magnet schools</b>	Battle Creek Elementary	94%	92%	94%	94%	95%
	Farnsworth	93%	95%	95%	97%	96%
	Jackson	89%	90%	89%	92%	91%
	Nokomis	94%	97%	97%	96%	97%
	Capitol Hill	97%	97%	97%	98%	98%
<b>All elementary schools</b>		90%	90%	91%	91%	91%

<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 decreasing during the 2006-07 school year, the student stability rate increased in 2007-08 and then again in 2008-09, reaching the highest level seen in the previous five years. While it is difficult to establish whether the stability rates for 2007-08 and 2008-09 represent a long-term upward trend for John A. Johnson, it is encouraging to see that the rate is increasing. Other schools in the East Side neighborhood experienced both declines and increased stability rates.

# Appendix

*Open-ended comments*

*Self-reliance instrument*



## Open-ended comments

### A1. Preparation for future problems

	Yes	No
If you had a housing problem again, would you be better prepared to solve it <i>because</i> of the services or referrals you received from the program? (N=10)	9	1
In what ways would you say you are better prepared to solve your housing problems? (N=9) <sup>a</sup>		
<b>Landlord/tenant responsibilities and communication</b>		
I can talk to my landlord. Before I was scared to talk to her. I now know what to say or do. I know what my tenant rights are.		
I know more about tenant/landlord responsibilities.		
We know what responsibilities belong to the landlord and which one belong to us.		
<b>Money management</b>		
I'm wiser on how to pay my bills on time and how to budget better.		
We learned how to manage or distribute our money for housing, bills, etc.		
<b>Resources and referrals</b>		
I have more information. I have a guide or resource booklet to refer to.		
I have more resources. I know who to contact for help now.		
I know more about tenant/landlord responsibilities. I have more access to resources.		
I know where to see help, like damage deposits at the Ramsey County, food and clothes shelves, etc. We're better informed.		
<b>Other comments</b>		
Having the know-how of how and what to do.		
I'm more stable. I can talk to your program.		

<sup>a</sup> Some respondents' answers appear in more than one category here.

---

**A2. Improvements in other areas**

	Yes	No
<b>Have things improved for you or your family in other ways, besides housing, because of the help or referrals you received from the program? (N=10)</b>	9	1
<b>In what other ways have things improved? (N=9)<sup>a</sup></b>		
<b>Family involvement and relationships</b>		
I get along with my teenage sons better because of the parenting and therapy classes.		
Me and my son have a better relationship. We're more patient.		
Me and my wife do not argue/fight anymore.		
We learned to spend quality time with our children.		
We're a closer family now and we are getting to know other families in our neighborhood.		
I get along with my teenage sons better because of the parenting and therapy classes.		
Me and my son have a better relationship. We're more patient.		
<b>Family stability</b>		
I am able to keep a steady job, not worried about homelessness, and have more stability.		
I can provide food and clothes for my family now without any help.		
My kids are going to school every day. He attends programs and activities at school.		
<b>Mental health and wellbeing</b>		
[My children] do not see their parents worrying and scrambling to pay our next rent all the time.		
I have a better attitude on life and my problems.		
I have therapy sessions for my kids and myself.		
Less stress in our family life and marriage.		
<b>Better conditions for children and family</b>		
[My children] have a more secure, healthy environment.		
We have a cleaner place to live.		

<sup>a</sup> Some respondents' answers appear in more than one category here.

## 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>
<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.			
<b>Employment Status</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>Employment Status Scale</b>		<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Unemployed		1 ____/____/____
	2 = Working < 15 hours per week		2 ____/____/____
	3 = Working 15 – 19 hours per week		3 ____/____/____
	4 = Working 20 – 24 hours a week		4 ____/____/____
	5 = Working 25 – 29 hours per week		5 ____/____/____
	6 = Working 30 – 34 hours per week		6 ____/____/____
	7 = Working 35 – 40 hour per week		
	8 = Working > 40 hours per week		
	9 = Unable to work/retired		
<b>Job Retention and Stability</b>			
<b>2</b>	<b>Job Retention and Stability Scale</b>		<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Unemployed		1 ____/____/____
	2 = Worked less than one month at current job		2 ____/____/____
	3 = Worked one month but less than three months at current job		3 ____/____/____
	4 = Worked three months but less than six months at current job		4 ____/____/____
	5 = Worked six months or longer at current job		5 ____/____/____
	9 = Unable to work or retired		6 ____/____/____

Income Source		
3	<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 _____ / ____ / ____
<b>NOTE: Public cash benefits include MFIP, GA &amp; SSI.</b> <b>Earned income includes employment income, SSDI, Veterans benefits, Retirement benefits, Social Security.</b>		
Child Support Income		
4	<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 _____ / ____ / ____
Adequacy of Income for Food and Shelter		
5	<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 _____ / ____ / ____
Quality of Credit		
6	<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 _____ / ____ / ____



Housing Stability		
7	<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 _____ / ____ / ____
Section 8 Status		
8	<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 _____ / ____ / ____
Housing Affordability		
9	<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 _____ / ____ / ____
Household Health Care Coverage		
10	<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	
	7 = Private insurance for all household members	6 _____ / ____ / ____
<b>NOTE: Public insurance includes Medicaid (MA), Minnesota Care, Medicare, etc</b>		

Child Care		
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 _____ / ____ / ____
	5 = No child care needed	5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____
Education		
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 _____ / ____ / ____
Transportation		
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 _____ / ____ / ____
Social Support		
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 _____ / ____ / ____

Tenant/Landlord Relationship		
15	<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 dispute more than once in current quarter	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Program needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord dispute only once in current quarter	3 _____ / ____ / ____
	4 = Program not needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord dispute in current quarter	4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____
<b>Child Protection Case</b>		
16	<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>		
17	<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>		
18	<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 _____ / ____ / ____

Enrollment in Pre-school programs		
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 _____ / ____ / ____
School attendance		
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 _____ / ____ / ____
	<i><b>“Regular basis” is defined as school attendance on at least 85% of the eligible school days</b></i>	5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____

## ASSESSMENT SECTION

Mental Health Assessment		
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 _____ / ____ / ____
Chemical Dependency Assessment		
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 _____ / ____ / ____

Domestic Abuse		
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 _____ / ____ / ____
Tenant Training		
24	<b>Tenant Training Scale</b>	<b>Score      Date</b>
	1 = Tenant training class recommended	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Participant not attending recommended tenant training class	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Participant attended 1 – 4 tenant training classes to date	3 _____ / ____ / ____
	4 = Participant completed tenant training class	4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____

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

Community Credentials			
25	Community Credentials Scale		
Does participant have:	Status at intake	Status at exit	
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.**

Supportive Services				
26	Supportive Services Scale			
Did the participant receive or get a referral to support services for:	RATING SCALE			
	1 = Participant needed this service (if yes, continue to column 2)	2 = Participant received EHOP program services (continue to column 3)	3 = Participant was referred to other agency for services (if yes, continue to column 4)	4 = Participant received services from other agency
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>