

**At Home/Chez Soi**

**Winnipeg Site**

**Later Implementation Evaluation Report**



Report researched and prepared by:

Scott McCullough & Matthew Havens

Institute of Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg

with

Corinne Isaak & Tracy Deboer  
Department of Psychiatry, University of Manitoba

August 13th, 2012

## Key Messages:

This report is the second documenting the implementation of the Mental Health Commission of Canada's At Home/Chez Soi project in Winnipeg, covering the late 2010 to late 2011 period. It reports on the changes in program fidelity over this time, and reflects on continued and emerging strengths and challenges in the implementation of the project. The results demonstrate that, while there are challenges, there have been many positive results for participants.

Service teams have built on relationships with individual participants over the past year. Daily drop-in programs are particularly successful, providing participants with a consistent, normal social circle. Other improvements include better supports, increased advocacy, and participants learning to be independent. Increased knowledge in working with solvent users has made substantial improvements working with this group of participants.

Housing procurement remained the most significant challenge into the second year. There is a severe lack of affordable housing and this limited participant choice. Service teams have adapted by using some congregate housing, and increasing staff. Eviction prevention is recognized as more important now, as is providing diversity in housing types.

The challenge of delivering sufficient services to participants was identified in Fidelity Reports. Service arms created discussion groups over the last year, which were successful, and are being reimplemented. Staffing problems eased over the last year. All teams have made changes to staffing, and improved workplace culture. Caseloads have eased compared to the first year, and this has allowed teams to focus on long-term case-management solutions for participants. Improvements in communication across the Site have also helped, as have the adaptations of the site including the integration of Aboriginal culture.

Severe addictions, especially to solvents, were identified by the teams as a major barrier to housing stability; yet progress is being made. ACT has made significant inroads in working with this group, procuring appropriate housing and services. Connecting all participants to adequate external clinical services continues to be a challenge for all service teams.

Teams note the remarkable recovery that many participants have achieved including housing stability, and the seeking out of education, volunteering and employment opportunities. Family reunification has been especially rewarding for some participants.

Landlords had mixed experiences with the project. They typically liked the programs and services offered and felt that At Home is a positive program for participants. Landlords attributed success stories to good supports and service workers. However, for the failed tenancies, landlords cited insufficient supports for participants, lack of life-skills, and addictions as important contributing factors. Landlords interviewed were averse to working with solvent abusers. Landlords commented on unhelpful changes to the project since its inception, and the need for better communication.

As the project moves into its final year, questions about sustainability have become increasingly important for participants and staff alike. The project is working on continuation, but participants are worried that they will be on the street again. Planning for the transition has begun with a push to get all participants on the waiting list for Manitoba Housing. Site leadership feels that the public is growing more aware about the prevalence of homelessness and attitudes are changing for the better. Lastly, we heard over and over again that harm reduction works, and that the At Home project is working.

## Three-Page Executive Summary:

This report is the second documenting the implementation of the Mental Health Commission of Canada's At Home/Chez Soi project in Winnipeg covering the late 2010 to late 2011 period. It reports on the changes in program fidelity over this time, and reflects on continued and emerging strengths and challenges in the implementation of the project. The results of interviews and focus groups demonstrate that, while there are issues and challenges associated with the Site, there have been numerous positive results for participants, many of whom are moving towards recovery and stability. These successes are beginning to reveal the effectiveness of the Housing First model.

Focus groups revealed that service teams have built on relationships with individual participants through trust, respect, and a commitment to understanding them as individuals. Daily drop-in programs are seen as particularly successful, providing participants with a consistent, normal social circle. Other successful strategies include better identification of the proper supports for each individual, the ability to be mobile to meet with people in the community, advocating on behalf of participants, and working to teach participants independence. Increased knowledge in working with solvent users has contributed to a change of attitude towards this population and has generated specific support services for them, though challenges remain.

The Winnipeg Site has faced numerous challenges over the last year. Housing procurement remained the most significant challenge into the second year. There is a lack of affordable housing and this limited participant choice of housing to a more central concentration of units; in environments many consider unhelpful to recovery. Service teams have adapted to this challenge through some use of congregate housing, and changes in staffing to provide more housing-support. All stakeholders recognized more time should be spent on eviction prevention rather than constantly re-housing participants. More diversity in housing types was seen as a key missing component, particularly in terms of shared and communal living. Many stakeholders felt there is a need to broaden the definition of **housing** in the At Home program to include other choices. The ability to quickly house participants was hampered by factors including, participants' lack of a housing history or rental record, the lack of a damage deposit fund; and, there remains significant difficulties in housing (and re-housing) solvent users.

The teams identified severe addictions, especially to solvents, as a major barrier to housing stability; yet progress is being made. High rates of eviction, damage, and re-housing were all symptomatic of solvent abuse. Teams have made extraordinary efforts to work with solvent users. ACT has made significant inroads in working with this subgroup, procuring appropriate housing and providing services. There is recognition of a need for additional or different types of programming for solvent users; and an identified need for general substance abuse programs across the Site. Connecting participants to adequate external clinical services continues to be a challenge for all service teams.

Many stakeholders contend that those who have mental health challenges have been more successful than those with severe addictions. The difficulty of connecting participants to medical and psychiatric help was seen as a significant barrier to success for many participants and Wi Che Win felt that there are many undiagnosed participants.

The challenge of delivering sufficient services to participants was identified in Fidelity reports in 2011 and 2012. In response, Wi Che Win and NiApin created groups over the last year, which were successful. However, groups appear to have now declined or stopped for both agencies. Wi Che Win intends to restart group work and NiApin remains focused on its successful drop-in center.

Burnouts, staffing turnover and the use of temporary contracts have affected the ability of staff to build and maintain relationships with the participants and provide the necessary service levels. High eviction rates, and difficulties in maintaining contact with participants, have also affected success rates. All teams have developed strategies to counter this, including changes to staffing, more productive case-meetings, new management, and improved workplace culture. Site Coordinators recommended creating a pool of casual service staff to cover staff-leaves. Also contributing to improvements, caseloads have eased compared to the first year, and there is less need to respond to repeated crisis and re-housings. This has allowed teams to move into more long-term case-management solutions for participants, and this is already demonstrating results.

The Site has had great success with the inclusion of people with lived experience in the project. Teams report on the great value of the work they do working with participants. There is some concern, that high demands have been placed on people with lived experience, resulting in increased stress.

Working with external service agencies and bureaucracies continues to be a challenge for the Site. Teams have made good contacts with Employment Insurance Canada and, to a lesser extent, Child and Family Services. However, many external agencies have processes that work at cross-purposes to each other and the At Home project; causing frustration for the teams. More work strengthening relationships with external agencies would be beneficial to the project.

Most noteworthy for this report was the enthusiasm among service staff for the remarkable recovery that many participants have achieved. Many outcomes have changed for the participants including participants remaining in housing for two years, and many stories of participants seeking out education, volunteering opportunities and employment. Some participants have become more confident in advocating for themselves, and family reunification has been especially rewarding for some.

Personal change among participants is being observed. Participants are developing their own voice and strengths, and this is apparent with participants 'going to a doctor' or overcoming anxiety; to participants testifying in court or with the Residential Tenancy Board. Service teams have begun seeing participants '*going to a deeper level*' in their sharing and Site Coordinators remarked on the long-lasting impacts the project is having in communities as people begin to embrace Housing First.

Service teams noted some critical ingredients of Housing First: Acceptance, Empowerment and Responsibility, have become the philosophies of the teams. Personal staff qualities of non-judgmental kindness, respect, acceptance, and commitment, were also emphasized.

Landlords had mixed experiences with the project. They typically liked the programs and services offered: holding fees, provision of repair services through Manitoba Green Retrofit, assistance with moving problem tenants, and the education component. All landlords felt that At Home is a positive program providing advantages and opportunities to participants. Several identified that participants without addictions, were the least trouble for them. At the same time, the guaranteed rent offered by the program was seen as less of a benefit to landlords. All landlords wanted participants that were quiet, clean, and respectful of the property and neighbours. Almost all noted the importance of life-skills as a factor in participant success. Most landlords said that they tried to treat At Home participants the same, or better, than any other tenant.

