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Our mission is to advance solutions that use housing as a platform for services to improve the lives of the most vulnerable people, maximize public resources and build healthy communities.

We envision a future in which high-quality supportive housing solutions are integrated into the way every community serves the men, women and children in most need.

CORE VALUES: Integrity, Respect, Persistence, Making a difference
Returning Home Ohio - Roles
Goal – Reduce Revolving Door
RHO Providers

- Columbus
  - Amethyst, Inc.
  - YMCA of Central Ohio
  - New provider coming soon
- Cleveland
  - EDEN, Inc./Frontline Services
- Dayton
  - Miami Valley Housing Opportunities/Places, Inc.
- Cincinnati
  - Volunteers of America Greater Ohio
- Akron
  - Coming soon
What is Supportive Housing?

Affordable Housing

Support: Flexible Voluntary Independent

Coordinated Services

Case Management

Mental Health Services

Health Care

Substance Abuse Treatment

Employment Services

Housing: Affordable Permanent Independent
Who does PSH help

Supportive housing is proven to work best for very vulnerable men, women and families.

- Chronically homeless
- Frequent users/multiple barriers
- Chronic health issues
- Mental health issues
- Co-occurring disorders

Returning Home Ohio target population

- Severe and persistent mental illness
  - Co-occurring disorders
- HIV
- 120 days post release
The nexus of homelessness and incarceration

- Imprisonment, shelter use, mental health hospital use and recidivism after release
- Is there a “revolving door” between shelters and prisons
- Prisoner cohort released from a NY prison to NYC from 1995 – 1998; 2 yr. follow-up.
- Descriptive results: 11.4% of releases spent time in a shelter & 32.8% returned to prison within 2 years after release. Over ½ of shelter stays – first month after release.
- Multiple regression: Cox proportional hazards

Recidivism after prison release

Risk of Reincarceration

- Prior Shelter Use: 23%
- Prior Imprisonment: 35%
- Prison Admission from or Release to MH Hospital: 231%
- Released on Parole: 92%

Some factors significantly related to shelter use

Risk of Shelter Use

- Prior Shelter Use: 490.0%
- Prior Imprisonment: 0.1%
- Prison Reincar. & Release w/in 2 yrs: 528.0%
- Parole Release: 76.0%
- Prison release from/to MH hospital: -15%

Homelessness is a reentry problem.

Screening while imprisoned should identify those most in need of housing assistance.

Homelessness appears to impact recidivism. Need more research.

Service costs for SMI clients who were recently homeless and placed in a supportive housing program; compared costs to a matched comparison group (prior service use, diagnosis, gender, age).

Estimated the effects on changes in number of days of reduced shelter, incarceration, & service use two years after placement, controlling for other factors

Reductions in incarceration, shelter, & service days

Cost Savings per person

- Prior to intervention: over $40,000/year in health, corrections, and shelter system costs.
- After the intervention: reduction in services use of $12,146 per client per year.
- Supportive housing units cost less than group homes or other placements in the program
- Likely greater savings over time

## Total Cost Reduction per unit for SH SMI Clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provider</th>
<th>Annual Cost Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DHS (shelter)</td>
<td>$13,660,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMH (state mh hospital)</td>
<td>$29,860,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHC (public hosp.)</td>
<td>$6,401,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid (inpatient)</td>
<td>$13,689,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid (outpatient)</td>
<td>-$9,604,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA hospital</td>
<td>$2,151,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC (state)</td>
<td>$1,511,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC (city)</td>
<td>$1,187,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$58,857,628</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History of RHO-Identifying Need

- Ohio Supreme Court Justice Evelyn Lundberg Stratton initiated workgroup
- DRC primarily relied on halfway houses for *supervised* offenders who needed services. Half of our population that is not supervised upon release
- Mental health services board requirements in some counties preclude staying at some halfway houses if from other county.
- 2006–began putting wheels in motion to add permanent supportive housing to the mix. Director wanted evaluation; CSH & DRC hired UI to do it
Returning Home Ohio Process Evaluation—Data Sources and Methodology

- Annual semi-structured interviews with RHO stakeholders
- Field observations of program operations, services, and facilities in the community
- Reviews of program materials
- Frequent teleconferences with CSH staff

Logic of RHO: Ideal Participant Pathway

- Inmate identified by Institution staff
  - BCS Determines Client Is Eligible
  - BCS Determines Client Is NOT Eligible

- Inmate referred to Provider
  - Provider Determines They Will Consider Inmate
  - Provider Determines They Will NOT Consider Inmate

- Inmate is selected for interview
  - Provider Determines Inmate Meets Criteria
  - Provider Determines Inmate Does NOT Meet Criteria.

- Inmate selected for housing
  - Provider Arranges Housing
  - Provider Does NOT Arrange Housing

- Inmate released

Client NOT Housed

Ramping up the Referrals

- **Educate:** Culture shift and knowledge gaps for everyone involved
  - Initial trainings & retraining (e.g., what is supportive housing, consent form administration)
  - New procedures/contacts between departments within institutions

- **Communication**
  - Marketing materials
  - Quarterly meetings

Participant Pathways to Supportive Housing

- **Ideal Pathway:** Pre-release referral, in-reach and pre-release enrollment, housing post-release. N=53; 45%

- **Mixed Pathway:** Pre-release referral, post-release enrollment, housing post-release. N=21; 18%

- **Post-Release Pathway:** Post-release referral, post-release enrollment, housing post-release. N=20; 17%

