RESEARCH REPORT

Sustainability of Supportive Housing for Families in the Child Welfare System

The State of Services Integration and Systems Change in Participating Communities as a Federal Demonstration Ends

Martha R. Burt

June 2019

ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The nonprofit Urban Institute is a leading research organization dedicated to developing evidence-based insights that improve people's lives and strengthen communities. For 50 years, Urban has been the trusted source for rigorous analysis of complex social and economic issues; strategic advice to policymakers, philanthropists, and practitioners; and new, promising ideas that expand opportunities for all. Our work inspires effective decisions that advance fairness and enhance the well-being of people and places.

Contents

Acknowledgments

Executive Summary

The Partnerships to Demonstrate the Effectiveness of Supportive Housing, funded by the US Department of Health and Human Services, was designed to explore the effects of providing housing and intensive services to high-need families in the child welfare system. Demonstration sites created new service delivery structures to accomplish their goals, worked more intensively than ever with partner agencies, and changed agency policies and procedures to make the demonstration successful. Sites also found ways to sustain effective practices once their demonstration-funded projects ended. This report examines these sustainability efforts—specifically, maintaining the key policies and practices that *changed systems and integrated services* to more effectively target and support families.

Services integration refers to a community's ability to provide an individual or family the services they need, especially when the needs span two or more service systems. *Systems change* refers to changes that two or more service systems make that reorient activities to support the families the systems have in common, achieving shared goals more efficiently and effectively.

The principal agencies involved in the demonstration within each site included child welfare agencies, supportive service organizations, and public housing authorities (PHAs). Homeless assistance, health, and child-serving agencies played significant roles in some sites.

Highlights

All demonstration communities have seen changes in the public and nonprofit systems involved in the local projects. Some have received new funding to continue demonstration service configurations, some have expanded housing options, and some have brought new partners to the table. Memphis and San Francisco have continued the housing, services, and supports of their demonstration projects and extended them to new families. Connecticut has incorporated demonstration practices into the operations of its ongoing Supportive Housing for Families program, which existed before the partnership. In Broward County, child welfare–involved families similar to those in the demonstration will still receive wraparound services but without the housing, and Cedar Rapids has a new program through Communities of Hope that child welfare–involved families can access.

New Child Welfare Funding

Memphis and San Francisco have obtained substantial resources from child welfare agencies to continue and expand their demonstration project's work. This is impressive because among the ways a demonstration's benefits can be sustained, raising cash is probably the most difficult. Shelby County's Department of Children's Services has committed $187,000 to cover 15 months of supportive services, which were recently renewed when results (reduced placements) justified the outlay. San Francisco's Human Services Agency received a $1.9 million grant for 30 months of supportive services under the state's Bringing Families Home initiative, also renewable. Because the rent subsidies are still available to families similar to those who qualified for the demonstration, Memphis and San Francisco can keep their demonstration practices intact.

Demonstration Practices Sustained into the Future

SCREENING AND INTAKE PROCEDURES

The child welfare agencies in Connecticut and San Francisco have incorporated the demonstration's screening procedures to identify housing need into standard agency operating procedures, including intake or investigations databases and reports. They have increased their focus on housing need early in investigations and have trained staff (statewide in Connecticut) to use the new procedures.

FAMILY TEAM MEETINGS

All sites found value in the interagency team approach to identifying and carrying through on family service needs. All sites that will continue wraparound services intend to continue the family team meetings.

SPECIALIZED SERVICES

San Francisco's child welfare agency is continuing to pay for the housing specialist who has been so successful working with the San Francisco Housing Authority to house demonstration families. Connecticut's child welfare agency is continuing to pay for vocational specialists, expanding the cadre from one specialist for the demonstration to three specialists who cover the whole state. Vocational specialists help child welfare–involved families prepare for work, improve their job skills, and find and keep employment.

Connecticut, Memphis, and San Francisco made extensive use of caseload data to improve agency practices, service delivery, and decisionmaking for everything from defining need for services to arguing for investment to continue services after demonstration funding expired. These sites expect to maintain and strengthen their use of data for performance improvement.

Changes in the Larger Communities of Demonstration Sites

Most demonstration communities saw significant changes in PHA policies and practices, and some saw changes in homeless assistance agency policies.

PHA CHANGES

- **Set-asides or preferences.** The Cedar Rapids Housing Services Division (the local PHA) created a preference for child welfare–involved families and opened its otherwise-closed list twice to these families. Fifty-five families involved in Partners United for Supportive Housing, the Cedar Rapids demonstration project, received a permanent voucher or project-based unit. Broward County's five participating PHAs established a preference for families in the Housing, Empowerment, Achievement, Recovery, and Triumph Alliance for Sustainable Families during the demonstration but have not extended it. Memphis collaborators are working with the Memphis Housing Authority to set aside 25 vouchers for families moving on from the local demonstration's project-based housing, but this has not happened yet.

- **Administrative adjustments.** San Francisco's demonstration partners worked with the housing authority to ease eligibility criteria for Family Unification Program (FUP) vouchers and to simplify the application process. Both arrangements will continue. Memphis collaborators are working with the Memphis Housing Authority to accomplish similar administrative adjustments, including the option for families to complete their voucher application in the offices of the lead agency, where they can get help from staff.

- **Regional collaboration.** PHAs in the San Francisco Bay Area are developing common eligibility criteria, applications, and procedures for FUP and other vouchers to allow more efficient movement of families with vouchers from one PHA jurisdiction to another, eliminate the need for families to reapply to the new jurisdiction, and reduce similar barriers. The San Francisco demonstration's difficulties finding San Francisco–based housing for its families was one of the motivating factors for this collaboration, which could be a model for other regions.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE AGENCY CHANGES

- In February 2018, the Connecticut Interagency Council on Supportive Housing and Homelessness established a preference for child welfare–involved families for the supportive housing under its aegis.

- Memphis's lead agency for the demonstration, the Community Alliance for the Homeless, is responsible for all homeless-related resources coming to the city from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. During the demonstration, it committed more than 80 project-based permanent supportive housing units for families. These will be available to new families as demonstration families move on, along with rapid re-housing funds that can provide 12 or more months of rent subsidies to preservation families working to obtain permanent subsidies.

- In San Francisco, families similar to those in the demonstration may be able to access housing through the city's Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. The city's Human Services Agency has linkage arrangements with the department, which has consolidated all homeless-related public resources under one roof.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES OFFERED BY COMMUNITY AGENCIES

Child-serving nonprofit agencies will continue supportive services for families similar to those in the demonstration in most demonstration communities. In Connecticut, Memphis, and San Francisco, child welfare resources will support continued services at the same nonprofits involved in the demonstration—The Connection Inc. in Connecticut, Promise Development Corporation in Memphis, and the Homeless Prenatal Program in San Francisco.

In addition to these publicly funded commitments, demonstration communities have seen some private investment:

- The foundation associated with Kids in Distress (KID) in Broward County will support up to three caseworkers to provide supportive services to families similar to those in the demonstration. Along with this private funding commitment, Legal Aid in Broward County will work with KID to provide legal services to families being teamed. KID estimates that during the demonstration, Legal Aid's in-kind contribution of an advocate probably equaled $500,000 in legal assistance that families otherwise would not have received.

- Communities of Hope, a Casey Family Programs initiative, is working with Partners United for Supportive Housing collaborative partners in Cedar Rapids to create a Success Center to

prevent child abuse and neglect. Families similar to those in the demonstration will be able to access services at the Success Center.

OTHER IMPORTANT CHANGES

The Corporation for Supportive Housing selected Memphis for a pay for success project, which includes Memphis Strong Families Initiative project partners; UnitedHealthcare, the local Medicaid managed care agency; and the City of Memphis Housing and Community Development Department. The Corporation for Supportive Housing will help participating agencies design the project, structure the contracts for services, initiate service delivery, and establish monitoring procedures.

The Role of the Administration for Children and Families Demonstration Convenings

The partnership convenings were coordinated by the Administration for Children and Families, the division of the US Department of Health and Human Services that managed the demonstration, along with the Corporation for Supportive Housing and the Center for the Study of Social Policy, which provided technical assistance to sites throughout the demonstration. Team members at all sites agreed these meetings were useful. The convenings were invaluable for building trust, developing functioning teams, and sharing ideas that have payoffs long after the convenings are over.

Implications

Demonstration communities have made significant strides extending demonstration activities and principles. Most have found new money for services, have continued access to housing subsidies, and have developed collaborative relationships to push new developments into the future.

Long-term impacts on child welfare agency policies and practices are most likely to happen when the child welfare agency has the lead responsibility for the demonstration. Conversely, the child welfare agencies in two communities for which the lead agency was a nonprofit children's services agency did not play any leadership role during the demonstration and have not made significant changes. The child welfare agency in Memphis, though, was not the lead but was strongly involved in the local collaboration, remains involved, and has invested its own money to continue services.

Systems change is a never-ending process. It is difficult to get relevant agencies in any community to move in tandem toward a goal, even a shared goal. Once significant coordination and collaboration

have been achieved, it takes vigilance to keep the action going. Further, not all relevant agencies will be on board from the beginning. Demonstration communities were typical in this respect, gradually bringing in new agencies and strengthening ties across agencies as their projects matured. It is as important to recognize the weak links in demonstration communities as it is to note the successful collaborations and to acknowledge the ways some communities are building on their successes to use housing to reduce child welfare involvement for high-need families.

Sustainability of Supportive Housing for Families in the Child Welfare System

Recent research suggests a strong link between inadequate housing (e.g., substandard housing, doubling up, frequent moves, and homelessness) and family involvement in the child welfare system, including reports of child maltreatment or removal of children to state custody. Early studies using nonexperimental designs showed promise that assuring families of permanent housing by giving them a housing subsidy would reduce the families' involvement with child welfare. One study evaluating the Family Unification Program (FUP) found that FUP vouchers and related services reduced a family's involvement with the child welfare system and increased child well-being (Rog and Gutman 1997). A study of Keeping Families Together, a pilot program in New York City for homeless child welfare–involved families, found that supportive housing that combines rent subsidies and intensive services improves families' housing stability and decreases their risk of subsequent involvement with child welfare (Swann-Jackson, Tapper, and Fields 2010). An evaluation of Connecticut's statewide Supportive Housing for Families (SHF) program, which has served thousands of child welfare–involved families since 1998, provided additional evidence supporting this connection (Farrell et al. 2010).

These early studies focused on child welfare–involved families and the effects of *supportive housing*, an intervention that provides intensive wraparound services together with affordable housing. The goals of supportive services for child welfare–involved families include lasting housing stability, child safety, and resolution of issues that brought the family to the child welfare system's attention, which may include mental illness or substance use disorders. The supportive housing approach reasons that once a family has stable housing and no longer needs to worry about finding safe shelter, its members are better positioned to use supportive services to address their challenges with child safety (Tsemberis, Gulcur, and Nakae 2004).

The promising results of the early studies contributed to the decision by the US Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families to launch the multisite Partnerships to Demonstrate the Effectiveness of Supportive Housing for Families in the Child Welfare System (hereafter, "the Partnerships Demonstration" or "the demonstration"). Supportive housing is the core feature of the demonstration and has two components: (1) housing, which is made affordable to families through rent subsidies, and (2) intensive wraparound supportive services that help families

stabilize in housing. The early studies provided promising evidence, but none were conclusive. The demonstration improves on those early designs by using random assignment to create equivalent groups of families that do and do not receive the housing and services intervention.[1]

In September 2012, the Administration for Children and Families announced the five communities selected to participate in the demonstration: Broward County, Florida; Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Memphis, Tennessee; San Francisco, California; and the state of Connecticut. Each community received a $5 million grant covering a five-year period to provide supportive housing to homeless and unstably housed families involved in the child welfare system and to fund a local evaluation. Shortly thereafter, four private foundations—the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Casey Family Programs, and the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation—collaborating with the Administration for Children and Families, provided support for the Urban Institute to conduct a national evaluation to document themes and findings. The demonstration's goals were to (1) increase housing stability; (2) reduce child welfare system involvement, including reduced child maltreatment, child removals, and foster care placements; and (3) improve health and social and emotional outcomes among children and caregivers (Cunningham et al. 2015). In addition, demonstration communities were to do everything possible to sustain the demonstration's benefits into the future.

To accomplish these goals, the five grantee communities had to work across systems—including child welfare, housing, social services, and health—to develop procedures for integrating their services to best serve families. In addition to moving toward integrated services, the hope was also that some local systems would change permanently, as procedures developed for the demonstration proved efficacious and useful to their clients. The five grantees used the first year of their grants (fall 2012 through summer 2013) to plan their approach and the next year (fall 2013 through summer 2014) to implement it. Full practice was expected to be in place by summer 2014, with the grant running through 2017. Sites were up and running soon after implementation began, but, as with all complex change efforts, processes and relationships continued to grow and evolve. Each site worked with a local evaluator of its own choosing as part of its grant and participated in the Urban Institute's national evaluation, of which this report is a part.

The national evaluation has several components, including an impact study, a targeting and prediction study, a cost study, and an implementation and process study (Cunningham et al. 2015). The impact component of the national evaluation reveals whether housing with supportive services improves residential stability and well-being in families with housing issues severe enough to threaten removal of a child or to impede reunification with children already in care (Pergamit et al. 2019). In addition to being homeless or at imminent risk of homelessness, target families had to have at least one

of the following challenges: mental illness, disability, substance use disorder, domestic violence, or a child with a disability. Most families selected for the demonstration met two or more eligibility criteria.

The process component focused initially on how each site handled essential implementation tasks: developing screening procedures capable of identifying appropriate families and referring them to the demonstration, establishing functioning multiagency teams to provide wraparound services, and creating a governance structure at the frontline, middle-management, and executive levels.

Each site strove to bridge and penetrate the silos that often separate child welfare, local housing agencies, housing and homeless service providers, and other community partners. Multiagency partners worked together to implement an intervention that included housing subsidies, case management services, parent and family functioning services, and child well-being services. These services and resources were hypothesized to increase housing stability, family stability, and parenting, which would improve child well-being and reduce families' risk of remaining involved in the child welfare system. Accomplishments during the demonstration's first two years of full implementation were reported in Burt, Gearing, and McDaniel (2016). McDaniel and colleagues (2019) provide the final assessment.

Methods and Definitions

During the demonstration's later years, the process component focused on the demonstration's *organizational* impact. Specifically, we looked at whether child welfare and other agencies adopted demonstration practices and whether there were community commitments to sustaining new practices for child welfare–involved families with housing issues. Such commitments could take the form of money, permanently changed procedures, ongoing partnership interactions, and the like. This report describes themes from the national evaluation of the ways the five demonstration communities have been able to sustain and expand their successes in services integration and systems change as the demonstration ended. Information from the sites' semiannual reports and interviews with key site staff and local evaluators conducted in February 2018 forms the basis of this report (we did not interview anyone from the Linn County child welfare agency, and in Broward County, we spoke with only one person about intake data, not about the demonstration as a whole and ChildNet's involvement). Summaries of site visits conducted throughout the demonstration, the last ones occurring in September and October 2017, augment the other sources.

Defining Services Integration, Systems Change, and Their Markers

The demonstration brought together three types of agencies: (1) child welfare agencies that provide families for the demonstration; (2) supportive services supplied by social services, mental health, and health agencies; and (3) housing or subsidy providers that make housing affordable for demonstration families. These agencies needed to work together for the intervention to help families most effectively. Though some agencies had collaborated before the demonstration, each site had to include more agencies in more intensive interactions than were standard practice before the demonstration began. Agencies worked through services integration and systems change to coordinate with one another; these were the demonstration's intended outcomes:

- **Services integration** refers to a community's ability to get any individual or family the services it needs, especially when the needs span two or more systems. A major demonstration goal was to develop new partnerships among child welfare agencies, housing providers, and other service organizations, assuming that the families eligible for demonstration services would need various supports and would need to coordinate those supports to be effective. An outcome of the demonstration would be that communities would find resources to assure that one or more of the services integration mechanisms developed during the demonstration would become standard operating procedure for the agencies involved.

- **Systems change** refers to changes in two or more service systems that reorient the systems' activities toward more efficient and effective achievement of new or long-standing goals and supports for families the systems have in common.

To reach the demonstration's ambitious goals, each community established multiagency casework teams to comprehensively and holistically serve families. These teams involved agencies offering child welfare services, family services, and housing and housing supports. Other services and agencies that might be involved, depending on family needs, offered employment services, mental health and substance abuse treatment, criminal justice support, or domestic violence services.

In addition, demonstration communities set up systems of governance to improve service delivery and related system changes within individual agencies. Ultimately, if practices developed through the demonstration proved effective for families with complex needs, the local governance structure, particularly its executive level, was expected to establish permanent procedural, policy, and funding changes within and across agencies to benefit child welfare–involved families, the agencies, or both. Table 1 provides a snapshot of the core agencies, housing providers, and services in each site. The appendix profiles each site's progress toward sustainability after the demonstration ended.[2]

TABLE 1
Snapshot of the Demonstration Sites

Site	Core agencies involved	Subsidy source	Housing type	Services provided
Housing, Empowerment, Achievement, Recovery, and Triumph Alliance for Sustainable Families: Broward County, Florida	Kids in Distress, ChildNet, Broward County Sheriff's Office, five public housing authorities	Housing choice vouchers (Section 8)	Scattered site	Substance abuse treatment, mental health treatment, financial planning, employment services, housing advocate, parenting, cognitive behavioral therapy
Partners United for Supportive Housing: Cedar Rapids, Iowa	Four Oaks, Linn County Dept. of Human Services, Affordable Housing Network	24-month rent subsidies supported by renewable grant and housing choice vouchers	Scattered site	Substance abuse treatment, mental health treatment, continuing education, job training, workforce development, parenting, cognitive behavioral therapy
Intensive Supportive Housing for Families: Connecticut[a]	Dept. of Children and Families, Connecticut Dept. of Housing, The Connection Inc.	State and federal vouchers	Scattered site	Substance abuse therapy, mental health therapy, parenting, functional family therapy, cognitive behavioral therapy, vocational services
Memphis Strong Families Initiative: Memphis, Tennessee	Community Alliance for the Homeless, Promise Development Corporation, Tennessee Dept. of Children's Services	HUD family Supportive Housing Program grant	Project-based, five apartment buildings	Substance abuse therapy, mental health therapy, parenting, cognitive behavioral therapy, employment services
Families Moving Forward: San Francisco, California	Human Services Agency, San Francisco Housing Authority, Homeless Prenatal Program, Infant-Parent Program	FUP and housing choice vouchers; city-funded rent subsidies through a local operating subsidy program	Scattered site and project-based	Parenting, access to social programs, cognitive behavioral therapy, peer mentors, housing specialist

Note: FUP = Family Unification Program; HUD = US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

[a] Connecticut has a second treatment condition (Supportive Housing for Families), which enrolled 56 families.

The national evaluation team analyzed information gathered from sites in relation to markers of services integration and systems change. These markers include changes in communication, coordination, and collaboration among demonstration partners and changes in commitments of leadership and people in power, funding commitments, knowledge, skills, habits, and attitudes (Burt and Spellman 2007; Greiff, Proscio, and Wilkins 2003). These markers are central to organizational functioning and should look different over the course of the demonstration if services become more integrated and if systems change. For example, cross-agency communication, coordination, and collaboration would likely increase in ways that meet families' needs more smoothly or seamlessly. Agencies would also likely change their staff and funding to reflect new cross-agency activity. An example of a change in commitments of leadership and people in power might include an agency dedicating staff to assuring the new activity's success. Funding commitment change could include an

agency earmarking routine funding for the new activity. Changes in knowledge, skills, habits, or attitudes might include staff in different partner agencies knowing more about what their partner agencies do and understanding partner agencies' constraints. Or there may be a new and shared understanding across agencies about the families they jointly serve and the problem the new activity aims to solve. After the demonstration ended, the national evaluation team's analysis focused on permanent changes in these elements that communities are sustaining into the future.

Systems Change Following the Demonstration

Demonstration communities made progress toward systems change in their early years, change that accelerated as the local projects ended. We focus here on changes in child welfare and other casework practices and the funding to sustain them, changes in rental subsidy opportunities, and new and expanded community collaborations. Activities and accomplishments described here receive fuller treatment in the site descriptions in the appendix.

Changes at Child Welfare Agencies

NEW FUNDING FOR SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
The ultimate indicator that a community has found the partnership's project valuable is its commitment to continue the work with new families once the project ends. Two aspects of this commitment are money and agency practices. This section reports the new financial commitments to sustain the approaches to working with child welfare–involved families with housing needs the five sites developed. The next section looks at extensions of child welfare and other service practices.

Table 2 summarizes the new *financial resources* for or from child welfare agencies that communities are investing to extend the work of their demonstration project. Table 3 summarizes new *staffing* and *practice* commitments in child welfare agencies to extend demonstration practices, and table 4 summarizes housing commitments.

TABLE 2
New Financial Commitments within, from, and to Child Welfare Agencies

Community	Amount of new funding	Source of new funding	What new funding pays for
Broward County	No	No	No
Cedar Rapids	No	No	No
Connecticut	No	No	No
Memphis	$187,500 for 15 months, renewed once, renewability continuing	Shelby County office of the Tennessee Department of Children's Services	Extending Memphis Strong Families Initiative supportive services to new families, both preservation and reunification
San Francisco	$1.9 million for 30 months, renewable	California Department of Social Services, administrator of Bringing Families Home, new state program; 12 counties received awards in the first round	Extension of Families Moving Forward supportive services to new families

Memphis and San Francisco obtained substantial resources from child welfare agencies to continue and expand their demonstration project's work. This is impressive because among the ways a demonstration's benefits can be sustained into the future, raising cash is probably the most difficult.

Memphis. Shelby County's Department of Children's Services (DCS) invested $187,500 to continue the Memphis Strong Families Initiative (MSFI) collaboration for 15 months, with the option to renew if results were as promised. One renewal has just occurred. The state administers child welfare services, and each locality has funds to use at its discretion to further its mission. The DCS regional administrator most active in the MSFI collaboration knew that Shelby County, where Memphis is located, had money allocated for certain services, but it was underspent. She went to the commissioner and budget director with a proposal to direct those funds toward continuing and expanding MSFI services once the demonstration ended. Using outcomes data from the MSFI, she showed how many families and children were being helped to remain with their families because they have housing. To continue this success with more families and reduce the county's in-care population, she asked to be able to contract with the Community Alliance for the Homeless, or CAFTH (rather than with agencies that already had DCS service contracts), to provide housing stabilization and retention services.

She asked for and received $37,500 to fund services beginning in March 2018 for the rest of the 2017–18 fiscal year, and $150,000 for fiscal year 2018–19 (July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2019). The DCS renewed the funds for fiscal year 2019–20 when the data continued to show reduced use of out-of-home care.

The program will still be called the MSFI but will cover a broader range of families and a broader range of services, expanding from preservation families to include families seeking reunification. The expanded MSFI will be able to use rapid re-housing dollars for housing costs for families in housing but at risk of losing it, which can benefit intact families in need of preservation services. Although rapid re-housing programs do not provide a permanent subsidy, they can provide up to 24 months of rental assistance, giving a family time to stabilize and find either a permanent subsidy or the earned income to cover housing costs. The MSFI also has access to resources restricted to households that are literally homeless. When needed, the DCS can cover essential costs such as rent deposits and first month's rent to help people move into housing.

San Francisco. San Francisco's Human Services Agency, the demonstration's lead agency, received a $1.9 million grant in May 2017 from the California Department of Social Services to implement a new state program, Bringing Families Home (BFH). BFH in San Francisco will continue supportive services and other aspects of Families Moving Forward (FMF) for new families over two and a half years. One advocate promoting the legislation that created BFH used the FMF experience to show San Francisco legislators why they should support the legislation.

BFH funding is one leg of the Human Services Agency's sustainability commitment. It supports the agency's actions to embed major practice elements developed for FMF into standard agency procedures for families with FMF levels of need. These include (described in more detail in the next section)

- screening all new cases for housing needs;

- dedicating case management and housing specialists at the Homeless Prenatal Program for families found eligible for BFH;

- using FMF's case management model, including documentation, as it evolved over the course of FMF;

- using a continuous quality improvement process to maintain effective services;

- ensuring continued access to FUP vouchers through the San Francisco Housing Authority; and

- promoting bridge housing at Holloway House to stabilize families while they wait to receive a voucher and get into permanent housing.

DEMONSTRATION PRACTICES SUSTAINED INTO THE FUTURE

Agencies involved in the demonstration thought child welfare practices developed for the demonstration were effective and contributed sufficient value that those practices are being incorporated as standard operating procedure locally and, in one instance, statewide. These practices include housing-focused screening procedures and requirements for intake reports, family team meetings, extended specialty services, and data use for monitoring and quality improvement. All involve substantial resources.

The new money in San Francisco and Memphis supports the extensions of demonstration practices described in this section. But new money is not the only way agencies have committed their resources to continuing demonstration practices. The changes in practice detailed below involve significant staff time. In addition, child welfare agency financial resources have been committed through contracts to nonprofits to continue or expand specialized services such as vocational or housing specialists. These shifts of resources constitute systems change. Table 3 summarizes the ways demonstration practices continue in child welfare agencies.

TABLE 3

Continuing Demonstration Practices in Child Welfare Agencies

Community	Screening and intake	Family team meetings	Special services	Data use
Broward County	No	No	No	No
Cedar Rapids	No	No	No	No
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	Vocational specialists	Yes
Memphis	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
San Francisco	Yes	Yes	Housing specialist	Yes

SCREENING AND INTAKE PROCEDURES

The first challenge most sites faced was getting enough referrals of appropriate families from child welfare agencies. Each site eventually worked out procedures to get enough families. In three communities, these procedures were formal and have been adopted as standard agency procedure. The lead agencies for the San Francisco and Connecticut projects were the child welfare agencies. Both developed formal screeners to identify appropriate families during the demonstration, and both have institutionalized these housing-focused screeners into their everyday practice. In Memphis, the child welfare agency was not the lead agency but was an active partner in the MSFI. The agency did not change its screener but significantly increased its focus on housing issues and is likely to change even more as negotiations continue for interagency relations under the expanded MSFI.

Software is an aspect of bureaucratic functioning that is often impervious to change. It takes a lot of motivation in any organization to add fields to a long-standing computer program—in this case, the software used for intake and case processing. The agency must view the new fields as adding significant value to commit to the changes that, in addition to the actual software changes, include retraining staff and modifying case planning to accommodate the new information. It is significant that two sites have taken this step. Also, these are the sites with child welfare agencies as the lead agencies. They had sufficient initial interest in demonstrating the role of housing to apply for the demonstration as the lead agency, and they had the organizational authority, once demonstration practices proved effective, to implement them throughout their jurisdiction—citywide and countywide in San Francisco's case and statewide in Connecticut's.

San Francisco. San Francisco's Human Services Agency developed a screener for Families Moving Forward, its demonstration program, to obtain consistent and systematic information on each family's housing status and needs and their implications for family preservation and reunification decisions. Before FMF, this had not been standard operating procedure. The FMF screener has now been embedded in the child welfare agency's intake procedures and software. All new investigations are screened for housing needs, assuring that the demonstration's housing focus continues throughout the agency.

Connecticut. Even though Connecticut's Department of Children and Families had had a program, Supportive Housing for Families, for about 15 years before its local demonstration program began, it did not have an easy-to-use, reliable, and consistent tool for assessing housing need. Just before the demonstration project, Intensive Supportive Housing for Families (ISHF), started, local evaluators shortened an existing instrument assessing families' housing needs, the Risks and Assets for Family Triage (RAFT), for use in the demonstration, where it became the Quick Risks and Assets for Family Triage (QRAFT). The Department of Children and Families began using the QRAFT in regions 3 and 4, where the demonstration was located, to identify housing need. The QRAFT helped focus the demonstration on families with the highest level of housing need.

The tool has proven its worth, and the Department of Children and Families intends to embed the QRAFT into its standard intake instrument for use statewide. With respect to the demonstration, the tool has been the only formal, consistent way the department has had to determine, via self-report, whether a family was in shelter when referred to the department or had been in shelter or otherwise literally homeless at some time in the past. Literal homelessness would increase household risk and is a

vital piece of information for the Department of Children and Families to obtain—especially for the demonstration, but also for child welfare practice in general.

The Department of Children and Families is using multiple vendors for different segments of the new Connecticut Child Welfare Information System based on flow of work. Careline is expected to be launched by the end of 2019, and the department anticipates that the scope of work for intake—the part that will incorporate the QRAFT—will tentatively be launched in 2020. Its inclusion will provide the information to highlight housing issues at child welfare intake throughout the state.

EXPANDED HOUSING FOCUS AT INTAKE IN MEMPHIS

Intake screening procedures at the Department of Children's Services are essential to Memphis Strong Families Initiative practice that will continue in the expanded MSFI. Early in the demonstration, the DCS decided to continue using its existing protocol for the demonstration, as it already included questions that could reveal what they needed to know about a family's housing situation. But the department modified the structure of its intake report to focus on the housing-related information gathered at intake in addition to the information gathered regarding the reason the family was referred to the department, which was not usually the family's housing situation. Casework practice changed for the demonstration to require that a summary be included in each case write-up of the family's housing situation and risks it poses to the children. Supervisors and workers received training on the full documentation and thorough assessment of housing status now required. This documentation influenced families' case plans during the demonstration.

These practices continue for the expanded MSFI. In addition, partners are taking time to further assess their intake protocols to be sure they consistently gather the housing information found most valuable during the demonstration. They are also tackling such problems as how to assess housing needs on a continuing basis (i.e., after intake) and how to extract and summarize data on housing needs and status changes, including progress toward housing stability.

FAMILY TEAM MEETINGS

The interagency teams that all sites assembled for the demonstration proved their value to participants and are continuing in some form in all demonstration communities. During the demonstration, these practices brought the resources of numerous agencies into play to provide wraparound services for treatment group families through attendance with the families at regular meetings. Connecticut, Memphis, and San Francisco child welfare agencies continue their team meeting structures with all or

most participants. In Broward County and Cedar Rapids, team meetings continue but with diminished participation of several agencies.

In Connecticut, family team meetings will continue through the Department of Children and Families as part of its long-standing Supportive Housing for Families program. The Connection Inc., the nonprofit agency that provided wraparound services in Connecticut's demonstration, first used family team meetings during the demonstration and continues to do so now that the demonstration is over. San Francisco also continues family team meetings through contract with its demonstration service partner, the Homeless Prenatal Program. Memphis's extension and expansion of the MSFI also continues to use family team meetings with the same partners involved in the demonstration.

Colocation and Expanded Team Meetings

Memphis's housing for the demonstration was based in five multifamily buildings. The supportive services provider housed staff on-site in these buildings, and the DCS added its own staff member who was familiar with DCS procedures and support options. This colocation facilitated MSFI families' access to important supports on a daily basis as well as during family team meetings. This staff member remains on-site for the expanded MSFI and will be available to help new families. Further augmenting MSFI procedures for the expansion, a standardized communications protocol has been established to specify who does what and when in intake and case processing. For the demonstration, the Memphis Inter-Faith Association did all the intake assessments, determining families' eligibility and referring them for random assignment. This will change in the future. A memorandum of understanding was designed to implement services under the MSFI expansion, specifying many details of the collaboration among the DCS, the Memphis Inter-Faith Association, CAFTH, and Promise Development Corporation, such as eligibility (and for what services), referral processes, data and documentation, and how the DCS data system will be used. The Memphis Inter-Faith Association process worked so well for the demonstration that it will continue to do the assessments, with a DCS worker as the point person for joint case planning.

Extended Specialty Services

Several demonstration sites used grant funds to cover specialists in areas useful for treatment group families. San Francisco covered the cost of a housing specialist at its service partner, the Homeless Prenatal Program, during the demonstration and continues to cover this position. The housing specialist helps families find housing, work through the San Francisco Housing Authority voucher application

process, move in, and stabilize in housing. She also works with landlords, recruiting new ones, serving as backup should landlords need help with tenant issues, and assuring that units pass San Francisco Housing Authority inspection (thus improving the landlord experience with the housing authority). She is credited with improving the relationship between the Human Services Agency and the housing authority to the advantage of both agencies and especially of demonstration families and new families.

In Connecticut, the Department of Children and Families used demonstration funds to cover the cost of a vocational specialist housed at The Connection Inc. The vocational specialist helped parents prepare for, find, and keep employment. This position proved so valuable that the department has now tripled its availability, covering three vocational specialists to serve new families throughout the state through its Supportive Housing Program.

Uses of Data for Monitoring and Quality Improvement

Data are usually a hard sell in overworked agencies serving children, including child welfare agencies and nonprofit children's services agencies. The usual source of resistance is that entering data takes time away from working with clients, and the data never get used anyway, at least in ways that help the frontline workers who must enter them. The demonstration projects in several sites changed those attitudes and overcame resistance, with significant impacts on practice. The best examples of using data effectively come from Connecticut (step-down and step-up procedures), San Francisco (continuous quality improvement activities), and Memphis (documentation of impact leading to new funding).

CONNECTICUT

Intensive Supportive Housing for Families had a formal logic model that included identifying family needs and providing relevant services, with the expectation that the services would help and that families would later need fewer of them—that is, the family would thrive on fewer services, or "step down." Alternatively, a family that had been doing well could face a crisis and need more services than it had been receiving, or "step up." To assess this model and to ensure that changes in case management intensity were intentional, demonstration staff and local evaluators had to measure family stability and progress in addressing needs so changes could be related to service receipt. Early in the demonstration the local evaluators realized that no such systematic documentation existed. They teamed up with the Department of Children and Families and The Connection Inc. to develop and use a formal recording structure to document family progress and be the basis for decisions that the family was ready to step down or needed to step up. Using this protocol for the rest of the demonstration included routine feedback to caseworkers about the need for and effects of changes in services, as well as feedback

about the effects of service changes and whether they had or had not accomplished their goals. Caseworkers found these feedback sessions valuable and came to appreciate what good data could tell them to help them do their jobs more effectively.

This step-down and step-up protocol has been formally adopted in Supportive Housing for Families. Program staff at the Department of Children and Families were trained in family team meeting and the case management service intensity protocol and decisionmaking process in August 2017, and both components have been fully implemented. All SHF partners were trained in the same approaches and procedures, and the components are fully implemented statewide in the SHF program as SHF takes over the demonstration's work.

SAN FRANCISCO

Respondents described the highly interactive process through which the Human Services Agency and the Homeless Prenatal Program have evolved into their present state of collaboration. The process involved creating a logic model for the intervention, developing a case management and housing model that followed the logic model and had measurable steps, using data to examine what was working and what was not, analyzing reasons and making adjustments, and repeating the process to make continuous improvements in service quality and effectiveness. The continuous quality improvement team met every month throughout FMF. The Human Services Agency has been pleased with the results and is using the continuous quality improvement process for other innovative projects and disseminating information about how the model works.

MEMPHIS

The DCS regional administrator for Shelby County used outcomes data from the MSFI to show that the demonstration helped keep families together and avoid out-of-home placements. Her advocacy, plus the data, convinced her superiors that continuing and expanding the MSFI by investing department funds would further the department's mission.

Changed Attitudes toward Utility of Housing and the Housing First Model

Change in child welfare agencies also included changed attitudes. Many child welfare caseworkers were initially unfamiliar with the idea of Housing First and were more likely to believe that families had to address barriers to housing and parenting before being ready for housing, showing they were motivated and deserving. These attitudes are not surprising given that, before the demonstration, child welfare workers did not have housing resources to offer and did not think about when housing resources should

be made available. Further, it is common in many helping professions to think of housing as a reward for good behavior and to demand that behavior before providing the reward.

Studies of Housing First have shown, however, that many behaviors have little chance to improve *without* housing and that housing is the platform on which improvements in health and behavioral health can occur (Tsemberis, Gulcur, and Nakae 2004). In theory, by putting housing first, families can stabilize and then attend to other issues. Demonstration staff worked with child welfare caseworkers and supervisors through training, personal contacts, informal discussions, and documentation of results with families to change these attitudes. Child welfare caseworker behavior changed in most sites as the demonstration proceeded. Caseworkers altered the ways they referred families and worked in the teams to support them. Some caseworkers still adhere to the "housing as reward for good behavior" approach, but as the demonstration projects ended, an increasing number appreciated Housing First.

Pragmatic concerns will still influence the timing of housing placement. For example, if a parent must enter residential drug treatment for several months, it may not be feasible to reunify a family and place it in housing until the parent can live with the children again. Child welfare agencies also struggle to apply Housing First principles because their chief responsibility is children's safety, which they must consider as they develop case plans. For PHAs, a different pragmatic concern emerged with reunification families. Reunification families receiving Broward County vouchers received the voucher and the housing, on average, *12 months* before they got their children back from foster care, owing to the time it took courts to release the children once stable housing could be documented. The housing authorities felt this represented many months during which vouchers were in use and tying up PHA resources but not housing families with children. The Broward County courts were not part of the Housing, Empowerment, Achievement, Recovery, and Triumph (HEART) collaboration.

Changes in the Larger Community

Housing

Housing was the demonstration's key ingredient, the basic need to which most child welfare agencies had no access. Lack of housing is not a sufficient reason for removing or failing to return a child in most jurisdictions, though it can contribute to an agency's decision. Broward County is the exception to this generalization because Florida law requires that a family have stable housing before it can reunify with a child in care. When a Florida child welfare agency has no housing to offer, it must deny reunification.

In general, child welfare agencies do not have access to short- or long-term rental subsidies. This may account for agencies' light focus on a family's housing needs (e.g., few agencies have a field for housing status in their intake database or require a section on housing needs in all investigation reports).

Demonstration sites had to show in their applications that they had access to housing. All had access to various forms of housing. Broward County, Connecticut, and San Francisco had access to housing choice or FUP vouchers through their local public housing authorities. These vouchers are "permanent," lasting as long as recipients are income-eligible, can pay the rent, and do not violate their lease, or until they choose to relinquish them. The vouchers were used to subsidize rents in units scattered throughout the community. Memphis used a different form of long-term subsidy: units of permanent supportive housing for families available under the aegis of that community's lead agency, the Community Alliance for the Homeless. All families met the disability levels required for this housing, but eligibility also included having at least one child in the household, so Memphis could not serve reunification families unless at least one child remained with the parent. The units were project-based, located in five multifamily buildings whose tenants were all treatment group families. Finally, the Cedar Rapids demonstration only had access to private funds to provide up to 24 months of rental assistance to project clients. Families used this assistance to access units throughout the community, and the Cedar Rapids collaborators worked hard to get the local PHA to establish a preference for child welfare–involved families so treatment group families could receive a long-term housing choice voucher when they had used all that Partners United for Supportive Housing (PUSH) could give them.

