



Neighborhood House East Side Housing Trust Fund Evaluation Report

Results for the 2013-14 school year

J A N U A R Y 2 0 1 5

Prepared by:
Stephanie Nelson-Dusek

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Program overview.....	1
Evaluation.....	2
Summary of findings.....	3
Student success.....	6
Stability.....	6
Attendance.....	7
Reading levels.....	8
Client self-reliance.....	9
Demographics.....	9
Community credentials.....	10
Housing issues.....	11
Employment, education, and financial issues.....	11
Health care and well being.....	12
Child well-being.....	13
Other issues.....	14
Client satisfaction.....	16
Participant information.....	16
Household situation.....	18
Program participation.....	19
Client satisfaction.....	21
Program impact.....	22
Issues to consider.....	25
Appendix.....	26
Additional data tables: Participant survey.....	28
Client satisfaction survey instrument.....	32
Self-reliance instrument.....	43

Figures

1.	Johnson Elementary School stability index.....	6
2.	Student stability at select Saint Paul Public Schools.....	7
3.	Average number of tardies, absences, and suspensions	8
4.	Reading levels for school year 2013-14	8
5.	Respondent demographics.....	10
6.	Community credentials at first assessment	10
7.	Change in self-reliance for housing issues	11
8.	Change in self-reliance for employment, education, and finances.....	12
9.	Change in self-reliance for health care and well-being	13
10.	Change in self-reliance for child well-being	13
11.	Change in self-reliance for other issues	14
12.	Change in self-reliance status for all indicators	14
13.	Respondent demographics and information	16
14.	Current housing	18
15.	Rent costs	18
16.	Reasons for seeking help from the HTF program	19
17.	Help with housing-related needs	20
18.	Help with other needs.....	20
19.	Attendance at HTF classes	21
20.	Rating the HTF program	21
21.	Ways housing situation has improved.....	23

Acknowledgments

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

Judy Davis
Joan Schlecht
Malena Vang

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

Mark Anton
Surin Assawajaroenkook
Jenny Bohlke
Jackie Campeau
Marilyn Conrad
Madeleine Hansen
Monica Idzelis Rothe
Miguel Salazar

Introduction

Program overview

The East Side Housing Trust Fund (HTF) program takes a community-wide approach to increasing housing stability. A venture of the Neighborhood House's East Side Family Center (ESFC), the program works to demonstrate that neighborhoods, foundations, landlords, schools, businesses, government entities, private investors, and service organizations can work together to create family and neighborhood stability and vitality. To this end, HTF partners with school staff, landlords, and community agencies to offer resources and referrals for a variety of issues that may pose challenges to self-reliance, such as employment, mental health, transportation, and child care. The program is housed at John A. Johnson Achievement Plus Elementary School and is meant for families with children attending the school.

The Housing Trust Fund provides case management and housing placement services to help families find and maintain decent, safe, and affordable rental and owner-occupied housing. As a first step toward receiving services, staff request that each client who wants to improve their housing situation complete a Family Housing Plan. The Plan includes questions regarding the family's financial information and current housing concerns.

After receiving a Family Housing Plan, the case manager completes an intake form 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. HTF works to reduce the mobility of families who rent by addressing rental housing quality, affordability, availability, and landlord and tenant issues.

Program staff 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 issues through direct communication with the landlords, code enforcement, legal remedies, and also through encouraging other, more supportive landlords to purchase the properties in question.

In addition to the other services provided by HTF, the Life Skills Education Program offers classes and provides tools for strengthening families and helping them stabilize their housing situations.

Evaluation

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

This year, self-reliance assessments were completed for seven clients. The same number of clients participated in the client satisfaction survey; however, they were not necessarily the same group of people. There was attendance data available for 11 children and reading level data for 13 children. Readers should interpret all findings with caution, as the number of participants involved in the evaluation is small.

Summary of findings

This report focuses on HTF program services provided during the 2013-14 school year. A summary of this year's findings is presented below.

Student success

The student stability rate for Johnson Elementary School during the 2013-14 school year was 83 percent, which is slightly lower than the previous school year (86%) and lower than the average of all Saint Paul public schools (89%).

Attendance data were available for 11 children and reading level data were available for 13 children of the families that participated in the HTF program. While the attendance of children enrolled in the housing program did improve, reading levels generally declined. It is important to keep in mind, however, that when children are significantly behind (one or two full grade levels), it will take longer for them to catch up. Program staff should explore barriers to improved reading levels, but also consider using more finely tuned measurements for tracking the progress of children throughout the school year.

As discussed later in the report, the measures currently used to track student success in this evaluation are not necessarily reflective of the success of the Housing Trust Fund program, since the program has little influence on areas such as reading or overall student stability. Therefore, it is Wilder's recommendation that we explore other options for tracking HTF student success.

Client self-reliance

During the 2013-14 school year, there were seven clients for whom matched baseline and follow-up data were available. While this is a smaller number of clients than in previous years, there were important improvements to self-reliance, particularly in the areas of housing affordability, employment, income, and quality of credit.

- **Housing affordability.** All seven clients either improved or maintained high levels of self-reliance in the area of housing affordability. Out of all of the areas tested, housing affordability showed the greatest improvement.
- **Employment, income, and credit.** Four clients each improved their income adequacy, employment status, and quality of credit, while three improved their job retention and income source, meaning that they earned some or all of their income, as opposed to receiving only public cash benefits.

Three clients were also able to improve in the areas of tenant/landlord relationships, transportation, and social support; however two clients each declined in their landlord relationship and social support, while two maintained low levels of self-reliance in the area of transportation.

Several clients were also able to maintain already high levels of self-reliance in the areas of health care coverage and children's well-being, namely their medical needs (ensuring that children have a regular pediatrician or clinic), school attendance, immunizations, and child protection status.

- **Health care coverage.** Most case management clients had public health insurance benefits for all of their household members at their baseline assessment; five clients maintained high levels of self-reliance.
- **Child well-being.** Six clients were able to maintain high levels of self-reliance around their children's medical needs, five maintained high self-reliance around school attendance, and four each maintained high levels of self-reliance regarding immunizations and child protection, although it should be noted that self-reliance in terms of child protection status declined for three people.

Clients continued to struggle with their housing stability, which showed the most amount of decline of any area on the self-reliance form, as well as their own education.

HTF program staff have expressed concerns about the decline in housing stability; however, it should be noted that a similar decline was reported last year, where 35 percent (or 6 of 17 clients with available follow-up information) were shown to have a decline in housing stability since their baseline assessment; the decline may be more noticeable this year, given the smaller number of clients assessed. In addition, the level of "decline" can mean different things; for example, it is possible that a client was on the border of the "maintain high" category (i.e. "subsidized rental housing) only to move down one level (i.e. transitional housing (time limited) into the "maintain low" category. See the Appendix for an explanation of how Wilder defined the "maintain high" versus "maintain low" categories.

- **Housing stability.** Three clients improved their housing stability; however four declined in this area.
- **Education.** At their baseline assessment, five clients reported not having the formal education necessary to meet employment needs, while the remaining two had formal education, but not enough for work advancement. At their most recent assessment, these numbers stayed largely the same, with only one client showing improvement.

Client satisfaction

In addition to examining clients' self-reliance, this evaluation gauges clients' satisfaction with the HTF program. Several highlights from the interviews are listed below:

- Five out of seven participants rated their overall satisfaction with services provided by the HTF program as “outstanding.”
- All participants were satisfied with the knowledge and skills of program staff (five said they were “outstanding” and two said they were “good”).
- 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. Most commonly, clients felt that they had better landlords and that their current home is more secure.
- 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.
- Four out of seven adult clients enrolled in the program had received referrals for mental health supports, and four participants reported that their children had received mental health referrals. Participants generally felt these referrals were helpful.
- Five out of seven participants indicated that things had improved for them or their families in other ways besides housing because of the help or referrals they received from the HTF program. Participants noted that they had happier and more stable families, improved well-being for children, and better budgeting and financial skills.

Student success

Stability

Student stability is important to both the HTF program and Johnson Elementary School as a whole, which previously set a goal of achieving (and maintaining) a 90 percent stability rate. In order to monitor overall student stability, Wilder Research uses the Stability Index, generated each year by Saint Paul Public Schools. Stability is determined by the number of students enrolled at the school for 160 days or more during the school year, divided by the official enrollment count at the school on October 1. This measures the proportion of students who stay at the school for the whole school year. Higher percentages indicate greater stability.

Figure 1 shows that stability at Johnson Elementary School has fluctuated over the years. During the 2010-11 school year, stability was at a high point of 91 percent; this year it is 83 percent. While the overall rate for Johnson Elementary School is 83 percent, HTF program staff report that, for their families, students have a 100 percent stability rate.

1. Johnson Elementary School stability index

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Enrollment	300	303	330	263	301	349	398
Stability index ^a	86%	88%	86%	91%	83%	86%	83%

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

For comparison purposes, Figure 2 shows the stability rates over the past six 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, East Side neighborhood schools, and some magnet schools.

Johnson Elementary School has a stability rate that is slightly below the average of all Saint Paul elementary schools (89%), as well as other East Side neighborhood schools, such as Bruce F. Vento (86%) and Eastern Heights (88%). It is similar, however, to Dayton's Bluff (82%).

That being said, it should be noted that the HTF program has little influence on student stability for the overall population of Johnson Elementary School. As the evaluation moves forward, it is worth considering the importance of measuring overall stability, given that the program does not have an impact at that level.

2. Student stability at select Saint Paul Public Schools

		Stability Index ^a						
		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Achievement Plus schools	John A. Johnson	86%	88%	86%	91%	83%	86%	83%
	Dayton's Bluff	78%	82%	86%	85%	81%	85%	82%
	St. Paul Music Academy	86%	86%	89%	84%	92%	95%	90%
East Side neighborhood schools	Bruce F. Vento	81%	87%	87%	88%	87%	87%	86%
	Eastern Heights	87%	86%	90%	88%	86%	86%	88%
	Frost Lake	93%	91%	95%	95%	97%	95%	90%
	Highwood Hills	88%	84%	87%	87%	87%	90%	85%
	Phalen Lake Hmong	88%	89%	91%	92%	96%	94%	94%
Other neighborhood schools	Chelsea Heights	93%	93%	91%	93%	94%	93%	91%
	Como Park	85%	83%	83%	86%	88%	87%	89%
	Groveland Park	91%	92%	93%	92%	95%	95%	93%
	Hamline	94%	95%	95%	92%	95%	94%	91%
	Horace Mann	96%	98%	97%	96%	98%	95%	95%
Magnet schools	Battle Creek	94%	95%	96%	93%	97%	93%	87%
	Capitol Hill	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	97%	97%
	Farnsworth Aerospace	97%	96%	95%	96%	95%	95%	95%
	Jackson Preparatory	92%	91%	94%	94%	96%	97%	90%
	Nokomis (North)	96%	97%	96%	98%	98%	97%	97%
All elementary schools		91%	92%	92%	92%	93%	92%	89%

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

Attendance

As stated earlier, the Stability Index is based on the number of students enrolled at a school for 160 days or more; therefore, consistent attendance is a key factor in strengthening the stability of a school and each individual student. In the 2013-14 school year, attendance data were available for 11 children (out of a possible 13) of the families that participated in the HTF program.

On average, students experienced fewer tardies in May 2014 (<1 day) than in May 2013 (1.3), and tardies have been generally declining since May 2009, with the exception of 2011 when the average number jumped to 8.8 days. The average number of excused and unexcused absences also declined slightly in May 2014, compared to the previous year. Few, if any,

participating students have been suspended since 2009. Student attendance is tracked by program staff, and averages are calculated by taking the total numbers of tardies, absences (excused and unexcused), and suspensions for the month of May and dividing those individual numbers by the total number of students for whom data are available (Figure 3).

3. Average number of tardies, absences, and suspensions

	May 2009 (N=16)	May 2010 (N=16)	May 2011 (N=21)	May 2012 (N=16)	May 2013 (N=19)	May 2014 (N=11)
Tardy (to class and school)	11.1	7.6	8.8	3.3	1.3	<1.0
Excused absences	1.1	5.2	4.3	<1.0	1.2	<1.0
Unexcused absences	3.1	1.6	1.8	<1.0	1.1	<1.0
Suspended	0	<1.0	<1.0	0	0	0

Note: Averages are calculated by taking the numbers of tardies, absences (excused and unexcused), and suspensions for the month of May and dividing each of those numbers by the total number of students for whom attendance data are available.

Reading levels

In addition to student attendance, staff also track the reading levels of students whose families are enrolled in the HTF program; for school year 2013-14 this was 13 children. At the end of the school year, no students were reading at their grade level, although data were missing for five students. All eight students for whom data were available were two or more grade levels behind (Figure 4). Yet, most of the students who had data across all three time periods (n=7) increased their reading level between the beginning and end of the year. Scores are based on the Wright Group McGraw Hill reading assessment.

