

Evaluation of Chicago's 10 Year Plan to End Homelessness

Christine George, Michael Sosin, and Susan Grossman

Presentation to the Steering Committee for Version Two of Chicago's Plan to End Homelessness

Specific Goals of the Evaluation

- To trace client needs and outcomes under service programs provided under the Plan
 - How do clients experience the move into and through the system?
 - What are the characteristics of the clients who are served in each type of program?
 - How long do clients stay at the programs?
 - What types of needs do clients have and how, if at all, do these differ by type of program?
 - What sort of services do clients receive at the programs?
 - Do clients improve over time?
 - What types of clients do not improve?
- To analyze the services that actually are delivered by agencies
 - To detail in precise terms the program models that actually have been implemented;
 - To determine if there are gaps or other issues in the implemented programs;
 - To determine if resources and programs are appropriately targeted to improve those outcomes.

Components of the Evaluation

- Longitudinal Client Survey
- Exploration of Access and Negotiation of the System:
 - Focus groups with consumers of service
 - Participant observation of homeless individuals at points of entry into the homeless service system (i.e., police stations and hospital emergency rooms)
 - Assessment of the City of Chicago's 311 City Services system
- Program Providers Survey
- Qualitative Interviews with Homeless Youth

The Client Survey

- A central part of the evaluation included the client survey
- The survey followed individuals in the three types of housing programs supported by the Plan to End Homelessness
 - Emergency programs
 - Interim programs
 - Permanent/supportive housing programs
- Individual who agreed to take part in the survey were followed for a year by taking part in 3 interviews at six month intervals

Methodology

- The client survey was conducted utilizing a structured questionnaire, which included questions about client demographic characteristics, homeless experiences (including at the time of the first and most recent homeless episodes), service needs and utilization, experiences with service providers, client difficulties (including health and mental health challenges and substance abuse problems), housing quality, and social support resources.
- Questions in the follow-up interviews asked about current homeless status and changes in housing, service needs and use, and status related to areas of client difficulty and support systems.
- The best way to insure representativeness was by developing a random sample by randomly selecting programs within each program category or strata and then randomly sampling individuals within each selected program.

The Final Sample

Table 1

Group	Unweighted N Time 1 (% of Total)	Unweighted N Time 2 (% of Total)	Response Rate	Unweighted N Time 3 (% of Total)	Reponses Rate
Emergency	185 (34.0%)	121 (28.9%)	65.4%	108 (27.1%)	58.4%
Interim	192 (34.7%)	140 (33.4%)	72.9%	134 (33.7%)	69.8%
Permanent Housing	177 (31.9%)	158 (37.7%)	89.2%	156 (39.2%)	88.1%
Total	554	419	75.6%	398	71.8%

Review of Key Descriptive Findings From the Client Survey

- Comparison Across Program Types
 - Shelters
 - •Interim Housing Programs
 - Permanent/Supportive Housing Programs

39.8**

44.4

6.2

65.6

80.4**

41.8**

42.6**

14.8

76.4

15.3**

Supportive Housing

45.1

49.1

3.3

56.3

63.3

19.7

22.3

14.3

84.3

3.2

being lapine maits by Type of Trogram					
Table 2					
Trait	Shelter	Interim Housing	Permanent/		

48.0

3.1

61.2

72.5

7.4*

6.9**

10.4

86.7

5.5

For comparison to individuals in Permanent/Supportive Housing:* p \leq .05; ** p \leq .01; *** p \leq .001

Respondents in family programs are over ten years younger than other respondents.

Notes: + Over 90% of respondents in family programs are female.

79.4***

Mean Age (in years)

Currently Married (%)

Living with Children Under 18

(No Children Clients Coded as

% In Family Programs * (by

Never Married (%)

Have Children (%)

sampling criteria)

White (%)

Black (%)

Hispanic (%)

Male (%)

No)

Demograpi	nic Iraits E	By Type c	of Progran

Demographic Traits By Type of Program

Selected Personal Characteristics by Program Type

Table 3

Characteristic	Shelter	Interim Housing	Permanent/ Supportive Housing		
% with Less than 12 Years of Education	35.3	35.8	30.4		
% with Military Experience	13.9	10.6	13.1		
% Convicted of Felony	48.1	37.8	36.3		
% Reporting Chronic Medical Condition	41.3**	49.5	58.0		
% with Diagnosed Disability	28.7***	27.0***	61.2		
% Use of Alcohol (to the point of feeling the effects) in last 30 days from interview	35.6***	8.9*	17.7		
% with Pension for Disability	4.8*	3.8***	16.0		
% Reporting Previous Psychiatric Hospitalization	21.1***	28.1**	48.4		

