



East Side Housing Trust Fund evaluation report

Results for the 2011-12 school year

SEPTEMBER 2012

East Side Housing Trust Fund evaluation report

Results for the 2011-12 school year

September 2012

Prepared by:

Amy Leite Bennett

Wilder Research
451 Lexington Parkway North
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104
651-280-2700
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.....	3
Program goals	4
Opportunities for goals: 2012-2016.....	5
Client satisfaction.....	6
Key findings.....	6
Participant demographics.....	7
Household situation	8
Program participation.....	9
Client satisfaction.....	12
Program impact.....	14
Issues for consideration.....	16
Client self-reliance	17
Key findings.....	17
Demographics	18
Community credentials.....	19
Employment, education, and financial issues.....	19
Housing issues	24
Physical and mental health issues.....	27
Child well-being.....	27
Other issues.....	33
Issues for consideration.....	35

Contents (continued)

Student success	37
Student attendance	37
Academic achievement	37
Issues for consideration.....	38
Student stability	39
Results.....	39
Issues for consideration.....	40
Appendix.....	41
Open-ended comments.....	41
Self-reliance instrument	43

Figures

1.	Respondent demographics	7
2.	Household costs and members.....	8
3.	Mobility.....	9
4.	Clients' reasons for seeking help from the HTF program	10
5.	Housing-related services provided to clients	10
6.	Other program services (non-housing related)	11
7.	Attendance at Life Skills Education Programs	12
8.	Client ratings of services.....	12
9.	Open-ended question: Clients' perceptions of what has been of most help	13
10.	Open-ended question: Clients' suggestions for improvement	14
11.	Ways in which the client's housing situation was improved.....	15
12.	Referral for mental health services or support.....	15
13.	Referral for mental health services or support for children	16
14.	Respondent demographics	18
15.	Community credentials at first assessment.....	19
16.	Employment status.....	20
17.	Job retention and stability	20
18.	Change in employment status	21
19.	Change in job retention status.....	21
20.	Education	21
21.	Change in education status.....	22
22.	Income source	22
23.	Change in income source status.....	23
24.	Adequacy of income for food and shelter.....	23
25.	Change in income adequacy status	23
26.	Quality of credit	24
27.	Change in quality of credit status.....	24
28.	Housing stability	25
29.	Change in housing status	25
30.	Housing affordability	25
31.	Change in housing affordability status	26

Figures (continued)

32.	Tenant/landlord relationship	26
33.	Change in tenant/landlord relationship status	26
34.	Household health care coverage	27
35.	Change in household healthcare coverage status	27
36.	Child protection	28
37.	Change in child protection status	28
38.	Enrollment in pre-school programs	28
39.	Change in preschool enrollment status	29
40.	School attendance	29
41.	Change in school attendance status	29
42.	Child support income	30
43.	Change in child support income status	30
44.	Child care	31
45.	Change in child care status	31
46.	Child immunizations	31
47.	Change in child immunizations status	32
48.	Child's medical needs	32
49.	Change in child medical needs status	32
50.	Transportation	33
51.	Change in transportation status	33
52.	Social support	34
53.	Change in social support status	34
54.	Change in self-reliance status for all indicators	35
55.	Proportion of tardies and absences by student	37
56.	Reading level (Wright Group McGraw Hill assessment)	38
57.	Johnson Elementary School stability index	39
58.	Student stability during the school year: Saint Paul Public Schools	40

Acknowledgments

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

Amber Birchem
Joan Schlecht
Leslie Myles
Malena Vang
Talia Gildner

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

Mark Anton
Jenny Bohlke
Jacqueline Campeau
Marilyn Conrad
Cheryl Holm-Hansen
Nam Nguyen
Miguel Salazar
Lue Thao

Introduction

Program information

The East Side Housing Trust Fund program takes a community-wide approach to increasing housing stability. A venture of the East Side Family Center (ESFC) of Neighborhood House, the program works to demonstrate that neighborhoods, foundations, landlords, schools, businesses, government, private investors, and non-profit developers and service organizations can work together to create family and neighborhood stability and vitality. The program is housed at John A. Johnson Achievement Plus Elementary School with the primary goal of increasing the number of students who stay at 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 Housing Trust Fund program advisory committee considered recommendations from the 2008 evaluation report and established the following goals for 2009-2012. This report focuses on HTF program services during the 2011-12 school year, and explores progress toward goals identified by the HTF program advisory committee.

Goals for 2011-2012 school year

- 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 advocating for themselves without the assistance of program staff.

- Half of the younger children participating in HTF 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 current stability rate of the Saint Paul Public School District.

Research methods

The East Side Family Center, Neighborhood House, contracted with Wilder Research to conduct an independent evaluation of the HTF program. Wilder Research assessed 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. Client satisfaction was measured using a telephone interview conducted by Wilder Research. Changes in participants' self-reliance were tracked through a self-reliance assessment that program staff complete for clients receiving case management services. Data on student stability at Johnson was provided by Saint Paul Public Schools.

Contents of the report

This report summarizes program results for the 2011-12 school year, including the program's progress toward annual goals. The report begins with a description of HTF program services. Results are then presented in three main sections: 1) a "Client satisfaction" section presenting results from the telephone interviews; 2) a "Client self-reliance" section assessing results from case manager assessments; and 3) 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 the major HTF 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

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

Services to families who rent

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

Life Skills

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

Program goals

The HTF advisory committee established the following goals for 2009-2012. The following identifies progress toward these goals during the 2011-12 school year.

50 percent of HTF clients demonstrate improvement in or maintain high levels of self-sufficiency related to income through stabilized employment or access to public benefits

Self-reliance assessments 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. Baseline and last assessments for 15 clients who received services during the 2011-12 school year indicate that, at baseline, 54 percent of clients reported high levels of self-reliance. As of the last follow-up, 60 percent of clients were demonstrating high levels of self-reliance related to income. Sixty percent of clients improved or maintained high levels of self-reliance between baseline and last assessment, a slight decrease from 72 percent in 2011, but exceeding the goal of 50 percent.

Another goal is to increase income through stabilized employment. As of the most recent assessment, one-third of clients (33%) had high levels of self-reliance. However, 47 percent of clients had either improved or maintained high levels of job retention and stability from baseline to most recent assessment.

Half of HTF clients are better prepared to access community resources and advocate for themselves without the assistance of HTF 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 HTF, each of the nine participants answered "yes," exceeding the goal of 50 percent. When asked in an open-ended question to describe how they were better prepared, participants addressed having the skills and knowledge to resolve landlord/tenant problems, improved money management skills, and more knowledge of and access to resources for assistance.

Half of the younger children participating in HTF are enrolled in a formal early childhood program

At baseline, only one client reported that all eligible children were enrolled in pre-school programs, such as ECFE, Head Start, and center-based child care. Eight clients reported that none of their eligible children were enrolled in pre-school programs. At follow-up, four of five clients reported all eligible children were enrolled in programming, exceeding the

program goal of 50 percent or more. Three of four families demonstrated improvement or maintained high levels of self-reliance in pre-school 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 2011 and May 2012, not reaching the program goal. However, improvements were seen between the 2010-11 school year.

At the end of the 2010-11 school year, nine students were reading at their grade level; additionally, fewer students were two or more grade levels delayed at the end of the school year, compared to October 2010. Each student with multiple screenings increased his or her reading level between October 2010 to June 2011. This met the program goal of 75 percent of HTF students improving their academic performance.

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

For the 2010-11 school year, the most recent year available, the student stability rate was 90 percent, achieving the goal of established by the HTF program. This is an increase compared to previous years. It will be important to continue to monitor annual stability rates to determine a continued upward trend.

Opportunities for goals: 2012-2016

The Housing Trust Fund program was successful in achieving each of its goals established for the period of 2008 – 2012. Given these successes, it is recommended the program establish new goals and benchmarks going forward. Based on findings from the most recent 2011-2012 academic year evaluation report, the following are recommended as potential areas for improvement:

- Continue to track overall academic achievement and attendance for children served through the program.
- Consider additional measures of child success.
- Consider monitoring progress toward increased employment/stability of income.
- Continue to work with families to become connected socially, perhaps through empowerment training.
- Continue to monitor student stability at John A. Johnson.

Client satisfaction

This section presents satisfaction results for clients participating in the Housing Trust Fund program. In June 2012, current Housing Trust Fund recipients were asked to complete a telephone interview regarding their experiences with the HTF program. 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. Each of the nine eligible participants completed the interview, for a response rate of 100 percent.

It is important to note that the program experienced reductions in staff time, and the transition of a long-term staff person from the case management position during 2011-12 school year.

Key findings

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

- All participants rated their overall satisfaction with the services provided as “good” or “outstanding.”
- All were satisfied in how well their housing needs are getting met now. Participants noted that their current home is more secure, closer to public transportation, more affordable, and is in better condition.
- All participants reported that their housing situation had improved since they first sought help from the program, and all felt that the services or referrals they received from the HTF program helped them to improve their housing situation.
- All participants indicated they would be better prepared to solve a housing problem in the future because of the services or referrals they received from the HTF program.
- Seven of nine adult clients and nearly half of children enrolled in the program had received referrals for mental health supports. Participants generally felt the referrals for mental health services had been helpful.
- 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 the HTF program. Participants noted greater family involvement and relationships, improved mental health and well-being, and better conditions for their children and families.

Participant demographics

Participants' self-reported demographics are presented in Figure 5. Three respondents identified themselves as Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano; another three identified as Black, African-American, or African; two participants identified as Asian or Pacific Islander; and one as biracial/multiracial. Five of nine reported that they were married. The average age of the respondents was 33 years old.

Four participants had attended some college and four had less than a high school education. Six of nine participants reported an annual household income between \$10,000 and \$20,000. Three participants reported income of less than \$10,000. More than half identified that they are at home full time. Three of nine respondents identified that they were either unemployed or looking for work, going to school, or working fulltime. One participant was unable to work or disabled. Participants may have indicated more than one response (Figure 1).

1. Respondent demographics (N=9)

Characteristics		N
Age	20-24	1/9
	25-29	3/9
	30-34	2/9
	35-39	0/9
	40-44	2/9
	45-49	1/9
Race/ethnicity	Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano	3/9
	Black, African-American, or African	3/9
	Asian or Pacific Islander	2/9
	Biracial or multiracial	1/9
	White or Caucasian	0/9
Marital status	Never been married	4/9
	Married	5/9
	Living with someone (marriage-like)	0/9

1. Respondent demographics (N=9) (continued)

Characteristics		N
Education	Less than high school graduate	4/9
	High school graduate or GED	1/9
	Some college	4/9
	Four-year college degree	0/9
Employment status ^a	At home full-time	5/9
	Unemployed and looking for work	3/9
	Going to school	3/9
	Working part-time	1/9
	Working full-time	3/9
	Unable to work or disabled	1/9
Total household income	Less than \$10,000	3/9
	\$10,000 to \$20,000	6/9
	\$20,001 to \$30,000	0/9

^a Participants could respond "yes" to more than one category.

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012.

Household situation

All 9 participants reported living in a rental situation. Participants paid an average of \$264 of their total monthly rent. Four of nine reported that they pay the entire energy bill; households paid an average of \$164 a month for energy cost with higher figures in the winter months (Figure 2).

2. Household costs and members (N=9)

	Range	Mean
Amount of rent respondent pays	\$0-\$850	\$264
Monthly energy costs (if not included in rent payment) (N=8 households)	\$73-\$300 ^a	\$164

^a Energy cost were averaged between winter and summer months

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012.

Five participants reported that they were the only adult in the home, and four reported that there were two adults in the home. The average number of children per household was just over 1. Eight of nine 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 zero to six times, with an average of more than two times.

Six participants reported having moved since they sought help from the program. Their reasons for moving included poor housing conditions, foreclosure, and conflict with landlords (Figure 3).