It should also be noted that, like overall student stability, the HTF program has little influence on reading levels. While staff can encourage and provide tutoring referrals for families, the program itself does not provide assistance with reading. Again, as the evaluation moves forward, staff may want to reconsider the importance of tracking this information.

4. Reading levels for school year 2013-14

	October 2013 (n=10)	January 2014 (n=7)	June 2014 (n=8)
At grade level	1	0	0
One grade or less delayed	0	0	0
Two or more grade levels delayed	9	7	8

Note: Reading scores are based on the Wright Group McGraw Hill reading assessment. Reading levels were not reported for 3 students in October, 6 students in January, and 5 students in June.

Client self-reliance

In addition to student data, this evaluation examines the self-reliance of adult clients enrolled in the Housing Trust Fund program. Self-reliance is measured through a tool created by Wilder Research and administered by HTF program staff, which assesses the following key areas: housing, employment, income, education, child care, and physical and mental health needs. During the 2013-14 school year, a case manager completed assessments with seven clients who received services; therefore, this section represents the baseline and follow-up information for only those seven people.

To identify any changes in self-reliance throughout involvement in the program, Wilder Research compared each family's baseline scores and most recent scores from the Self-Reliance Progress Form. Baseline information was collected at the time of a family's enrollment in the Housing Trust Fund program. Follow-up information is collected every six months after baseline to determine whether or not clients make gains in a variety of self-reliance areas. Both baseline and follow-up information was gathered by HTF program staff.

An increase in scores from the baseline assessment to the most recent assessment indicates an improvement in self-reliance for that item, while a decrease in scores indicates a decline. When two separate client scores were not available for an item, the client was excluded from the analysis for that particular item. Recognizing that maintaining high levels of self-reliance can indicate success, the analysis also makes distinctions between clients who maintained at a high level and those who maintained at a low level (indicated by a score that did not change from baseline assessment to follow-up assessment). A copy of the Self-Reliance Progress form can be found in the Appendix, along with a table that illustrates the maintenance-level determinations.

Demographics

Demographic information for the clients served during school year 2013-14 is outlined in the table below (Figure 5).

5. Respondent demographics (N=7)

		N	%
Gender	Female	6	86%
	Male	1	14%
Race	American Indian	0	0%
	Asian	3	43%
	Black or African-American	1	14%
	Multi-racial	1	14%
	White or Caucasian	0	0%
	Unknown	2	29%
	Hispanic origin	3	43%
Ethnicity	Non-Hispanic origin	4	57%

Community credentials

Program staff asked participants about their access to a variety of community credentials. At first assessment, most clients had telephone or voicemail access and a Social Security card. Four clients had a green card, a medical ID card, and a Minnesota driver's license; however fewer clients had an open bank account, birth certificate, library card, Minnesota identification card, or voter registration (Figure 6).

6. Community credentials at first assessment (N=7)

At first assessment does participant have:	Yes	No	Don't know/ Missing	Not needed or obtainable
Telephone or voicemail access	6	0	1	0
Social Security card	5	1	1	0
Alien registration card (green card)	4	1	1	1
Medical ID card	4	1	2	0
Minnesota driver's license	4	2	1	0
Bank account	3	3	1	0
Birth certificate	2	2	3	0
Library card	2	4	1	0
Minnesota identification card	2	4	1	0
Voter registration	1	4	2	0

Housing issues

At baseline, all seven clients were paying at least 30 percent of their income for housing (and five were paying more than 50 percent). By their most recent assessment, however, all clients were paying less than 30 percent of their income for housing, which means that all clients (for whom matched data were available) either improved or maintained high levels of self-reliance in the area of housing affordability. Out of all of the areas tested on the self-reliance form, housing affordability showed the greatest improvement (Figure 7).

A few clients also improved their self-reliance around tenant/landlord relationships and housing stability. At baseline, case managers considered three of the clients with matched data to have a “failed” relationship with their landlord, which was not the case for anyone at the most recent assessment. Rather, three clients improved their self-reliance in this area, while two maintained high levels of self-reliance (Figure 7).

In addition, three clients served during the 2013-14 school year were homeless, while no one was homeless at their most recent assessment; however, four clients declined in the area of housing stability (Figure 7).

7. Change in self-reliance for housing issues (N=7)

	Improved	Maintained high	Maintained low	Declined	N/A or Missing
Housing affordability	5	2	0	0	0
Tenant/landlord relationship	3	2	0	2	0
Housing stability	3	0	0	4	0

Employment, education, and financial issues

Most of the seven clients with matched data were able to improve or maintain high levels of self-reliance in the areas of employment, income, and credit, particularly in the adequacy of their income to buy food and shelter. Four clients each improved their employment status and the quality of their credit, while three improved their job retention (although two declined in this area) (Figure 8).

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.¹

¹ 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

At baseline assessment, four clients reported having no earned income; however, by their most recent assessment, three had improved and two had maintained high levels of self-reliance in this area (Figure 8).

Unlike other areas in the self-reliance assessment, education remained an issue for most of the clients served during the school year. At their baseline assessment, five clients were assessed as not having the formal education necessary to meet employment needs, while the remaining two had formal education, but not enough for work advancement. At their most recent assessment, these numbers stayed largely the same, with only one client showing improvement (Figure 8).

8. Change in self-reliance for employment, education, and finances (N=7)

	Improved	Maintained high	Maintained low	Declined	N/A or Missing
Income adequacy	4	2	0	0	1
Employment status	4	0	1	1	1
Quality of credit	4	0	1	1	1
Income source	3	2	1	0	1
Job retention	3	0	0	2	2
Education	1	1	4	0	1

Health care and well being

In terms of health care coverage, self-reliance was generally high to begin with; most case management clients had public health insurance benefits for all of their household members at their baseline assessment. Five clients maintained their high levels of self-reliance, while one maintained a low level and one client declined in household healthcare coverage (Figure 9).

Case managers are also asked to assess clients' mental health and domestic abuse statuses; however, follow-up information for several clients was missing in these areas. For those who did have information available, three improved in the area of mental health, while one person each maintained high levels of self-reliance in the areas of mental health and domestic abuse (Figure 9).

employment income, Social Security, Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI), veterans' benefits, and retirement benefits.

9. Change in self-reliance for health care and well-being (N=7)

	Improved	Maintained high	Maintained low	Declined	N/A or Missing
Mental health	3	1	0	0	3
Household healthcare coverage	0	5	1	1	0
Domestic abuse	0	1	1	0	5

Child well-being

In the areas of self-reliance related to clients' children, the greatest strengths appear to be medical needs (ensuring that children have a regular pediatrician or clinic), school attendance, up-to-date immunizations, and child protection, with most clients maintaining already high levels of self-reliance; however, three clients did show decline in the area of child protection.

Two clients were reported to improve in the area of pre-school enrollment, which includes ECFE, Head Start, and center-based child care. However, at follow-up, it was reported that three clients did not have children who were in need of pre-school services, and so this question did not apply to them (Figure 10).

Additionally, one client improved her child care situation and one maintained high levels of self-reliance related to child support income; however, information was either missing or did not apply for most clients in these areas (Figure 10).

10. Change in self-reliance for child well-being (N=7)

	Improved	Maintained high	Maintained low	Declined	N/A or Missing
Enrollment in preschool	2	0	0	0	5
Child immunizations	1	4	1	1	0
Child care	1	1	0	0	5
Child's medical needs	0	6	0	1	0
School attendance	0	5	0	1	1
Child protection	0	4	0	3	0
Child support income	0	1	2	0	4

Other issues

Many case management clients also have limited access to transportation and social support. In the 2013-14 school year, three clients experienced improvements in these areas, while two experienced a decline in their social support and two clients maintained low levels of self-reliance related to transportation needs (Figure 11).

11. Change in self-reliance for other issues (N=7)

	Improved	Maintained high	Maintained low	Declined	N/A or Missing
Transportation	3	1	2	0	1
Social support	3	0	1	2	1

Overall, clients experienced the greatest improvements in their housing affordability, income, credit, and employment status. Several also maintained already high levels of self-reliance areas related to children's well-being, particularly medical needs and school attendance. Figure 12 below illustrates the change in self-reliance for clients served during the 2013-14 school year for all indicators.

12. Change in self-reliance status for all indicators (N=7)

	Improved	Maintained high	Maintained low	Declined	Missing
Housing affordability	5	2	0	0	0
Income adequacy	4	2	0	0	1
Employment	4	0	1	1	1
Quality of credit	4	0	1	1	1
Income source	3	2	1	0	1
Tenant/landlord relationship	3	2	0	2	0
Mental health	3	1	0	0	3
Transportation	3	1	2	0	1
Job retention	3	0	0	2	2
Social support	3	0	1	2	1
Housing stability	3	0	0	4	0
Enrollment in preschool	2	0	0	0	5
Child immunizations	1	4	1	1	0

12. Change in self-reliance status for all indicators (N=7) continued

	Improved	Maintained high	Maintained low	Declined	Missing
Child care	1	1	0	0	5
Education	1	1	4	0	1
Child's medical needs	0	6	0	1	0
School attendance	0	5	0	1	1
Household healthcare coverage	0	5	1	1	0
Child protection	0	4	0	3	0
Domestic abuse	0	1	1	0	5
Child support income	0	1	2	0	4

Client satisfaction

In addition to measuring clients' self-reliance, Wilder spoke with clients to gauge their satisfaction with the Housing Trust Fund program. In September 2014, current Housing Trust Fund recipients were asked to participate in a telephone interview regarding their experiences with the HTF program. Staff from Wilder Research conducted telephone interviews with clients, asking questions about program participation, satisfaction with services, and the impact of these services. Seven out of eight eligible participants completed the interview. Below are key findings from the satisfaction survey. A copy of the survey instrument is provided in the appendix.

Participant information

Respondents, the majority of whom were women, had an average age of 38 years old. Three identified their race/ethnicity as Asian, two identified as Hispanic, one identified as White, and one as biracial. Respondents tended to have never been married, and had low levels of education and income. All respondents had a household income of less than \$30,000 per year. The average number of family members supported by this income was four people (Appendix A1).

Two respondents were employed full-time, while three were unemployed but looking for work; two were unable to work. Five clients were at home full-time and one was in school (Figure 13). (Note that the numbers add up to more than 100%, since respondents were able to select more than one response.)

13. Respondent demographics and information (N=7)

Gender	N	%
Female	6	86%
Male	1	14%
Age		
<25 years old	0	0%
25-29 years old	1	14%
30-39 years old	3	43%
40-49 years old	3	43%

13. Respondent demographics and information (N=7) continued

Race/ethnicity	N	%
Latino, Hispanic, or Chicano	2	29%
Asian or Pacific Islander	3	43%
Black, African-American, or African	0	0%
American Indian or Native American	0	0%
White or Caucasian	1	14%
Biracial or multicultural	1	14%
Marital status		
Married	1	14%
Living with someone in a marriage-like relationship	1	14%
Separated	0	0%
Divorced	1	14%
Widowed	0	0%
Never been married	4	57%
Education		
Less than high school graduate	5	71%
High school graduate or GED	1	14%
Some college (including 2-year degrees)	1	14%
Four-year college degree (BA, BS)	0	0%
Post-graduate degree (masters, doctorate, MD, etc.)	0	0%
Employment status*		
Employed full time	2	29%
Employed part time	0	0%
Unemployed and looking for work	3	43%
On layoff from a job	1	14%
Going to school	1	14%
At home full time (raising children, homemaker, etc.)	5	71%
Unable to work or disabled	2	29%
Household income		
Less than \$10,000	6	86%
\$10,000 to \$20,000	0	0%
\$20,001 to \$30,000	1	14%
\$30,001 to \$40,000	0	0%
More than \$40,000	0	0%

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

Household situation

At the time of the survey, three out of seven participants lived in subsidized housing using a voucher. Those who did not live in subsidized housing either lived in a single family home, duplex, or an apartment (Figure 14). Participants paid an average of \$301 per month for rent (down from \$546 last year) (Figure 15). For all seven clients, this did not include energy costs. The average monthly energy bill payment was \$107 and four respondents reported that they tend to pay the entire energy bill, as opposed to only a portion each month (Appendix A2-A4).

14. Current housing (N=7)

Do you live in subsidized housing?	N	%
Yes	3	43%
[Do you live in public housing or have a voucher?]		
Voucher	3	100%
Public housing	0	0%
No	4	57%
[What type of living arrangement do you have?]		
Single family home	2	29%
Apartment building	1	14%
Duplex	1	14%

15. Rent costs (N=7)

How much rent do you pay?	N	%
<\$100/month	3	43%
\$100-\$499/month	2	29%
\$500-\$999/month	1	14%
\$1,000+/month	1	14%
Average	\$300.86	

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

Five participants reported that they were the only adult in the home, and two said that there were two adults in the home. The average number of children per household was just over three, and the average number of children attending Johnson Elementary School was two (Appendix A5-A7).

When asked how many times they had moved in the past three years, two clients said they had not moved at all and the remaining five clients moved between one and five times (Appendix A8).

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. As found in last year’s report, the most common responses were homelessness, credit issues, landlord-tenant problems, and their rent was too high (Figure 16).

16. Reasons for seeking help from the HTF program (N=7)

Please tell me whether this issue was a reason you sought help from the program.	% saying “yes”	
	N	%
Homelessness	5	71%
Credit issues	4	57%
Landlord-tenant problems	4	57%
Rent that was too high	4	57%
Eviction	3	43%
Domestic conflict	2	29%
Housing foreclosure	2	29%
Poor quality housing	2	29%
Home improvement loan	1	14%
Housing code violations	0	0%
Other	1	14%

Note: Percents equal more than 100% as respondents were able to give multiple reasons. “Other” includes the following responses: “Energy bill was too high”.

After joining the HTF program, participants received a variety of housing-related services. All clients received help paying for their first month’s rent or the security deposit and help paying a rent application fee. Several clients also received help locating different housing (n=6) and help with landlord-tenant mediation (n=5).

17. Help with housing-related needs (N=7)

Did you get help with...?	% saying "yes"	
	N	%
Paying for first month's rent or security deposit	7	100%
Paying rent application fee	7	100%
Locating different housing	6	86%
Landlord-tenant mediation	5	71%
Paying utilities (telephone, heat, or electric bills)	4	57%
Moving your things to a different location	2	29%
Paying home-buyer workshop fees	1	14%
Other	2	29%

Note: Percents equal more than 100% as respondents were able to give multiple reasons. "Other" includes the following responses: "Bridging program to get free furniture" and "They paid the first month's storage fee for my belongings".

Participants were also asked about non-housing related services they received from the program. The most common types of non-housing related assistance included education for their children and help with employment, followed by help with clothing, food, getting children connected to activities, and school attendance for children (Figure 18).

18. Help with other needs (N=7)

Did you get help with...?	% saying "yes"	
	N	%
Education or schooling for your children	6	86%
Employment	6	86%
Clothing	5	71%
Food	5	71%
Getting your child(ren) connected to activities	5	71%
School attendance for children	5	71%
Domestic abuse problems	4	57%
Education or schooling for yourself	4	57%
Legal assistance	4	57%
Child care	3	43%
Parenting issues	3	43%
Transportation	3	43%
Medical care	2	29%

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

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 seven respondents took at least one of the classes. Figure 19 illustrates the number of respondents attending each class offered during the 2013-14 school year.

19. Attendance at HTF classes (N=7)

Did you attend any of the following classes sponsored by HTF?	% saying "yes"	
	N	%
Financial Literacy	5	71%
Home Ownership	5	71%
HTF bi-monthly meetings	5	71%
Weatherization and Energy Assistance	5	71%
Family Fun Roller Skating	3	43%
Other classes sponsored by the program	3	43%

Note: Percents equal more than 100% as respondents were able to give multiple reasons. "Other" includes the following responses: "Budgeting class," "Stress class," and "Renter's Rights, budgeting class, and cleaning/coupon classes".

Client satisfaction

Overall, participants were satisfied with the services they received from the HTF program, with five out of seven clients saying the services were "outstanding." The survey also asked about individual aspects of the program and participants generally rated each one as "outstanding" or "good (Figure 20).

20. Rating the HTF program (N=7)

How would you rate...?

	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor
The knowledge and skills of program staff	5	2	0	0
How well your housing needs are getting met now	5	1	1	0
The ease of working with program staff	5	1	1	0
Your overall satisfaction with the services provided	5	1	1	0
How quickly you were able to get help	4	2	1	0

When asked to describe which services were the *most* helpful, in an open-ended question, respondents were most likely to mention rental assistance or homeownership resources. Other responses included assistance with children's education, mental issues, and general support through the HTF program.

The homeownership resources [were the most helpful], because I was sick of renting; they really did a lot for me to get a house.

The rental assistance; they always remind me to meet my goals and appointments

The rental assistance program; we were homeless without income; I had nothing

Getting a shelter and my children's education

The mental issues class; how to deal with stress

Any support I get [is helpful]; just knowing they are there. I can call to talk about my day.

They quickly resolved my problem; the staff are very friendly.

Participants were also asked to describe how the program could improve its services. Most had no suggestions for improvement; however, two suggestions included getting help with filling out forms (such as for disability or social security) and having an on-call staff member available on weekends in case of a client emergency.

Program impact

Housing services and referrals

Clients were asked if they had moved into different housing since they sought help from HTF; three respondents said yes and four said no. All participants indicated that their housing had improved, compared to when they first sought help from the program, and each said that the services or referrals they received from the HTF program helped them to improve their housing situation (Appendix A9-11).

Respondents reported a variety of ways in which their housing had improved. All clients said that they had a better landlord and felt that their current home is more secure. Most also said their current housing is closer to public transportation, in better overall condition, and more affordable (Figure 21).

21. Ways housing situation has improved (N=7)

I'm going to read some ways your housing may have improved. For each one, please answer "yes" or "no" for your situation today.	% saying "yes"	
	N	%
Do you have a better landlord?	7	100%
Is your current home more secure?	7	100%
Is your housing more convenient to public transportation?	6	86%
Is it in better condition or were some repairs made?	6	86%
Is it more affordable?	5	71%
Do you have more bedrooms?	4	57%
Are there other ways your housing situation is better?	1	14%
Just having a place to live; I was homeless before		

Mental health and other services and referrals

Four of the seven respondents reported that they had received referrals for mental health services or supports from the program. Of those, three found the services helpful; the reason the fourth client did not find the services helpful was because she said her family did not follow through with the services. Specifically, participants noted that the mental health services have connected them to therapists and medication, and helped them know who to contact in case of an emergency (Appendix A12-13).

Another four respondents also reported that they had received referrals for mental health services for their children in the previous year. Of those, all found the referrals helpful. Parents reported that their children's mental health issues are being addressed through therapy and medication (Appendix A14-15).

Some clients received referrals for other services for their children, such as after school or summer activities. Of the four clients who reported receiving such referrals, all found them to be helpful, particularly in getting their children into out-of-school activities, such as YMCA summer camp. Parents also said that their children received help with tutoring and learning to speak English (Appendix A16).

Overall impact of services and referrals

Asked if they would be better prepared to solve housing problems in the future because of the services or referrals they received from the HTF program, all seven respondents answered "yes" (Appendix A17). This was because they were generally more aware of resources and contacts in the community, or because they had learned how to deal with specific issues, such as communicating with their landlord.

I'm more alert and organized about searching for housing in the area.

I learned about resources that I did not know where out there, like Legal Aid.

Because of the class I took, now I know who to contact for each problem that comes up.

[I am better prepared to solve future housing problems] because of the people we have met – the networking and all of the community connections that I have now.

I'm more responsible. I have learned to keep one step ahead with payments, like utilities and rent.

Landlord issues

I now have a full-time job; financial stability

When asked if things had improved for them or their families in other ways besides housing because of the help or referrals they received from the HTF program, five respondents answered “yes” (Appendix A18). Participants indicated that they had happier and more stable families, improved well-being for children, and better budgeting and financial skills.

We have a steady place to live now, close to the school.

I've gotten help from therapists and family counseling through Wilder.

I know how to budget our money and how to keep a happy, presentable home.

Issues to consider

The Housing Trust Fund has experienced both success and challenges over the past school year, each outlined below. HTF program staff should continue the good work they are doing, particularly with regards to student attendance and stability; helping clients improve their housing affordability, employment, and income; and providing quality services and referrals, as clients are generally satisfied with the program.

Program successes

- The children enrolled in the program (for whom data were available) experienced fewer tardies and absences; and, although overall student stability at Johnson Elementary School decreased slightly from the previous school year, it was in line with previous years. Also, HTF staff reported that, for their families, the stability rate was 100 percent.
- Adult clients (N=7) showed improved self-reliance in the areas of housing affordability, employment, income, and credit. Several clients were also able to maintain already high levels of self-reliance in the areas of health care coverage and children's well-being, particularly their medical needs, school attendance, and immunizations.
- A few clients were also able to improve their relationship with their landlord as well as their access to transportation and social support; however, it should be noted that some clients declined or maintained low levels of self-reliance in these areas.
- Clients are generally satisfied with the HTF program, especially the knowledge and skills of program staff. All clients said that their housing had improved since they first sought help from the program and all indicated that they were better prepared to solve a housing problem in the future because of the services or referrals they received from the HTF program.

Program challenges

Areas that program staff should continue to monitor include student reading levels, housing stability, and adult education. HTF program staff may also want to keep an eye on landlord-tenant relationships, access to transportation, and social issues; these were areas in which some clients improved and some declined.

- Students continue to have difficulty with reading, and no students during the 2013-14 school year were reading at their grade level, although data were missing for five students.

- Clients continued to struggle with their housing stability, which showed the most amount of decline of any area on the self-reliance form, as well as their own education.

Evaluation methodology

This evaluation is currently in its seventh year. As the HTF program evolves and its clients experience different needs, it is important for Wilder and HTF staff to revisit the goals of the program and to determine if current evaluation methods help measure progress towards those goals. For example, as mentioned earlier in the report, the HTF program currently does not have the ability to impact overall student stability and student reading levels; therefore, Wilder suggests eliminating or altering those assessments. Below are some possible changes to the current evaluation plan, as well as ideas for moving forward.

Suggested revisions to the evaluation plan

- Client self-reliance. Wilder recommends discontinuing the use of the current Self-Reliance Progress Form, largely because the program already captures much of that information through its “Self-Sufficiency Matrix.” The Self-Reliance Progress Form is also cumbersome for staff to use and does not provide a great deal of new data from year to year.
- Student success. While student stability data from SPPS is helpful in tracking the overall student population of Johnson Elementary School over time (and compared to other area schools), the attendance and reading level data may not be capturing the whole picture of progress made by students enrolled in the HTF program specifically. Attendance data are currently calculated based only on the month of May. It is our recommendation that student attendance be calculated by determining the average number of tardies and absences across the entire school year. Likewise, the Wright Group McGraw Hill reading assessment only examines reading levels at three points in time during the school year. It is our recommendation that we attempt to get report cards from students (with consent from parents) to look at academic success in areas beyond just reading and to see possible improvements in grades and GPA over the school year.

Suggested additions to the evaluation plan

Below are several possible additions to the evaluation plan, depending on the goals identified by program staff and the budget for the next contract cycle.

- Interviews with landlords. HTF staff members have mentioned that, this year, they have had a more difficult time getting landlords to accept the families they serve into the properties they manage. Conducting key informant interviews with a sample of area landlords (provided by HTF program staff) may help the program to learn what changes they can make to improve this situation.
- Process evaluation. Another valuable research method is to conduct a process evaluation, which looks at how the program is delivered to the families it serves. Process evaluation questions often include: To what extent is the program implemented as planned? How is the program received by clients, as well as program staff? What are some of the challenges to program implementation, and what are the successes? This type of evaluation would also give HTF program staff the opportunity to showcase all of the work that they do with families, and give them a chance to reflect on this work – making adjustments to strategy where needed.
- Case study. Rather than focusing only on the outcomes of all families at a high level, it may be helpful to conduct a case study, which would provide a very detailed, in-depth look at one or two families that receive services from the HTF program. This would help to provide a more comprehensive picture of the challenges that a “typical” HTF family faces; and it is also a useful methodological approach when n-sizes are very small.
- Parent and/or child interviews. Currently, Wilder conducts satisfaction interviews with parents receiving services. Wilder recommends continuing these interviews, but examining the current instrument to determine if the questions that have been asked in the past meet the current needs of the program. A revised parent protocol may help the program get more and updated information from participants. If possible (with parent consent), we may also want to interview children served by the program, to hear their perspective on the services their families receive.

Regardless of which methods are chosen for next year, it will be imperative for Wilder and HTF program staff to sit down together and review the program goals, as well as what data are most valuable moving forward.

Appendix

Additional data tables: Participant survey

A1. Number of family members supported by income (N=7)

How many people were supported by that income?	N	%
1 person	0	0%
2 people	1	14%
3 people	1	14%
4 people	2	29%
5 people	1	14%
6 people	2	29%
Average	4.29	

A2. Energy costs included in rent (N=7)

Does your rent payment include energy costs?	N	%
Yes	0	0%
No	7	100%

A3. Energy costs (N=7)

On average, how much do you pay monthly for energy costs?	N	%
<\$100/month	3	43%
\$100-149/month	2	29%
\$150-200/month	2	29%
Average	\$106.71	

A4. Energy bill (N=7)

Is the amount you pay monthly for energy costs the entire bill or a portion of the bill?	N	%
Entire bill	4	57%
Portion of the bill	3	43%

A5. Number of adults in household (N=7)**Including yourself, how many adults age 18 or older live in your household?**

	N	%
1 adult	5	71%
2 adults	2	29%

A6. Number of children in household (N=7)**How many children age 17 or younger live in your household?**

	N	%
1 child	1	14%
2 children	2	29%
3 children	1	14%
4 children	1	14%
5 children	1	14%
6 children	1	14%
Average	3.29	

A7. Number of children attending John A. Johnson Elementary School (N=7)**How many of your children attend John A. Johnson Elementary School?**

	N	%
1 child	3	43%
2 children	2	29%
3 children	1	14%
Missing information	1	14%
Average (excluding missing)	2	

A8. Number of times moved in past 3 years (N=7)**How many times have you moved into different housing in the past 3 years – that is, since June 2010?**

	N	%
0 times	2	29%
1 time	1	14%
2 times	1	14%
3 times	1	14%
5 times	1	14%
Missing	1	14%

A9. Mobility (N=7)

Have you moved into different housing since you sought help from HTF?	N	%
Yes [Why?]	3	43%
Assistance from program is done		
Bought a new house		
Apartment had to be remodeled		
No	4	57%

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

A10. Improved housing situation because of the HTF program (N=7)

Is your housing situation better now than it was when you sought help from HTF?	N	%
Yes	7	100%
No	0	0%

A11. HTF services helped improve housing situation (N=7)

Did the services or referrals you received from HTF help you to improve your housing situation?	N	%
Yes	7	100%
No	0	0%

A12. Mental health referrals (N=7)

Have you received any referrals for mental health services or supports, such as Goodwill Easter Seals or Wilder, from East Side Family Center in the last year?	N	%
Yes	4	57%
No	3	43%

A13. Helpfulness of mental health referrals (N=4)

Have the mental health service referrals been helpful?	N	%
Yes	3	75%
No	1	25%

A14. Children's mental health referrals (N=7)

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	%
Yes	4	57%
No	3	43%

A15. Helpfulness of children's mental health referrals (N=4)

Have the mental health service referrals been helpful?

	N	%
Yes	4	100%
No	0	0%

A16. Children's other referrals (N=7)

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

	N	%
Yes	4	57%
No	2	29%
Don't know	1	14%

A16. Helpfulness of children's other referrals (N=4)

Have the activity referrals been helpful?

	N	%
Yes	4	100%
No	0	0%

A17. Prepared to solve housing problems (N=7)

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

	N	%
Yes	7	100%
No	0	0%

A18. Other improvements because of the HTF program (N=7)

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

	N	%
Yes	5	71%
No	2	29%

Client satisfaction survey instrument

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

Activity Code: 71771

INTRODUCTION:

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

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

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

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

IF YES, PROCEED.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

a. Weatherization and Energy Assistance	1	2	7	8
b. Family Fun Roller Skating	1	2	7	8
c. Financial Literacy	1	2	7	8
d. Home Ownership	1	2	7	8
e. HTF bi-monthly meetings	1	2	7	8
f. Other classes sponsored by the program? (SPECIFY: _____)	1	2	7	8

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

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

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

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

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

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

8B. Why did you move?

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

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

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

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

- 9C. Did the services or referrals you received from HTF help you to improve your housing situation?
- Yes 1
 - No 2
 - Refused 7
 - Don't know 8

- 10A. If you had a housing problem again, would you be better prepared to solve it **because** of the services or referrals you received from HTF?
- Yes 1
 - No(GO TO Q. 11A)..... 2
 - Refused(GO TO Q. 11A)..... 7
 - Don't know(GO TO Q. 11A)..... 8

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

- 11A. Have things improved for you or your family in other ways, besides housing, **because** of the help or referrals you received from HTF?
- Yes 1
 - No(GO TO Q. 12)..... 2
 - Refused(GO TO Q. 12)..... 7
 - Don't know(GO TO Q. 12)..... 8

11B. In what other ways have things improved?

12. Have **you** received any referrals for mental health services or supports, such as Goodwill Easter Seals or Wilder, from East Side Family Center in the last year?
- Yes 1
 - No..... (GO TO Q. 13) 2
 - Refused..... (GO TO Q. 13) 7
 - Don't know..... (GO TO Q. 13) 8

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14A. Have the activity referrals been helpful?

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

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

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

15. Do you live in subsidized housing?

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

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

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

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

15C. How much rent do you pay? _____

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

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

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

_____ Monthly energy costs

- 15F. Is the amount you pay monthly for energy costs the entire bill or a portion of the bill?
- Entire bill 1
- Portion of the bill 2
- Refused 7
- Don't know 8

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

_____ Adults

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

_____ Children

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

_____ Number of children

19. How many times have you moved into different housing in the past 3 years – that is, since June 2011?

_____ Number of times moved

These last few questions are about you.

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

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

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

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

_____ Age

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

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

23. Are you currently...

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

26. How many people were supported by that income?

_____ People supported

27. What is your gender?

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

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

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

29. What is your correct address?

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

Certified1
Regular mail.....2

Interviewer: _____

Date: _____

Interviewer Employee #: _____

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 _____ _/___/___
<i>NOTE: Public cash benefits include MFIP, GA & SSI. Earned income includes employment income, SSDI, Veterans benefits, Retirement benefits, Social Security.</i>		
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	6 _____ _/___/___
	7 = Private insurance for all household members	6 _____ _/___/___
NOTE: Public insurance includes Medicaid (MA), Minnesota Care, Medicare, etc		

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	___/___/___
	<i>“Regular basis” is defined as school attendance on at least 85% of the eligible school days</i>	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"/> Credential not needed or obtainable ₉	<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"/> Credential not needed or obtainable ₉	<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"/> Credential not needed or obtainable ₉	<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"/> Credential not needed or obtainable ₉	<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"/> Credential not needed or obtainable ₉	<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"/> Credential not needed or obtainable ₉	<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"/> Credential not needed or obtainable ₉	<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"/> Credential not needed or obtainable ₉	<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"/> Credential not needed or obtainable ₉	<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"/> Credential not needed or obtainable ₉	<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

Self-Reliance: Determining “maintained high” and “maintained low”

To identify any changes in self-reliance throughout involvement in the program, Wilder Research compared each family’s baseline scores and most recent scores from the Self-Reliance Progress Form. Baseline information was collected at the time of a family’s enrollment in the Housing Trust Fund program. Follow-up information is collected every six months after baseline to determine whether or not clients make gains in a variety of self-reliance areas. Both baseline and follow-up information was gathered HTF program staff.