For comparison to individuals in Permanent/Supportive Housing: * p \leq .05 ** p \leq .01; *** p \leq .001

Homologeness and Program Tenura by Type of Program

nomelessifess and Program lendre by Type of Program					
Table 4					
Trait	Shelter	Interim Housing	Permanent/ Supportive Housing		
Mean Age of First Homelessness (in	37.9 *	31.4	33.7		

38.7

2.0

39.6

191.9**

91.9

44.7

2.0

63.5

777.2

589.2

45.0

2.0

63.3

344.1**

92.0

For comparison to individuals in Permanent/Supportive Housing: * p \leq .05 ** p \leq .01; *** p \leq .001

Notes: Families in Interim Housing Programs report on average 24.2 months of homelessness.

years)

Homeless for First

Time Current Spell

Average Total Months

Median Time

Homelessness

Homelessness

Mean Days in

Program So Far

Median Days in

Program So Far

Reported Referral Source to the Program by Program Type

110ported 110rd11d1 00d1 00 to the 110gram by 110gram 17po				
Table 5				
% Reporting	Shelter	Interim Housing	Permanent/ Supportive Housing	
Referred by Previous Housing				Ī

2.80***

19.0***

37.0

8.9*

10.0

28.7***

For comparison to individuals in Permanent/Supportive Housing: * p \leq .05; ** p \leq .01; *** p \leq .001

Agency or Program to the

Referred by Family/Friends

Reported by Institution

Reported by the City of Chicago

Present Program

Referred by Other

Agencies/Programs

311 Call Center

Other

43.7

8.0

18.7

13.5**

18.6

18.3

18.3

35.6

28.0

2.7

16.7

15.4

Service Utilization at Baseline Interview

Table 6

Resources	Shelter (N=129)	Interim Housing (N=149)	Permanent/ Supportive Housing (N=160)
Mean Number of Total Professional Services Received by Client ¹	0.7	2.1***	2.2***
Mean Number of Total Employment Related Services Received by Client ²	0.2	0.6**	0.4
Mean Number of Total Advocacy Services Received by Client ³	1.2	1.7***	1.5*

For comparison to individuals in Emergency/Overnight Shelter :* $p \le .05$; ** $p \le .01$; *** $p \le .001$ Notes:

- 1. Includes counseling or family services, detoxification services, outpatient drug or alcohol treatment, 12 step programs, outpatient mental health services, medical care and help with money management.
 - 2. Includes job/employment related services, education, community voicemail, and child care or daycare.
 - 3. Include services to help you find housing, cash assistance from TANF, Workfare, SSI or Social security and Food stamps or SNAP.

Ratings of Problems in Various Areas and Receipt of Services

Table 7

	Shelter	Interim Housing	Permanent/ Supportive Housing
% Rating Extent to Which They Have Been Bothered by Medical Problems In the Last 30 days as Moderate to Extreme	46.2	46.8	60.5
Of These Percent Receiving Any Medical Treatment in the Last 30 days.	54.0**	63.0	72.7
% Rating Extent to Which They Have Been Bothered by Employment Problems in the Last 30 days as Moderate to Extreme	51.0***	46.3***	21.4
Of These Percent Receiving Any Employment Services in the Last 30 days.	15.7	38.3	24.9
% Rating Extent to Which They Have Been Bothered by Psychological Problems in the Last 30 days as Moderate to Extreme	31.9	44.6	39.3
Of These Percent Receiving Any Out Patient Mental Health Services in the Last 30 days.	16.1***	33.5*	54.8

For comparison to individuals in Permanent/Supportive Housing: * p \leq .05; ** p \leq .01; *** p \leq .001

Ratings of Problems in Various Areas and Receipt of Services Table 7 Con't.

	Shelter	Interim Housing	Permanent/ Supportive Housing
% Rating Extent to Which They Have Been Bothered by Alcohol Problems in the 30 Days Before the Interview as Moderate to Extreme	11.5	4.2	5.3
Of These, Percent Receiving Out Patient Drug or Alcohol Treatment in the Last 30 Days	0	22.8	44.4
% Rating Extent to Which They Have Been Bothered by Drug Problems in the 30 Days Before the Interview as Moderate to Extreme	13.0	6.7	7.7
Of These Percent Receiving Out Patient Drug or Alcohol Treatment Services in the Last 30 days.	0	20.5	51.8

For comparison to individuals in Permanent/Supportive Housing: * p \leq .05; ** p \leq .01; *** p \leq .001

Clients Moving Through the System

- Comparison Across Program Types
 - Shelters
 - •Interim Housing Programs
 - Permanent/Supportive Housing Programs

Where Clients Starting in Emergency Shelter Are at the Final Interview? Table 8						
Emergency (Total N=129)		N	%			
Remained in Emergency		69	53.5			
Of Those Who Remain:			% of Total			
	Stayed in Baseline Program Continuously	57	43.9			
	Left Baseline Program & Returned as of Last Interview Completed*	7	5.6			
	Left Baseline Program & Returned to a Shelter that was not the Original Program as of the Last Interview Completed*	5	4.0			

In Permanent Housing at Final Interview

In Market Housing at Final Interview

60

3

10

4

15

28

46.5

% of Total

2.3

7.8

2.8

12.1

21.6

Of Those Who Left: On The Street at Final Interview In Institutional Setting of Some Kind at Final Interview In Interim Housing at Final Interview

* Includes Individuals Interviewed Only 2 Times As Well As All 3 Times

Left Baseline Program as of Last

Interview Completed*

Where Clients Starting in Interim Housing Are at the Final Interview?

Ta	h	O

Left Baseline Program as of Last

Table 9			
Interim (Total N=149)		N	%
Remained in Interim		44	29.7
Of Those Who Remain:			% of Total
	Stayed in Baseline Program Continuously	22	14.5
	Left Baseline Program & Returned as of Last Interview Completed*	4	2.9
	Left Baseline Program & Returned to a Another Interim Housing Program that was not the Original Program as of the Last Interview Completed*	18	12.4

105

68

70.3

% of Total

1.1

2.6

2.2

18.7

45.6

In Market Housing at Final Interview

Interview Completed* Of Those Who Left: On The Street at Final Interview In an Emergency Shelter at Final Interview 4 In an Institutional Setting of Some Kind at Final 3 Interview In Permanent Housing at Final Interview 28

^{*} Includes Individuals Interviewed Only 2 Times As Well As All 3 Times

Where Clients Starting in Permanent Housing Are at the Final Interview?

Table 10

Permanent (Total N=160)		N	%
Remained in Permanent		137	86.0
Of Those Who Remain:			% of Total
	Stayed in Baseline Program Continuously	130	81.0
	Left Baseline Program & Returned as of Last Interview Completed*	1	0.5
	Left Baseline Program & Returned to Another Permanent Housing Program that was not the Original Program as of Last Interview Completed	7	4.5
Left Baseline Program as of Last Interview Completed		23	14.0
Of Those Who Left:			% of Total
	In Market Housing at Final Interview	23	14.0

^{*} Includes Individuals Interviewed Only 2 Times As Well As All 3 Times

Stability of Clients

- Comparison Across Program Types
 - Shelters
 - Interim Housing Programs
 - Permanent/Supportive Housing Programs

Living Arrangement Among Clients who Left Baseline Program – Percent Who Stayed Where They First Went and Percent Who Moved to a Different Location

Table 11

Table 11			
		N	%
Emergency (N=73)			
	Moved From Where They First Went	34	47.0
	In Same Location at the Time of the Last Interview	38	53.0
Interim (N=127)			
	Moved From Where They First Went	49	38.7
	In Same Location at the Time of the Last Interview	78	61.3
Permanent (N=30)			
	Moved From Where They First Went	5	15.6
	In Same Location at the Time of the Last Interview	26	84.4

Living Arrangement at Most Recent Interview in Relation to Select Client Characteristics and Tal

% Male**

% Black

% White

Baseline**

Interview***

% Hispanic Origin

ble 12	E×

% in Family at Baseline Interview***

% < HS Education at Baseline Interview

% Any Alcohol Use at Baseline Interview**

Includes People interviewed at 12 months Only

% Any Drug Use at Baseline Interview

% Any Alcohol to the Point of Feeling the Effects at

% Felony Conviction Reported at Baseline Interview*

% Diagnosed with a Disability at time of Baseline

Mean Age at Baseline Interview (in years)*

Experiences for Whole Sample ##				
	Homeless	Interim		

(N=30)

49.0

85.3

2.6

88.88

9.5

8.7

29.1

33.0

60.8

27.5

41.2

22.5

* p < .05, ** p \leq .01, *** p \leq .001 + Statistical Significance cannot be calculated using Complex Sample Statistics.