3. Mobility

	Yes	No
Have you moved into different housing since you sought help from the program? (N=9)	6/9	3/9
Why did you move? (N=6)		
Because the house was in bad condition. The second house our landlord was foreclosed so then we moved again to our current house.		
Because the apartment was un-livable and not up to the city code. The fire marshal said I could not live there.		
The violations that house had. The landlord never brought it up to city code. They gave 90 days and he never did anything.		
Only when my apartment building was being remodeled last summer 2011 and then they moved me back.		
Because we had a leak in the bedrooms. The landlord didn't want to repair it.		
The first one, the landlord had a foreclosure. Then they found me a second place.		

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012.

Program participation

Participants were asked about the initial concerns or issues that brought them to the HTF program, and were allowed to indicate more than one reason for seeking help from the program. The most common responses were homelessness, credit issues, housing code violations, eviction, and landlord-tenant problems (Figure 4).

4. Clients' reasons for seeking help from the HTF program (N=9)

Reason for seeking help	N ^a
Homelessness	8/9
Credit issues	7/9
Landlord-tenant problems	5/9
Housing code violations	5/9
Eviction	5/9
Poor quality housing	4/9
Rent that was too high	4/9
Domestic conflict	3/9
Housing foreclosure	2/9
Home improvement loan	1/9
Other	0/9

^a Respondents were allowed to indicate more than one reason.

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012.

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, landlord-tenant mediation, paying utilities, and paying rent application fees. Other services reported included help with paying utilities and moving possessions to a different location (Figure 5).

5. Housing-related services provided to clients (N=9)

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

^a Respondents were allowed to indicate more than one service.

^b Other housing-related services include furniture referral (n=2), renter's workshop and education on renting (n=1), filing a police report (n=1)

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012.

Participants were also asked about non-housing related services they received from the program, and again were allowed to indicate all that applied. Their responses indicated they received a variety of other services from the HTF program. The most common types of non-housing related assistance included assistance with employment, education or schooling for their children, clothing, food, school attendance for children, and child care. Several respondents also received help with parenting issues and their own schooling or education (Figure 6).

6. Other program services (non-housing related) (N=9)

Did you get help with:	N
Employment	7/9
Education or schooling for your children	7/9
Clothing	5/9
Food	6/9
School attendance for children	6/9
Child care	6/9
Parenting issues	4/9
Education or schooling for yourself	4/9
Domestic abuse problems	3/9
Transportation	1/9
Medical care	1/9
Legal assistance	0/9
Other ^a	2/9

^a: Other program services include mental health issues, summer day camps, and furniture

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012.

Through its Life Skills Education Program, the HTF program offered clients a variety of classes aimed at promoting healthy families and providing tools for stabilizing housing. All nine respondents took one or more of the classes offered by the program. Figure 7 provides a list of the classes offered during 2011-12 school year and the number of respondents attending each one.

7. Attendance at Life Skills Education Programs (N=9)

Did you attend any of the following classes:	N
Winterize your home	8/9
Spring cleaning/bed bug prevention	8/9
Healthy eating	9/9
Budgeting	7/9
Prioritizing for success	8/9
Stress reduction	5/9
Yoga/weight loss	9/9
Self-defense	9/9

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012.

Client satisfaction

Participants were asked several questions about their satisfaction with the HTF program services. All 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 provided ratings of “good” or “outstanding” for each item (Figure 8).

8. Client ratings of services (N=9)

How would you rate:	Poor	Fair	Good	Outstanding
How quickly you were able to get help?	-	-	6/9	3/9
The ease of working with program staff?	-	1/9	2/9	6/9
The knowledge and skills of program staff?	-	1/9	3/9	5/9
How well your housing needs are getting met now?	-	-	3/9	6/9
Your overall satisfaction with the services provided?	-	-	2/9	7/9

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012.

When asked to describe which services were of most help, the most frequent responses were assistance with housing-related services, including help with rent and utilities, and other services such as support for parenting issues, mental health support, and specific Life Skills classes (Figure 9).

9. 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=9)

Housing-specific services

The stability with rental assistance, to keep from being homeless and to keep my daughter in school, the same school.

The assistance to get help through the Housing program to be able to afford my rent.

Rental assistance. It means everything to me, security, and structure for my family. I'm very grateful for this program.

That they made or paid my electric bill. I was behind and unemployed because I'm on maternity leave.

Found housing and helped me with paperwork.

Other services

The nutrition class because I have an obese child. They allowed my child to be there and he learned a lot and has lost weight significantly.

Basically helping me with my kids and their mental health issues and my own mental illness. Connecting me/us with Wilder Foundation.

The Thursday classes and house cleaning class.

Goal setting. I've gotten myself on track with my parents, school, my kids, and my landlord.

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012.

Participants were also asked to describe how the program could improve its services. Several had no suggestions for improvement. Some of the suggestions for improvement included additional mediation with landlords, expanded hours, more staff, and specific Life Skills class topics (Figure 10).

10. Open-ended question: Clients' suggestions for improvement

In what ways could the program have improved its services to you? (N=9)

Nothing

It's all good right now.

Nothing at all, they have done everything for me.

Nothing really.

No idea. I think it is good now.

Suggestions for improvement

Extend the hours that they are open/available. They are only there on Tuesdays.

More mediation with the landlord. I never got that resolved. I still owe like \$2000.00 to my old landlord.

That if your children or grandchildren graduate from Johnny Johnson they can continue to help.

They could have a class for First Aid for adults and the children.

Maybe a little bit more staff, it sounds like [case manager] is over-worked and has a huge caseload.

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012.

Program impact

Participants were asked if their housing situation is better now, compared to when they first sought help from the program. Each of nine participants indicated that their housing had improved, and each indicated that the services or referrals they received from the HTF program helped them to improve their housing situation. Interpreted together, these results indicate that each of the participants reported improvements in their housing situation due in part to the services they received from the HTF program.

Most respondents said their situation had improved, stating that their current home is more secure, closer to public transportation, more affordable, and is in better condition. Only two respondents indicated that they had more bedrooms in their new place (Figure 11).

11. Ways in which the client's housing situation was improved (N=9)

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

Source: HTF Program Participant Survey, 2012.

Seven of nine respondents reported that they had received referrals for mental health services or supports for themselves. Of those, all found the services helpful. Specifically, participants noted that the mental health services have connected them to medication, that they feel less stress, and generally feel better about themselves (Figure 12).

12. Referral for mental health services or support (N=9)

	Yes	No
Have you received any referrals for mental health services or supports, such as Goodwill Easter Seals or Wilder, from the East Side Family Center in the last year? (N=9)	7/9	2/9
If yes, have the mental health service referrals been helpful? (N=7)	7/7	-

Please describe how the referrals have or have not been helpful? (N=7)

I'm able to monitor and stay on my medications.
I am dealing better with my depression, being able to keep my appointments because they are offered at the school. They have also made a home visit to my home.
Basically we have learned why my son act's the way he does. I have learned to take control of my son's anger, outburst, and criminal activity.
They help me get back on my medication.
My husband is in counseling and we both have marriage counseling. That's all I know now.
Because I was able to talk about my nervous system with a counselor. I had two sessions and I'm much better now. I had experience some mild depression.
They help me with school supplies and that makes me feel less stressful.

Four of nine respondents reported that they had received referral for mental health services for their child or children in the previous year. Of those, all found the referrals helpful. Parents reported that their child's mental health issues are being addressed through medication and therapy (Figure 13).

13. Referral for mental health services or support for children

	Yes	No
Have your children received any referrals for mental health services or supports, such as Goodwill Easter Seals or Wilder, from East Side Family Center in the last year? (N=9)	4/9	5/9
If yes, have the mental health service referrals been helpful? (N=4)	4/4	0/4
Please describe how the referrals have or have not been helpful? (N=4)		
It kept my daughter out of trouble at school. It gave her someone to talk to like a support system for her.		
We have a diagnosis from Wilder now (Wilder staff). Before this we did not know what my grandson had.		
They have given me referrals so that I can get started dealing with my mental issues.		
My daughter is under control with her medication. She feel's good about seeing a psychologist.		

Asked if they would be better prepared to solve a housing problem in the future because of the services or referrals they received from the HTF program, each of the nine respondents answered “yes.” When asked in an open-ended question to describe how they were better prepared, participants 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 the HTF program, each respondents answered “yes.” When asked in what ways things had improved, participants indicated greater family involvement and relationships, improved mental health and well-being, and better conditions for their children and families (Figure A2).

Issues for consideration

Overall, Housing Trust Fund participants rated their satisfaction with the HTF program services highly. Asked for suggestions for improving the program, clients suggested assistance with housing-related finances, including help with rent, and increasing hours of availability and staff.

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 15 clients who received services at some point during the 2011-2012 school year. At the time of this report, 10 families were still engaged in case management services. Two families were discharged from the program.

This section describes the demographics and community credentials, baseline self-reliance scores, and an analysis of change in self-reliance experienced by the 15 clients who received services during the 2011-2012 school year. 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. The following describes the baseline self-reliance of each client upon intake into the HTF program for clients who received services in 2011-2012 school year, as well as improvement for each client. Participants served during this time period were enrolled in the HTF program for between 14 and 82 months, with an average of 45 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, 60 percent of HTF clients were unemployed. As of the last assessment, 40 percent remained unemployed.
- The percentage of clients whose current education was adequate for current employment increased from 53 percent at baseline to 80 percent as of the last assessment.

- As of the last assessment, 93 percent of HTF clients were able to meet both food and housing expenses in a given month, compared to 33 percent at baseline. All reported paying less than or equal to 30 percent of their income for housing.
- At baseline, nearly all (93%) clients reported poor or no credit. As of the most recent assessment, six clients (40%) had begun to restore or establish good credit.
- Most (73%) clients reported inadequate transportation at baseline. As of the most recent assessment, 80 percent reported adequate transportation.
- Clients had improved their child or children’s pre-school enrollment. As of the last assessment, most (4 of 5 families) school-aged children were attending school on a regular basis.

Demographics

Of the 15 clients served during the 2011-2012 school year, two-thirds were female (67%). Thirty-three percent identified as African-American, 40 percent as Hispanic or Latino, and 20 percent as Asian (Figure 14).

14. Respondent demographics (N=15)

Demographics	Number
Gender	Female
	67%
Race/ethnicity	Male
	33%
Race/ethnicity	Black, African-American, or African
	33%
	Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano
	40%
	Asian or Pacific Islander
	20%
	20%
	0%

^a Participants may have indicated more than one racial/ethnic background.

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 50 percent had a Minnesota driver's license. All clients had telephone or voice mail access (100%). Slightly fewer clients had an open bank account (43%) or library card (43%) (Figure 15).

15. Community credentials at first assessment (N=14-15)

At first assessment does participant have:	Yes	No	Don't know	Credential not needed or obtainable
Social Security Card	67%	20%	-	7%
Minnesota driver's license	50%	50%	-	-
Minnesota identification card	27%	60%	-	7%
Voter registration	36%	43%	14%	7%
Birth certificate	46%	31%	23%	-
Medical ID card	57%	29%	14%	-
Telephone or voice mail access	100%	-	-	-
Library card	43%	57%	-	7%
Bank account	43%	50%	-	7%
Alien registration card (green card)	50%	14%	-	33%

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

Employment, education, and financial issues

At baseline, 60 percent of HTF clients were unemployed. As of their most recent assessment, 40 percent of clients remained unemployed (Figure 16).

Analyses of change indicates that seven clients improved their employment, and six improved their job stability status. Two clients maintained low levels of employment and job retention, and four clients experienced a decline in employment (Figures 17-19).

16. Employment status (N=15)

Employment status	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
Unemployed	9 (60%)	6 (40%)
Working < 15 hours per week	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
Working 15-19 hours per week	-	
Working 20-24 hours per week	-	1 (7%)
Working 25-29 hours per week	-	1 (7%)
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Working 30 – 34 hours per week	3 (20%)	1 (7%)
Working 35 – 40 hours per week	1 (7%)	4 (27%)
Other		
Unable to work/retired	1 (7%)	1 (7%)

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

17. Job retention and stability (N=15)

Job retention and stability	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
Unemployed	9 (60%)	6 (40%)
Worked less than one month at current job		
Worked one month but less than three months at current job		1 (7%)
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Worked three months but less than six months at current job	2 (13%)	1 (7%)
Worked six months or longer at current job	3 (20%)	6 (40%)
Other		
Unable to work or retired	1 (7%)	1 (7%)

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

18. Change in employment status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	7	47%
Maintained – high	-	-
Maintained – low	2	15%
Declined	4	31%

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

19. Change in job retention status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	6	40%
Maintained – high	2	13%
Maintained – low	2	13%
Declined	3	20%

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

Overall, more than half (53%) 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, 47 percent of clients assessed did not have enough formal education to meet their employment needs. As of their most recent assessment, 80 percent had adequate education for their current employment but not advancement, and 13 percent had adequate education for advancement (Figures 20-21).