A critical need as the demonstration ended was to find more housing subsidies, often through set-asides, preferences, or modifications to eligibility requirements and application procedures. Some demonstration communities have done this through their PHAs, while others have done it through homeless assistance mechanisms. In addition, changing attitudes among housing providers have led to increased willingness to rent to families resembling those in the demonstration, leading to greater access to housing units. Table 4 summarizes these changes.

TABLE 4
Sources of New Housing Subsidies and Mechanisms for Improved Access

Community	Rent subsidies through PHAs	PSH through homeless assistance agencies	Rapid re-housing funds through homeless assistance agencies	Procedural modifications that improve access after demonstration ends
Broward County	No	No	No	No
Cedar Rapids	Yes	No	No	Yes
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Memphis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
San Francisco	Yes	Maybe	No	Yes

Note: PHA = public housing authority; PSH = permanent supportive housing.

Public Housing Authorities

Demonstration partners in all sites have worked with PHAs to increase families' access to housing choice and FUP vouchers, including sites where PHAs have been active partners in the demonstration and those where PHAs have had more of a sideline role. PHAs have established preferences within their administrative plans for families who are homeless, involved in the child welfare system, or both. They have established set-asides, smoothed out eligibility criteria and application procedures, and facilitated portability when families had to move from one PHA's jurisdiction to another's.

PREFERENCES

The Cedar Rapids Housing Services Division, a unit of the Cedar Rapids city government, serves Cedar Rapids and the surrounding Benton and Linn Counties. It has been involved in PUSH since the proposal stage and is an active partner on the interagency implementation team. In the demonstration's third year, the Housing Services Division established a preference in its administrative plan for homeless families with an open child welfare case. Since then, the division has opened its otherwise closed list twice for these preference families (the second time was still active in spring 2018), allowing 55 PUSH treatment group families to obtain long-term rental subsidies either with a tenant-based housing choice voucher or in a project-based unit. The preference has been particularly important for PUSH families because the vouchers they receive through the preference provide longer-term housing support than the privately funded 24-month rental assistance they received through PUSH. Most important for homeless child welfare–involved families in the future, the preference is permanent. Families entering the child welfare system beyond the demonstration will benefit from this preference.

Several PHAs in Fairfield County, Connecticut, came together to establish a preference for homeless families, which has been in effect since at least 2009. They established these preferences as

part of a process in which the Department of Children and Families worked with PHAs to obtain FUP vouchers. Some of the PHAs that did not receive FUP vouchers established the preference as an alternate way to help. Although not specifically for child welfare–involved families, any such family that was literally homeless could qualify.

During the demonstration, five of the six Broward County PHAs created a preference for demonstration families, developed a strategy for distributing the 50 housing choice vouchers proportional to PHA size, and facilitated portability. With the end of intake for treatment group families, this commitment has been fulfilled, but the PHAs have not been able to extend the preference beyond the demonstration because of budget constraints. The participating PHAs initially stipulated that vouchers relinquished by treatment group families would revert to the PHAs. They have, however, allowed the demonstration to keep these vouchers and reassign them to additional families, allowing a few more families to receive vouchers. The Broward County Housing Authority has also been working with demonstration partners to apply for additional FUP vouchers, which would be available to families with characteristics similar to those in the demonstration.

SET-ASIDES

The Memphis Housing Authority did not participate in the demonstration, but toward the demonstration's end, CAFTH began negotiating with the housing authority on several fronts for participation after the demonstration. As a result, the housing authority set aside 72 housing choice vouchers for Keeping Families Together. MSFI families may use these vouchers when they are ready to "move on"—that is, out of the permanent supportive housing projects and into scattered-site housing with fewer supports. New families coming into Keeping Families Together may also use them. CAFTH also worked with the housing authority to establish either a set-aside or a waiting list preference for any homeless family (i.e., not only families who are involved with child welfare). Finally, CAFTH negotiated with the housing authority to permit housing choice voucher applicants to complete their applications at CAFTH offices and have them approved there, without having to appear at the housing authority. This is a huge advantage for homeless families, as they could work with CAFTH staff to assemble the needed paperwork and fill out the complicated applications with assistance from CAFTH staff.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS

Easing eligibility criteria and application processing. San Francisco has seen the most extensive changes related to housing, so we draw examples of administrative adjustments from this site and mention similar adjustments elsewhere only briefly. During FMF, the Human Services Agency's relationship with the San Francisco Housing Authority started out unevenly but evolved into an effective working

partnership. Early in the demonstration, the San Francisco Housing Authority was in considerable organizational trouble and was close to having HUD place it in receivership. The shake-up that followed involved many new staff in leadership positions, including some who understood HUD program requirements and were favorable to FMF. FMF staff identified three additional factors contributing to the changes: continued contacts between the Human Services Agency and housing authority staff, the work of the housing specialist paid for with demonstration funds and housed at the Homeless Prenatal Program, and the annual Partnerships Demonstration convenings in Washington, DC. All these changes helped establish trust and improved working relationships with the new housing authority staff, such that two people at the housing authority who were in the right positions and understood the rules governing vouchers worked with FMF to get families vouchers faster and more efficiently. Modified eligibility criteria and streamlined application processing helped this happen.

Changing fair market rents. San Francisco's high rents posed problems for many low-income households. San Francisco and other high-rent counties negotiated with HUD to increase fair market rents for their jurisdictions because of high prevailing rents, which prevented families with vouchers, including FMF families, from finding an affordable home in San Francisco. FMF had to move families to other counties to find apartments they could afford even with a voucher. The negotiations succeeded, and in January 2017, HUD raised the fair market rents 30 percent in San Francisco and two other Bay Area counties. This made a huge difference for FMF, and now for BFH. Because fair market rents have increased, the Human Services Agency has been able to place new BFH families in housing in San Francisco, closer to its supportive services and to family and community supports.

Facilitating portability. The need to "port," or transfer, vouchers became clear during the early years of FMF, when the fair market rents in San Francisco were lower than the going rents.[3] What also became clear was that porting a voucher from one jurisdiction to another was hampered by different eligibility criteria, different family and unit size criteria, the need to rescreen at each PHA, and other differences that made the process cumbersome, time-consuming, and costly. PHAs appealed to the San Francisco office of HUD's Region IX to convene a conversation, and the idea of a regional agreement emerged. FMF staff were involved in these discussions. The Region IX office applied to HUD for technical assistance to help Bay Area PHAs develop a streamlined, consistent-across-jurisdictions approach to porting FUP and other vouchers.

At the project's outset, the HUD regional office offered to host a convening of interested Bay Area PHAs. Coming out of that meeting, San Francisco and Contra Costa PHAs developed a protocol that participating PHAs could adopt as a consistent cross-PHA operating procedure. FMF and San Francisco Housing Authority staff presented the protocol at an annual conference of the National Association of

Housing and Redevelopment Officials, where it was favorably received. Several large Bay Area PHAs are now interested in participating and are determining what changes would need to be made to the protocol to ensure wide participation. The technical assistance grant, with Abt Associates and Quadel Consulting Corporation as the technical assistance providers, is helping with the transition that each PHA will need to make, including models for fiscal analysis to show the benefits of consistent practice, waivers from HUD, changes to their administrative plans, and similar issues.

Already, the convening is extending beyond its initial focus on FUP vouchers to other types of vouchers. The hope is that success with this regional alignment can become a model for other locations where a regional approach makes sense and will save time, money, and frustration.

Homeless Assistance Agencies

Memphis is the standout. Because the demonstration's lead agency in Memphis is the Community Alliance for the Homeless—the local administrator of HUD's Continuum of Care, Emergency Solutions Grant, and Supportive Services for Veteran Families funding—it has been easy for Memphis to access CAFTH resources for child welfare–involved families following the demonstration.

Memphis used a Continuum of Care grant for permanent supportive housing for families during the demonstration and continues to use this resource for new child welfare–involved families as units become available. For the MSFI expansion, CAFTH is also making rapid re-housing rent subsidies available on a transitional basis (usually up to 12 months) through its Emergency Solutions Grant and through Supportive Services for Veteran Families if the family includes a veteran. Rapid re-housing resources will be used for scattered-site housing for child welfare–involved families who do not meet the disability criteria for permanent supportive housing but nonetheless need to obtain housing or stabilize in the housing they have. Though not a permanent subsidy, a rapid re-housing subsidy does give a family time to stabilize its housing and develop the means to pay for it.

Connecticut and San Francisco have connections to housing through homeless assistance agencies for new child welfare–involved families. In February 2018, the Connecticut Interagency Council on Supportive Housing and Homelessness established a preference for child welfare–involved families for the supportive housing under its aegis. This preference came in response to strong advocacy from councilmembers from the Department of Children and Families and The Connection Inc. who participated in Connecticut's demonstration since its inception.

And on July 1, 2016, the City and County of San Francisco created the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to bring all homeless-related services under one roof. For the Human Services Agency, this meant that all Continuum of Care funds and functions were transferred from the agency to the new department. The change has potential advantages for child welfare in general and casework for BFH families in particular, relating to decisions about how to prioritize BFH families for permanent supportive housing or rapid re-housing. On the potentially positive side, the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing is the hub of the city's coordinated entry system for homeless services. Everyone seeking homeless-specific housing must pass through this system and be assessed for housing need. Child welfare–involved families might be able to access the department's housing resources if they can meet HUD's stricter definition of homelessness (being literally homeless, in shelters, or on the streets). The system is too new for us to know how this major change will play out for families similar to those served by FMF.

Attitudes among Housing Providers

We have already noted how child welfare agency staff changed their attitudes about the need for and utility of housing. Similar changes have occurred within agencies offering housing to demonstration families. For instance, at the Affordable Housing Network in Cedar Rapids, the agency that housed most PUSH treatment group families, the director changed her approach to tenants. She moved from focusing on "what are the rules" to "how can we make this work for this family." While adhering to fair housing rules, the Affordable Housing Network relaxed rules about evictions and ability to sign a lease, knowing that its service partners at PUSH would provide backup to work out difficulties. These new attitudes increased accessibility to housing during the demonstration for families that landlords might otherwise have rejected. Throughout demonstration communities, being able to offer landlords backup in working with tenants through the projects' wraparound services, staff have opened up housing units for treatment group families that would not have been available without the demonstration. Doing so changed many landlords' attitudes toward families similar to those in the demonstration. In demonstration communities that no longer have the resources to offer tenant assistance, we hope landlords will maintain and act on their new insights.

Changes Related to Supportive Services Offered by Community Agencies

All demonstration communities have seen important developments grow out of the partnerships forged during the demonstration. Earlier, we noted coordination among Bay Area PHAs and housing-related changes in other communities. Here, we note developments among child-serving agencies in Broward County and Cedar Rapids.

In Broward County, Kids in Distress (KID), the nonprofit children's services agency that was the lead agency for HEART, Broward County's demonstration program, is committed to continuing family team meetings. KID has a foundation that can take on worthy projects. In summer 2017, the KID Foundation committed to covering the cost of services to help families stabilize and maintain housing in a program that will allow HEART services to continue. The funding will cover up to three case managers and is sufficient to continue the services available through HEART toward the end of the demonstration.[4] KID staff are seeking permanent funding from public and philanthropic sources. The foundation is willing to continue its funding until more permanent funding is available.

Broward County did not use demonstration funds to cover specialty services, but its Legal Aid service partner regularly attended family team meetings and helped treatment group families with legal problems, including family law issues (e.g., divorce, child support, and domestic violence) and landlord-tenant issues (e.g., threatened evictions, repairs, and safety issues). Although Legal Aid did not, and still does not, represent families in child welfare cases, the Legal Aid representative on the interagency team advocated for families, and child welfare caseworkers attend family team meetings. KID, the demonstration's lead agency, estimates that the legal assistance provided during the demonstration could easily have amounted to $500,000 over the course of the demonstration. This advocate will continue to attend family team meetings for KID's extension of HEART.

Communities of Hope is a Casey Family Programs initiative that helps communities develop programming that protects, supports, and strengthens families to keep children safe. In Cedar Rapids, PUSH collaborators reached out to this national program to explore the possibility that Cedar Rapids could become a Community of Hope. If that could happen, the community could offer some form of ongoing supportive services to families both involved and not involved in the child welfare system. Casey Family Programs staff visited PUSH and were interested in working with Cedar Rapids to determine what form a Community of Hope might take (Communities of Hope are different in different cities, as they are intended to meet local needs as locally defined). Casey staff visited Cedar Rapids several times to facilitate local decisionmaking and design, and people on the local organizing

committee (many of whom have been involved in PUSH) visited other Communities of Hope cities to explore their options.

The Cedar Rapids organizing committee decided to develop a Success Center, which seemed from their visits to other Communities of Hope to fit best with perceived needs. The Success Center will be located in the Harambee House, a Jane Boyd Community House program. Harambee House is a community center where families "can go to feel safe, receive housing assistance, and get clothes for your growing children or a suit for your job interview." The center provides internet access, job search through Iowa Works, and food distribution.