Landlords attributed success stories to good supports and service workers; and there have been many successes. However, for the failed tenancies, landlords cited insufficient supports for participants, lack of life-skills, and addictions as contributing factors. There were reports from landlords that a few participants had not received the supports that the program promised, and this is partially supported by the Fidelity Reports. Landlords suggested transitional housing with life-skills learning services, and

more ownership on the part of participants in terms of choosing their housing and furnishings, would be beneficial to the project.

Landlords singled out solvent abusers stated that they had zero tolerance for solvent use contending it is a health and safety risk for everyone in the building. Landlords interviewed were averse to working with solvent abusers.

A common issue raised by landlords was the added layers of bureaucracy that working with the program entailed. This situation was aggravated by poor communication at multiple levels. Landlords offered a simpler line of communication as a solution.

Several landlords also commented that the project had not lived up to verbal agreements. The changes in holding fees, assistance in evicting problem participants, and the reduction in the services of Manitoba Green Retrofit were viewed negatively by landlords.

As the project moves into its final year, questions about sustainability have become increasingly important for participants and staff alike. Service teams are making every effort to be clear with participants that the project is working on continuation, but communication with participants has been a problem. Participants, of course, are worried that they will be on the street within a year, and this is causing anxiety. Staff as well, have expressed worry, but planning for the transition has begun with a push to get participants on the waiting list for Manitoba Housing.

All stakeholders interviewed for this report offered an enormous amount of information on lessons learned about the project, its implementation, and future directions. Several needs were identified including: programming to help tenants who have been evicted, addictions and trauma programming, and additional types of housing. Stronger relationship with outside service agencies, governments departments, and Aboriginal agencies were also often remarked upon.

Staff workloads and workplace culture have improved dramatically over the last year, especially with the initial intake now past. Improvements in communication across the Site have helped, as have the adaptations of the site including the further integration of Aboriginal culture by all teams, and the development of the service agencies, Manitoba Green Retrofit and Housing Plus.

Site leadership felt that the public is growing more aware about the prevalence of homelessness and attitudes are changing for the better. Lastly, we heard over, and over again that harm reduction works, and that the At Home project is working.

# I. Introduction

This report is the second documenting the implementation of the Mental Health Commission of Canada's At Home/Chez Soi project in Winnipeg covering the late 2010 to late 2011 period.. It reports on the changes in program fidelity that have occurred over this time, and reflects on continued and emerging strengths and challenges in the implementation of the project. The report is the result of a series of interviews and focus groups facilitated by researchers at the Institute of Urban Studies at the University of Winnipeg and the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Manitoba.

## II. Methodology

### *A. Description of Site and Sample*

The research component of the Winnipeg demonstration project is co-led by the Institute of Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg and the University of Manitoba. It is structured as follows:

Site Coordination: Marcia Thomson and Project Consultant Carla Kematch<sup>1</sup>; Co-Principal Investigators: Dr. Jino Distasio, Associate Professor of Geography and Director of the Institute of Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg and Dr. Jitender Sareen, Professor of Psychiatry and Community Health Sciences and Director of Research, Department of Psychiatry, with Corinne Isaak as Research Coordinator.

The Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre undertakes delivery of the Intensive Case Management (ICM) interventions known as Wi Che Win (or "Walk with Me"), while the Mount Carmel Clinic (MCC) is responsible for implementing the Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) interventions. The Aboriginal Health and Wellness Centre offers the Ni-Apin Program as the site-specific (Third Arm) intervention component. It is an ICM model with an additional day program and provides housing alternatives to its constituents at first point of entry into the program.

The Winnipeg Regional Health Authority (WRHA) coordinates housing procurement in association with Housing Plus and works with the Service Arms to identify appropriate housing. They also have an educational role with landlords in terms of Aboriginal Cultural Awareness and Mental Health First Aid.

The Project Leadership Team, (comprised of the Site Co-Coordinators, the Co-Principal Investigators, the Lead Service Providers, and the Housing Procurement Coordinator), provides overall management and coordination of the Winnipeg Project. The Advisory Committee helps to secure holistic and effective partnerships across housing, service and health care sectors, while the Aboriginal Cultural Lens Committee ensures that Aboriginal perspectives are honoured and promoted in Site implementation. Persons with lived experience in mental health and in homelessness (PWLE) are represented in various roles of the Project, on the Advisory Committee or as staff of the lead service providers. The inclusion of Aboriginal perspectives and of persons with lived experience in mental health and homelessness are considered integral to the Winnipeg Site.

---

<sup>1</sup> On June 30, 2012, Marcia Thompson stepped down and was replaced by Lucille Bruce.

All interviewees were stakeholders in the Winnipeg Site, and had been integrally involved in its implementation of the project over the past year or more. In total, thirty-seven people participated in consultations with more than seventeen hours of interviews recorded for this second fidelity-evaluation.

The stakeholders interviewed for this report included with the three service teams, site coordinators, the housing team and the landlords participating in the project. The number of participants in these interviews and focus groups were as follows:

Wi Che Win - ICM:	6	Site Coordinators :	2
Mount Carmel Clinic ACT:	8	Housing Team :	3
NiApin:	6	Landlords:	12

Of the twelve landlords interviewed seven were from independent private companies. The other five interviews were with resident managers or tenant service coordinators of Manitoba Housing, who deal directly with the project participants. Manitoba Housing is the largest supplier of housing units to the Winnipeg Site.

## ***B. Documentation of Methodological Steps***

Feedback sessions between the Service teams and the QA team were observed by the researchers and field notes taken. Strengths and challenges were noted, as were discrepancies in perspectives and other issues. These field notes were used to inform the focus group interviews with the Service teams.

In-depth interviews were conducted with the Site Coordinators, while focus groups sessions were held with the service and housing teams. A subsequent interview with one housing team member unable to attend the group session was also held. Lastly, telephone interviews were completed with landlords participating in the project.

The Interview Guides supplied by the national team were first simplified by removing extraneous (i.e., instructional) text, and then emailed to Stakeholder participants in advance of the meetings, along with consent forms. Upon meeting, participants were invited to sign the consent form and explained the research purpose and process. These sessions were facilitated by alternating combinations of Dudley, Isaak, Havens and McCullough.<sup>2</sup>

Some of the questions for both interviews and focus groups were adapted in the field. Questions relating to identifying ‘barriers’, ‘challenges’ and ‘strengths’ tended to be repeated throughout the interview guide. As a result, questions that repeated information previously covered were not restated.

Researchers with the Winnipeg Site concluded all sessions with an open invitation to offer comments on anything relevant not already covered, framed in terms of, "Are there any other perceptions about the implementation of the At Home program you haven't had a chance to mention that you would like to add?".

---

<sup>2</sup> This analysis was undertaken by researchers with prior knowledge of the project at the Winnipeg Site. The Principal Investigators Dr. Jino Distasio and Dr. Jitender Sareen supported research. Researcher Michael Dudley has been involved with the At Home / Chez Soi project since 2010, while Corinne Isaak has been involved in overseeing the consumer narrative research since 2009. Researchers Matthew Havens, Tracy Deboer and Scott McCullough have been involved since 2011.

In total, twelve interviews were conducted with landlords. Thirty landlords were contacted out of the population of approximately forty landlords that have participated in the At Home / Chez Soi project in Winnipeg, resulting in a participation rate of 40%. Each interview took approximately 30 minutes to complete. Interview data was collected by digital recording over speakerphone with notes also taken by the researcher. Interviews were conducted between March and May of 2012. Open-ended questions and prompts were used to elicit responses. Respondents were given the option of not answering questions, as participation was voluntary. The anonymity of respondents was ensured at the time of interview.

