

End of Year Evaluation Report

Calendar Year 2020

I. Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation report is to provide a review of the Anacortes Family Center (AFC) Emergency Shelter program for the calendar year 2020. The program is evaluated in terms of the achievement of AFC's mission and goals.

- The mission of the Anacortes Family Center's Emergency Shelter is "to serve homeless women, children, and families in crisis by providing shelter in addition to transformational services to achieve long lasting personal success and self-sufficiency."
- The primary goal of the Anacortes Family Center's Emergency Shelter is to assist clients to achieve self-sufficiency by the conclusion of their participation in the program.

II. Methodology

The author examined confidential case files that contained information for each individual client and family. Information was gathered from each case file for specific categories of analysis in this review. These categories include information about client demographics, homelessness history, domestic violence victimization, disabilities and health conditions, criminal history, employment and income, obstacles faced, services provided, reason for leaving the program, and destination when exiting the program. The case files for each household contained additional, detailed case management information that was not used for the purpose of this evaluation.

The records reviewed were cases that closed in the calendar year 2020. Please note that this includes clients that began services in 2019 but exited the program in 2020, and excludes clients that began services in 2020 but did not exit the program by December 31, 2020.

Please note that all decimals were rounded to the nearest whole number. Due to this estimate, every grouping may not equal out to 100% exactly.

III. Findings

The following findings are organized into the aforementioned specific categories for review.

A. Demographics

In 2020, the Anacortes Family center served one hundred and ninety-seven (197) individual clients from seventy-nine total (79) households.

- The clients consisted of ninety-eight (98) adults and ninety-nine (99) children
- The adult clients included seventy-seven (77) women and twenty-one (21) men.

- In total, 39% of clients were women, 11% of clients were men, and 50% of clients were children.
- The average age of adult clients was thirty-seven (37) years old, and for children it was six (6) years old.

The head of household for the 79 families identified the family race/ethnicity.

- Two (2) families identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, two (2) families identified as Asian, three (3) families identified as Black or African American, eleven (11) families identified as Hispanic, fifty-six (56) families identified as White, and five (5) families identified as Multiracial.

The households were comprised of two adults and children, single women with children, single women without children, single men with children, and two adults with no children.

- There were sixteen (16) families comprised of two adults and children or 20%,
- Thirty four (34) single women with children or 43%,
- Twenty two (22) single women without children or 28%,
- Four (4) single men with children or 5%, and
- Three (3) families comprised of two adults and no children, or 4%.

Seven (7) women were pregnant when they entered the program. Five (5) of the seven pregnant women, or 71%, were considered high risk pregnancies.

Fourteen (14) of the 57 families with children reported involvement with CPS in the last six months. One (1) single woman without children reported that she had CPS involvement in the last six months as well. This client had children that were not living in the Emergency Shelter with her and was therefore considered a single woman without children for this evaluation.

B. Homelessness

Every household (100%) was considered literally homeless upon application to the Emergency Shelter program. Twenty-six (26), or 33%, of the families were chronically homeless. Chronic homelessness in this context is defined as continually homeless for one year or longer, or four more instances of homelessness in the last three years that equate to one year or more of homelessness. Further questioning determined that fifteen (15) families, or 19%, had an adult in their household that experienced childhood homelessness (individuals were homeless before the age of 18). Twenty-six (26) families, or 33%, had some history of eviction from housing in the past.

C. Domestic Violence

A majority (75%) identified as victims of domestic violence. Fifty-nine (59) of households reported a history of domestic violence, and twenty (20) of those with a history of domestic violence reported that they were actively fleeing domestic violence.

D. Disabilities and Health Conditions

In their intake paperwork, thirty (30), or 38%, of clients reported physical or developmental disabilities.

- Of those with physical or developmental disabilities, twelve (12), or 40%, indicated that their disability has affected their ability to secure housing.
- Sixteen (16) families, or 20%, indicated that they had a chronic health condition that impacted their ability to find housing.
- Twenty-two (22) families, or 28%, reported that members of their household required access to life sustaining medications, treatments, or equipment, or needed assistance with activities of daily living due to an accident, illness, or disease. There was some overlap between families that indicated they had a physical or developmental disability and those that reported a chronic health condition that impacted their ability to find housing.

A majority of clients, 82%, reported that they had sought or received mental health care in the past and 77% of clients had a professional mental health diagnosis. Fifty-five (55), or 70%, indicated that they were in need of mental health services currently. Thirty (30) clients, or 38%, reported that they were in recovery from substance use and twenty-one (21) of those that reported they were in recovery disclosed that they were currently in treatment for their substance use.

E. Criminal Behavior

A client with a criminal background can face additional barriers to obtaining long term housing.

- Thirty-three (33), or 41.8%, clients reported that they had been arrested, charged, or convicted of a misdemeanor crime.
- Seventeen (17), or 21.5%, reported that they had been arrested, charged, or convicted of a felony crime.
- The majority of clients (14 of the 17 total) who had been arrested, charged, or convicted of a felony crime also reported being arrested, charged, or convicted of a misdemeanor.

F. Employment, Income, and Budgeting

While enrolled in the Emergency Shelter program, clients are provided with assistance and tools to obtain and maintain employment, and to better manage the family's finances.

- Twenty-two (22) families, 28%, used a household budget at the time they enrolled in the program, and seventy-nine (79) families, or 100%, reported using a household budget at the time they exited the program. That was a total increase of 57 or 72% with the assistance of AFC services.
- The Anacortes Family Center's program emphasizes securing employment while in the program. Thirty-eight (38), or 42%, of the adults considered to be the head of household were employed at enrollment and seven (7), or 37%, of the nineteen partners or second

adult in the household were employed. In total, forty-five (45) of the 98 adults in the program, or 46%, were employed upon entering the program.

- At the conclusion of the program, fifty-five (55), or 70%, of the adults considered to be head of household were employed, and thirteen (13), or 68%, of the nineteen partners or second adults in the household were employed. In total, sixty-eight (68) of the 98 adults in the program, or 69% were employed upon exiting the program. This is an increase of 13 adults, or 13%.
- To calculate average monthly income per household, some adjustments were made to reflect the overarching goal of the Anacortes Family Center to decrease reliance on social services. The following calculations exclude Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Social Security Disability Income (SSDI), TANF, General Assistance, Social Security Retirement Income, EBT, and SNAP (food stamps). The adjusted calculations include the following income sources: Earned income, Unemployment insurance, Worker’s compensation, Veteran’s pension, Pension from a former job, Child support, Alimony or other spousal support, and Other income sources.
 - With these adjustments, there was an average increase from total household monthly income of \$1309.90 at enrollment to \$1739.20 at exit. This is an average increase of \$429.30 a month, or 33%.
- To evaluate income from a different angle, we assessed the household’s income to determine if it was below the poverty level, or less than 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI). See table below for reference. At the point of enrollment, fifty-three (53), or 67%, of households earned less than 30% AMI. At the conclusion of their time in AFC’s Emergency Shelter program, thirty-four (34), or 43%, of households earned less than 30% AMI. This is a decrease of 19 families, or 24%, of families earning less than 30% AMI.

Household Income < 30% Area Median Income (AMI)								
HH Size	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Income	16,000	18,250	21,330	25,750	30,170	34,590	39,010	43,430
Monthly	1,333	1,521	1,778	2,146	2,514	2,883	3,251	3,619

G. Client Identified Obstacles at Enrollment and Exit

At the time of enrollment, clients identified the greatest obstacles they were currently facing. Only 67 of the 79 total households provided a response.

- The primary responses were obstacles related to housing (54%), financial issues, (52%) and employment (39%). Additional significant obstacles that clients identified included obstacles related to transportation, childcare, criminal background, mental health, rental history.

As they left the program, clients were asked to identify the services or referrals that best assisted them while participating in the program. 48 of the 79 total households provided a response.

