

THE EVOLUTION OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR THE
HOMELESS: AN EVALUATION OF A COMMUNITY OUTREACH RESPONSE TO THE
ONE-STOP CAREER MODEL

by

KERRI JO STEELE

(Under the Direction of Edwin Risler)

ABSTRACT

This study is a program evaluation of the Job TREC program, an employment program for homeless people in Athens, GA. This study is both summative and formative as the results will be used to both evaluate the program's success and modify program services. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of Job TREC at increasing successful client employment and decreasing barriers to housing. Three research questions helped determine the efficacy of the program. The questions related to the characteristics of Job TREC participants, the supportive services associated with successful employment, and the impact of the program on housing status of client and former clients. Quantitative data gathered from a secondary source was used to evaluate the program. There were three hundred participants in the sample. Based on the data obtained, there was no relationship between any of the supportive services offered by Job TREC and successful participant employment. There are statistically significant relationships between some of the supportive services, themselves. The findings also show that on average, participants improved their housing status between enrollment and discharge. Recent changes in the Job TREC program address some concerns raised over the course of this

study. Further data must be gathered to study accurately the relationship between supportive services and successful employment. Future research is needed to determine what factors beyond supportive services are associated with successful employment in the Job TREC program.

INDEX WORDS: Job TREC program, Program evaluation, Homeless, Employment programs

THE EVOLUTION OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR THE
HOMELESS: AN EVALUATION OF A COMMUNITY OUTREACH RESPONSE TO THE
ONE-STOP CAREER MODEL

by

KERRI JO STEELE

B.A., Concord College, 2001

M.S.W., Tulane University, 2006

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2013

© 2013

Kerri Steele

All Rights Reserved

THE EVOLUTION OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR THE
HOMELESS: AN EVALUATION OF A COMMUNITY OUTREACH RESPONSE TO THE
ONE-STOP CAREER MODEL

By

KERRI JO STEELE

Major Professor: Edwin Risler

Committee: Larry Nackerud
David Okech

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my chair, Dr. Edwin Risler. Thank you for taking me on, thank you for guiding me, thank you for pushing me, and thank you for being available for all of my questions, comments, concerns, and times where I felt like banging my head against the desk and giving up. I absolutely would not have finished without your support and direction. I would also like to thank my committee members Drs. Nackerud and Okech. Dr. Nackerud, thank you for helping me step back, open my mind, and think in different ways when I felt stuck. Dr. Okech, I appreciate your guidance with everything from my research questions to my formatting. I cannot accurately put into words my gratitude to both of you.

Next, thank you to the administrators at Athens Area Homeless Shelter, Job TREC, and the UGA School of Social Work. To Shea Post and Katie Smith at Athens Area Homeless Shelter, you both helped me grow as a clinician and a researcher. Thank you for your help on this project, your commitment to the profession of Social Work is inspiring. I would also like to offer a very special thank you to Kat Farlowe, the Administrative Specialist and unsung hero of the PhD program at the School of Social Work. Thank you, Kat, for keeping me on track with the program, and for always having an open door and a smile on your face.

Finally, thank you to my family. To my husband, thank you for moving all over the east coast with me, for supporting me on this journey, and for keeping me sane during this process. For my parents, your unwavering belief in me and your constant encouragement over the many stages of my life made this whole thing possible. I love you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
History of Homeless Aid Programs	2
Statement of the Problem.....	15
Development of Research Approach	17
Importance of the Study	22
Purpose of the Study	23
Conclusion	25
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	26
Definition of Homelessness	27
Counting the Homeless	41
Economics of Homelessness.....	47
Employment Programs and Housing	57
Conclusion	64
3 METHODOLOGY	65
Research Questions	65
Research Design.....	67

Variables68

Data Procedures70

Data Collection75

Conclusion75

4 ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA77

 Research Question One.....77

 Research Question Two82

 Research Question Three85

 Summary of Significant Findings89

5 DISCUSSION90

 Supplemental Data Needed.....91

 Participant Characteristics94

 Correlation of Supportive Services.....95

 Current Changes to Job TREC Program.....98

 Limitations of Current Study101

 Future Research103

 Conclusion105

REFERENCES107

APPENDICES119

 A PATHWAYS COMMUNITY NETWORK CLIENT AUTHORIZATION FORM.120

 B CLIENT INTAKE FORM122

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Continuum of Care Programs	12
Table 2: Federal Poverty Guidelines.....	24
Table 3: Summary of Explanatory and Response Variables	69
Table 4: Demographic Characteristics.....	78
Table 5: Housing Demographics	79
Table 6: Participant Exit Characteristics.....	80
Table 7: Service Utilization	81
Table 8: Services Accessed by Employed Participants	83
Table 9: Housing Status at Entry	87
Table 10: Housing Status at Exit	88

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Social workers are an integral part of the treatment and prevention of homelessness in the United States. There is a long standing tradition of social workers as skilled professionals who provide efforts to stabilize and maintain displaced people through shelters, work programs, and supportive services. Although the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) stated a 2.1% decrease in national homelessness in 2011, the population increased in 24 out of 50 states (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011). The National Alliance to End Homelessness (NAEH) estimates that with current economic trends and forecast, the number of people without stable housing will increase by 5% in the next three years (2011).

