



**VA NATIONAL CENTER ON HOMELESSNESS AMONG VETERANS**

*Promoting data-driven, evidence-based solutions to end Veteran homelessness*

# **Evidence Base Supporting Low Demand Housing Programs**

**M. Scott Young, PhD**

Research Associate Professor  
University of South Florida

**Paul Smits, LCSW**

Senior Policy Analyst  
University of South Florida



UNIVERSITY OF  
SOUTH FLORIDA



# Outline

## Do Low Demand Programs Work? What Does the Research Tell Us?

- Large study of VA-funded GPD programs (2011)
- Large study of HUD-VASH programs (2014)
- Meta-analysis of 44 housing programs (2009)

## Lessons from WFF National Survey of Safe Havens (2005)

- Ward Family Foundation (WFF) national study of 79 Safe Havens
- Conclusions: Permanent Housing & Best Practices

## Relation of WFF Evaluation to Low Demand GPD Process and Fidelity Assessments



**VA NATIONAL CENTER ON HOMELESSNESS AMONG VETERANS**

*Promoting data-driven, evidence-based solutions to end Veteran homelessness*

# **Do Low Demand Programs Work? What Does the Research Tell Us?**



VA NATIONAL CENTER ON HOMELESSNESS AMONG VETERANS

*Promoting data-driven, evidence-based solutions to end Veteran homelessness*

# Requiring Sobriety at Program Entry: Impact on Outcomes in Supported Transitional Housing for Homeless Veterans

John A. Schinka, Ph.D.

Roger J. Casey, Ph.D., M.S.W.

Wesley Kaspro, Ph.D., M.P.H.

Robert A. Rosenheck, M.D.

***Psychiatric Services* 62:1325–1330, 2011**

**GPD Study**

# *Schinka et al. (2011) Psychiatric Services*

<b>Objective</b>	To compare client characteristics & outcomes between Vets admitted to sobriety vs non-sobriety based programs
<b>Data Set</b>	3,188 GPD admissions & discharges from 2003 to 2005
<b>Comparison Groups</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. 49 programs requiring sobriety at admission (n=1,250); required 14-90 days of sobriety before admission</li><li>2. 59 programs without a sobriety requirement (n=1,938)</li></ol>

# *Schinka et al. (2011) Psychiatric Services*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Form X</b> – structured interview administered by program staff upon admission to program that includes sociodemographic, psychosocial, health, housing, employment, & staff diagnostic impressions
	<b>Form D</b> – reasons for discharge, place of residence, work status
	<b>Facility Survey</b> – program requirements, number of housing units, etc.

## **Findings at Entry to Program**

No differences between groups with regard to demographics (age, marital status, rural/urban, employment, VA and non-VA benefits)

Vets in sobriety based programs had fewer medical problems, were more likely to have used VA services in past 6 months, and had fewer days of alcohol & drug use

Vets who used alcohol or drugs at admission had more problematic histories (several general health and mental health variables)

## Findings at Exit from Program

Vets using alcohol or drugs at admission had shorter stay

Small differences in completion rates, homeless recidivism, & employment at discharge, “but effect sizes for these analyses were uniformly small and of questionable importance.”

Regression analyses did not find meaningful support for sobriety affecting any of the outcome measures

**Conclusion:** “sobriety on program entry is not a critical variable in determining outcomes for individuals in transitional housing programs.”





VA NATIONAL CENTER ON HOMELESSNESS AMONG VETERANS

*Promoting data-driven, evidence-based solutions to end Veteran homelessness*

Addictive Behaviors 39 (2014) 455–460

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Addictive Behaviors



Alcohol and drug use disorders among homeless veterans:  
Prevalence and association with supported housing outcomes

Jack Tsai <sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Wesley J. Kaspro <sup>b,c</sup>, Robert A. Rosenheck <sup>a,b,d</sup>

**HUD-VASH Study**

# Tsai et al. (2014) Addictive Behaviors

<b>Data Set</b>	29,143 homeless Vets in HUD-VASH
<b>Comparison Groups</b>	1. No SUD (n=11,753; 40%)
	2. Only Alcohol Use Disorder (n=4,848; 17%)
	3. Only Drug Use Disorder (n=3,193; 11%)
	4. Both AUD and DUD (n=9,349; 32%)
<b>Analyses</b>	Compared Group 1 (No SUD) to each other group, one at a time, on all of the following housing and clinical variables using GEE
	Comparisons made at 2 time periods: 1) baseline upon entry to program 2) 6-month follow-up

# Tsai et al. (2014) Addictive Behaviors

## **Housing Variables**

Nights in your own place

Nights in someone else's place

Nights in transitional housing or  
residential treatment

Nights in an institution

Nights homeless

# Tsai et al. (2014) Addictive Behaviors

## **Clinical Variables**

Mental health symptom score (self-report 8 items from ASI)

GAF score (1 to 100, clinician rated)

Clinician-rated alcohol use (rated from 1 abstinent to 5 dependence with institutionalization)

Clinician-rated drug use (1 to 5)

Social quality of life (self-report)

# Tsai et al. (2014) Addictive Behaviors

## **Findings Upon Entry to Program**

Vets with any SUD were older and more likely to be male

Prior to HUD-VASH, 60% had a SUD

54% of those w/SUD had both AUD & DUD

Vets w/both AUD & DUD reported the most homeless episodes in past 3 years

Vets w/any SUD stayed more nights in transitional housing or residential treatment in previous month