20. Education (N=15)

	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
Formal education not adequate to meet employment needs	7 (47%)	1 (7%)
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Formal education adequate for current employment but not for work advancement	8 (53%)	12 (80%)
Formal education adequate for current employment and advancement	-	2 (13%)

21. Change in education status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	8	53%
Maintained – high	6	40%
Maintained – low	1	7%
Declined	-	-

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

Self-reliance assessments also ask the case manager to indicate clients' sources of income, including whether they receive no income, only public cash benefits, a combination of public cash benefits and earned income, or only earned income. At baseline assessment, just under half (47%) 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 22-23).

22. Income source (N=15)

Income source	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
No income	-	2 (13%)
Public cash benefits/no earned income	5 (33%)	2 (13%)
More than 50% public cash benefits/some earned income	2 (13%)	2 (13%)
Higher levels of self-reliance		
More than 50% earned income/some public cash benefits	1 (7%)	4 (27%)
Earned income/no public cash benefits	7 (47%)	5 (33%)

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

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

23. Change in income source status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	6	40%
Maintained – high	3	20%
Maintained – low	1	7%
Declined	5	33%

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

Financial concerns were a serious issue for many clients. At the time of the first assessment, only one-third (33%) of clients were able to meet both their food and housing expenses. Nine clients (60%) showed improvement in the adequacy of their income for food and shelter, and one-third (33%) maintained high levels of self-reliance in this area (Figures 24-25).

24. Adequacy of income for food and shelter (N=15)

Adequacy of income for food and shelter	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
Unable to meet food AND housing expenses during the last month	2 (13%)	-
Able to meet food OR housing expenses during the last month	8 (53%)	1 (7%)
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Able to meet BOTH food and housing expenses during the last month	5 (33%)	14 (93%)

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

25. Change in income adequacy status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	9	60%
Maintained – high	5	33%
Maintained – low	1	7%
Declined	-	-

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

While some improvements were seen in the quality of clients' credit from baseline to last assessment, credit remains a challenge for many clients. At baseline, nearly all (93%) clients reported poor or no credit. As of the most recent assessment, six clients (40%) had begun to restore or establish good credit (Figures 26-27).

26. Quality of credit (N=15)

Quality of credit	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
No credit	6 (40%)	7 (47%)
Poor credit	8 (53%)	2 (13%)
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Restoring credit or beginning to establish credit	1 (7%)	6 (40%)
Good credit or credit restored	-	-

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

27. Change in quality of credit status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	5	33%
Maintained – high	1	7%
Maintained – low	8	53%
Declined	1	7%

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

Housing issues

At baseline, 40 percent of clients served during the 2011-2012 school year were homeless. Six clients (33%) improved their housing stability while in HTF, and three maintained high levels of housing stability self-reliance (Figures 28-29).

28. Housing stability (N=15)

Housing stability	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
Homeless	6 (40%)	-
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Subsidized rental housing	3 (20%)	15 (100%)
Market rate rental housing	6 (40%)	-

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

29. Change in housing status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	6	40%
Maintained – high	3	20%
Maintained – low	-	-
Declined	6	40%

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

At baseline, 73 percent of clients reported paying more than 50 percent of their income for housing. As of their last assessment, 100 percent of clients were paying less than or equal to 30 percent of their income for housing; twelve clients had experienced improvement in housing affordability, and three had maintained high levels of self-reliance (Figures 30-31).

30. Housing affordability (N=15)

Housing affordability	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
Pays more than 50% of income for housing	11 (73%)	-
Pays less than 50% but more than 30% for housing	1 (7%)	-
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Pays less than or equal to 30% of income for housing	3 (20%)	15 (100%)

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

31. Change in housing affordability status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	12	80%
Maintained – high	3	20%
Maintained – low	-	-
Declined	-	-

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

At baseline, nearly half of clients (47%) reported low levels of self-reliance related to tenant/landlord relationships. As of their last assessment, five clients had improved their self-reliance, and six had maintained high levels of self-reliance (Figures 32-33).

32. Tenant/landlord relationship (N=15)

Tenant/landlord relationship	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
Last tenant/landlord relationship failed – tenant evicted or lease not renewed	4 (27%)	-
Program needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue more than once since last assessment	1 (7%)	4 (27%)
Program needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue only once since last assessment	2 (13%)	4 (27%)
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Program not needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue since last assessment	8 (53%)	7 (47%)

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

33. Change in tenant/landlord relationship status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	5	33%
Maintained – high	6	40%
Maintained – low	2	13%
Declined	2	13%

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

Physical and mental health issues

Most case management clients had public health insurance at their baseline assessment; at the last assessment, 60 percent had public health insurance benefits, while 13 percent had private health insurance for some or all members of their households. At the last assessment, one-quarter (27%) had public health insurance for only some household members (Figures 34-35).

34. Household health care coverage (N=15)

Household health care coverage	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
No insurance for any household members	2 (13%)	-
Public health insurance benefits for some household members	2 (13%)	4 (27%)
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Public health insurance benefits for all household members	11 (73%)	9 (60%)
Private insurance for all household members	-	2 (13%)

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

35. Change in household healthcare coverage status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	1	7%
Maintained – high	9	60%
Maintained – low	2	13%
Declined	1	7%

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

Child well-being

The case manager assessed several aspects of child well-being. As of the last assessment, one family had a newly opened child protection case (Figures 36-37).

36. Child protection (N=15)

Child protection	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Lower levels of self-reliance		
Child protection case open – child/children not with parent	-	-
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Child protection case closed	1 (7%)	2 (13%)
Family does not have a child protection case (open or closed)	14 (93%)	13 (87%)

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

37. Change in child protection status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	-	-
Maintained – high	14	93%
Maintained – low	-	-
Declined	1	7%

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

At baseline, about half of clients (53%) reported that none of their eligible children were enrolled in pre-school programs. Of those families, only one still had a child who was eligible for pre-school service not enrolled in services (Figures 38-39).

38. Enrollment in pre-school programs (N=15)

Preschool	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
None of the eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services	8 (53%)	1 (7%)
Some but not all of the eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services	-	-
Higher levels of self-reliance		
All eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services	1 (7%)	4 (27%)
Other		
No children in need of pre-school services	6 (40%)	10 (67%)

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

Note: Pre-school programs include ECFE, Head Start, and center-based child care.

39. Change in preschool enrollment status (N=4)

	N	%
Improved	2	50%
Maintained – high	1	25%
Maintained – low	1	25%
Declined	-	-

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

At baseline most families (93%) 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 40-41).

40. School attendance (N=15)

School attendance	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
None of the school-age children attending school on a regular basis	1 (7%)	-
Some but not all school-age children attending school on a regular basis	-	-
Higher levels of self-reliance		
All school-age children attending school on a regular basis	15 (93%)	15 (100%)

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

41. Change in school attendance status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	1	7%
Maintained – high	14	93%
Maintained – low	-	-
Declined	-	-

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

At baseline, one-third (33%) of clients reported that they were eligible for child support but were not receiving full benefit; this remained constant as of the most recent assessment. (Figures 42-43)

42. Child support income (N=15)

Child support income	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
Eligible for child support, no income benefit	5 (33%)	5 (33%)
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Eligible for child support, partial benefit	1 (7%)	2 (13%)
Eligible for child support, full benefit	1 (7%)	-
Other		
Not applicable	8 (53%)	8 (53%)

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

43. Change in child support income status (N=6)

	N	%
Improved	-	-
Maintained – high	1	17%
Maintained – low	4	67%
Declined	1	17%

Source: Self-Reliance Progress Form.

At baseline, 46 percent of clients reported inadequate access to child care. As of the most recent assessment, only one family was experiencing inadequate child care (Figures 44-45).

44. Child care (N=15)

Child care	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
No child care available	5 (33%)	-
Child care available but inadequate to meet need	2 (13%)	1 (7%)
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Child care is available and adequate with subsidy	2 (13%)	2 (13%)
Child care is available and adequate without subsidy	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
Other		
No child care needed	5 (33%)	11 (73%)

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

45. Change in child care status (N=4)

	N	%
Improved	2	50%
Maintained – high	1	25%
Maintained – low	-	-
Declined	1	25%

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

While most families (93%) reported that immunizations were up-to-date for all children in the household, immunizations are not up-to-date for children of one client (Figures 46-47).

46. Child immunizations (N=15)

Child immunizations	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
Immunizations are not up-to-date for any of the children in the household	-	-
Immunizations are up-to-date for some but not all of the children in the household	3 (20%)	1 (7%)
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Immunizations are up-to-date for all of the children in the household	12 (80%)	14 (93%)

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

47. Change in child immunizations status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	3	20%
Maintained – high	11	73%
Maintained – low	-	-
Declined	1	7%

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. All three clients reported improvements in children having a regular pediatrician or clinic from baseline to last assessment (Figures 48-49).

48. Child's medical needs (N=15)

Child's medical needs	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
None of the children in the household have a regular pediatrician or clinic	2 (13%)	-
Some of the children have a regular pediatrician or clinic	1 (7%)	-
Higher levels of self-reliance		
All children in the household have a regular pediatrician or clinic	12 (80%)	15 (100%)

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

49. Change in child medical needs status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	3	20%
Maintained – high	12	80%
Maintained – low	-	-
Declined	-	-

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 (73%) clients reported inadequate transportation at baseline. As of the last assessment, nine clients experienced improvements in transportation adequacy, and two reported continued inadequate transportation (Figures 50-51).

50. Transportation (N=15)

Transportation	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
Transportation not adequate to meet daily needs	2 (13%)	-
Transportation adequate to meet some but not all daily needs	9 (60%)	3 (2%)
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Transportation adequate to meet daily needs	4 (27%)	12 (80%)

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

51. Change in transportation status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	9	60%
Maintained – high	4	27%
Maintained – low	2	13%
Declined	-	-

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

At baseline most clients (80%) reported inadequate social support. One-third (33%) of clients reported improvement in social support at last assessment, while 47 percent continued to report inadequate social support (Figures 52-53).

52. Social support (N=15)

Social support	Baseline assessment N (%)	Last assessment N (%)
Low levels of self-reliance		
Little or no support from family, friends, or community support groups	2 (13%)	-
Some social support, not usually adequate	10 (67%)	9 (60%)
Higher levels of self-reliance		
Adequate social support	3 (20%)	6 (40%)

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

53. Change in social support status (N=15)

	N	%
Improved	5	33%
Maintained – high	3	20%
Maintained – low	7	47%
Declined	-	-

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. At the time of this report, two clients exited the HTF program. Exit questions were recorded for one client; due to this small sample size, results are not reported here.

Issues for consideration

Figure 54 identifies the change in self-reliance for clients served during the 2011-12 school year for all indicators.