### ***C. Description of Coding/Analysis Process***

A collaborative approach was adopted in the preparation, coding and analysis of the interviews and focus group results. Each report author read the transcripts of interviews individually, and then met to identify common themes. The researchers worked together to ensure that ambiguous words or terminology were clarified and the overall accuracy of the transcriptions was confirmed. Collaborative coding ensured that inputs were readily and mutually interpretable. Usefulness of data was ensured by seeking to maintain focus on fidelity assessment issues.

Findings from the interviews and focus groups were paraphrased, summarized and synthesized. Responsibility for drafting the report was divided between McCullough and Havens.

### ***D. Description of how the quality of the data was established***

Key informant interviews were recorded in-person using a digital voice recorder. Dates and interview subjects were identified in the recordings. To ensure security, files were moved from the voice recorder to a password-protected laptop. Focus group sessions with the Service Teams were also digitally recorded, and were documented by researchers taking detailed notes on a laptop and in longhand. The notes and recordings were later compared and combined. To ensure confidentiality, the task of transcribing focus groups sessions was assigned to a transcriber. The interviewers transcribed landlord interviews. Both mp3 files and typed transcripts were stored on the hard drives of the authors, as well as a collaborative file-sharing site.

## **III Findings**

The results of interviews and focus groups demonstrate that, while there are issues and challenges associated with the Winnipeg Site, there have been numerous positive results for participants, many of whom are moving towards recovery and stability. The Winnipeg Site continues to develop its resources and approaches, with awareness of the uniqueness of the city's conditions presenting particular challenges and opportunities.



## ***A. Developmental evaluation issues***

### ***a) Maintained and emerging strengths***

#### **(1) Description of strengths from the fidelity report**

##### **NiApin (3<sup>rd</sup> Arm)**

The 2012 Fidelity Report notes that NiApin is making effective use of their daily drop-in as evident in the appreciation that participants have shown for this service. The fact that the team is running groups for participants is a positive that is being built upon. Fidelity also noted that the team adheres to the concept of self-determination for participants, being respectful of people as individuals and the path they may choose, and avoids the use of coercion. This contributes to the team's positive efforts in supporting all aspects of the lives of participants.

NiApin has benefitted from having a housing specialist on the team, in light of the transition of housing procurement being reassigned to the service arms. This specialist is working to build connections with existing and new landlords. The team has become more proficient at facilitating the re-housing of participants, taking a more deliberate approach and creating a plan to ensure the participant will be successful in the new unit.

NiApin team members have a good working relationship and show mutual respect and support for each other. This is evident in the efficient and thoughtful discussions that take place at team meetings. This allows them to effectively plan and share resources, especially when dealing with participants who are facing crisis.

##### **ACT**

The fidelity team reported that the ACT team has begun to focus more on long-term issues for participants, and less on intake. The team is making an effort to facilitate the building of more meaningful lives for participants. This has been facilitated by the development of a new 'recovery plan system'. Another important change has been the shift away from 'doing things for participants', towards teaching participants to do it themselves.

The ACT team has had good success with a family reunification program, allowing participants that have progressed in recovery to reconnect with their children. Fidelity also noted that the team's group-work is strong, continuing to attract participants. The trauma group, facilitated by a trauma specialist, especially received praise from participants. The team has built good connections with participants' EI workers, benefitting from more frequent face-to-face contact with them.

Fidelity notes that the attitude of the ACT team towards solvent abuse has changed, as the team gained experience and developed strategies to effectively work with the issues. Fidelity also noted that the team is well-versed in the harm-reduction method and makes good use of motivational interviewing. The ACT team is also developing an eviction prevention plan that includes increased visits with participants, improved landlord relations, and strategies relating to solvent abuse.

##### **ICM (Wi Che Win)**

The 2012 Fidelity Report highlighted the ICM team's great success in working with and advocating for participants involved in the criminal justice system. This team has the highest number of participants involved in the legal system in Winnipeg, and the experience the staff has gained has been valuable.

The ICM team is committed to using harm reduction approaches and also makes use of motivational interviewing techniques. The team has been more engaged with participants, and is more thoughtful about each person's situation. The team is well-grounded in the concept of self-determination and respectful of an individual's uniqueness when helping them to plan and meet goals.

## (2) Service provider perspectives on strengths

For the most part, the service teams' perspectives on their strengths converged with those found in the fidelity report. During the focus groups, staff tended to speak more about the positives that they saw with the participants, both generally and as individuals.

All three service teams shared the success they have had building relationships with individual participants. Staff members have built trust with participants by showing sincere respect and a commitment to understanding them as individuals. NiApin has benefited greatly in this aspect from the running of a daily drop-in that is consistently staffed, which allows participants to stay connected. The drop in and an "open door" policy adopted by staff has facilitated a more relaxed, sociable and community feel among the NiApin participants and staff. A feeling of trust has allowed participants of all the teams to share their personal concerns, what they feel they need, and has also allowed them to feel more comfortable speaking up for themselves.

The ACT team has developed strategies to better support solvent users; this is also noted by fidelity. Prior to this project, working with solvent users was challenging and the project has contributed to the change of attitudes towards working with this population. This experience has generated more support for solvent abusers such as a "solvent user move-in kit." The team is willing to work with other service providers to pass on this knowledge.

Both the ACT and ICM teams said that they have had a lot of success helping participants maintain their housing, and many remaining in the original unit that they occupied. Almost half of the participants in the ACT program are in their first housing location. ACT team staff said that most participants who had to be re-housed learned from the experience, achieved stability and did not have to be re-housed again. The ACT team works hard on eviction prevention and works closely with participants to try and prevent having to be re-housed.

Two of the teams reported on the beneficial changes made in their approach to service. The NiApin team has learned to move away from an '*authoritarian attitude*' when dealing with participants to a more participatory one. "*[I]n the beginning we set out to prevent people from making bad choices. Now we provide positive opportunities,*" said a team member of NiApin. The ACT team has developed a **move-in checklist** that helps them ensure none of the important details of that process are missed. The ACT team also had landlords accept more than a single individual on a lease. This has allowed couples to live together without risk of eviction due to violation of the lease, as has been a concern in the past.

Both NiApin and ICM mentioned that advocating on behalf of participants is an important element of their work. This has included staff providing advocacy for participants when dealing with EI, CPP, and with landlords, especially when unit maintenance is required. Along with advocacy, the service teams have been working to teach participants independence, facilitate self-determination and allow them to find resources and supports on their own. The NiApin team commented that having some participants looking for their own place to live has been a very valuable experience for the individual. The ICM team has noticed that some participants are showing independence and finding their own opportunities for personal growth. At the ICM team they provide volunteer opportunities for participants which helps them gain experience and uses their strengths. Participants from all the service arms have been achieving a variety of things that indicate recovery; such as returning to school, volunteering, gaining

employment or looking for work, and being reunited with families. The fact that participants have regained custody of their children as a result of their recovery has been especially significant.

Staff of the service teams commented that despite being very unique and challenging work, the staff is very supportive of each other. *“The atmosphere of the team is positive, caring, and nurturing and the team has good cohesion.”*

The ACT team said that they are very flexible in providing support for each other. They have been more effective at scheduling, and have found time to do monthly debriefings with each staff member. No staff has left the ACT team due to the nature of the work which they have all found rewarding.

## ***b) Recurrent challenges or trouble spots***

### **(1) Description of challenges from the fidelity reports**

#### **NiApin (3<sup>rd</sup> Arm)**

The fidelity team reported a concern regarding the NiApin team’s frequency of visits with participants. NiApin has been seeing some participants less than the required three times each month. Participants reported that most of the services they receive happen when they drop by the office. *“The team is struggling to see people at least once a week. Based on the chart review, 60% of participants are seen at least three times a month and several were seen only once or not at all.”* Participants said they would like to see staff more frequently in their home or elsewhere in the community. The service team would also benefit from providing opportunities for participant input concerning the delivery of services.

The fidelity report also noted that the team should rethink the use of “home inspections” as this may come across to participants as monitoring and may interfere with rapport. It was also noted that the team would benefit from better use of the motivational interviewing approach.

The role of the ‘peer support worker’ is uncertain within the team and must be clarified. The team has also struggled with connecting participants to psychiatric and other services that participants need for recovery.

#### **ACT**

The fidelity review noted that the ACT team needs to work further on providing opportunities to allow participants to give input into the program. This would allow participants to take more ownership of the services offered and more pride in successful participation of those programs. Fidelity also reported that re-housing continues to be a challenge, and the ACT team is making efforts to be proactive on this issue.

There is a lack of services in the community for stage-wise substance abuse intervention, which many participants would benefit from. The team is having difficulty connecting participants to these services, especially when there are extensive waiting lists for existing programs.

#### **ICM (Wi Che Win)**

The fidelity report indicates that the ICM team’s service delivery consistency and chart-keeping needs improvement. Some note-taking is occurring, but fidelity found that some charts don’t appear to reflect goal planning.

Also of concern were support groups not being maintained consistently, and most had discontinued altogether. This has resulted in a loss of connection with some participants who make use of the groups.

The team is also struggling to connect participants to existing medical, psychiatric, and addiction services within the community.

Concern was expressed by fidelity that there was some inconsistency in how often participants were seen, some regularly and others rarely. This was attributed to staff turnover, difficulty locating participants, and inconsistent record keeping.

## **(2) Service provider perspectives on challenges**

Staff from all three service teams discussed the challenges of trying to contact some participants, and the delays involved in recovery planning if a participant misses an appointment. Most participants do not have phones. Budgeting for, or providing phones would allow a quick call to confirm a meeting or to check in. Another challenge of keeping in touch with participants is the concern over safety. Home visits often require two staff members for safety, and this can be difficult to schedule when all staff have full work loads. Teams also state that every individual requires their own level of involvement with staff, some needing infrequent check-ins and others requiring many hours per week.

Both the ICM and NiApin teams shared their concerns about difficulties and confusion surrounding the role of “peer support workers” or “peer specialists.” The ICM staff were concerned that some of these peer specialists that were hired had not even recovered from trauma themselves. They also had a concern that the definition of “peer” was unclear, and as envisioned, was not necessary. ICM felt that people did not have to suffer the same sort of trauma in their lives to be a peer, or provide support. Some of the staff feels that life experiences of all types provide people with the ability to give adequate peer support.

The NiApin teams concern centred more on the job description of the peer support workers. They were originally assigned to strictly provide accompaniment for case workers, to provide safety, and to work during drop-in hours. This evolved into “picking up the slack” when things became busy and undertaking roles that were not suitable; such as doing the work of case workers, one-on-one meetings with participants, and going out alone on house calls.

## **(3) Perspectives on moving forward to address the challenges (from Fidelity reports & service teams)**

- The NiApin team is categorizing participants as high, medium, and low needs and graduating participants as they are ready.
- The ACT team is placing some common sense conditions on participants that need to be re-housed and who have had multiple units. They are also developing a process based on the medicine wheel that has helped with re-housing.
- A congregate-type setting may be a viable housing alternative for those who have not had success living in scattered sites.
- Service teams might try to arrange to have clinicians spend a few hours a week at their office to allow for walk-in appointments.

*c) Emerging implementation challenges or trouble spots (if evident)*

**(1) Description of challenges from the fidelity reports**

**NiApin (3<sup>rd</sup> Arm)**

The team has been challenged by the changes in housing procurement. Lack of available or feasible units due to low vacancy rates, desirability, and quality of upkeep have slowed the process of housing and re-housing people. A big concern when attempting to procure units is the limitation of the \$485 subsidy and the lack of quick access to a damage deposit.

**ACT**

The ACT team's housing specialist has been working hard to build connections with landlords. The team has less leverage when procuring units, especially due to the inability to quickly provide damage deposits. It is also unclear who is responsible for making rent stipend payments.

The fidelity report noted that the ACT team should be mindful of when participants are ready for a transition to a lower level of service. An important part of this process is ensuring that participants have learned to do things for themselves, as opposed to having things done for them. Fidelity suggests that staff should also be mindful of where the participant is at, and if they are ready to be challenged – questions that should be asked of the participant.

The fidelity report also noted that both ACT and ICM, along with the housing team commented that the regular meeting had changed, with less focus on housing. This meeting is an important chance to share information concerning available units, landlords, repair issues, and other items that facilitate unit procurement.

**ICM (Wi Che Win)**

The team has been challenged by a significant turnover in staff. This has led to varying support and understanding of the model, and how it is to be implemented. There also seems to be varied levels of understanding of the harm-reduction strategy and motivational interviewing techniques. Staff turnover has also resulted in a loss of relationship with EI and other external services, making it more difficult to advocate on behalf of participants.

The ICM team is also facing challenges due to the change in the project's housing procurement system. There exists confusion for the team about who is supposed to pay the rent, do repairs, and contact landlords. Landlords are also expecting incentives that were guaranteed in the past, but can no longer be maintained (such as repairs). The change in the housing process raised concerns about the ability to procure units with the limited subsidy of \$485, and lack of immediate access to damage deposits.

**(2) Service provider perspectives on challenges**

Service staff also shared frustration with their lack of ability to procure housing for the program. Teams noted especially the difficulties encountered when participants have become incarcerated (often from pre-existing charges), as EI will not cover the cost of a rental while the person is in jail. This makes it difficult to maintain housing, and requires participants to be re-housed after release. Acquiring damage deposits has also been difficult, these need to be better budgeted for.

The ACT team said that difficulties were encountered when changes in the service delivery were not communicated effectively to landlords. Promises that were made to landlords concerning consistency in payments and repairs to units were unable to be met as the project went on. One staff said that they

need a single approved message to give to landlords about what the project can offer. These discrepancies have affected relations with landlords.

**(3) Perspectives on moving forward to address the challenges  
(from Fidelity reports & service teams)**

- The ICM team is working on developing team cohesion. Staff would benefit from a teleconference about the principles of housing first and harm reduction especially for new members of the team or those who would like a review. The team is also organizing a visit from the SOS team to learn about strategies for working with solvent users.
- The ICM team will benefit from their newly assigned housing specialist and should also consider working closer with the ACT team, as well as try to set up meetings with EI and other external agency workers in order to build connections.
- The entire Winnipeg site is implementing a new goal planning methodology that takes a very holistic approach versus a medical model approach.
- Housing specialists from each team should continue to meet on a weekly basis to discuss issues that pertain directly to housing. The purpose of this housing meeting would be to recruit, vet, and share potential landlords and leads.

***d) Other emerging implementation issues (barriers, adaptations, innovations)***

**(1) Description of issues**

The speed of intake that was required to meet the project goals presented challenges to providing service. The ACT and ICM teams both discussed how the pressure to bring in the quantity of the people required by the research interfered with the quality of service they could provide. The effects of this initial push to house a large number of participants were also commented on by Site Coordinators. Closer to the start of the project, when participant numbers were still low, staff had more time to spend with people. As numbers increased it was very difficult to give participants the individual attention they required to help them maintain housing. The housing shortage in Winnipeg caused staff to spend a lot of time finding housing for new referrals, and took time away from working with existing participants. One Staff from ICM commented “*how do we justify chasing housing when I know that people are traumatized and I should really be attending to that?*” The speed of intake and housing shortage also prevented staff from really getting to know some of the participants. If there was an existing housing stock reserved for the project, service teams felt they wouldn’t have to spend a large portion of their time trying to find homes for participants. An addition challenge is many new participants lack a housing history or rental record that landlords need to refer to before offering a lease.

Challenges working with external services emerged. Timing of payments from some services presented ongoing budgeting challenges for staff and participants. Another example is some staff have experienced a situation where they were not allowed to assist participants when the participant was trying to obtain benefits. Agencies require that only the applicant can answer questions being asked over the telephone. If the agency representative hears assistance being given in the background or is given an incorrect identification answer, the representative will discontinue the conversation and require the participant to meet somebody in person. Staff and participants also face difficulties when agencies are frequently reassigning participants to different workers, and team staff feel that some agency workers do not show the commitment required to help people in need.

## **(2) Perspectives on moving forward to address the issues**

- The ACT team is making efforts to schedule their days more efficiently.
- The ICM team has modified their staffing and has new leadership over the last year. ICM has also done a complete file review and created more purposeful case-management meetings. ICM management has also worked on bring more work/life balance to the agency staff.

### ***e) Issues identified from first implementation and fidelity reports (housing/re-housing; housing clinical relationship; People with Lived Experience (PWLE); staffing)***

#### **(1) Description of issues & Perspectives on moving forward**

### **COMBINED BY TOPIC**

The 2011 Fidelity Reports and 2011 Implementation Report identified many successes and challenges for the service teams.

#### **Housing:**

Housing and re-housing remain the biggest challenges at the Winnipeg Site. Fidelity Reports note the ongoing constraints in the Winnipeg affordable housing market remain a problem, limit participant choice, and that almost all housing is found centrally in environments many considered unhelpful to recovery. Site Coordinators and service teams mentioned the ongoing struggle to obtain damage deposits and the need for housing outside of the core. The 2011 Implementation Report noted that some participants went months without being housed, that some targets had not been met, some participants ended up in inappropriate housing, and identified the need for congregate-style housing for some participants.

NiApin (3<sup>rd</sup> Arm) was applauded in the first Fidelity Report for proactive approaches to housing problems including assigning more staff to housing and developing a congregate living option. And, by the 2012 Fidelity, this congregate option had developed to more closely follow the Housing First model. NiApin has made extensive efforts with re-housing solvent users and has made progress in creating a '*more thoughtful process*'. But in their focus group, NiApin also expressed frustration with the multiple re-housings of solvent abusers.

The first Fidelity Report notes that ACT experienced significant challenges in housing and re-housing, particularly finding housing in suitable areas and getting participants into housing quickly. ACT now has a housing specialist working to find new landlords.

Wi Che Win (ICM) has also struggled to find housing in areas desired by participants. The 2011 Fidelity reports that ICM had a high percentage of participant move-ins within six weeks. They are currently working on better recovery planning for individuals who need to be re-housed. As well, ICM has modified their staffing positions to include a half-time housing-support worker.

Site Coordinators report that the high numbers of re-housing (some as many as seven or eight times), as well as extensive damages to suites has made it increasingly difficult and frustrating for the service teams. They also reported that the service teams have begun to address re-housing differently. Teams are beginning to ask important questions about what can be done differently when a participant needs to be housed a third or fourth time. All stakeholders recognized more time needs to be spent on eviction prevention rather than constantly re-housing participants. This is anticipated to be possible with the current shift to more long-term case-management.

**Service Delivery:**

Wi Che Win (ICM) and NiApin (3<sup>rd</sup> Arm) were identified in the 2011 Fidelity as struggling to meet participants often enough (at least 3 times a month). This was also identified as a challenge in the 2012 Fidelity Report. It was suggested that these agencies look at more formal opportunities to see participants through groups, and this course was pursued by both service teams. However, the regular meeting of these groups declined or stopped for both agencies over the last year. Wi Che Win stated it is re-starting groups while NiApin spoke of the success of its drop-in center in developing community for participants. Wi Che Win noted the very high staff turnover over the last year, and very high case-loads as contributing to service delivery challenges. Wi Che Win also suggested in the focus group that 20 participants per worker is too high to provide sufficient services. Fidelity notes that Wi Che Win caseloads have hit 30 participants at times. NiApin strongly disagreed with the 2012 Fidelity assessment on service delivery. They suggested that many participants have advanced to a point of self-sufficiency where they do not need as many visits; and that there are other contributing factors for not visiting participants such as their emphasis on case-worker safety.

**Staffing:**

Several staffing issues were identified in the First Fidelity and Implementation reports. The burnout of staff due to high stress and high case-loads was identified a year ago in the 2011 Implementation report. Site coordinator interviews note the struggle service teams have had in maintaining full staffing, and how hard the work is on service teams. Burnout and case-loads were discussed in all three focus-groups, and each service agency has developed strategies to lessen the problem. Wi Che Win (ICM) spoke a great deal of staff burnout, short-staffing and high caseloads. They have addressed this with new staff and leadership over the year, as well as more purposeful case-management meetings. Staff feels these changes have been effective making the project *“feel more in control because there’s more direction.”* ICM management has also worked on bringing more work/life balance to the agency staff. The need for additional training in harm-reduction techniques and motivational interviewing was emphasized for Wi Che Win in both 2011 and 2012.

ACT spoke of the challenging and tremendous workloads as well as their difficulty keeping staff, though emphasized that they have a *“wonderful team”*. One challenge they note is the agency does not have full control over its own Human Resources, but operates under Mount Carmel Clinic and tends to be last on the list for new hires. ACT appears to have good self-care in place for its staff, including monthly debriefs, flexible time off when necessary, and cultural healing (sweat lodges). The management style at NiApin appears to have changed over the last year with a more *“open-door”* policy that has resulted in positive relationships with staff and participants. Both ACT and NiApin spoke of the difficulty of finding staff with the possible end of project, a challenge that Site Coordinators also recognize. Positions are posted as lasting for less than a year, making them more difficult to fill. Site Coordinators recommended a pool of casual service staff to cover the team member leaves as necessary, and to lower burnout rates.

**PWLE:**

The inclusion of persons with lived experience in the At Home project has been a fundamental underpinning that has brought strengths to the teams, but also challenges. The service teams widely acknowledged that lived experience is important for the staff to have understanding of participants. It has also been a powerful source of knowledge exchange resulting in the staff not seeing themselves as separate from the participants. As a Site Coordinator said, *“I would say that 80% of our staff are of Aboriginal descent and have had some lived experience, so the participants have said “you can tell who has had the experience and those that haven’t.”* One cannot underestimate the positive effect of lived experience staff working with participants.



The 2011 Implementation Report warned of the risk of re-traumatizing lived-experience people through exposure to similar life-stories during interviews. ACT has noted the challenges of including volunteer peer-level PWLE and fully including them in their work. ACT has also noted burnout in PWLE who have been asked to do too much and that the expectations of lived experience people were too high, that such expectations placed too much demand and stress on these at-risk people. There was also some concern raised over the skill levels of lived experience staff, “*sometimes it is hard to find staff with both skill set and lived experience. For example, we had some sex offenders and the case worker might not have been able to pick up on that [because of lacking skills]. It makes everyone a little vulnerable...*”

Generally though, the teams valued the staff with lived experience, noting that participants were so comfortable with the staff with lived experience that it makes up for lack of formal skills. Staff with lived experience were seen to have the ability to develop relationships with participants that worked very well. A Site Coordinator noted that if the project had used a traditional route [mostly white, formally trained service workers], the Site wouldn’t have participants feeling as good about themselves.

### **Aboriginal: Housing and Trauma**

The 2011 Implementation report identified that many Aboriginal participants prefer a more collective living arrangement, and the scattered site model of Housing First can cause feelings of isolation and stress for these participants. The effects of long-term trauma on Aboriginal participants were also identified early. These issues continue to be strongly talked about by the service teams.