An increase in scores for a particular Self-Reliance Progress Form item from the baseline assessment to the most recent assessment indicates an improvement in self-reliance for that item, while a decrease in scores indicates a decline. When two separate client scores were not available for an item, the client was excluded from the analysis for that particular item.

Recognizing that the maintenance of self-reliance – especially when maintaining at a high level – can indicate success, the analysis also makes distinctions between clients who maintained at a high level and those who maintained at a low level (indicated by a score that did not change from baseline assessment to follow-up assessment). The table below illustrates the maintenance-level determinations for each Self-Reliance Progress Form item.

1. Employment Status Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Unemployed 2 = Working < 15 hours per week 3 = Working 15 –19 hours per week 4 = Working 20 – 24 hours a week 5 = Working 25 – 29 hours per week
Maintaining High	6 = Working 30 – 34 hours per week 7 = Working 35 – 40 hour per week 8 = Working > 40 hours per week
2. Job Retention and Stability Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Unemployed 2 = Worked less than one month at current job 3 = Worked one month but less than three months at current job
Maintaining High	4 = Worked three months but less than six months at current job 5 = Worked six months or longer at current job

3. Income Sources Scale

Maintaining Low	1 = No income 2 = Public cash benefits/no earned income 3 = More than 50% public cash benefits/some earned income
Maintaining High	4 = More than 50% earned income/some public cash benefits 5 = Earned income/no public cash benefits

4. Child Support Income Scale

Maintaining Low	1 = Eligible for child support, no income benefit
Maintaining High	2 = Eligible for child support, partial benefit 3 = Eligible for child support, full benefit

5. Adequacy of Income for Food and Shelter Scale

Maintaining Low	1 = Unable to meet food AND housing expenses during the last month 2 = Able to meet food OR housing expenses during last month
Maintaining High	3 = Able to meet food AND housing expenses during the last month

6. Quality of Credit Scale

Maintaining Low	1 = No credit 2 = Poor credit
Maintaining High	3 = Restoring credit or beginning to establish credit 4 = Good credit or credit restored

7. Housing Stability Scale

Maintaining Low	1 = Homeless 2 = Emergency shelter, doubled up, or notice of eviction or foreclosure 3 = Transitional housing (time limited)
Maintaining High	4 = Subsidized rental housing 5 = Market rate rental housing 6 = Home ownership

8. Section 8 Status Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Has Section 8 Voucher, but can't find housing 2 = Has Section 8 Voucher, but needs to move because of inappropriate housing (e.g. substandard conditions; not large enough; safety concerns; etc.) 3 = Has Section 8 Voucher, but needs to move because of tenant/landlord issues
Maintaining High	4 = Has Section 8 Voucher and no need to move from housing
9. Housing Affordability Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Pays more than 50% of income for housing 2 = Pays less than 50% but more than 30% for housing
Maintaining High	3 = Pays less than or equal to 30% of income for housing
10. Household Health Care Coverage Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = No insurance for any household members 2 = Public health insurance benefits for some household members 4 = Mix of public and private insurance for some household members 6 = Private insurance benefits for some household members
Maintaining High	3 = Public health insurance benefits for all household members 5 = Mix of public and private insurance for all household members 7 = Private insurance for all household members
11. Child Care Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = No child care available 2 = Child care available but inadequate to meet need
Maintaining High	3 = Child care is available & adequate with subsidy 4 = Child care is available & adequate without subsidy
12. Education Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Formal education not adequate to meet employment needs
Maintaining High	2 = Formal education adequate for current employment, not work advancement 3 = Formal education adequate for current employment and advancement

13. Transportation Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Transportation not adequate to meet daily needs 2 = Transportation adequate to meet some but not all daily needs
Maintaining High	3 = Transportation adequate to meet daily needs
14. Social Support Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Little or no support from family, friends, or community support groups 2 = Family/friends may be supportive, but not able to help
Maintaining High	3 = Adequate social support
15. Tenant/Landlord Relationship Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Most recent tenant/landlord relationship failed – evicted/lease not renewed 2 = Program needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue more than once since last assessment 3 = Program needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue only once since last assessment
Maintaining High	4 = Program not needed to prevent or resolve tenant/landlord issue since last assessment
16. Child Protection Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Child protection case open – child/children not with parent 2 = Child protection case open – children with parent
Maintaining High	3 = Child protection case closed 4 = Family does not have a child protection case

17. Child's Immunization Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Immunizations (age appropriate) are not up-to-date for any of the children in the household 2 = Immunizations (age appropriate) are up-to-date for some, but not all, of the children in the household
Maintaining High	3 = Immunizations (age appropriate) are up-to-date for all of the children in the household
18. Child's Medical Needs Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = None of the children in the household have a regular pediatrician or clinic 2 = Some, but not all, of the children in the household have a regular pediatrician or clinic
Maintaining High	3 = All of the children in the household have a regular pediatrician or clinic
19. Enrollment in Pre-School Programs Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = None of the eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services 2 = Some, but not all of the eligible children, are in pre-school services
Maintaining High	3 = All eligible children are enrolled in pre-school services
20. School Attendance Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = None of the school-age children are attending school on a regular basis 2 = Some, but not all of the school-age children, are attending school on a regular basis
Maintaining High	3 = All of the school-age children are attending school on a regular basis
21. Mental Health Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Mental health assessment recommended
Maintaining High	2 = Mental health assessment completed and appropriate referral made 3 = Mental health services being provided

22. Chemical Dependency Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Chemical dependency assessment recommended
Maintaining High	2 = Chemical dependency assessment completed and appropriate referral made 3 = Chemical dependency services being provided
23. Domestic Abuse Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Domestic abuse issues present in family – not currently addressed
Maintaining High	2 = Referral made for supportive services 3 = Domestic abuse services being provided
24. Tenant Training Scale	
Maintaining Low	1 = Participant not attending recommended tenant training classes 2 = Participant attended some, but not all, recommended tenant training classes since last assessment
Maintaining High	3 = Participant attended all recommended tenant training classes since last assessment