Market

(N=90)

41.6

31.8

45.1

83.9

11.2

9.1

26.5

10.5

24.9

18.9

27.5

25.1

Permanen

t (N=296)

45.9

53.6

18.7

82.1

14.9

3.2

32.6

22.1

29.4

18.0

42.3

65.9

(N=25)

44.9

58.5

10.1

83.9

10.4

8.7

33.5

9.2

31.5

12.5

58.4

24.3

Change in Client Outcomes Over Time

 Comparison Over Time on Key Areas for Those in Shelters, Interim Housing and Permanent/ Supportive Housing Programs

Outcomes of Clients in Emergency Housing at the Baseline Interview & Final Interview # Table 13 (N=129)

Mean Number of Days Clients Report Having Health Problems

Mean Number of Days Clients Used Alcohol to the Point of

Mean Number of Days Clients Used Any Drugs Other than

clients doubled up for less than 30 days; and for clients in Interim housing.

Feeling the Effects in 30 Days Prior to the Interview

Alcohol in 30 Days Prior to the Interview*

Last 30 Days Prior to the Interview

Mean Rating on Trauma Scale³

"fair," and 5 equals "poor."

* p < .05, ** p < .01; *** p < .001

trauma.

Mean Number of Days Clients Experienced Emotional Problems in

Circumstances & Functioning of Clients		_
Mean Number of Days Homeless in 60 days prior to Interview ^{1**}	55.7	33.9
Mean Overall Health Rating by Client ²	3.0	3.0

1.) Includes spending nights at all-night theater, subway station, or other indoor public place; subway or bus;

2.) Based on a 5 point rating scale where 1 equals "excellent," 2 equals "very good," 3 equals "good," 4 equals

3.) The Trauma scale is a 6 item measure with a 5 point scale where higher scores represent greater feelings of

#. Final Interview Could be at either at 6 months from Baseline Interview or 12 months from Baseline Interview

abandoned building; car or other private vehicle; on the street or other outdoor space; emergency shelter;

Baseline

Interview

8.3

3.8

11.3

2.9

3.4

Final

Interview

5.8

3.4

11.8

2.9

11.0

Outcomes of Clients in Emergency Housing at the Baseline Interview & Final Table 13 Cont'd Interview

(N=129)	Baseline Interview	Final Interview
Changes in Level of Victimization		
Mean Total Times Clients Were Victimized by Assault/Robbery in 60 days Prior to the Interview	0.1	0.2
Mean Total Times Clients Were Victimized by Domestic Violence or Rape in 60 Days Prior to the Interview	0.0	0.0
Changes in Resources		
Mean Number of Days Clients Were Paid for Working in the Last 30 Days Prior to the Interview	3.4	5.1
Mean Number of Total Professional Services Received by Client	0.7	0.7
Mean Number of Total Employment Related Services Received by Client	0.2	0.3
Mean Number of Total Advocacy Services Received by Client	1.2	1.3

^{#.} Final Interview Could be at either at 6 months from Baseline Interview or 12 months from Baseline Interview * $p \le .05$, ** $p \le .01$; *** $p \le .001$

Outcomes of Clients in Interim Housing at the Baseline Interview & Final Interview "		
Table 14		
(N=149)	Baseline Interview	Final Interview
Circumstances & Functioning of Clients		_
Mean Number of Days Homeless in 60 days prior to Interview ^{1***}	55.5	19.4
_		

2.9

7.2

6.1

12.4

0.6

3.4

2.8

6.5

5.2

12.2

1.5

4.9

Mean Overall Health Rating by Client²

Mean Number of Days Clients Report Having Health Problems

Mean Number of Days Clients Experienced Emotional Problems in Last

in the 30 Days Prior to the Interview Mean Rating on Trauma Scale³

Mean Number of Days Clients Used Alcohol to the Point of Feeling the Effects in 30 Days Prior to the Interview

Mean Number of Days Clients Used Any Drugs Other than Alcohol in 30 Days Prior to the Interview 1.) Includes spending nights at all-night theater, subway station, or other indoor public place; subway or bus;

abandoned building; car or other private vehicle; on the street or other outdoor space; emergency shelter; clients doubled up for less than 30 days; and for clients in Interim housing.

- 2.) Based on a 5 point rating scale where 1 equals "excellent" and 5 equals "poor."
- 3.) The Trauma scale is a 6 item measure with a 5 point scale where higher scores represent greater feelings of trauma.

#. Final Interview Could be at either at 6 months from Baseline Interview or 12 months from Baseline Interview * p < .05, ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Outcomes of Clients in Interim Housing at the Baseline Interview & Final Interview #

Table 14 Cont'd

(N=149)	Baseline Interview	Final Interview
Changes in Level of Victimization		
Mean Total Times Clients Were Victimized by Assault/Robbery in 60 days Prior to the Interview	0.1	0.1
Mean Total Times Clients Were Victimized by Domestic Violence or Rape in 60 Days Prior to the Interview	0.1	0.0
Changes in Resources		
Mean Number of Days Clients Were Paid for Working in the Last 30 Days Prior to the Interview	3.4	4.9
Mean Number of Total Professional Services Received by Client***	2.1	1.4
Mean Number of Total Employment Related Services Received by Client	0.6	0.6
Mean Number of Total Advocacy Services Received by Client**	1.7	1.4

^{#.} Final Interview Could be at either at 6 months from Baseline Interview or 12 months from Baseline Interview.

^{*} $p \le .05$, ** $p \le .01$; *** $p \le .001$

Outcomes of Clients in Permanent Housing at the Baseline Interview & Final Interview

Table 15

(N=160)	Baseline Interview	Final Interview
Circumstances & Functioning of Clients		
Mean Number of Days Homeless in 60 days prior to Interview ¹	4.7	2.2
Mean Overall Health Rating by Client*2	3.3	3.1
Mean Number of Days Clients Report Having Health Problems	9.4	9.0
Mean Number of Days Clients Experienced Emotional Problems in Last 30 Days Prior to the Interview	8.6	7.8
Mean Rating on Trauma Scale ³	13.0	13.3
Mean Number of Days Clients Used Alcohol to the Point of Feeling the Effects in 30 Days Prior to the Interview	1.9	2.2
Mean Number of Days Clients Used Any Drugs Other than Alcohol in 30 Days Prior to the Interview***	3.7	14.2

^{1.)} Includes spending nights at all-night theater, subway station, or other indoor public place; subway or bus; abandoned building; car or other private vehicle; on the street or other outdoor space; emergency shelter; clients doubled up for less than 30 days; and for clients in Interim housing.

- 2.) Based on a 5 point rating scale where 1 equals "excellent" and 5 equals "poor."
- 3.) The Trauma scale is a 6 item measure with a 5 point scale where higher scores represent greater feelings of trauma.
- #. Final Interview Could be at either at 6 months from Baseline Interview or 12 months from Baseline Interview.

^{*} $p \le .05$, ** $p \le .01$; *** $p \le .001$

Outcomes of Clients in Permanent Housing at the Baseline Interview & Final

Table 15 Cont'd	Interview #		
(N=160)		Baseline Interview	Final Intervie
Changes in Level of Victimization			
NA T T' C	<i>r</i>		

Mean Total Times Clients Were Victimized by

Assault/Robbery in 60 days Prior to the Interview

Mean Total Times Clients Were Victimized by Domestic

Violence or Rape in 60 Days Prior to the Interview

Changes in Resources

Mean Number of Days Clients Were Paid for Working in the

Last 30 Days Prior to the Interview* Mean Number of Total Professional Services Received by

Client Mean Number of Total Employment Related Services

Received by Client Mean Number of Total Advocacy Services Received by

Client

0.1

0.1

0.0

5.0

1.8

1.4

0.2

3.9

2.2 0.4

0.4

1.5

#. Final Interview Could be at either at 6 months from Baseline Interview or 12 months from Baseline Interview. * $p \le .05$, ** $p \le .01$; *** $p \le .001$

Predicting Client Outcomes

Please Turn Your Attention to the Handout

 We looked at the outcomes of clients who were originally in either interim or emergency housing programs

 We also looked for differences between those who were in two different housing programs (emergency vs. interim)

What We Did:

- First, we "control" for a number of factors that may have some effect on homelessness independent of the efforts undertaken by the programs (Model 1), such as:
 - Whether individuals were homeless with family versus single at the time of the baseline interview
 - Demographic Traits Gender, Race, Age, Education, and etc.
 - Personal characteristics Felony Convictions, Disability Status, Substance and Alcohol Use/Abuse, Psychiatric Hospitalization
 - Homeless History
 - Other Factors: Days in Program, Time Between First and Last Interview
- Then (Model 2), we also control for the type of services received in the 30 days prior to the baseline interview (such as Professional, Advocacy and Employment Related Services)
- Finally (Model 3), we control for whether their first move was to market housing or not

What We Find:

- Interim housing programs are more successful than emergency shelters in assisting people to escape homelessness
 - They do this because they help clients obtain employment-related services
 - And, because they also help clients move to permanent housing programs or to market housing
- Families are more successful in escaping homelessness than singles
 - This is strongly related to their first move being to either a permanent housing program or market housing; and that move being stable.

Other Findings:

- There is no clear evidence that family heads and individuals who are unusually problem prone – that is experience more personal problems - are more likely to be homeless at the final interview than those who do not experience such problems.
- The one problem area that does seem to be related to days of homelessness at the final interview is alcohol use. In this case, individuals who report more days of alcohol use experience fewer days of homelessness.
- African Americans are more likely to be homeless at the final interview with all other factors controlled for.
- Also, Latinos experience more days of homelessness at the final interview than Whites and Blacks.
- While not statistically significant, there are some indications that those with felony convictions experience slightly more days of homelessness at the final interview (1 day out of 60).

Summary of Results

- Types of Programs
 - Shelters
 - Interim Housing Programs
 - Permanent/Supportive Housing Programs
- Family Heads
- Client Needs and Program Experience

Summary of Combined Findings Regarding Accessing and Negotiating The Homeless System

- Focus Groups
- Participant Observations and interviews
- Testing of the City of Chicago's 311 City Services system

Accessing the System

- The 311 City Services system was a very passive system
 - Most testers rated the 311 operators respectful, yet few found them helpful
 - Both single adults and heads of families focus group participants reported that they were just redirected to "nearest police stations"
 - Youth focus group members complained that their special needs not taken in consideration and directed to adult shelters
 - Test callers found the de-facto 311 protocol was to tell caller to go to closest police station or hospital emergency room and then call 311 back again
 - Operators mostly did not refer to specific programs, not even DFSS service centers
 - However, testers reported that in 16% of cases there was some more detailed information given. (Gave street address of police station or hospital, etc.) These were likely to be to youth or family callers
 - No tester was offered a well being check, call back or pick up for families with young children or unaccompanied youth

Accessing the System

Police Stations and Hospitals

- Often no staff at sites with knowledge of system to help, just a place to make a phone call
- Long waits for transportation pick up

Street Outreach

- HOP teams don't have direct linkage to organizations that provide clinical or housing services
- Possible mixed messages (regarding sweep teams)
- Contract team observed to have "best practices"

DFSS Service Centers

- Not primary point of access to shelter system but we observed and focus group members described some direct referrals to shelters
- Long waits for service and limited hours (9-5)
- Youth reported much better referrals and assistance at DFSS service centers compared to the City of Chicago 311 Call Center

Negotiating the System Key Themes: Siloing/Fragmentation & Lack of Sufficient Staff/Resources

DFSS

- Observations
 - System under-resourced in terms of staff and also referral programs (especially housing)
 - Long waiting lines for services
 - Workers helpful but, in a couple of notable exceptions, often passive in their approach
 - Limited tool kit
 - High demand means abbreviated case management

Focus Groups

- Most had no interaction with DFSS
- Of those who did, most talked about lack of resources and passivity of workers
 - However, there were reports of very helpful workers/effective services, especially from family heads and youth
- 10 S. Kedzie was valued as warming center, place to hang out and a source of mid-day food (Salvation army)

Negotiating the System

Key Themes: Siloing/Fragmentation & Lack of Sufficient Staff/Resources

Other Service Providers

- Focus group participants reported positive experiences from the agencies they were currently receiving services from
- But report system very fragmented
- Agency staff don't provide over-view of system
- A real need for more
 - Individualized services
 - Skillful case managers
 - Help in negotiating various systems
 - Assistance with employment and affordable housing
- Feel caught in system (blame their homelessness on larger system and economic conditions)
- Youth had less of a problem with lack of linkages within and without homeless system. (Education system helpful)



Questions/Comments