Most Aboriginal persons would find it unthinkable to not welcome family and friends to share their housing unit. Concern was expressed that the project did not address the validity of this cultural practice as an expected social norm, although it was identified early in Wi Che Win 2011 Fidelity report. These *visitors* were much discussed by all stakeholders but were not fully anticipated in the model. Yet the presence of visitors was among the primary stated reasons for evictions. The inability to share housing had a huge impact on some participants’ ability to maintain their tenancy. Many stakeholders strongly suggested the need for more flexible or communal housing options in such a project, especially options that take into account Aboriginal social norms. Remarkable on was the need for housing that accommodated extended family, and the need for congregate options outside of the core (to minimize isolation and provide community). The Site has tried two examples of communal housing with limited success to date. Both were transitional housing in nature: one was shared apartments, the other rooming house style. Both housed participants together who may not know each other; and who may not have wanted to live together. Neither accommodated families. NiApin had some success with this housing as it gave the agency options and flexibility during the initial intake. However, these two Site experiments with communal living do not appear to have accurately addressed the problem, and the challenge of communal housing needs to be revisited. ACT, Wi Che Win, and Site Coordinators all commented on the ongoing conflict between the housing model and the reality of Aboriginal participants’ lives.

The service teams and Site Coordinators spoke of the damaging effects of intergenerational and complex trauma to Aboriginal participants including the legacy of residential schools, poverty, addictions, solvent abuse, violence, sexual violence, and the abuse of children. ACT and Wi Che Win (ICM) both noted that deep trauma affects many of the participants. Wi Che Win states “*trauma seems to be the biggest factor*” in participant success, that trauma causes the addictions, and homelessness is merely a symptom. Wi Che Win identifies the critical need for complex trauma-addictions treatment in the project.

### **Substance Abuse Programming:**

The need for substance abuse programming, particularly for solvent abuse, was identified in both ACT’s and ICM’s First Fidelity reports and the Implementation report. The Implementation Report also noted the high number of solvent abusers at the Winnipeg Site would require adaptations to the project;

and that landlords will not accept solvent users. Site Coordinator interviews show the project has done a lot of work with solvent users after the first year. ACT has made the most advances on this front having developed successful solvent-abuse strategies (such as the move-in kit), and has created a group for solvent users that is regularly attended. The Fidelity team has recommended that Wi Che Win pair up with ACT to make use of services, and Wi Che Win stated in their focus group that they are pursuing working with ACT on solvent abuse programming. ACT also recognized that it has knowledge to share and offered to hold workshops for the other service arms on its solvent abuse strategies.

### **Special Lease Provisions:**

Landlords' use of 'special provisions' in participant leases continues to be a problem. This includes clauses that bar participants from having guests, or mandating abstinence. Fidelity reports conclude that all three teams are strong advocates for participants against this problem. Successes have been achieved. Many more participants are now taking landlords to the Residential Tenancy Board to address issues; and ACT has made the important change to no longer working with landlords who use special provisions.

### **Participant Information / Bureaucracy:**

The 2011 Implementation Report noted the lack of participant information sharing within the project. The created a challenge of housing new participants without rental histories, and housing teams learning about serious problems too late. This issue appears to have improved over the ensuing year with better information sharing and the use of participants' names instead of identification numbers. Site Coordinators have also noted the sharing of knowledge between the teams over the last year and the confidence that has created.

The service teams still note the issue of obtaining participant information from external organizations, as well as bureaucratic red-tape. Even when participants give consent, medical histories are difficult to obtain. Waiting lists can be two or three years long for external services and obtaining identification, or handling issues like taxes, continue to be extremely challenging for service teams. Challenges in working with external service organizations and government departments were remarked upon by all three service teams and Site Coordinators.

## ***B. Housing First Theory of Change***

### **(1) Learnings about what outcomes occur during the first year and the second**

All service teams spoke of the many positive outcomes of the project and the advances participants made over the last year. Time seems to be the essential factor; as participants have been with the project for longer periods of time, and they have developed stronger relationships with project staff, they have made greater improvements in their lives. NiApin pointedly commented, "*It takes 1-2 years for recovery; and 5-7 years to get their life together*", and spoke of the desire of participants for long-term recovery programming. A Site Coordinator corroborated this assessment by suggesting the project needed more than five years working with participants for full results.

Success stories include some participants returning to work or school, reported by all service teams. Reuniting families was also seen as a major accomplishment of the project. ACT reported a high level of family reconnection, including visits to estranged children, or returning home after a long period away. Site Coordinators note the difference this kind of connection can make in a participants life. Wi Che Win (ICM) expressed how impressive it is for someone to be able to make these kinds of changes within two years.

Personal changes among participants were also remarked upon by the service teams. ACT and NiApin noticed that participants have begun feeling cared for in a way that is unconditional, that participants have developed their own voice, and that they are capable of great things. Site Coordinators note that participants begin to realize that there “*is nothing wrong with them, they aren’t bad, they aren’t sick.*” Developing this kind of strength has also been seen in participants going to Residential School Hearings, making victim impact statements, or testifying in court. Site Coordinators note that the number of participants going to the Residential Tenancy Board (to fight evictions, or demand improved building conditions) has tripled over the last year.

Service teams often remarked on the small successes of participants: learning to pay for a lost key, going to a doctor, managing stress, learning patience, and overcoming anxiety were all mentioned by ACT and NiApin.

For those participants who have been in the project for a while, Wi Che Win has seen them going to a deeper level with sharing trauma, and noted that “*it’s much more satisfying work, but it’s also more difficult.*” Site Coordinators remarked on the long-lasting impacts the project is having in communities as people begin to embrace harm reduction strategies and begin to work together.

### **(2) Learnings about who benefits the most from Housing First, and who doesn’t**

Wi Che Win (ICM) expressed the belief that success comes from the participants themselves, it comes to those who want to make positive changes in their life. This desire to “make it work” was also identified as important by landlords. Wi Che Win stated that anyone “*who can see a future, anyone who has a little bit of hope,*” can be reached and can benefit from the project. Those participants who had been diagnosed by a psychiatrist, and have the proper medication, were also cited by Wi Che Win and Site Coordinators as more likely to succeed; “*my sense is that those with a mental health issues maybe tend to respond quicker and faster [than those with trauma or addictions issues].*” The difficulty of connecting participants to medical / psychiatric help was seen as a significant barrier to success for many participants and Wi Che Win felt that there are many undiagnosed participants. NiApin stressed that each participant has a different timeline for independence, or moving to housing.

NiApin noted that those in high-risk categories, especially solvent abusers, were those who the program helped the least. Service teams and a Site Coordinator suggest that there is much work to do in addressing addictions. As stated earlier, Wi Che Win has found that trauma seems to be the biggest factor in participant success. They note that a participant can go for addiction treatment repeatedly, but the trauma re-triggers the addiction.

### **(3) Learnings about the critical ingredients of Housing First (what ingredients are most important for whom and when)**

Critical ingredients mentioned by the service teams were enunciated by NiApin as “Acceptance, Empowerment, and Responsibility.” Participant responsibility was highlighted by Wi Che Win and NiApin as an important ingredient that was not emphasized at the beginning of the project; but is now seen by the service groups as critical, “*We’re trying to give back the responsibility to the participants to make their own choices. It’s about being responsible for their own lives.*” Both teams suggested that there was too much enabling in the beginning of the project.

Two teams stressed that Housing First is a different approach compared to a more institutional approach and that it does not dictate to participants what they have to do and is more accepting of who they are in their progression. It does not say ‘*you have to get here first [before the program will help you].*’

Necessary qualities for staff to have for facilitating change were seen as Kindness, non-judgmental, Respect, Honesty, Acceptance, Commitment, and Participant-focused.

More learnings were offered on the operation of the project itself. One widely recognized challenge was the high intake numbers at the beginning. It was felt to be extremely challenging for a service team to take on a hundred participants in a year. The teams felt that a more gradual implementation process would have resulted in better outcomes.

Although re-housing has frustrated the service and housing teams, they have recognized that re-housing almost always works, in terms of creating long term tenancy. NiApin and Manitoba Housing both commented on the value of a participant learning from an unsuccessful tenancy. ACT has found that very few people need to be re-housed again after the first time. This in itself is an important lesson for the project.

