



Moving In, Moving Up, Moving Forward

Developing an Assessment Tool to Identify
Potential Graduates from Permanent
Supportive Housing Programs Serving Persons
with Disabilities

Research Collaborators



- **Andrew Timleck, MPH, Ph.D.**
andrew@airshome.org; jtimleck@mac.com

AIRS – AIDS Interfaith Residential Services
1800 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21201
410-576-5070, x40



- **Sunny Lai, MPH**
sunnylai86@gmail.com

Bloomberg School of Public Health,
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD



Core Issue 1: Demand for Affordable Housing Outpaces Availability

- **Permanent Supportive Housing for persons experiencing disabilities is a successful health and social intervention**
 - HOPWA, HUD CoC (S+C, SHP, NEDs etc.); Provincial and Federal ministry collaborations
 - Housing as Health Care and prevention
 - Enhance psychosocial and physical health: Meds compliance, connection to care, supportive services, recovery, personal growth etc.
 - Fiscally smart – stop expending limited \$\$\$ on dead end interventions!
 - Encounters with police (→Jail/prison)
 - High utilizers of health services (ERs, institutions etc.)
- **Openings however are extremely limited, wait lists are long**
 - Limited funds, aging in place, economic climate etc.

Core Issue 2: We're not getting more housing so can we be more efficient?

- HEARTH Act (2010): **Providers should develop “graduation programs”**
- Not likely #units needed to meet demand will increase soon.
- Decrease time spent by residents in PSH programs →
- Increase “turn over” of existing units =
- Greater unit utilization

- While we are good at identifying eligible persons, and bringing them *into* our programs **we're not good at identifying who might be ready to exit those programs, potential “graduates”**.
 - HUD performance measures (income and housing destination at exit, e.g.) assess a resident's *stability*. They don't distinguish *who those people are, what they are like, or why they were stable or why they exited to permanent housing*

Identifying Potential Graduates, Creating a “Moving On” Program

- Efficiency dictates we **identify potential graduates** from our PSH programs to participate in “Moving On” programs.
- Participation is always voluntary
- **Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) defines “Moving On” as...**

“...enabling stable tenants of supportive housing who no longer require on-site services to transition to a private apartment with rental support and after care. ...while the vacated unit can be utilized by a vulnerable person who can best benefit from the intervention of supportive housing.”

What are the core components of a “Moving On” program?

- We reviewed existing graduation programs and found core components include...
 - **Assessment** (measure/score) of personal, social, economic, health and systemic barriers, residents’ lack of motivation, fears etc.
 - **Dedicated case management** (beyond “usual” supports) to assist residents to overcome barriers, exit to other housing.
 - **Economic incentives** targeted to residents AND agencies.
 - **Aftercare and follow-up case management** support.
 - **Private and foundation funding support** for extra costs incurred
 - No federal dollars typically.
- “Moving On” assessment is not a “Self-Sufficiency” assessment
 - Traditionally this would measure *current stability* – *not future success* – more psychosocial involved.

Motivations and Barriers to Resident Participation

■ Motivations

- Seeking greater independence
- Move to safer neighborhood
- Reunite with family
- Strong and trusted case management relations
- Availability of housing vouchers and moving stipends

■ Barriers

- Lack of affordable housing/subsidies
- Securing and maintaining employment/unstable incomes
- Don't want to leave their community
- Want to retain their case management services
- Agency's desire to retain stable tenants

Findings from “Moving On” Graduation Programs

- Success in “Moving On” programs happened when/where:
 - **Resident in PSH had stable rent history** (even in PSH), > 6mos
 - **No clinical crisis/es** in last 12 mos.
 - **Strong case management support and trust** – a relationship that could encourage the resident to become fully independent, without them feeling like they were being “turned out”.
 - **Stable source of income** – and not necessarily employment.
 - **Dedicated, trained, staff** to do the “graduate program”
 - **Committed funds** - for furniture, utilities, security deposits, overhead and staff (appear to range between \$800 to \$2000 per participant)
 - **Agencies who were motivated to place people** – e.g. “bonus payments” (i.e. Hilton Foundation paid \$2000 for each placement made by NYC Corporation for Supportive Housing)

Who's creating "Moving On" Graduation Programs?

- **Currently, about six such programs in the U.S.**
 - New York, NY; Columbus, OH; Detroit, MI; Atlanta, GA; and Los Angeles, CA
- **All are in "piloting" or early test phases**
 - Developing processes and protocols
 - Who should be targeted, how?
 - Developing screening and assessment tools to identify those ready *and likely able to succeed*.
 - Measures for stability, income, health, social and community supports, independent living skills.
- **In summary – "Moving On" programs are in their infancy, with only very recent testing of tools, and executed amongst a limited diversity of persons and communities of need.**

The numbers are so few!

Why should my agency do a "Moving On" program?

- On average only 3-5% of residents would score as "ready" and "eligible" for such a program. But....
- The longer residents stay *the less likely* they will have motivation, learn the skills, to be able to leave.
 - Non-program participant Stayers reside about 10 mos. to 1.5 years longer than leavers that *did* do the program (Detroit, Moving Up)
 - So it's not that they *won't leave* but that they may already be ready – just haven't *learned* that they are ready!
- Participants likely have even better health outcomes
 - Program participant "Leavers" utilize less ER and crisis services than "Stayers" that later left, without program support, to "non-independent" housing.
- Our own pilot testing showed probably 5-10 (2-5%) of households would qualify as "ready"
 - Turning over even those small numbers of units each year and housing *more vulnerable persons* is a demonstrable program success.
 - 5 households x 1.5 years saved = 7.5 years more of housing - increasing our capacity to serve more persons.

What's next?

- **We want to share the tool** (With permission from the first, piloting agencies whose work we derived our metrics from) with interested partnering researchers/agencies.
- **Test and refine the assessment tool.**
 - **Validity** –Do they measure what they say they do? Do we need better measures?
 - **Reliability** – does it work as expected? Are “graduates” more successful than “non-participants”?
 - **Generalizability** – across different groups, what needs to be added? What could be left out
 - **Simplicity** – Not one more tool or assessment! ARGH!
 - It has to be *usable* and that means easy, less work, with returns on invested effort as successful outcomes and measured, minimal financial costs.

Thank-you!

Contact Information

- **Andrew Timleck**, MPH, Ph.D.

andrew@airshome.org; jtimleck@mac.com

AIRS – AIDS Interfaith Residential Services

1800 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21201

410-576-5070, x40

- **Sunny Lai**, MPH

sunnylai86@gmail.com

Bloomberg School of Public Health,

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD