

A Supportive Housing Program in San Francisco



Preliminary Evaluation Findings of Bringing Families Home

August 2020

Amy Dworsky

Emily Rhodes

 **CHAPIN HALL**
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Introduction

Counties participating in California's Bringing Families Home (BFH) program have the difficult task of designing and implementing rapid housing and supportive service programs for child welfare-involved families experiencing homelessness, often in a very short period of time. Among the BFH counties, San Francisco County is the only one that had previously developed and tested a supportive housing program for child welfare-involved families experiencing homelessness as part of a federal demonstration project (see text box). An evaluation of that project showed that such programs can be effective, but serving high-need families in places where affordable housing is scarce requires significant planning, cross-system collaboration, and time. This paper describes the BFH program, presents data on early outcomes, and offers recommendations for moving forward.



Families Moving Forward

In 2012, the Children's Bureau funded five sites across the U.S. to design and test models for providing permanent housing along with supportive services to child welfare-involved families experiencing homelessness. The purpose of the demonstration was to reduce the need for foster care using a housing-first approach. The San Francisco Human Services Agency (SF-HSA), which was one of the grantees, created a scattered-site housing program called Families Moving Forward (FMF). FMF coupled intensive supportive services and housing search assistance with a mix of housing resources, but primarily Family Unification Program (FUP) Housing Choice Vouchers. Homeless Prenatal Program (HPP), a community-based partner, provided supportive services.

Chapin Hall used a randomized controlled trial to evaluate the effects of FMF. Families with newly opened in-home cases (Family Maintenance) and families with newly opened out-of-home care cases (Family Reunification) were separately randomized to a treatment group ($n = 79$) that was offered an opportunity to participate in FMF or a control group ($n = 75$) that received usual service.

BFH is the sustained version of FMF.

Key Findings from FMF Evaluation

Housing

"Housing first" in San Francisco did not mean "housing fast." Obtaining permanent housing took FMF families an average of 10 months; nearly one-third of the families left the program before being housed. However, the absence of immediate housing did not prevent families from participating in FMF and benefiting from the program. Ultimately, FMF families were more likely to become and stay permanently housed than control group families. FMF families with in-home cases were more likely to secure housing than families with reunification cases

Child Welfare

FMF improved short-term child welfare outcomes. Among families with reunification cases, FMF families reunified faster than control group families, but the percentage of families that reunified was the same, and 85% of all reunifications occurred before families were permanently housed. FMF families with in-home

cases were marginally less likely than control group families to have their children removed within the first 6 months after randomization, but this difference had disappeared after one year.

Well-being

Families with reunification cases were less likely to engage in FMF than families with in-home cases. In fact, all the families with in-home services cases engaged in FMF. Nearly all the families with reunification cases that failed to engage in FMF had substance-exposed newborns. Their reunification services were terminated after they failed to engage with the child welfare worker.


Engagement

FMF improved family functioning, increased residential stability and social connectedness, and reduced parental substance abuse. Child well-being outcomes tended to improve, but the changes were small.

Bringing Families Home (BFH)

San Francisco began implementing Bringing Families Home (BFH) in July 2017 and families continue to enroll. Like FMF, BFH serves two groups of child welfare system-involved families experiencing homelessness: families receiving in-home services to prevent their children from being placed in foster care and families with children in foster care receiving reunification services. These are referred to as family maintenance cases and family reunification cases, respectively. To be eligible for FMF, families must be identified as homeless or at risk for becoming homeless on a Structured Decision Making risk assessment conducted by HSA, and have at least one other risk factor (e.g., substance use, mental health, or disability).

All eligible families whose case has been opened for at least 6 months are referred to BFH. By the end of this 6-month period, families have typically been assigned a long-term protective service worker, the family's case status (i.e., family maintenance or family reunification) has been determined, and the parent who will receive in-home maintenance or reunification services has been identified. At this point, HPP can reach out to the protective service worker and primary parent to engage them in BFH. Currently, BFH has a waitlist of approximately 40 families and time to program enrollment is longer than 6 months.



Early BFH Outcomes

While most families referred to BFH are still in the program, some early outcomes data are available.

Engagement

Eighty-two percent ($n = 113$) of the 137 families referred to BFH have engaged in the program as of July 1, 2020. Of the remaining 24 families, 17 were ineligible or did not engage. The remaining 7 were recently referred and are waiting for an orientation meeting. To increase engagement, HPP recently started holding “town halls” with protective service workers at SF-HSA to clarify referral criteria, involve protective service workers in gathering the vital documents needed for the housing voucher application, and share information about BFH.

Housing


Seventy-eight families have been permanently housed through BFH as of July 1, 2020. Ninety-seven percent ($n = 76$) of these families were housed

with a FUP voucher. Two families have a long-term housing subsidy provided by the county. The majority of these families (86%) have been housed in the city of San Francisco. Families have taken a median of 133 days, or approximately 4 months, to secure permanent housing after they are referred to HPP.

Supportive Services

Families receive an average of **7 hours of case management per month** from HPP. Services are the most intensive in the first month (see Figure 1), when families receive an average of 18 hours of case management. During that month, HPP takes steps to engage the family and gather vital documents for the housing voucher application. On average, families receive more hours of case management while they are searching for housing (10 hours per month) than after they are stably housed (4 hours Figure 1. Average Homeless Prenatal Program.


Figure 1. Average Homeless Prenatal Program (HPP) Case Management Hours per Family, by Month in Program ($n = 102$)



Well-being

HPP administers the Adult Needs and Strengths Assessment (ANSA) with parents at program entry as part of case planning and every 6 months thereafter to monitor case progress. An ANSA domain is considered “actionable” if the family needs immediate services in that domain. As of April 30, 2020, 102 adults had completed baseline ANSAs and 67 had completed at least one follow-up ANSA. Of the adults with follow-up ANSAs, **significantly fewer had actionable legal, substance abuse, family functioning, and residential stability needs at follow-up than at baseline** (see Figure 2). Adults continue to have needs related to anxiety, depression, life skills, and medical conditions, and may still be receiving services in those domains.

Figure 2. Differences in Adult Needs and Strengths between Baseline and Follow Up: Adults Engaged in BFH as of 4/30/2020 (n = 67)



*p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001




FMF INSPIRED SYSTEMS CHANGE

FMF generated many changes in how systems collaborate to serve child welfare system-involved families experiencing homelessness. Efforts to improve the identification of homeless families included training child welfare workers on a single definition of homelessness and monitoring the data to ensure that homeless families were identified and served. Child welfare workers are now expected to record the housing status of families and incorporate housing into case plans. The collaboration between SF-HSA and the San Francisco Housing Authority improved, making it easier to serve child welfare system-involved families experiencing homelessness and accelerating the issuance of housing vouchers. Prior to the FMF project, San Francisco was not making full use of FUP vouchers. Now all of its FUP vouchers are being used.

Child Welfare

As of December 31, 2019, 102 families had an open child welfare case at the time they were referred to HPP. Fifty-one percent of these families ($n = 52$) had an in-home child welfare case and 49% ($n = 50$) had a family reunification case. Six of the 52 families with an in-home child welfare case (12%) had experienced a child removal and 23 of the 50 families with a family reunification case (46%) still had children in foster care (see Figure 3). Eighty-one percent ($n = 22$) of the 27 families whose children had left foster care were reunified. Five families had children exit through guardianship.

Figure 3. Exit Outcomes for BFH Families with Reunification Cases (N=50 as of 12/31/2019)



Program outcomes

As of July 1, 2020, 44% ($n = 50$) of the 113 families that engaged in BFH had exited the program (Table 1). The most common exit reason is achieving stable housing ($n = 25$). These families had permanent housing, their child welfare cases were closed, and the parents had no actionable needs as measured by the ANSA. The next most common exit reasons are discontinuation of reunification efforts ($n = 10$) and disengagement or whereabouts unknown ($n = 7$).

Figure 4. BFH Program Outcomes for Families that Exited the Program as of 7/1/2020 (N=50)



Summary

Early analysis suggests that BFH is successfully engaging, housing, and providing supportive services to most referred families. Adult well-being improves for families that persist in the program on some ANSA domains, especially residential stability and family functioning. These results suggest that BFH is helping families stabilize their housing and address their other needs. Evaluators will continue to monitor process and outcome indicators, including child welfare outcomes, as more families successfully complete the program.

BFH Projections and Recommendations

Projections

Based on the pace of eligible referrals and the experiences of referred families to date, our expectations for the coming year are for 57 eligible families to enroll, 50 eligible families to engage with HPP, and 40 families to be housed.



Narrow the target population to in-home services (family maintenance) families and reunification families for whom the case plan goal is likely to remain reunification.

In other words, exclude families whose children are in out-of-home care and likely to be fast-tracked to adoption or guardianship and create a housing solution for these families that is better tailored to their needs.



Continue to refer families to BFH using the process developed for FMF.

Staff at HSA should consistently review the homelessness indicator included in the Structured Decision Making risk assessment administered to families when a child welfare case is opened and other child welfare data to ensure that all eligible families are referred and all referred families are eligible.



Continue to offer temporary housing and subsidies as a bridge to permanent housing.

Bridge housing is likely an essential ingredient in any program operating in a housing market where the supply of affordable housing is low and families are likely to experience a protracted housing search.



Ensure that families are enrolled soon after case opening.

BFH's theory of change is based on the assumption that the best chance of success for families is early intervention.



Continue to improve communications about the program.

BFH recently started "town halls" between SF-HSA and HPP to clarify program referral criteria, engage protective service workers in gathering vital documents needed to apply for housing vouchers, and encourage collaboration on providing supportive services.

Statement of Independence and Integrity

Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization that engages in research and dissemination to inform public and private decision-makers and evidence-based policies and practices to improve the lives of children, youth, and families. Chapin Hall adheres to the values of science, meeting the highest standards of ethics, integrity, rigor, and objectivity in its research, analyses, and reporting.

Acknowledgement and Disclaimer

This project was funded by the State of California. We would like to thank our project partners at the San Francisco Human Services Agency and the Homeless Prenatal Program.

Suggested Citation

Rhodes, E., Dworsky, A. (2020). *Preliminary Evaluation Findings for Bringing Families Home San Francisco*. Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago

Correspondence

Robin Love, Program Manager, San Francisco Human Services Agency

Robin.Love@sfgov.org

Geoffrey Nagaye, Program Analyst, San Francisco Human Services Agency

Geoffrey.Nagaye@sfgov.org

Emily Rhodes, Researcher, Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago

erhodes@chapinhall.org