## **C. Landlord / Caretaker issues**

### **(1) What's working well from the perspective of landlords**

Landlords typically liked the programs and services offered by the At Home project, and thought they offered significant advantage when they worked well. Mentioned specifically were the holding fees, provision of cleaning / repair services for damaged suites, assistance with moving problem tenants, the roundtable gatherings for landlords, and the education component. Landlords had mixed experiences communicating with the project, some having positive experiences, others having difficulty contacting caseworkers or the service teams. There was uniformly high praise for the housing team, notably Lori Hudson who was repeatedly commended for going beyond the call of duty. The guaranteed rent offered by the program was seen as less of a benefit to landlords because current market conditions in Winnipeg guarantee the rental of any unit, even without the project.

Landlords had strong feelings on what made for successful tenancies. At a basic level, all wanted participants that were quiet, clean, and respectful of the property and neighbours. Almost all noted the importance of life-skills. More importantly, many landlords commented on attributes of participants they saw as leading to success, such as: having a positive attitude, a *“desire to make it work,”* or participants who recognize the opportunity offered and have taken full advantage of it. Many landlords note the importance of an active relationship with the support worker. Others commented on the importance of positive surroundings, good communication, and building relationships between participants, landlords, and service workers.

Most landlords said that they tried to treat At Home participants the same, or better, than any other tenant. Many stated that they had given *“extra chances”* to participants when there was a problem, with one landlord remarking he was *“a bit lenient with them for some of the stuff... because we knew they were trying to settle down.”* Other landlords stated that they were very strict with the rules in their buildings.

There were sometimes differences in the way participants were treated compared to other tenants. Of note, are different conditions to rental agreements including forbidding alcohol or drugs on premises and banning all visitors. One landlord stated that such rental clauses were *“used as a backup,”* giving a landlord an easy way to evict any tenant. In addition, there are differences inherent in being a part of the project: particularly, landlords did not get to screen tenants as they would normally; instead, landlords mostly took what the project sent them. As one landlord said, *“I wouldn't rent to them if it wasn't for the program, they wouldn't qualify for one of our apartments.”*

## (2) What's working less well from the perspective of landlords

The initial positive feelings landlords held for the project were, in some cases, eroded by changes to the delivery of the project: "*When it first started I found that the supports were magnificent but as the case load got heavier, they [the case workers] were spread thin it was a lot harder.*" Workers were seen to be overwhelmed with increasing caseloads and, in the words of one landlord, "*lost control*" and it was felt by some that services declined rapidly over time.

All landlords recognized the delivery of services to participants as the most important part of the project. Success stories were attributed to good supports and service workers; and three of the twelve landlords reported the participant had received good supports. However, four landlords felt that the number of caseworker visits to the participant was insufficient, or that the participant did not have a caseworker for extended periods. NiApin and Wi Che Win were both singled out for this shortfall. This viewpoint of landlords is partially supported by the Fidelity Reports.

A contributing problem was communication with the caseworkers / service arms. Four landlords reported difficulty in contacting the caseworkers / service arms when problems occurred, and four landlords mentioned not being informed of caseworker turnover or being unable to contact the service arm because of staff turnover.

Landlords gave consistent reasons for evictions. The most common eviction reasons were: parties, noise / disruption, abuse of drugs / alcohol, filthy suites, heavily damaged suites, begging or aggressive behaviour towards other tenants, solvent abuse and problem visitors. Landlords commented the last two on extensively. They saw that some participants had many people staying with them. Landlords recognized that sometimes it was participants "*helping out their street buddies,*" or when participants are being taken advantage of by other people. Often visitors are family who travelled from northern First Nation communities. The 2011 Implementation Report also identified this Aboriginal preference for collective living arrangements as a challenge for the project. For landlords, the problem is that visitors stay in the suite or perhaps cause damages, while the lease stipulates just one tenant.

Solvent abuse is a serious issue for landlords. Five of the landlords interviewed had dealt with tenants who were solvent abusers. These landlords stated that solvent abusers were consistently evicted, and one landlord stated that every eviction they had was due to solvent use. Two stated that there was zero tolerance for solvent use, from both landlords and other tenants; and this is the policy for the largest housing provider, Manitoba Housing. Landlords consider solvent use a health and safety risk for everyone in the building due to the presence of inflammable liquids, often while smoking. Landlords also noted that zero tolerance is not discrimination against At Home participants, as anyone who has inflammables in their apartment could be evicted. Solvent abuse was also identified as a challenge a year ago. It is recognized that the service teams have worked hard to develop solvent strategies (especially ACT); however, landlords interviewed were not aware of these solutions.

A common issue raised by landlords, was the added layers of bureaucracy that working with the project entailed. Normally, a landlord deals only with the tenant when there is a problem. With At Home, landlords had to contact caseworkers and/or housing and wait for them to address an issue, often in an untimely manner. Problems typically occurred on weekends, when service teams were not available. This situation was aggravated by poor communication. Landlords saw the 24-hour emergency line as ineffective, as messages were only taken and forwarded the next business day, an inappropriate response during an emergency. About half of the landlords reported good responses by the service teams to problems, half stated that when service teams were contacted about a problem, nothing seemed to happen or be resolved. The consensus among landlords was that contact with the project needed to be **single-point, easy to use, and solution-oriented.**

The lack of life skills among project participants was another concern for landlords, especially among those who were unsuccessful in their tenancy. Lack of life-skills was seen to profoundly affect the ability of a participant to maintain a tenancy successfully, because the lack of skills brought participants into conflict with landlords or other tenants, and sometimes caused damages (e.g. not closing windows resulting in frozen burst pipes). It was felt that for these participants, the service teams were not teaching the necessary life skills or providing adequate case management and this resulted in a strong feeling among some landlords that many of the participants are “*not quite housing ready.*” It is recognized that the service teams do currently provide some life skills training. The service teams have noted in their focus groups that they are moving to long-term case-management, now that the initial recruitment has passed, which will allow for more life-skills training. The lack of life-skills was the most common theme cited by landlords, but should be placed in the context of the successes achieved at the Site. The comments made were generally referring to the failed tenancies.

Half of landlords felt the project lived up to expectations, and half did not. Of the half who felt it did not; the failure of the project to live up to verbal agreements was seen as one problem. Mentioned was the termination of holding fees, slow or poor repairs to damaged units, declining supports for participants, and lack of assistance in evicting problem participants. When a service was discontinued landlords felt that they were left “*holding the bag*” when having to deal with a problem tenant. Several landlords also commented on the landlord roundtables and the education components (mental health first aid, cultural awareness) which were deemed effective, but were unfortunately also discontinued.

A number of landlords had positive experiences with Manitoba Green Retrofit’s (MGR) repairs to units, but some found that the turnaround time was far too long, sometimes months. Because this affects the ability of a landlord to re-rent a unit, there was often a loss for a landlord that minimizes the benefits of providing MGR’s services.

Many landlords spoke of, or alluded to, the project’s inability to recognize that landlords and the other tenants in a building also have rights, especially to “*some peace and quite, and to feel safe in their home.*” Some tenants were “*unhappy to have unstable people moving in.*” The turmoil that problem participants cause in a building and the hours this costs landlords was seen as detrimental. Many landlords spoke of the lack of reciprocal rights and responsibilities; that project participants were not accepting the responsibilities inherent in becoming a tenant.

### **(3) Landlord suggestions / learnings / affirmations:**

Although landlords were critical of problems encountered, many had positive suggestions and learnings that may be beneficial for moving forward. All landlords felt that At Home is a positive program providing advantages and opportunities to participants. Several identified that participants without addictions were the least trouble for them and were willing to continue to rent to them. Manitoba Housing noted that even unsuccessful tenancies were a learning experience, closely mirroring the experience of the service teams,

*“A failed tenancy is not all negative, its part of the journey, part of the learning experience. So it didn’t work this time, but you had your own place, you saw what it felt like, you experienced it all, and hopefully you take away something from the experience for the next time.”*

#### **Participation:**

Several landlords brought up the problem of “*lack of true participation by the participants*” because everything was given to them. Landlords felt that participants needed to have more initiative to better themselves. This mirrors comments made during the service team focus groups that suggest greater

participant involvement in the finding of apartments and furniture can result in greater ownership and responsibility on the part of participants.