Homelessness affects people of all ages, races, ethnicities, and geographies. A recent demographic and economic study by NAEH identifies several groups at-risk for housing instability (2012a). Over the course of a year, the odds of a person in the general population becoming displaced are 1 in 194. For persons who have been discharged from jail or prison, the odds that they will end up without a home is 1 in 13. Similarly, persons who have aged out of foster care have a 1 in 11 chance of experiencing homelessness. Other groups at-risk for loss of housing include the impoverished and veterans. Analysis from the United States Census Bureau's 2010 American Community Survey shows that three out of every four households at or below the poverty line pay more than 50% of their income towards housing meaning any unexpected costs could result in loss of home (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011). Additionally, 2010 and 2011 had country-wide increasing unemployment rates

and underemployment rates, or employment at part time hours or low wage when full time wage and hours are needed (NAEH, 2012a). The most common cited reason for homelessness is inability to afford housing (NAEH, 2012a; National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011; Economic Policy Institute, 2005; Burt, 1991). As underemployment and unemployment can result in inability to afford housing and an itinerant state of being, social workers must be knowledgeable in employment programs aimed at decreasing affected population.

Job TREC (Training, Resource, Education, and Case Management) is an example of an employment program for homeless persons located in Athens, GA. Job TREC seeks to increase the employability of clients through supportive services and thus eliminate barriers to stable housing. An evaluation of the Job TREC program is needed to understand, verify, and increase the impact of best quality services for clients served. This study seeks to describe and examine effectiveness of the Job TREC program and services in terms of assisting clients with finding employment at a wage above the federal poverty level.

History of Homeless Aid Programs

The state of homelessness has been documented since the mid-1640's, however assistance programs did not begin until the early 1800's. Programs providing relief can be historically traced through economic shifts and policies.

Early Poverty Relief

Homelessness has been documented in the United States since 1640. In the 1600's, most of the world saw vagrancy as a character flaw. People who were without a house were generally believed to be bad people who were being punished by God (Jencks, 1994). Homeless people in the early 1600's were transient, moving from town to town until they were able to prove their worth to community leaders and be given permission to stay. Those who were unable to find

permanent employment or housing were seen as undeserving of handouts since they added no value to society. While those without shelter could be found scattered throughout colonies, the transient homeless wandering through cities were more obvious (Kusmer, 2002). This group included immigrants, former indentured servants, and escaped slaves. Early poor relief in America very closely followed the Elizabethan Code of 1601 making each parish, county, or town directly responsible for its own poor (Rossi, 1989). Towns could choose to assist the vagrant by boarding them with a family, offer cash for the transient person to move to another town, or disregard any poor persons not born in the township, thus allowing for the banishment of a houseless person. While exact numbers are unknown, homelessness was seen as a local problem that affected few people until the great periods of nationwide economic depression in the early 19th century (Kusmer, 2002).

Aid for the “Worthy Poor”

In 1819, the United States experienced its first major, nationwide economic crash as banks foreclosed on farms to pay off debts accrued during the War of 1812 (Rossi, 1989). It is estimated that thousands of Americans migrated from farms to cities in search of jobs in the 1820's and 1830's due to foreclosure or to find employment during the Industrial Revolution (Shipler, 2005). The population of New York City approached one million during this time period, and cities like Boston, Baltimore, and Philadelphia doubled in size (Kusmer, 2002). The inequality between classes grew during this time period and gave rise to a new economic class, the working class. Working class Americans were those who were able to meet their basic needs only with each paycheck (Dawley, 1976). Loss of a paycheck would result in a working class person falling into poverty. During this time period, the U.S. also reformed the nation's welfare policies from outdoor relief, cash and other goods, to workhouses or public institutions meant to

rehabilitate the poor and replace welfare use with work ethic (Rossi, 1989). Most cities distributed aid for the “worthy poor” or those incapacitated or incapable of caring for themselves due to sickness, disability, or age (Rodgers, 1978). Those that were unemployed often found themselves subject to newly enacted pan-handling laws and jails became de facto shelters (Kusmer, 2002). Lack of home ownership was still seen as a moral deficiency during this time by most of the nation, but some well-to-do citizens began dispensing food to homeless people during the winter months and small charities providing shelter, food, and other support gave to homeless persons out of a sense of civic or religious duty (Skocpol, 1992). It was still widely held at this point that homelessness was a small scale problem and that the growing industrialization of the nation and expanding west borders would end poverty and vagrancy (Kusmer, 2002). This proved to be untrue after the Civil War.

Anti-vagrancy Laws

The post-Civil War era gave rise to the terms “tramp” and “bum” being applied to homeless persons (Kusmer, 2002). Physically wounded ex-soldiers often received assistance from charities or friends, but those psychologically affected or unable to re-assimilate into civilian life were not afforded assistance (Skocpol, 1992). Additionally, many soldiers, particularly from the South, spent months traveling from town to town seeking shelter in an effort to return home (Faust, 2008). The postwar recession made it difficult for many ex-soldiers to find employment and as a result, many turned to vagrancy. In Massachusetts alone, the number of homeless persons using state public facilities doubled in 1866. Around this same time-period, vagrancy arrests in New York City grew by 50% and the number of unsheltered people seeking police stations for overnight shelter in Philadelphia increased fourfold (Skocpol, 1992). The increase in the number of people living in a transient state and the massive growth of

the railroad led to the unsheltered population being more evident in small towns across the country, rather than just large cities in the North. Anti-vagrancy and anti-tramp laws became widespread during the 1870's resulting in harsher penalties for the wandering poor than the local poor (Kusmer, 2002). Cities that did not have anti-vagrancy laws offered minimal assistance to the itinerants through sub-standard overnight shelters above police stations (Skocpol, 1992). While the public reaction to widespread state of homelessness was generally negative during this time period, social reformers called for alternative efforts to aid the population other than jails. Early efforts began with the Charity Organization Society.

Settlement Houses

In 1877, the Charity Organization Society (COS) movement was one of the first efforts in welfare reform for homeless people (Watson, 1922). The key innovation of the COS was wayfarers' lodges which provided meals and shelter in exchange for manual labor like chopping wood or breaking stones that were then sold to local citizens or companies (Kusmer, 2002). In this way, the wayfarers' lodges were able to operate without cost to taxpayers or charity. However these lodges still operated under the idea that that people without shelter were lazy or unmotivated to work. Furthermore, the COS actively campaigned against giving money to beggars on the street (Watson, 1922). While the COS was an early form of social welfare reform, a more tolerant attitude toward the vagrant developed with settlement houses and community organization.

Settlement houses began in the 1880's as a humanitarian effort in poor, urban areas as large buildings where volunteer settlement workers lived and interacted with the poor and unsheltered in the area in an effort to alleviate poverty by sharing knowledge, culture, and needed services like English language classes and child care (Barbutto, 1999). Modeled after

Toynbee Hill in London, settlement houses differed from previous efforts at treating poverty and homelessness not by services, but by approach. Settlement houses focused on general welfare rather than just dispensing charity. As settlement house residents learned more about their communities, they proposed changes in the local government and lobbied for federal legislation on social and economic problems (Skocpol, 1992). Over 400 settlement houses were located across the country by 1918 located primarily in areas of heavy immigration to assist immigrants with assimilation and transition into the American labor force (Barbuto, 1999). Settlement houses marked a change in societal views on vagrancy. The state of homelessness did not disappear during the time of settlement houses, but its harsher stereotypes were replaced by tamer forms. Poverty and homelessness became a topic popular with influential writers in the early 1900s including Jack London and George Orwell while tramps were romanticized in George Rockwell's paintings, W.C. Fields comedies, and Charlie Chaplin's movies (Kusmer, 2002). The economic collapse of the 1930's led to another shift in both societal attitudes and national policies about toward the unsheltered population.

Joint Public and Private Aid Programs

The Great Depression of the 1930's caused a devastating impact on the number of people living on the streets (Jencks, 1994). The United States government was reluctant at first to intervene, taking a hands off approach to economics. The initial response of many social agencies was also negligent as officials were hampered by settlement laws from the colonial era mandating the return of transient people to their state of legal residence (Kusmer, 2002). As a result of the policies of the government and local charities, appropriated aid failed to find its way to average citizens resulting in increased unemployment and foreclosures (Jencks, 1994). While nearly one-third of Americans were unemployed in the early 1930's, vagrancy increased almost

sevenfold in most large cities across the country (Rossi, 1989). During the early part of the Depression, many towns were only able to treat the unsheltered with one night of lodging and one meal (Kusmer, 2002). Public agencies and private charities began joining together to provide additional space and expand shelter facilities (Jencks, 1994). However, the increased shelter space could not meet the need. The Great Depression led to new self-developed accommodations for unsheltered known as shantytowns or “Hooverilles” in reference to President Hoover (Kusmer, 2002). Homeless men, women, and children built make-shift communities with tents or shacks made out of cardboard (Jencks, 1994). The sight of shantytowns and long lines of people needing food daily became a symbol of the breakdown of the American economic system. Young social workers began advocating for broad humane treatment of homeless persons and the old dichotomy of the worthy and unworthy poor gave way to the idea of complex causes of state of homelessness (Kusmer, 2002). The softening of the public’s attitude toward population was echoed in the government policies through the New Deal.