- 80% of the sample falls into these three main pathways; the remaining had missing data, different order, or date issues

Average days between housing pathway “events”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Release to housing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake to housing</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release to intake</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral to intake</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral to intake</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Services recommended and delivered

MH medication: 70.4%
MH supportive therapy: 62.0%
Outpatient substance abuse: 49.3%
AA/NA/support group: 62.0%

Recommended
Delivered

MH medication
MH supportive therapy
Outpatient substance abuse
AA/NA/support group

Percent Recommended
Percent Delivered
- Identification and referral of potential participants took longer than expected
  - Turnover at ODRC/BCS
  - Initial confusion over the referral process
- Pathways to supportive housing, beginning prerelease, varied considerably
  - Challenges facilitating the reentry process prerelease
  - Number of institutions involved in the pilot increased over time
- Provision of supportive housing upon release varied considerably
  - Providers varied in their exclusionary criteria, target population, housing model, and city/county
  - Expertise and background of providers varied
- Enrollment process took time, careful attention and coordination, and troubleshooting

Impact Evaluation—Overview

Impact Research Questions

- Primary: Does RHO reduce recidivism?
- Primary: Does RHO reduce residential instability?
- Secondary: What is the impact of RHO on service use?

Administrative Data Sources
## Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=121</td>
<td>N=118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (percent)</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Release (years)</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent White***</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Served in Prison (in days)</td>
<td>907.4</td>
<td>1289.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Previous Incarcerations</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless at Arrest (percent)</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary or Secondary Disability Is Mental Health Illness (percent)</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary or Secondary Disability Is Alcohol/Drug Abuse (percent)***</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Level^**</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Level at Release#</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Postrelease Supervision (percent)</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban Institute analysis of data from ODRC.

^ Security level ranges from 1 to 5, where 1 is the lowest security level and level 5 is the highest. # Risk level ranges from negative 1 (basic risk) to 8 (intensive risk), which is ODRC’s classification of an inmates risk of reincarceration. Note: Independent sample t-test tests whether the difference in the means of the treatment group and the comparison group is significantly different from zero. Significance testing: *p<0.10; **p<0.05; ***p < 0.01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Treatment % (N)</th>
<th>Comparison % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Rearrest (percent)*</td>
<td>27.3 (n=121)</td>
<td>37.3 (n=118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Rearrest (percent)</td>
<td>18.2 (n=121)</td>
<td>17.8 (n=118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor Rearrest (percent)*</td>
<td>18.2 (n=121)</td>
<td>27.1 (n=118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Reincarceration (percent)</td>
<td>6.6 (n=121)</td>
<td>11.0 (n=118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reincarceration—New Crime (percent)</td>
<td>5.8 (n=121)</td>
<td>8.5 (n=118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reincarceration – Technical Violation (percent)^</td>
<td>0.8 (n=121)</td>
<td>2.5 (n=118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Rearrests</td>
<td>0.628 (n=121)</td>
<td>0.720 (n=118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to First Rearrest (days)</td>
<td>162.35 (n=34)</td>
<td>173.98 (n=45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to First Reincarceration (days) ^</td>
<td>277.36 (n=8)</td>
<td>240.42 (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Service Delivery (percent)**</td>
<td>37.2 (n=121)</td>
<td>22.9 (n=118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Intensive Service Delivery (percent)***</td>
<td>24.8 (n=121)</td>
<td>11.0 (n=118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days Services Delivered***</td>
<td>12.61 (n=121)</td>
<td>3.71 (n=118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days Intensive Services Delivered***</td>
<td>7.01 (n=121)</td>
<td>1.11 (n=118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to First Service Delivery (days)</td>
<td>91.16 (n=45)</td>
<td>104.19 (n=27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban Institute analysis of data from ODRC, ODMH, and ODADAS.
Note: Significance testing: * p < 0.10; ** p < 0.05; *** p < 0.01
^ These outcomes were not estimated using multivariate models because there were so few valid data points.
Analyzing the impact of RHO: outcomes

- **Recidivism**: any rearrest, felony rearrest, misdemeanor rearrest, any reincarceration, reincarceration for new crime; number of rearrests, number of reincarcerations, time to rearrest

- **Emergency shelter**: Yes/no during follow-up. No individual-level data (could not use regression)

- **Service use**: Any service delivery, days of service delivery, time (in days) to first service use.
60% less likely to recidivate back to prison
40% less likely to be rearrested
2 & 1/2 times less likely to be rearrested for a misdemeanor
What do the findings show about length of time to rearrest?

Length of time to rearrest is significantly longer for those in RHO
Returning Home Ohio Research Results

290% more likely to receive outpatient services

41% more likely to receive at least one service
Returning Home Ohio Research Results
SF is a 52 year old male.

- Lengthy criminal record dating back to 1988.
- He entered Returning Home Ohio in 2010 with nowhere else to go.
- Change did not occur quickly.
- Today he has a job, and just moved into his own apartment with no subsidy.
- He recently sent pictures to his case manager of his new apartment. He stated that he wanted someone else to “take his place.”
DM is a 51 year old male.

Incarceration and homeless history involved assault and domestic violence.

He entered the Returning Home Ohio program in February 2012 with little hope for a different kind of life.

Today he is faithful in his treatment and is working on balancing his “program” with holding a job.

Remains in Returning Home Ohio.
Next Steps for DRC/CSH

- Expand research by 2015
- Expand project to serve prison or jail diversion
- Expand to additional cities in 2013-2014 and 2014-2015
Questions?