The Success Center's first focus is to prevent child abuse and neglect, for which Casey Family Programs funding is already available. Currently, Harambee House helps families connect to various community resources, mostly by referral. The Success Center will offer more, and more intensive, services on-site. The implementation team is currently defining what those services will be. Mental health services are perceived to be important but are not currently offered, so Harambee House has submitted a grant proposal to the Linn County Department of Human Services to fund a mental health position. Once these first-tier services are in place and running smoothly, the organizing group will decide what to offer for the second tier, which will work more intensively with families who may have an open child welfare case.

Other Important Changes

Some significant developments in the aftermath of the demonstration are not easily classified into the earlier categories. These include CSH's selection of Memphis as one of its pay for success sites and expanding the use of demonstration-measuring instruments in Connecticut to increase the focus on housing needs among clients of community agencies, beginning with Head Start.

Pay for Success in Memphis

MSFI collaborators are expanding their partnership, and their application to become a CSH pay for success site has been approved. CSH received funding through the pay for success program of the Corporation for National and Community Service's Social Innovation Fund and augmented it with foundation support. It requested applications to receive intensive (six to nine months of) technical assistance to determine the feasibility of and move toward implementing a local initiative to address housing instability among child welfare–involved families. Memphis is one of the recipients.

MSFI partners (CAFTH, the DCS, the Memphis Inter-Faith Association, and Promise Development Corporation) worked on this application with UnitedHealthcare (the local Medicaid managed care agency), the City of Memphis Housing and Community Development Department, and the MSFI evaluators from the University of Tennessee. UnitedHealthcare's involvement is critical. This effort started when a key UnitedHealthcare staff member participated in an MSFI symposium in May 2016. He was impressed and contacted CAFTH to discuss how they could work together. Originally, UnitedHealthcare wanted to *build* housing, recognizing its importance to maintaining patients' health. CAFTH suggested there was enough housing but not enough supportive services. UnitedHealthcare requested that CAFTH apply to the company's western regional office for funding to provide services. UnitedHealthcare was excited about the possibilities and had CAFTH meet with its national leadership to explain what supportive services could do.

When the opportunity to apply for technical assistance through CSH's pay for success project came along, UnitedHealthcare was an enthusiastic proponent (the option to apply for UnitedHealthcare funding was subsumed in the collective process of obtaining pay for success technical assistance). CSH will help the local team design the project, structure the contracts for services, initiate service delivery, and establish monitoring procedures. CAFTH is the lead organization rather than the usual government agency because it has access to many partnerships, manages the local coordinated entry system for homeless people, has funds through the Continuum of Care that will be useful to the project (e.g., rapid re-housing funds that have a family preference), and the range of resources available at assessment through the Memphis Inter-Faith Association.

Use of QRAFT to Identify Housing Needs beyond the Department of Children and Families in Connecticut

There has been considerable interest in using the QRAFT—the screener for housing needs developed for the demonstration—to identify housing needs for families using other programs. The Partnership for Strong Communities, an advocacy group, encouraged Connecticut's Office of Early Childhood to assess housing needs among Head Start families using the QRAFT—a focus that had not existed before, although housing issues could have emerged for some families coincidentally, or as the result of a housing crisis.

The ISHF evaluators worked with the Office of Early Childhood and one of the largest Head Start agencies in Bridgeport, Connecticut, to develop an early childhood version of the QRAFT, which was piloted in 2017 with more than 1,000 Head Start families. In addition to the way the QRAFT was used in

ISHF, the evaluators programmed it to include an automated summary sent to caseworkers that identifies various needs (e.g., health and income), eligibility for various programs, and referrals to those programs.

This effort has paused to let participants see what they learned and decide how to proceed. Head Start staff have seen the value of the information and are discussing the value of adding back several items that were dropped from earlier versions to make the new QRAFT version shorter. They are also considering adding some items from the RAFT that touch on poverty-related issues that interact with housing. The pilot agency's staff will likely spread the word to its local association, Action for Bridgeport Community Development, and to the statewide Connecticut Head Start Association.

Role of the Annual Administration for Children and Families Convenings

San Francisco respondents added an aspect of the demonstration that was not in the original interview protocol: the role of the convenings held in conjunction with the Administration for Children and Families' grantee conferences in each of the grant's five years. The Partnerships Demonstration convenings were coordinated by the Administration for Children and Families, the Corporation for Supportive Housing, and the Center for the Study of Social Policy, the latter two being national partners throughout the demonstration. Team members at all other demonstration sites agreed these meetings were useful.

The respondents felt that the chance to "get away from the office" together, to have casual conversations over meals or relaxing around town, to hear about ways other communities have handled issues they are facing themselves, and to receive pertinent technical assistance contributed to team-building and trust. They pointed out specific new policies and practices that began with a casual suggestion over a meal and were followed up on later with concrete steps and changes in policy or practice. Memphis described the convenings as essential, noting that the convenings provided context for local work so the local demonstration was not operating in a vacuum and provided learning opportunities to let participants "steal shamelessly" from other sites and from approaches presented by the Partnership Demonstration's two technical assistance providers, CSH and the Center for the Study of Social Policy. Local evaluators in Connecticut found great value in having formal and informal opportunities to present, discuss, and consult with other local evaluators and the national evaluators. Local evaluators in Cedar Rapids and Broward County felt they would have benefited from even more

time with other evaluators at the convenings to confer on measures, collection and analysis methods, and the like—perhaps a full day before or after the two days allotted to all demonstration participants.

The positive and valuable nature of the convening experience has historical precedent. Much of the same feedback was heard from the 10 policy academies on ending chronic and family homelessness sponsored by HUD and the US Department of Health and Human Services from 2001 through 2007, as well as from partners at the US Departments of Labor, Education, and Veterans Affairs; the US Interagency Council on Homelessness; and the five national Supportive Housing Leadership Forums organized by the Corporation for Supportive Housing in the 2000s and the regional ones still being held (Burt and Spellman 2007).

Convenings similar to those offered to demonstration sites are invaluable for building trust, teams, and ideas that have payoffs long after the convenings are over.

Implications

Communities have made significant strides extending demonstration activities and principles. Most have found new money for services, have some continuing access to housing subsidies, and have developed collaborative relationships pushing new developments into the future.

Also, long-term impacts on child welfare agency policies and practices are most likely to happen when the child welfare agency leads the demonstration. San Francisco and Connecticut have seen significant changes in child welfare operations as practices developed for the demonstration are embedded into standard operating procedures. They may have taken longer to reach full implementation, as they had to bring a whole bureaucracy along, but once this happened, they had the commitments to make permanent changes if demonstration practices benefited families.

Conversely, child welfare agencies in Broward County and Cedar Rapids, for which the lead agency was a nonprofit children's services agency, did not play leadership roles during the demonstration and have not made any significant changes. During the demonstration, Broward County's child welfare agency, ChildNet, had multiple leadership changes and major organizational problems, so it was not positioned to take the lead or to make significant policy changes based on the demonstration.

Results in Memphis may be attributed to two factors. First, the child welfare agency's regional administrator was an enthusiastic partner. Second, the lead agency, CAFTH, had communitywide standing and many partners in its role as Continuum of Care administrator of HUD homeless funding,

and it capitalized on this strong position to sustain and strengthen partnerships that were effective before the demonstration and to continue partnerships after the demonstration. In all communities, agencies participating in the demonstration forged strong relationships that furthered the demonstration's purposes, and these relationships continue. But it takes a lead agency whose primary function is to bring people together and deepen their partnerships to see the kind of expansion that Memphis has experienced since the demonstration ended.

That said, every demonstration community had weak links. Sometimes, these were the child welfare agencies, as in Broward County and Cedar Rapids. Some communities also had problems working with their local public housing authorities. The Memphis team was not able to bring the Memphis Housing Authority on board until after the demonstration. The Linn County Housing Services Division did not contribute vouchers at the start of PUSH, but partners continued to negotiate, and ultimately, the Housing Services Division established a permanent preference for child welfare–involved families that has allowed many PUSH families to obtain permanent rent subsidies as their short-term PUSH subsidies expired. When San Francisco's demonstration project began, the San Francisco Housing Authority could not reliably provide vouchers. Major changes at the housing authority and continuing work to access that agency's housing resources finally eased the backlog of families needing vouchers to achieve housing stability. San Francisco had difficulties including the city's Department of Public Health as an active partner. And Memphis had to restructure its partner arrangements when the agency first responsible for delivering supportive services could not do the job.

Systems change is a never-ending process. It is difficult to get multiple agencies to move in tandem toward any specific goal, even if it is a shared goal. Once significant levels of coordination and collaboration have been achieved, it takes vigilance to keep the action going. Further, all relevant agencies are rarely on board from the beginning. Demonstration communities were typical in this respect, gradually bringing in new agencies and strengthening ties across agencies as their projects matured. It is as important to recognize the weak links in communities as it is to note successful collaborations and to acknowledge the ways some communities are building on their successes to use housing to reduce child welfare involvement among high-need families.

Appendix. Site Profiles

Broward County, Florida

Developments for the Housing, Empowerment, Achievement, Recovery, and Triumph Alliance for Sustainable Families (HEART) since the demonstration include the following:

- The KID Foundation has committed to continue HEART-like supportive services, and other HEART services are continuing in some form.

- The alliance has difficulties with ChildNet because of administrative and organizational challenges.

- The Broward County Public Housing Authority is exploring ways to provide similar services to families with FUP vouchers.

- Partners have a new appreciation of the role of housing in general and Housing First and supportive services in particular.

New Funding for Services from the KID Foundation

Kids in Distress, HEART's lead agency, has a foundation that can take on worthy projects. In 2017, the KID Foundation committed to cover the cost of services to help families stabilize and maintain housing in a HEART-like program that will allow HEART services to continue. The funding would cover three case managers to continue the services available through HEART toward the end of the demonstration. This case management depends on a continuous flow of families into services, so some families would require intensive services as they enter KID, while other families would require fewer services after they stabilize in housing. KID staff are seeking permanent funding from public and philanthropic sources, and the KID Foundation is willing to continue its funding until more permanent funding is available.

KID has been ready to start these services since the commitment was made, but it needs ChildNet's commitment and cooperation to proceed, and ChildNet has been in upheaval because of leadership turnover. As of spring 2018, it had an interim chief executive officer and was seeking to hire a permanent chief executive officer and an executive director. If the interim chief executive officer

becomes the permanent one, the extension of HEART should proceed quickly and smoothly. If a different person is hired, the transition could take more time.

Among HEART partners, Legal Aid is committed to continuing services for HEART families as part of the family support teams. These services address many issues that child welfare–involved families face, including family law (e.g., divorce, domestic violence, child support, and custody), eviction and credit histories, and landlord negotiations. Representation in court in child welfare cases has not been part of the services offered and will not be, but Legal Aid could advocate for families with child welfare case managers, has done so through the family team meetings, and could continue to do so in the future.

The Urban League will still be involved with the child welfare–involved families that KID will serve in the future but will not be colocated with KID caseworkers. The Urban League's Center for Working Families continues to offer workshops and trainings at its own location, and families served by KID caseworkers can attend. There will be fewer "warm handoffs," but the relationships built during HEART will ease access and support for new child welfare–involved families served by KID.

Difficulties with ChildNet

ChildNet experienced significant organizational difficulties during the demonstration. The liaison to the demonstration from ChildNet changed three times, necessitating reorientation and adjustment each time. HEART received referrals from the Broward County Sheriff's Office (for new preservation cases) and from ChildNet (for reunification cases and some preservation cases). Handoffs from the sheriff's office were efficient, but those from ChildNet were slow. Training for caseworkers in criteria for referring families had to be repeated several times because of caseworker turnover.

Effects on Public Housing Authorities in Broward County

The six PHAs in Broward County have long held quarterly meetings to share developments. KID and Group Victory made a presentation at one of these meetings as it developed the HEART proposal, following which they got buy-in from five PHAs to provide 50 housing choice vouchers. During the demonstration, these five PHAs created a preference for HEART families, developed a strategy for distributing the 50 housing choice vouchers proportional to PHA size, and facilitated portability. This commitment has been fulfilled, and the PHAs cannot extend the preference beyond the demonstration because of budget constraints. Nevertheless, PHA representatives continue attending the executive-level coordinating committee developed during HEART, as they did throughout the demonstration,

extending the connections made and capitalizing on the appreciation of each agency's capabilities and statutory and regulatory limitations.

Even before the demonstration, the Broward County Public Housing Authority perceived that families with FUP vouchers needed more than the limited services available early in tenancy to help them stabilize and prosper. The demonstration has reinforced that perception. The county's PHAs feel that HEART has done "a fantastic job" of supporting families using the vouchers they provided. Feedback from the service side notes that the PHAs did "a fantastic job" figuring out how they could award vouchers to families with many barriers. Some PHAs allowed HEART to retain vouchers and award them to additional families despite the initial intention that vouchers revert to the PHAs if families were no longer using them.

The Broward County Public Housing Authority has discussed with KID the possibility of including families newly receiving FUP vouchers in the extension of services that the KID Foundation will support. For this to happen, the memorandum of understanding between ChildNet and the housing authority (a requirement for the PHA to receive FUP vouchers) would need to be amended. That has not been possible because of ChildNet leadership turnover. The Broward County Public Housing Authority remains interested in pursuing this option when ChildNet is in a better position to be an active partner.

The Broward County Public Housing Authority also noted an important difficulty with the demonstration. For families where reunification is the issue, the courts must approve the children's return. For that to happen, housing must be in place. The county's PHAs found themselves providing vouchers to parents and covering rents long before children were returned—frequently as long as 12 or more months before. The Broward County Public Housing Authority felt it would be better for PHAs if the voucher could be issued closer to when the family would be reunited. The courts were not part of the HEART coalition, however, and little progress was made toward this goal during the demonstration.

Appreciation of the Housing First Model and the Effectiveness of Supportive Services

HEART partners—including KID, ChildNet, the Continuum of Care, and participating PHAs—have developed knowledge of the Housing First approach for families and the role of supportive services in helping families stabilize in and sustain housing. Previously, the Continuum of Care did not distinguish child welfare–involved families from other homeless families and took the same approach for all families. The Continuum of Care now recognizes the possibility of different needs. Its representatives

came to meetings during proposal development and the planning years but mostly dropped out, though they did contribute Homeless Management Information System data to the national evaluation.

Role of the Administration for Children and Families
Convenings of the Five Demonstration Teams

Broward County respondents felt that the convenings were a chance to "get away from the office" together to have casual conversations and that they contributed to team-building and trust. Memphis described the convenings as "essential," noting that the convenings provided context for local work so the local demonstration did not operate in a vacuum and provided learning opportunities to let partners "steal shamelessly" from one another. Policies and practices later adopted locally often began with a casual suggestion over a meal and were followed up on later with concrete steps and changes in policy or practice. At a minimum, attendees shared what they had learned with staff back at home, often leading to greater local understanding and commitment to the demonstration's underlying premises. Local evaluators felt they could easily have benefited from even more "together" time—perhaps an entire day before or after the rest of the teams met—to confer on measures, collection and analysis, and the like. They also appreciated the strong technical assistance support they received from CSH as they developed their network.

Cedar Rapids, Iowa

In August 2016, Partners United for Supportive Housing (PUSH) met its final target of 100 housed families. Developments in Cedar Rapids since the demonstration include the following:

- The Department of Children's Services and the Affordable Housing Network have a new appreciation for the role of housing in general and Housing First and supportive services in particular.

- Vouchers are provided through preference at the Cedar Rapids Housing Services Division.

- Communities of Hope and the Support Center at Harambee House continue to operate.

Changes at the Child Welfare Agency (Iowa Department of Human Services, Child Welfare Systems of Care, Linn County)

PUSH respondents felt that Linn County child welfare staff now appreciate the role housing can play in helping child welfare–involved families. They report that child welfare assessments routinely evaluate housing status and take this into account in decisions and service planning with families.[5]

Changes Related to Housing

EFFECTS ON THE CEDAR RAPIDS HOUSING SERVICES DIVISION

The Cedar Rapids Housing Services Division, a unit of the Cedar Rapids city government, serves Cedar Rapids and the surrounding Benton and Linn Counties. It has been involved in PUSH from the proposal stage and is an active partner on the interagency implementation team. In the demonstration's third year, the Housing Services Division established a preference in its administrative plan for homeless families with an open child welfare case. Since then, the division has opened its otherwise closed list twice for these preference families (the second time is still active), allowing 55 PUSH treatment group families to obtain long-term rental subsidies either with a tenant-based housing choice voucher or in a project-based unit. The preference has been particularly important for PUSH families because the vouchers they obtain through it provide longer-term housing support than the 24-month tenant-based rental assistance with which PUSH began.

The preference is permanent. Families entering the child welfare system beyond the demonstration will benefit from this preference.

EFFECTS AT THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING NETWORK

At the Affordable Housing Network, the agency that houses most PUSH treatment group families, the director has changed her approach. She has moved from focusing on "what are the rules" to "how can we make this work for this family." While adhering to fair housing rules, the Affordable Housing Network relaxed rules about evictions and the ability to sign a lease, knowing that the service partners at PUSH would provide backup to work out difficulties. These attitudes and accompanying behavior change might persist as the availability of backup supportive services disappears after the demonstration.

Changes Related to Supportive Services

EXTENDING SERVICES THROUGH COMMUNITIES OF HOPE

Communities of Hope is a Casey Family Programs initiative that helps communities develop programming that protects, supports, and strengthens families to keep children safe. The PUSH IIT and advisory board reached out to this national program to explore the possibility that Cedar Rapids could become a Community of Hope. If that could happen, the community could offer ongoing supportive services to families involved or not involved in the child welfare system. Staff from Casey visited PUSH and were interested in working with Cedar Rapids to determine what form a Community of Hope might take (Communities of Hope are different in different cities, as they are intended to meet locally defined needs). Casey staff have visited Cedar Rapids several times to facilitate local decisionmaking and design, and members of the local organizing committee (many of whom have been involved in PUSH) visited other Community of Hope cities to find out more about their options.

The Cedar Rapids organizing committee developed a Success Center, which will be located in the Harambee House, a Jane Boyd Community House program. Harambee House is a community center where families "can go to feel safe, receive housing assistance, and get clothes for…growing children or a suit for [a] job interview." It provides internet access, job search through Iowa Works, and food distribution.

The Success Center's first focus is preventing child abuse and neglect, for which Casey Family Programs funding is already available. Currently, Harambee House helps families connect to various community resources, mostly by referral. The Success Center will offer more intensive services on-site. The implementation team is defining what those services will be. Mental health services are perceived to be important but are not currently offered, so Harambee House has submitted a grant proposal to the Linn County Department of Human Services to fund a mental health position. Once the first tier of services are in place and running smoothly, the organizing group will work on what to offer for the second tier, which will work more intensively with families and who may have an open child welfare case.

One legacy from PUSH that will be active throughout the Success Center's partner agencies for clients they share is the Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths assessment tool. This instrument was developed by Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago, and staff came to Cedar Rapids to train relevant agencies on administering and using the tool.

Role of the Administration for Children and Families
Convenings of the Five Demonstration Teams

Cedar Rapids respondents felt that the convenings were a chance to "get away from the office" together to have casual conversations and that they contributed to team-building and trust. Policies and practices later adopted locally often began with a casual suggestion over a meal and were followed up on later with concrete steps and changes in policy or practice. At a minimum, attendees shared what they had learned with staff back at home, often leading to greater local understanding and commitment to the demonstration's underlying premises. Local evaluators stated they would have benefited from more time with other evaluators at the convenings—at least one of the two days—to confer on measures, collection and analysis, and the like.

Connecticut

After the demonstration ended, changes in system collaboration came together. Although the demonstration took a while to reach full speed, given the challenges of a large bureaucracy, once things began to move, the Department of Children and Families made progress in several areas that appear to be permanent changes. The big developments for the Intensive Supportive Housing for Families (ISHF) program are as follows:

- ISHF practices have been embedded into SHF (family team meeting, vocational specialists, step-down and step-up protocol).

- The QRAFT has been institutionalized in the Department of Children and Families investigation units statewide.

- The QRAFT has been expanded, and there have been modifications beyond the demonstration (Office of Early Childhood and Head Start).

- Preferences have been established for homeless families and child welfare–involved families in PHAs and the Interagency Council on Homelessness and Housing.

- Three hundred more vouchers are being provided for child welfare–involved families in 2016 and 2017.

Changes at the Child Welfare Agency (Department of Children and Families)

EMBEDDING ISHF PRACTICES INTO SHF

Connecticut has had its Supportive Housing for Families (SHF) program since 1998, thanks to its recognition that housing is often an issue for child welfare–involved families and that the Department of Children and Families should have resources to address it and legislative appropriations to make it a reality. ISHF, Connecticut's demonstration program, augmented SHF in important ways, several of which the Department of Children and Families has incorporated into SHF, which is ongoing. The first is the QRAFT screener. Attention to housing issues during intake and case planning is ongoing, though turnover among caseworkers and supervisors has reduced housing-related knowledge among department staff dealing with families. Supervisors who were in key positions during the demonstration remain in place, however, and can provide training and direction to bring new staff up to speed on the housing focus.

In addition,

- The Connection Inc., the service provider for the demonstration, only began using family team meetings with the demonstration but has found it so useful that it plans to continue with family team meetings for all families it serves who receive supportive housing; and

- the Department of Children and Families is covering the cost of two additional vocational specialists at The Connection Inc. The services provided by the demonstration's vocational specialist were so useful that the department is expanding their availability to serve more families and a broader range of families.

FORMALIZING STEP-DOWN AND STEP-UP PROCEDURES

ISHF had a formal logic model that included identifying family needs and providing relevant services, with the expectation that the services would help and that families would later need fewer of them— that is, the family could thrive on fewer services, or "step down." Alternatively, a family that had been doing well could face a crisis and need more services than it had been receiving, or "step up." To assess this model and to ensure that changes in case management intensity were intentional, demonstration staff and local evaluators had to measure a family's stability and progress in addressing needs, so changes could be related to service receipt. Early in the demonstration, the realization hit that no such systematic documentation existed. The evaluators teamed up with the Department of Children and Families and The Connection Inc. to develop and use a formal recording structure to document family progress and be the basis for decisions that the family was ready to step down or needed to step up.

This step-down and step-up protocol has been formally adopted in SHF. Program staff at the department were trained in family team meeting and the case management service intensity protocol and decisionmaking process in August 2017, and both components have been fully implemented. All SHF subcontractors were trained in the same approaches and procedures, and the components are fully implemented *statewide* in the SHF program as SHF takes over the demonstration's work.

INSTITUTIONALIZING THE QRAFT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Even though SHF had been a Department of Children and Families program for 15 years when ISHF began, it did not have an easy-to-use, reliable, and consistent tool for assessing housing need until just before the demonstration began, with the development of the Risks and Assets for Family Triage (RAFT) screening tool. This tool was originally developed to support a triage process that would enable the SHF program to match casework intensity to family strengths and needs. In the demonstration's early days, referrals to SHF shifted from the ongoing services arm of the Department of Children and Families to the investigations unit, which was unaccustomed to considering and gauging housing circumstances. When this became clear, the demonstration's evaluators modified the RAFT to create the Quick Risks and Assets for Family Triage, and the department began using it in ISHF regions 3 and 4 to identify housing need. The QRAFT helped the demonstration target families with the greatest housing need, who were the ISHF's target population.

The tool has proven its worth, and the Department of Children and Families intends to embed the QRAFT into its standard intake procedures for use statewide. The department is using multiple vendors for different segments of the new Connecticut Child Welfare Information System based on flow of work. Careline is expected to be launched by the end of 2019, and the department anticipates that the scope of work for intake—the part that will incorporate the QRAFT—will tentatively be launched in 2020. Its inclusion will provide the information to highlight housing issues at child welfare intake throughout the state. The QRAFT has been the only way the Department of Children and Families has had to determine, via self-report, whether a family was in shelter when referred to the department or had been in shelter or otherwise literally homeless sometime in the past. Literal homelessness would increase household risk and is a vital piece of information for the department to obtain—especially for the demonstration but also for good child welfare practice in general.

The QRAFT has helped caseworkers a lot. Its utility has been such that The Connection Inc., the nonprofit ISHF partner doing the casework around housing and wraparound services, is talking with the Department of Children and Families about revisiting the idea of triage using the QRAFT, designing

bundles of services appropriate to each level of housing need, and tracking family progress to see whether lower levels of service for QRAFT-identified lower levels of need yield good results.

The statewide programming for the QRAFT was slated to have begun already. But the department is now using multiple vendors for different parts of the new Child Welfare Information System, and a statewide launch date has not been determined as of spring 2018. The department decided that the programming to incorporate the QRAFT in the intake software should wait for the new vendor. Its inclusion will provide information highlighting housing issues at child welfare intake throughout the state.

USE OF THE QRAFT BEYOND THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES TO IDENTIFY HOUSING NEEDS

There has been considerable interest in using the QRAFT to identify housing needs for families using other programs. The Partnership for Strong Communities, an advocacy group, encouraged Connecticut's Office of Early Childhood to assess housing needs among Head Start families using the QRAFT—a focus that had not existed before, though housing issues could have emerged for some families coincidentally or because of a housing crisis.

The ISHF evaluators worked with the Office of Early Childhood and one of Bridgeport's largest Head Start agencies to develop an early childhood version of the QRAFT, which was piloted in fall 2017 with more than 1,000 Head Start families. In addition to the way it was used in ISHF, the evaluators programmed it to include an automated summary sent to caseworkers that identifies various needs (e.g., health and income), eligibility for various programs, and referrals to those programs.