- The services identified in order of frequency were housing assistance (31%), budgeting help (25%), employment services/resume writing (25%), the rent ready class, mental health services referrals, savings building, life skills class, and assistance securing childcare.

H. Service Providers

A feature of the Emergency Shelter program is providing service referrals to additional providers in the area that can support clients participating in the program. Sixty-one (61) of the 79, or 87%, households took advantage of the referral to service providers. The 18 families that did not either 1. Did not participate in the program long enough for referrals to be made, 2. Did not use the services provided, or 3. Did not provide a response in their exit paperwork.

- The following agencies were used by clients in order of frequency: DSHS (30), Other (12), DVSAS (11), Anacortes Housing Authority (10), Compass Health (8), Seamar (8), Skagit Housing Authority (8), CPS (5), Salvation Army (4), Friendship House (4), NWYS (3), Catholic Community Services (3), Skagit Crisis Center (3), SCCAA Housing (2), SCCAA Daycare (2), Work Source (2), Phoenix Recovery (1), SCCAA (1), and Tierra Nueva Faith House (1).

I. Reasons for Leaving Program

At the conclusion of a client's participation in the program, the case manager makes a determination regarding the reason for leaving the program. The reasons are broken down into the following categories: Completed program, Non-compliance with program, or Other reasons. The "other reasons" category includes criminal activity or property damage, unknown reason/client disappeared, or needs could not be met by the program.

- Sixty-three (63) households, or 80%, fully completed the program
- Seven (7) households, or 9%, left the program due to non-compliance with the program
- And nine (9), or 11%, left the program for other reasons

J. Destinations for Families

The case manager recorded the destination of the household at the time of exit in addition to the reason for leaving the program.

- Forty-seven (47) households, or 59%, moved into residences in which they were self-sufficient.
 - Forty-six (46), or 58%, moved into a rental without a subsidy
 - One (1), or 1%, moved into a residence owned by the client without subsidy
- Fifteen (15) households, or 19%, moved in with friends or family. These residences were considered long-term housing situations, and the clients may or may not have paid rent at these locations.
 - Fourteen (14), or 18%, were living with friends or family
 - One (1), or 1%, was renting from family or friends.

- Nine (9) households, or 11%, moved into residences in which they were not fully self-sufficient or received subsidies.
 - Seven (7), or 9%, moved into another emergency shelter
 - One (1), or 1%, moved into a rental with a non-VASH subsidy
 - One (1), or 1%, moved into transitional housing for homeless individuals
- One (1) family, or 1%, moved into a place not meant for habitation (car, tent, etc.)
- Additionally, seven (7) households, or 9%, did not report their household definition.

IV. Summary and Analysis

In this evaluation of the clients served by the Anacortes Family Center’s Emergency Shelter program, the author determined:

- The clients served were primarily **young single women with children**.
- All clients were **literally homeless** at the time they entered the program.
- A majority identified as **victims of domestic violence**, and a third of that population were actively fleeing domestic violence.
- Most clients reported that they had **sought or received mental health care** in the past, and had been **diagnosed with a mental health condition**.
- More than half of the adult clients were **unemployed** upon entering the program, and the bulk of families were **living below the poverty level** (earned less than 30% AMI). Upon exit, more than half the adult clients were **employed**, had **increased their income**, and were no longer living below the **poverty level**.

In 2020, despite the challenges faced due to a global pandemic, working from home, and decreased volunteer assistance, the Anacortes Family Center had a rate of **81%** for households that successfully exited the program and moved into stable housing.

V. Attachments

Attached to this report are 1. A table of findings, 2. A table of comparisons from 2020, 2019, and 2018, and 3. Evaluation Data by Client (**Confidential**).

Please note that Attachment 2 has data that was completed by Darby Brown, Senior Consultant with Public Consulting Group, Inc. and Social and Health Services Administrator, WA Department of Social and Health Services, and not the current author. However, in order to properly compare to current data, the percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number for 2019 and 2018 data.

Olivia Lauzon, B.A., M.A.
 MSW Intern, Anacortes Family Center
 University of Denver, Graduate School of Social Work