54. Change in self-reliance status for all indicators (N=4-15)

	% Improved	% Maintained high	% Maintained low	% Declined
Employment	47%	-	15%	31%
Job retention	40%	13%	13%	20%
Education status	53%	40%	7%	-
Income source	40%	20%	7%	33%
Income adequacy	60%	33%	7%	-
Quality of credit	33%	7%	53%	7%
Housing stability	40%	20%	-	40%
Housing affordability	80%	20%	-	-
Tenant/landlord relationship	33%	40%	13%	13%
Household healthcare coverage	7%	60%	13%	7%
Child protection	-	93%	-	7%
Enrollment in pre-school	50%	25%	25%	-
School attendance	7%	93%	-	-
Child support income	-	17%	67%	17%
Child care	50%	25%	-	25%
Child immunizations	20%	73%	-	7%
Child's medical needs	20%	80%	-	-
Transportation	60%	27%	13%	-
Social support	33%	20%	47%	-

Source: *Self-Reliance Progress Form.*

Thirteen of 15 clients included in the analysis of changes from baseline to last assessment were continuing to receive services from the HTF program at the time of this report. Despite overall improvements in a number of areas, clients continued to face challenges to their self-reliance. As they plan future program services, staff 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, 40 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.
- *Housing.* While clients reported high levels of self-sufficiency of their current housing, it is known that the program offers time-limited housing support for families. Program staff should continue to explore options for families to retain affordable housing in the absence of a housing voucher.
- *Child support.* At the most recent assessment, about half of clients were eligible for child support but were not receiving income benefit, or were not receiving their full benefit. Continue to encourage clients to pursue child support benefits, perhaps through Life Skills classes or one-on-one skill building.
- *Quality of credit.* Nearly two-thirds of clients reported having no or poor credit at the time of the last assessment. Continue to provide training and support to improve credit histories of clients.
- *Tenant/landlord relationship.* About half (54%) of clients reported low levels of self-reliance related to landlord/tenant issues, meaning that program staff needed to intervene at least once in the previous six months. Continue to build confidence and skills among clients to work directly with their landlords to resolve conflicts.
- *Social support.* Although there were improvements, nearly two-thirds (60%) 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 HTF clients to attend these activities and supporting other ways of improving clients' informal support systems.

Student success

Student attendance

One of the program goals established for 2009-2012 stated that three-quarters (75%) of school-aged children in HTF show improved attendance and academics. As of the end of the 2011-12 school year, 22 children whose families participated in EHOP and HTF were enrolled at John A. Johnson Elementary School. Children were enrolled in kindergarten through 5th grade. Attendance data was missing or very limited for six children; therefore, the results for the 2011-12 school year below reflect the attendance of 16 children only.

Student attendance is tracked by EHOP program staff. On average, students experienced fewer tardies in May 2012 compared to May 2011. Students experienced fewer excused and unexcused absences in May 2012 compared to May 2011 (Figure 55).

55. Proportion of tardies and absences by student

	May 2009 (N=16)	May 2010 (N=16)	May 2011 (N=21)	May 2011 (N=16)
Tardy (to class and school)	11.1	7.6	8.8	3.25
Excused absences	1.1	5.2	4.3	<1.0
Unexcused absences	3.1	1.6	1.8	
Suspended	0	0.1	0.1	n/a

Academic achievement

In addition to student attendance, ESFC program staff also track academic achievement of students whose families are enrolled the housing program. Three HTF students are receiving Special Education Services and have Individualized Education Plans (IEP). (Figure 56).

At the end of the 2010-11 school year, nine students were reading at their grade level; additionally, fewer students were two or more grade levels delayed at the end of the school year, compared to October 2010. Each student (100%) with multiple screenings increased his or her reading level between October 2010 to June 2011. This met the goal of 75 percent of HTF students improving their academic performance. Reading scores for students are assessed by the Wright Group McGraw Hill reading assessment.

56. Reading level (Wright Group McGraw Hill assessment) (N=16-20)

	October 2010	January 2011	March 2011	June 2011
At grade level	0	2	5	9
One grade or less delayed	7	9	7	6
Two or more grade levels delayed	9	7	7	5

Source: John A. Johnson attendance records.

Issues for consideration

Improving child attendance and academic achievement is a goal for this program year. While academic achievement of children enrolled in the housing program did improve, attendance declined during the 2010-11 school year but improved again during 2011-12. 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 the HTF program is to increase the number of students who stay at Johnson throughout the school year (and year to year). The program is using the stability index used by the Saint Paul Public Schools as the broadest measure of its impact. The stability index is defined as the number of students enrolled at the school 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 goal is for Johnson to increase the student stability index at Johnson to 90 percent, the current stability rate of the Saint Paul School District.

Results

Figure 64 shows that the Johnson stability index has fluctuated in individual years. The index had increased in the previous school year (2010-11), above the goal of attaining a student stability index of 90 percent, but dropped to 83 percent for the most recent school year (2011-12) (Figure 57).

57. Johnson Elementary School stability index

Indicator	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-2012
Enrollment (October 1 official count)	299	297	330	263	301
Stability index ^a	86%	88%	86%	91%	83%

^a *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 65 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 91 percent in 2006-07 and 2008-09, and 92 percent in 2009-10 and 2010-2011 (Figure 58).

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

	School	Stability Index ^a				
		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Achievement Plus	John A. Johnson	82%	86%	88%	86%	91%
	Dayton's Bluff	81%	78%	82%	86%	85%
East Side neighborhood schools	Bruce Vento	83%	81%	87%	86%	88%
	Phalen Lake	85%	88%	89%	91%	92%
	Ames	86%	82%	81%	89%	-
	Sheridan	87%	88%	90%	90%	-
	Hayden Heights	89%	88%	85%	94%	-
	Eastern Heights	84%	87%	86%	90%	-
	Prosperity Heights	90%	87%	89%	95%	-
	Some other neighborhood schools	North End	81%	79%	77%	88%
	Como Park	82%	85%	83%	83%	86%
	Chelsea Heights	91%	93%	93%	91%	93%
	Groveland Park	92%	91%	92%	93%	92%
	Mann	97%	96%	98%	97%	-
	Hancock-Hamline	95%	94%	95%	95%	92%
Some magnet schools	Battle Creek Elementary	94%	94%	95%	96%	93%
	Farnsworth	95%	97%	96%	95%	96%
	Jackson	89%	92%	91%	94%	94%
	Nokomis	97%	96%	97%	96%	98%
	Capitol Hill	97%	98%	98%	98%	98%
All elementary schools		91%	91%	91%	92%	92%

^a Stability index: Students enrolled 160 or more days divided by enrollment on October 1.

Source: Data provided by Saint Paul Public Schools.

Issues for consideration

After increasing between 2007-2011, the student stability rate decreased slightly in 2011-12 to 83 percent. It remains important to assess stability over time, to identify any upward or downward trends. The Saint Paul School District has experienced stable stability for the past five years.