This effort has paused to give participants a chance to see what they learned and decide how to proceed. Head Start staff have seen the value of the information and are discussing the value of adding back several items that were dropped (from the QRAFT–Early Childhood) to make the new QRAFT version shorter, and maybe adding items from the RAFT that touch on other poverty-related issues that interact with housing. The pilot agency's staff will likely spread the word to its local association, Action for Bridgeport Community Development, and to the statewide Connecticut Head Start Association.

Changes Related to Housing

PREFERENCES FOR HOUSING SUBSIDIES AND SERVICES

The PHAs in Fairfield County, Connecticut, have a preference for homeless families that has been in effect at least since 2009. The preferences were established as part of a process in which the Department of Children and Families worked with PHAs to obtain FUP vouchers. Some PHAs that did not receive FUP vouchers established the preference as an alternate way to help. Although the preference was not specifically for child welfare–involved families, any such family that was homeless could qualify. Additionally, in February 2018, the Connecticut Interagency Council on Supportive Housing and Homelessness established a preference for child welfare–involved families for the supportive housing under its aegis, in response to strong advocacy from representatives on the council from the Department of Children and Families and The Connection.

MORE VOUCHERS

In 2015, because of a shift in practice, the department began closing "congregate care" facilities to offer more community-type settings, such as therapeutic foster care. The department generated savings because of this change and advocated to the governor's general fund to recoup some of these savings. The department was granted this funding and then transferred these funds to the Department of Housing. The funds were earmarked for use in providing rental subsidies to child welfare–involved families for whom housing was a major issue in considerations for removal or reunification. Because such return of funds to a department to use toward the department's mission is rare in government, these negotiations could be significant.

The Department of Children and Families used the resulting 300 vouchers for families in SHF and ISHF. All are in use, and no additional vouchers were allocated to the department for 2017 or 2018. But the department may reuse vouchers that turn over within available funding.

Role of the Administration for Children and Families
Convenings of the Five Demonstration Teams

Connecticut respondents felt that the convenings were a chance to "get away from the office" together to have casual conversations and that they contributed to team-building and trust. Policies and practices that began with a casual suggestion over a meal and were followed up on later with concrete steps and changes in policy or practice. The evaluators found great value in having formal and informal opportunities to present, discuss, and consult with other local evaluators and the national evaluator.

Memphis, Tennessee

The Memphis Strong Families Initiative (MSFI) housed 87 families by the end of the program period in 2017. After the demonstration ended, several changes in system collaboration came together. Although the demonstration experienced a major change of providers and a new executive director at the lead agency, CAFTH, many things have come together in the past three years, leading to permanent changes in several areas. The big developments are as follows:

- The DCS has provided new funding to continue services for remaining MSFI families and extend services to new families meeting a broader range of criteria, including reunification. These funds were renewed at the end of the initial period.

- Some MSFI practices are continuing, including housing focus at intake, family team meetings, wraparound services in support of housing retention, and standardized communication protocol.

- The Continuum of Care is lead agency as the demonstration lead agency and has retained certain program elements, including coordinated assessment.

- The MSFI has strengthened local collaboration, leading to a coalition of agencies brought together by the MSFI now working with CSH to become a pay for success site, with major participation from UnitedHealthcare, the local Medicaid managed care provider.

Changes at the Child Welfare Agency (Department of Children's Services, Shelby County)

NEW DCS FUNDING TO CONTINUE AND EXPAND THE MSFI

The state administers child welfare services in Tennessee, and each locality has funds to use at its discretion to further its mission. The DCS regional administrator most active in the MSFI collaboration knew that Shelby County, where Memphis is located, had money allocated for certain services but was underspent. She went to the commissioner and budget director with a proposal to direct those funds toward continuing and expanding MSFI services once the demonstration ended. Using outcomes data from the MSFI, she showed how many families and children were being helped because they had housing. To continue this success with more families and reduce the county's in-care population, she asked to contract with CAFTH (rather than agencies that already had DCS service contracts) to provide housing stabilization and retention services.

She asked for and received $37,500 to fund services beginning in March 2018 for the rest of the 2017–18 fiscal year, and $150,000 for fiscal year 2018–19 (July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2019). The DCS renewed the funds for fiscal year 2019–20 when the data continued to show reduced use of out-of-home care.

The program changed its name to Keeping Families Together. It will cover a broader range of families and a broader range of services. The demonstration was restricted to families with at least one child in their custody because of the use of a HUD permanent supportive housing for families grant to provide the housing. The expanded MSFI will include families trying to reunify with their children and will benefit from being able to use rapid re-housing dollars and resources restricted to households that are literally homeless. When needed, the DCS can cover essential costs, such as rent deposits and first month's rent to help people move into housing.

EMBEDDING MSFI PRACTICES IN ONGOING DCS OPERATIONS

Essential elements of MSFI practices will be used in the expanded MSFI. Early in the demonstration, the DCS looked at the screeners developed by the San Francisco and Connecticut demonstration sites for possible adoption. After review, DCS staff decided they would continue to use their own protocol for the demonstration, as it already included questions that could reveal what they needed to know about a family's housing situation, but they needed more housing-related information gathered at intake. Previous practice was to have caseworkers focus their investigation on the facts pertinent to the complaint that brought the family to the DCS, which was not usually the family's housing situation. Casework practice changed for the demonstration to require that a summary be included in each case write-up of the family's housing situation and risks it poses to children, and supervisors and workers received training on the full documentation and thorough assessment of housing status now required. This documentation influenced the case plan for the family during the demonstration.

For the expanded Keeping Families Together, partners further assessed their protocols and brainstormed ways to assess housing needs on a continuing basis (i.e., after intake) and ways to extract and summarize data on housing needs and status changes, including progress toward housing stability.

Augmenting MSFI procedures, a standardized communications protocol is being established for the expanded MSFI to specify who does what and when in intake and case processing. For the demonstration, the Memphis Inter-Faith Association did all the intake assessments, determining a family's eligibility and referring for random assignment. This will change in the future. A memorandum of understanding is being designed to implement services under the MSFI expansion, specifying details of the collaboration between the DCS, the Memphis Inter-Faith Association, CAFTH, and Promise

Development Corporation, such as eligibility and for what services, referral processes, data and documentation, and how the DCS data system will be used. The Memphis Inter-Faith Association process worked so well for the demonstration that it will continue to do the assessments with a DCS worker detailed to be the point person for joint case planning.

DCS services will continue under the expanded MSFI, as will the family team meetings that have proven so valuable in facilitating service delivery to families.

Changes Related to Housing

EFFECT OF HAVING CAFTH AS LEAD AGENCY FOR THE MSFI

Memphis is the only demonstration site for which the demonstration's lead agency is also the Continuum of Care lead agency. Respondents felt this arrangement greatly benefited the demonstration. The obvious immediate advantage was being able to make permanent supportive housing immediately available to treatment group families. For the expanded MSFI, CAFTH brought in rapid re-housing resources to serve a broader range of child welfare–involved families, including those seeking reunification. In addition, the Memphis Inter-Faith Association has many resources at its disposal, including Supportive Services for Veteran Families funds, which it can use if a family being assessed includes a veteran. The association decides at assessment which resources best fit the household.

Having CAFTH as the demonstration's lead agency also facilitated inclusion of its broad network of partners in the demonstration's coalition of agencies. The Memphis Inter-Faith Association, which had always been the entry point to the homeless system, now better serves child welfare–involved families through the new memorandum of understanding. CAFTH, the DCS, the Memphis Inter-Faith Association, and Promise Development Corporation (the service provider for the demonstration and for the expanded MSFI) now have a solid history of working as a team at the system level and for individual families.

The Memphis Housing Authority did not participate in the demonstration, but toward its end, CAFTH began negotiating with the housing authority on several fronts for participation after the demonstration. As a result, the housing authority set aside 72 housing choice vouchers for Keeping Families Together. Families in MSFI housing may use these vouchers when they are ready to "move on"—that is, out of the permanent supportive housing projects and into scattered-site housing with fewer supports. New families coming into Keeping Families Together may also use them. CAFTH is also

working with the housing authority to establish either a set-aside or a waiting list preference for any homeless family (i.e., not only those who are involved with child welfare). Finally, CAFTH is negotiating with the housing authority to permit applicants for housing choice vouchers to complete their applications at CAFTH offices and have them approved there, without having to be present at the housing authority. This would be a huge advantage for homeless families, as they could work with CAFTH staff to assemble paperwork and fill out applications, which are complicated. CAFTH is identifying staff from other PHAs that already operate with similar practices to assist the Memphis Housing Authority in designing these changes, as a means of assuring the housing authority that they can be done and with significant advantages to families.

RESULTS OF MSFI COLLABORATION ON SUSTAINABILITY AND EXPANSION

In addition to the advantages of having CAFTH as the demonstration's lead agency, CSH is working to become a pay for success site. CSH received funding through the pay for success program of the Corporation for National and Community Service's Social Innovation Fund and augmented it with foundation support. It has requested applications from local governments and tribes to receive intensive (six to nine months of) technical assistance to determine the feasibility of and move toward implementing a local initiative to address housing instability among child welfare–involved families.

MSFI partners (CAFTH, the DCS, the Memphis Inter-Faith Association, and Promise Development Corporation) are working on this application with UnitedHealthcare, the local Medicaid managed care agency; the City of Memphis Housing and Community Development Department; and the MSFI evaluators from the University of Tennessee. UnitedHealthcare's involvement is critical. The partnership started when a key UnitedHealthcare staff member participated in an MSFI symposium in May 2016. He was impressed and contacted CAFTH to discuss how they could work together. Originally, UnitedHealthcare wanted to *build* housing, recognizing its importance to maintaining patients' health. CAFTH suggested that there was enough housing but not enough supportive services. UnitedHealthcare courted CAFTH, requesting that CAFTH apply to UnitedHealthcare's western regional office for funding to provide services (this option has since been subsumed in the collective process of obtaining pay for success technical assistance). UnitedHealthcare was excited about the possibilities and had CAFTH meet with its national leadership to explain what supportive services could do.

NEW PAY FOR SUCCESS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANT FROM CSH

When the opportunity to apply for technical assistance through CSH's pay for success project came along, UnitedHealthcare was enthusiastic. The partners completed the written application, which had

to show they had local buy-in and were committed to an expedited process. They passed this stage of the process, as well as the in-person review of the whole team, and were notified of their success in February 2018. CSH will help the local team design the project, structure the contracts for services, initiate service delivery, and establish monitoring procedures. CAFTH is the lead organization, rather than the usual government agency, because it has access to many partnerships, manages the local coordinated entry system for homeless people, has funds through the Continuum of Care that will be useful to the project (e.g., rapid re-housing funds that have a family preference), and the range of resources available at assessment through the Memphis Inter-Faith Association.

Role of the Administration for Children and Families
Convenings of the Five Demonstration Teams

Memphis respondents felt that the convenings were a chance to "get away from the office" together to have casual conversations and that they contributed to team-building and trust. Memphis described the convenings as "essential," noting that they provided context for local work so the local demonstration did not operate in a vacuum, and they provided learning opportunities to let partners "steal shamelessly" from one another. Policies and practices later adopted locally often began with a casual suggestion over a meal and were followed up on later with concrete steps and changes in policy or practice. At a minimum, attendees shared what they had learned with staff back at home, often leading to greater local understanding and commitment to the demonstration's underlying premises. Memphis also benefited from technical assistance provided by CSH when it had to reorganize its service provision under the demonstration.

The positive and valuable nature of the convening experience has historical precedent. Much of the same feedback was heard from the policy academies on ending chronic and family homelessness sponsored by HUD and US Department of Health and Human Services from 2001 through 2007, along with partners the US Departments of Labor, Education, and Veterans Affairs and the US Interagency Council on Homelessness. Likewise for the five national Supportive Housing Leadership Forums organized by CSH in the 2000s and the numerous regional ones still being held.

Convenings similar to those offered to demonstration sites are invaluable for building trust, teams, and ideas that have payoffs long after the convenings are over.

San Francisco, California

Families Moving Forward (FMF) stopped enrolling families in late 2015 and housed 47 families by the end of the demonstration. After the demonstration ended, several changes in system collaboration came together. Although the demonstration took a while to reach full speed, given the challenges of a large bureaucracy, once things began to move, the Human Services Agency made progress in several areas that appear to be permanent changes. The big developments are as follows:

- The California Department of Social Services has provided a new grant to implement BFH— $1.9 million over two and a half years to continue supportive services and other aspects of FMF for new families.

- HUD provided a grant to the HUD regional office to develop a regional approach to housing vouchers—$300,000 for technical assistance and implementation of common policies, practices, and an administrative plan for FUP and other rental vouchers.

- Use of FUP and other vouchers has been improved thanks to several interacting developments. Most new families are now being housed in San Francisco because of increased payment standards. Some FMF families have left the housing they started with, and moves have been planned in coordination with the Homeless Prenatal Program to something more sustainable or desirable. No family was evicted, thanks to a strong support structure.

- Partners understand the role of planning, continuous quality improvement, case planning, data collection, and high levels of collaboration for FMF and have committed to apply a similar process in other projects.