Vets w/any SUD had higher clinician ratings

# Tsai et al. (2014) Addictive Behaviors

**Findings 6 Months after Program Entry**

Controlling for differences between groups at baseline, there were no differences in housing outcomes

Vets w/SUD continued to report more problematic substance use, even after adjusting for baseline differences

All groups experienced improved GAF scores, quality of life, and housing

**Conclusion**

Despite strong associations b/w SUD & homelessness, HUD-VASH program is able to successfully house homeless Vets w/SUD



# Does One Size Fit All? What We Can and Can't Learn From a Meta-analysis of Housing Models for Persons With Mental Illness

H. Stephen Leff, Ph.D.

Clifton M. Chow, M.A.

Renee Pepin, M.A.

Jeremy Conley, B.Ph.

I. Elaine Allen, Ph.D.

Christopher A. Seaman, B.S.

PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES ' [ps.psychiatryonline.org](http://ps.psychiatryonline.org) ' April 2009 Vol. 60 No. 4

**Meta-Analysis**

## Methods

Meta-analysis of 44 unique housing alternatives described in 30 studies

Categorized each program into 1 of 4 types:

- 1) Residential care and treatment (**High Demand**)
- 2) Residential continuum (**High Demand**)
- 3) Permanent supported housing (**Low Demand**)
- 4) Non-model housing

Non-model programs consisted of arrangements with individuals living on the streets, using shelters, or residing in housing that were described simply as part of “treatment as usual.”



## Outcomes Variables

Housing stability, psychiatric symptoms, hospitalization, alcohol & drug abuse, satisfaction

## Results

All 3 housing models achieved significantly greater housing stability than non-model housing programs

But greatest housing stability associated with Low Demand programs

Low Demand programs had best outcomes for consumer satisfaction and reduced hospitalization

No differences in alcohol and drug abuse



VA NATIONAL CENTER ON HOMELESSNESS AMONG VETERANS

*Promoting data-driven, evidence-based solutions to end Veteran homelessness*

# Lessons from Ward Family Foundation (WFF) National Survey of Safe Havens



**VA NATIONAL CENTER ON HOMELESSNESS AMONG VETERANS**

*Promoting data-driven, evidence-based solutions to end Veteran homelessness*



Ward Family Foundation, Inc.

# **Safe Haven Programs**

## **Analysis of Strategies and Operating Practices**

**July, 2005**

### **Ward Family Foundation: National Survey of 79 Low Demand Safe Haven Programs**

<http://www.wardfamilyfoundation.org/wff-safehaven-programs.pdf>

# Ward Family Foundation, 2005

## **Purpose of Report**

Conscious decision not to look in any detail at the clinical symptoms of residents, and not to draw conclusions about impact that Safe Haven programs have on their recovery

Focused instead on whether Safe Havens are effective in moving residents into permanent housing, and identify best practices

## **Sample**

Identified 118 HUD-funded Safe Haven programs

79 returned a completed survey via mail

## Conclusion: Permanent Housing

Low Demand Safe Havens effectively engage and retain residents

More than half successfully transitioned into some type of permanent housing program:

- Approximately 30% exited to affordable perm. housing w/subsidy & supports (perm. supported housing)
- 13% to affordable permanent housing w/subsidy but without supports
- 7% to affordable permanent housing w/neither subsidy nor supports

# Ward Family Foundation, 2005

## Best Practices Benchmark (BPB)

Group of 15 programs with an 85.2% average exit to perm. housing, compared to 64 with a 41.6% rate

**BPB Basic Program Description:** More likely to be smaller programs, at full capacity, and offering more private accommodations

**BPB Admission Criteria:** more likely require diagnosis of SPMI + SUD for admission

**BPB Admission Procedures:** more likely to offer preadmission visits to assess if a good fit

**BPB Daily Life:** more likely to offer optional behavioral health activities

# Ward Family Foundation, 2005

**BPB Daily Life:** more likely to bring in people with different areas of expertise to discuss topics of interest (health, benefits, family)

**BPB Daily Life:** more likely to offer activities of general interest (sports night, cooking classes, monthly birthday dinner)

**BPB Daily Life:** more likely to offer regular opportunities for program governance participation (weekly meetings, feedback session)

**BPB Daily Life:** more likely to offer senior residents opportunities for mentoring and positive support

# Ward Family Foundation, 2005

**BPB Rules and Expectations:** more likely to given an incentive to do chores rather than forced to do them

**BPB Staffing:** higher staffing levels

**BPB Services:** more likely to offer a psychiatrist on-site

**BPB Services:** more likely to be clearly committed to vocational training, though mostly offered off-site





# Relation of WFF Evaluation to Low Demand GPD Annual Process & Fidelity Assessments

- Similar to the Ward Family Foundation, we are examining program policies and practices among Low Demand GPD programs
- HOMES data will be used for outcome comparisons
- No SOPs and flexibility to the extent that providers proposed different models
- We will use findings to guide technical assistance activities and inform discussions



## VA NATIONAL CENTER ON HOMELESSNESS AMONG VETERANS

*Promoting data-driven, evidence-based solutions to end Veteran homelessness*

# Questions/ Comments