Appendix

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=9)	9	0
In what ways would you say you are better prepared to solve your housing problems? (N=9)		
Landlord/tenant responsibilities and communication		
I'm more educated on this issue. I know better now of what my duty is and what duties the landlord has.		
I have more communication skills to talk to the landlord.		
Money management		
The taught me how to save money to pay bills.		
Resources and referrals		
Because I have a list of resources now. I am not afraid to look for assistance now because I was undocumented four years ago when I started this program.		
Because I have a job now. We also learned how to get help from other programs.		
I would know who and where to go if I need help.		
Because we are better informed of the community agencies in the area. We know how to look and write down the areas or problems we need to ask about.		
Other comments		
All of the knowledge I have now.		
Because I have attended all of the classes and am more informed.		

A2. Improvements in other areas

	Yes	No
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=9)	9	0
In what other ways have things improved? (N=9)		
Family involvement and relationships		
How to teach or educate my children. How to help them with their homework. We are better united as a family.		
We have a set routine now. We eat together now. We do more things together as a family. It has improved our family 100%.		
I'm going to collect for the first time. Me and my son are closer to each other now, a way better relationship with him.		
Mental health and wellbeing		
I'm learning how to deal and control the issues that my 12 year old son has.		
Better conditions for children and family		
Because we have a place to stay, we are less stressed, so we are more focused on life, schooling for the kids, etc.		
Because they help us save money for my kids.		
I'm just less stressed. They're more happy because we're in a cleaner home without seeing mice run around.		
WE received utility assistance and we were able to keep the lights on. My daughter has a bus to come take her to school now.		
We are less stressful now. We can feel the heavy burden taken off. We can enjoy and spend more time with our families.		

Self-reliance instrument

Self-Reliance Progress Form

Program Name			
Participant Information			
Last name, First Name, MI		Participant ID#	Intake Date ____/____/____
Racial/Ethnic Background: <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			
Hispanic origin? <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No	Gender <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Male <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Female	Number of adults in household (18 +)	Number of children in household (17 or younger)
<p>INSTRUCTIONS: 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). Read each item in the scale to determine the level that best describes this participant's situation. Enter the corresponding number in the box on the right, (in the column marked "<i>score</i>"). Enter the <i>date</i> of the rating in order to provide an accurate measure of the time interval between ratings.</p>			
Employment Status			
1	Employment Status Scale	Score	Date
	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		
Job Retention and Stability			
2	Job Retention and Stability Scale	Score	Date
	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	Income Sources Scale	Score Date
	1 = No income	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Public cash benefits/no earned income	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = More than 50% public cash benefits/some earned income	3 _____ / ____ / ____
	4 = More than 50% earned income/some public cash benefits	4 _____ / ____ / ____
	5 = Earned income/no public cash benefits	5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____
<p><i>NOTE: Public cash benefits include MFIP, GA & SSI, and child support. Earned income includes employment income, SSDI, Veterans benefits, Retirement benefits, Social Security.</i></p>		
Child Support Income		
4	Child Support Income Scale	Score Date
	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	Adequacy of Income for Food and Shelter Scale	Score Date
	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	Quality of Credit Scale	Score Date
	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	Housing Stability Scale	Score Date
	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	Section 8 Status Scale	Score Date
	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	Housing Affordability Scale	Score Date
	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	Household Health Care Coverage Scale	Score Date
	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 ___ / ___ / ___
NOTE: Public insurance includes Medicaid (MA), Minnesota Care, Medicare, etc. Private insurance includes Portico.		

Child Care		
11	Child Care Scale	Score Date
	1 = No child care available	1 ___ / ___ / ___
	2 = Child care available but inadequate to meet need	2 ___ / ___ / ___
	3 = Child care is available & adequate with subsidy	3 ___ / ___ / ___
	4 = Child care is available & adequate without subsidy	4 ___ / ___ / ___
	9 = No child care needed	5 ___ / ___ / ___
		6 ___ / ___ / ___
Education		
12	Education Scale	Score Date
	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	Transportation Scale	Score Date
	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	Social Support Scale	Score Date
	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	Tenant/Landlord Relationship Scale	Score Date
	1 = Most recent tenant/landlord relationship failed – tenant evicted or lease not renewed	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Program needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue more than once since last assessment	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Program needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue only once since last assessment	3 _____ / ____ / ____
	4 = Program not needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue since last assessment	4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____
Child Protection Case		
16	Child Protection Scale	Score Date
	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 _____ / ____ / ____
Child's Immunization Scale		
17	Child's Immunization Scale	Score Date
	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 _____ / ____ / ____
Child's Medical Needs		
18	Child's Medical Needs Scale	Score Date
	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	Enrollment in Pre-school Programs Scale	Score	Date
	1 = None of the eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services	1	___/___/___
	2 = Some but not all of the eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services	2	___/___/___
	3 = All eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services	3	___/___/___
	9 = No children in need of pre-school services	4	___/___/___
		5	___/___/___
		6	___/___/___

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

School attendance			
20	School Attendance Scale	Score	Date
	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	___/___/___
	“Regular basis” is defined as school attendance on at least 85% of the eligible school days	5	___/___/___
		6	___/___/___

ASSESSMENT SECTION

Mental Health Assessment			
21	Mental Health Scale	Score	Date
	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	Chemical Dependency Scale	Score	Date
	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	Domestic Abuse Scale	Score Date
	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	Tenant Training Scale	Score Date
	1 = Participant not attending recommended tenant training classes	1 _____ / ____ / ____
	2 = Participant attended some but not all recommended tenant training classes since last assessment	2 _____ / ____ / ____
	3 = Participant attended all recommended tenant training classes since last assessment	3 _____ / ____ / ____
		4 _____ / ____ / ____
		5 _____ / ____ / ____
		6 _____ / ____ / ____

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

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

This page is to be completed ONLY at program exit.

Supportive Services				
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 ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈
Life skills (not case management)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈
Alcohol or drug services	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈
Mental health services	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈
Health care services	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈
Domestic abuse services	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈
Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈
Housing placement	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈
Employment assistance	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈
Child care	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈
Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈
Legal	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈
Child protection	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈
Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ₁ <input type="checkbox"/> No ₂ <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know ₈