- Partners are working with the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to connect child welfare families with housing needs with coordinated entry.

Bringing Families Home

BFH funding is one leg of the Human Services Agency's sustainability commitment. It supports the agecny's actions to embed major practice elements developed for FMF into standard agency procedures for families with FMF levels of need. These include the following:

- screening all new cases for housing needs (FMF's screener has been embedded into the intake procedures and software, assuring its use throughout the agency)

- dedicating case management and housing specialist staff at the Homeless Prenatal Program for families found eligible for BFH

- using FMF's case management model, including documentation, as it evolved over the course of FMF

- using the continuous quality improvement process to maintain effective services

- continuing access to FUP vouchers through the San Francisco Housing Authority

- bridging housing at Holloway House to stabilize families while they wait to receive a voucher and get into permanent housing

In addition, BFH families will benefit from increased openness and appreciation among Human Services Agency caseworkers to Housing First and from their recognition of the utility of having transitional housing through Holloway House to allow families to stabilize while waiting for a voucher and permanent housing (instead of using hotels).

BFH will begin a little later than FMF did in a family's trajectory through the Human Services Agency. BFH will kick in when a family has been through the initial court process and is settling into case planning and implementation. Also, the Homeless Prenatal Program will retain the housing specialist role while more of the service planning will fall to Human Services Agency staff. But the same team meeting and continuous quality improvement approach will prevail in the new program.

BACKGROUND

Assembly Bill 1603 created the Bringing Families Home (BFH) program and housed it in the California Department of Social Services. BFH's goal is to reduce the number of families in the child welfare system experiencing homelessness, to increase family reunification, and to prevent foster care placement, similar to FMF goals. The program targets families involved with the child welfare system who are experiencing homelessness and offers housing supports to assist families in successful reunification. CSH was a major participant in moving this bill toward passage. The CSH lobbyist was aware of FMF and discussed the opportunity to continue FMF with San Francisco legislators as an inducement to vote for the assembly bill. Once the BFH grants were awarded, the California Department of Social Services convened the 12 grantees for training, at which the San Francisco Human Services Agency contributed to the training with a presentation describing how FMF had worked and the program's benefits.

The California Department of Social Services sent a request for proposals in 2016, inviting counties to apply for BFH grants, and 12 counties received grants in May 2017. San Francisco received a BFH grant of $1.9 million to cover a two and a half years of wraparound supportive services for families similar to those served by FMF.

The BFH funding allows the Human Services Agency to work with new families entering the system with profiles similar to those eligible for FMF. The agency is using other sources to continue supports for the FMF families who still need them.

Better Use of FUP and Other Vouchers

During FMF, the Human Services Agency's relationship with the San Francisco Housing Authority evolved into an effective working partnership. Respondents identified three important causes: continued contacts between Human Services Agency and San Francisco Housing Authority staff, the work of the housing specialist, and the Partnerships Demonstration convenings. All three established trust and improved working relationships, such that two people at the housing authority who were knowledgeable about the rules governing vouchers worked productively with FMF to get families vouchers faster and more efficiently. The housing authority modified screening criteria for FUP vouchers to make it easier for FMF families to be approved on initial application as opposed to on appeal, is addressing issues with "porting" San Francisco FUP vouchers to other Bay Area communities, participated with other high-rent-jurisdiction PHAs in getting the fair market rent raised 30 percent (allowing the Human Services Agency to house families in San Francisco rather than having to move them out of the city), and is streamlining voucher portability among Bay Area PHAs. These activities are facilitated by the Region IX HUD office and led through a federal technical assistance contract.

Grant to the HUD Regional Office to Coordinate Voucher Use among Bay Area PHAs

Cross-PHA collaboration is paying off for the Bay Area, and FMF has been part of the impetus. The 30 percent increase in fair market rents in January 2017 and smoother cross-PHA administration of FUP and other vouchers are important early results.

The change in fair market rents came after San Francisco and other high-rent cities asked HUD to increase its fair market rents for their jurisdictions because of the high prevailing rents, which prevented families with any kind of voucher, including FMF families, from finding an affordable home.

FMF was having to move families to other cities to find apartments they could afford even with a voucher.

The need to port vouchers become clear during the early years of FMF, when fair market rents in San Francisco were lower than the going rents. Also clear was that porting a voucher from one jurisdiction to another was hampered by different eligibility criteria, different family and unit size criteria, the need to rescreen at each PHA, and other differences that made the process cumbersome, time-consuming, and costly. These difficulties led PHAs to appeal to the San Francisco office of HUD's Region IX to convene a conversation, and a regional agreement emerged. That office applied to HUD for technical assistance to help Bay Area PHAs develop a streamlined, consistent-across-jurisdictions approach to porting FUP and other vouchers.

At the project's outset, the HUD regional office offered to host a convening of interested Bay Area PHAs. Coming out of that meeting, San Francisco and Contra Costa PHAs developed a protocol that participating PHAs could adopt as a consistent cross-PHA operating procedure and presented it at an annual National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials conference. Several large Bay Area PHAs are now interested in participating and are determining how to change the protocol to ensure most Bay Area PHAs participate. The technical assistance grant, with Abt Associates and Quadel Consulting Corporation as the technical assistance providers, is helping with many aspects of the transition that each PHA will need to make, including models for fiscal analysis to show the benefits of consistent practice, waivers from HUD, changes to their administrative plans, and similar issues.

Already, the convening is extending beyond its initial focus on FUP vouchers to other vouchers. The hope is that success with this regional alignment can become a model for other locations where a regional approach makes sense and will save time, money, and frustration.

Role of Planning and Continuous Quality Improvement

Respondents described the highly interactive process through which the Human Services Agency and the Homeless Prenatal Program have evolved into their present state of collaboration. The process involved creating a logic model for the intervention, developing a case management and housing model that follows the logic model and has measurable steps, using data to examine what is working and what is not, analyzing reasons and making adjustments, and repeating the process to improve service quality and effectiveness. The continuous quality improvement team met every month for the length of FMF, getting better at the process as it went along. The Human Services Agency has been pleased with the

results and is using the continuous quality improvement process for other innovative projects and disseminating information about how the model works.

Many components of the FMF collaboration worked well and will continue to operate once the demonstration ends. Arrangements with the Department of Public Health to be an active part of the family treatment team, including sharing child assessment results, did not work as well, though. The Department of Public Health administers the mental health assessments needed for case planning. The intent was for the assessment results to be shared during family team meetings and contribute to designing wraparound services. The department's ability to conduct timely assessments and participate in treatment teams was restricted by a severe staffing shortage.

The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing and the Coordinated Entry System

On July 1, 2016, San Francisco created the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to pull all homeless-related services under one roof. For the Human Services Agency, this meant that all Continuum of Care funds and Homeless Management Information System functions were transferred from the Human Services Agency to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. The change has several potential advantages and disadvantages for child welfare in general and casework for FMF and BFH families in particular. This change could affect decisions about how to prioritize them for BFH. On the potentially positive side, the department is the hub of the city's coordinated entry system, through which everyone seeking homeless-specific housing must pass and be assessed for housing need. Child welfare–involved families might be able to access department housing resources, though they would have to meet HUD's stricter definition of homelessness (i.e., being literally homeless, in shelters, or on the streets) to qualify. The system is too new to know how the system change will play out for families similar to those served by FMF.

Role of the Administration for Children and Families Convenings of the Five Demonstration Teams

San Francisco respondents felt that the convenings were a chance to "get away from the office" together to have casual conversations and that they contributed to team-building and trust. Policies and practices that began with a casual suggestion over a meal and were followed up on later with concrete steps and changes in policy or practice.

Notes

1 Since the Partnerships Demonstration began, results of other well-designed studies have reported positive impacts on child welfare outcomes. One study in Illinois evaluating the Family Unification Program with a random assignment design found that FUP decreased the likelihood of out-of-home placement (Fowler and Chavira 2014). A second study in Portland, Oregon, and San Diego, California, using a quasi-experimental design, found that FUP increased the probability of reunification in Portland and decreased the time to case closure for reunification families in Portland and preservation families in both sites (Pergamit, Cunningham, and Hanson 2017). The Family Options Study (Gubits et al. 2016) also found effects on child welfare outcomes of providing families stable housing using a randomized controlled trial design. That study differed from the two previous studies and from the Partnerships Demonstration in its population (families were selected for literal homelessness but not for child welfare involvement) and its intervention (permanent rental subsidies, mostly using housing choice vouchers, but no ongoing supportive services). Nevertheless, its sample size is larger (more than 2,300 families) and more nationally representative (from 12 major cities), so its findings add significantly to the literature on the impacts of stable housing on child welfare outcomes.

2 A summary of each site's services integration goals and achievements at the demonstration's two-year mark can be found in Burt, Gearing, and McDaniel (2016), appendix A.

3 Generally, a household must use a voucher in the jurisdiction of the issuing PHA. There is a complicated and time-consuming process of moving a voucher from one PHA jurisdiction to another, known as "porting" the voucher. PHAs in Broward County, the only other demonstration community in which more than one PHA was involved, worked out portability arrangements among the five participating PHAs as part of the initial commitment of vouchers for the demonstration.

4 HEART had five case managers at the beginning to serve its peak number of families. As families "graduated" from the demonstration, the number of caseworkers was gradually reduced to three.

5 No information is available directly from child welfare agency staff.

References

Burt, Martha R., Maeve E. Gearing, and Marla McDaniel. 2016. *Evolution in Programs Offering Supportive Housing to Child Welfare–Involved Families*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Burt, Martha, and Brooke Spellman. 2007. "Changing Homeless and Mainstream Service Systems: Essential Approaches to Ending Homelessness." In *Toward Understanding Homelessness: The 2007 National Symposium on Homelessness Research*, edited by Deborah Dennis, Gretchen Locke, and Jill Khadduri, 51–96. Washington, DC: US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.

Cunningham, Mary K., Michael Pergamit, Abigail Baum, and Jessica Luna. 2015. *Helping Families Involved in the Child Welfare System Achieve Housing Stability: Implementation of the Family Unification Program in Eight States*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Farrell, Anne F., Preston A. Britner, Mariana Guzzardo, and Samantha Goodrich. 2010. "Supportive Housing for Families in Child Welfare: Client Characteristics and Their Outcomes at Discharge." *Children and Youth Services Review* 32 (2): 145–54.

Fowler, Patrick J., and Dina Chavira. 2014. "Family Unification Program: Housing Services for Homeless Child Welfare–Involved Families." *Housing Policy Debate* 24 (4): 802–14.

Greiff, Debbie, Tony Proscio, and Carol Wilkins. 2003. *Laying a New Foundation: Changing the Systems That Create and Sustain Supportive Housing*. New York: Corporation for Supportive Housing.

Gubits, Daniel, Marybeth Shinn, Michelle Wood, Stephen Bell, Samuel Dastrup, Claudia Solari, Scott R. Brown, et al. 2016. *Family Options Study: Short-Term Impacts of Housing and Service Interventions for Homeless Families*. Washington, DC: US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.

McDaniel, Marla, Sarah Gillespie, Ashley Hong, Mary Cunningham, and Mike Pergamit. 2019. *Stabilizing Families in Supportive Housing: Lessons from a Federal Demonstration for Families in the Child Welfare System*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Pergamit, Mike, Mary Cunningham, and Devlin Hanson. 2017. "The Impact of Family Unification Housing Vouchers on Child Welfare Outcomes." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 60 (1–2): 103–13.

Pergamit, Mike, Mary Cunningham, Devlin Hanson, and Alexandra Stanczyk. 2019. *Does Supportive Housing Keep Families Together: Supportive Housing for Child Welfare Families Research Partnership*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Rog, Debra J., and Marjorie Gutman. 1997. "The Homeless Families Program: A Summary of Key Findings." In *To Improve Health and Health Care: The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Anthology*, edited by Stephen L. Isaacs and James R. Knickman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Swann-Jackson, Rebecca, Donna Tapper, and Allison Fields. 2010. *Keeping Families Together: An Evaluation of the Implementation and Outcomes of a Pilot Supportive Housing Model for Families Involved in the Child Welfare System*. New York: Metis Associates.

Tsemberis, Sam, Leyla Gulcur, and Maria Nakae. 2004. "Housing First, Consumer Choice, and Harm Reduction for Homeless Individuals with Dual Diagnosis." *American Journal of Public Health* 94 (4): 651–56.

About the Author

Martha Burt is an affiliated scholar at the Urban Institute, where she was the director of the Social Services Research Program for nearly 30 years. She has conducted research and evaluation pertaining to a wide variety of populations and issues. Her most recent book is *Repairing the US Social Safety Net,* which she coauthored with Demetra Smith Nightingale. She directed several studies for the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. She also directed the Initiative to End Homelessness for People with Mental Illness in Los Angeles County for the Corporation for Supportive Housing. She received her PhD in sociology from the University of Wisconsin–Madison.

URBAN INSTITUTE · ELEVATE · THE · DEBATE

500 L'Enfant Plaza
Washington, DC 20024

www.urban.org