### **Winnipeg's Housing Market:**

Several landlords noted that the market realities in Winnipeg have resulted in participants being housed in problem communities. This was succinctly stated as, "*You're putting a vulnerable person in a [dangerous] setting.*" This problem has also been repeatedly identified by the service teams and in the Fidelity Reports.

### **Communication:**

Landlords also expressed a wish to be better informed about the participants and the project. One suggested, "*someone should be calling the landlords regularly, maybe every couple weeks to check in to see if there's any issue.*" In addition, another suggested, "*what would be nice is a progress report once a year or so, just to keep in touch.*" This may indicate how Site communication with landlords could be improved.

### **Conclusions:**

It is difficult to form a narrow conclusion on the experiences of landlords because of the wide variety of opinions expressed. Clearly, some improvements could be made to the experiences of landlords, especially around communication with the project and possibly with the need for life-skills training for some participants. The landlords interviewed were averse to working with solvent abusers, but were receptive to most others. Every single landlord interviewed commented on the positive aspects of the project and the benefits to the participants. When asked whether they would recommend the project to other landlords, interviewees were divided. Four gave an unqualified yes, four said no, and four qualified their responses with conditions, such as "*if there was more supports*".

## ***D. Issues regarding sustainability and the future of the project***

### **(1) How sites address sustainability concerns of participants**

Service teams report they have been instructed to communicate to participants that there probably will be continued supports and continued subsidy within the service community, though possibly with different agencies. Teams have made an effort to be clear with participants on this, and have produced an information flyer for participants, but misunderstanding has been a problem. Some participants believe that their involvement with the project was over at the 24-month mark regardless of the project future. Teams also report that there is a big fear among participants about the possible end of the rent top-up. Participants, of course, are worried that they will be on the street again within a year, and it was noted that some are already feeling "*alienated*" and expecting to be "*abandoned*" again. This has put front-line staff in an awkward position, as they are instructed only to say that the project is working on sustainability, but have no real information or assurance to offer. Inconsistent or nonexistent messaging from the national team was a source of frustration for the service teams and Site leadership. There was also some concern for what this would mean for the TAU group: "*The TAU group...got nothing and got used. They hung on and answered questions and they got nothing.*"

### **(2) Sustainability concerns and strategies at the site level**

Sustainability concerns have also affected staff. As mentioned earlier, it has been difficult to fill vacant postings for positions that are advertised as short-term (until March 2013). Site leadership is also expecting increased staff turnover as staff anticipate the end of the project and move to other jobs. Service teams, Site leadership and the QA team have all remarked on the difficulty some teams are

having in maintaining positive messaging, and the resultant impact on the participants. Service teams expressed frustration that the lack of information on sustainability is affecting their lives as well. Staff too, need to plan for the future.

Site leadership is addressing the need to have a plan in place. The Site has completed case reviews determining high, medium, and low needs participants. Planning has begun for these participants. Site leadership suggests that there has been good indication from the provincial government for ongoing resources for housing and service, but it will likely not be configured the way it is now. There is currently a big push to get everyone on the waiting list for Manitoba Housing and the housing staff is anticipating a large number of moves.

### (3) Views about project legacy and lessons learned

All of the stakeholders interviewed offered an enormous amount of information on lessons learned about the project, its implementation, and future directions. Many felt that Winnipeg is unique; that it has a unique homeless population with unique needs, traumas, and addictions. These distinguishing characteristics were felt to have effects on the project implementation.

The need for more realistic project planning was remarked on. It was suggested that the Site misjudged its ability to house people, misjudged what it would take to sustain people in housing, and to prevent evictions. Many people suggested that the project tried to do too much, too fast.

There is a need for programming for those that have been evicted from their first home. Service teams and participants need to ask, “*What does the participant need to do to keep the home to prevent another negative experience?*” An increased emphasis on life-skills building is an example of such programming. One stakeholder commented that this type of programming would be key to sustainability.

The need for improved knowledge exchange between service teams, housing teams, and participants was commented on, as was need for improvement of communication between the project and landlords. Some felt that teams were siloed within the Site and that communication and cooperation could be improved. Many felt that communication between the national team and the site could have been improved, especially around sustainability. It is expected that in a project of this size and complexity, such communication challenges are to be expected. That said, communication between service groups has improved substantially over the last year, and Site leadership has remarked on the improved cooperation and improved working dynamic.

Many people commented on the need for different types of housing: single housing for single people, family housing for families, communal housing for some, scattered sites for others. It was felt that all are Housing First, and there may be a need to broaden the definition of **housing**, in Housing First.

Many people also commented on the need for better integration with outside service agencies and government departments. The Site has made great efforts to work with Child and Family Services and EI; but it was felt that more can be done, especially connecting to Aboriginal organizations. There were also reports of conflict with other service agencies. If a Housing First participant went to another organization, there were instances of service denial because Housing First was seen as having a huge amount of money. Improved connections with other service agencies may have helped. CFS, Manitoba Housing and EI all have rules and procedures that at times work at cross-purposes to each other or to the At Home project, to the detriment of participant recovery. There was also a significant need for formal partnerships with professional psychiatric staff to ensure proper diagnosis and medication,



which was also seen as a profound barrier. It would be beneficial for the project to ensure a seamless interface with external bureaucracies and professions.

We heard repeatedly that the project did not fully take into account the affects of generations of complex trauma on Aboriginal participants. Addressing residential schools, the sixties scoop, historic endemic poverty on reserves, and multigenerational abuse was not planned or prepared for. As well, it was felt that the timeline of the project is insufficient for addressing these traumas. Of course, the project was not specifically designed to address these issues; yet the majority of the participants of the Winnipeg Site are Aboriginal, and many are of these participants are facing these challenges. Service teams made great efforts to address these issues, but again, more is needed.

The sentiments that “*we missed the cultural piece,*” or “*we missed the difference between collective and individual societies*” were common in the interviews and focus groups. Many felt that there is a need for greater Aboriginal cultural awareness and cultural safety. As part of this, there was felt to be a need for staff who could speak Cree and Ojibwe, as well as better integration with Aboriginal organizations and acceptance of Aboriginal culture by, for instance, building in some accommodation for the extended families of participants.

## V Conclusion

### *Discussion: Crosscutting themes & lessons learned:*

A hallmark of the Winnipeg Site is **adaptation of the model** to work within the uniquely challenging environment of Winnipeg. It is seen with the integration of Aboriginal culture and needs into the programming of all three service teams. Adaptation is seen in the changes to housing protocol with the use of congregate housing adapted to the Housing First model. Adaptation is seen in the development of the service agencies, Manitoba Green Retrofit and Housing Plus, both innovations of the Winnipeg Site. Adaptation speaks to the **flexibility** and the **utility** of the Housing First model.

Flowing from these adaptations, and another characteristic of the Winnipeg Site, is **capacity building** within the Site. There were initial challenges attaining the participation of Aboriginal organizations with the project; but this has led to greater cooperation and knowledge exchange within the service community. The development of MGR and Housing Plus has resulted in agencies that are independent and will last, regardless of project sustainability. In addition, new knowledge, and techniques of harm reduction and Housing First are becoming disseminated within the service community.

Site leadership felt that the public is growing more aware about the prevalence of homelessness. Service agencies, the City, the Province, the Federal government, and the media have begun to take interest, and attitudes are changing for the better. Site leadership commented that there are the makings of a “*homeless network of some kind*” at the Winnipeg Site.

Lastly, we heard over and over again that harm reduction works, and that the At Home project is working. One service staff said, “*I don’t know how many times I have heard, “thank you for treating me like a human”* while another noted “*I’ve worked in programs for 25 years and helped develop programs in many cities and I’ve never seen a program as successful as this one.*” The projects success can, and should, be measured by the 170 participants who have moved successfully into housing.