The New Deal

The New Deal was a series of economic programs enacted as a response to the Great Depression. The first programs of the New Deal began in 1933 and provided federal relief for many large industries and charitable relief for soup kitchens and local non-profit agencies. The second programs of the New Deal began in 1936 and included the Social Security Act and federal work programs (Shipler, 2005). Federal transient aid became available during this time and was designed for anyone who had lived in a state less than one year, finally ending the settlement laws (Kusmer, 2002). Also, a plan to create a wide range of social programs and extend federal control in social welfare, initiatives were established to provide temporary aid to

those in need as part of the New Deal (Jencks, 1994). These initiatives included the first major federal assistance for employment through the Civilian Works Administration which financed public works projects to create jobs, specifically for the unemployed. As the economy of the U.S improved, homelessness decreased and these programs were terminated (Shipler, 2005). The post-New Deal homeless were less transient and became more a local problem than a national problem (Kusmer, 2002). This did not change until the mass deinstitutionalization of people with mental illness in the 1960's.

Day Shelters

In 1963, the Community Mental Health Act released long term psychiatric patients from state hospitals and community mental health centers. The law, commonly referred to as deinstitutionalization, provided funding to establish locally based community mental health facilities as a local alternative to institutionalization (Shipler, 2005). However, 1500 community mental health centers were to be funded through this act, yet only 789 received the needed financial funding to operate (Burt, 2004). Without the needed support in the community, people experiencing severe and chronic mental health issues who formally lived in institutions were now living with friends, family members, or on the street. Most shelters during this time operated during the night only, leaving the unsheltered to congregate in other safe areas during the day like churches and libraries (Kusmer, 2002). As a result of this influx, many of these shelter facilities began closing during the day, enforcing dress codes, and hiring security. New alternatives were needed to assist this specific group of homeless people.

To address the influx of people with mental illness living on the streets, day shelters based on settlement houses were established across the country in the 1970's (Barbuto, 1999). These shelters provided a place for the people in emergency to shelters to come each day and

work on education and training (Shipler, 2005). While these shelters assisted people in emergency shelters, it did little to assist those living on the streets. The public view shifted again during this time period as the unsheltered were once again seen as dangerous and deviant (Kusmer, 2002). The government efforts toward alleviating homelessness in the 1970's focused on the revitalization of dilapidated areas in major cities and older neighborhoods. Often these neighborhoods, comprised of those living in poverty and the homeless, were razed and replaced with buildings built for the middle and upper classes (Shipler, 2005). However, the demolition of lodging houses, buildings full of squatters, and neighborhoods of those living in poverty actually increased the number of people displaced and without housing. Deinstitutionalization, originally conceived as a humane alternative to large state hospitals, was an underfunded endeavor that actually increased total number of persons living on the streets. Homelessness emerged as a major social problem again in the 1980's.

The McKinney-Vento Act

Homelessness grew again in the 1980's and the population doubled between 1980 and 1984 due to cuts in federal aid and a weak economy (Kusmer, 2003). Unable to afford their current housing, many families ended up on the streets because of high unemployment rates and lack of affordable housing (Burt, 1991). An estimated 1 to 3 million people lived in a transient state by 1989 and about a third of that number was classified as children and youth (Jencks, 1994). This increase of unsheltered families, particularly children, resulted in homelessness becoming viewed as a significant social problem with national attention from the media and homeless advocates (Kusmer, 2002). The government response to the re-emergence of this population as a national issue was the passage of the McKinney-Vento Act in 1987 as one of the first significant federal legislative responses to homelessness as a separate issue and not just a

part of poverty (Jencks, 1994). The law provided federal money to homeless shelters programs to meet critical and urgent needs. This view of the state of homelessness as a national issue continued into the 1990's and 2000's.

In response to both the growth of the population and the emerging diversity of needs, new classifications for homeless people were developed beginning in the late 1990's and added to the McKinney-Vento Act (Kusmer, 2002). These included sheltered homeless or those living in shelters or transitional housing, doubled-up homeless or those who live with another family in a habitation unit designed only for one family, unsheltered or those who live in places not meant for human habitation such as cars and abandoned buildings, unaccompanied youth who are not in the custody of a parent or guardian, and the chronically homeless. Chronic homelessness, a term developed in 2002, refers to people who have been continually homeless for one year or who have experienced homelessness four times in three years (Burt, 2004).

Continuum of Care Model

The McKinney-Vento Act of 1987 provided federal support for new types of shelter and programs to operate at a local level in response to an increase in the country's shelter capacity and shelter needs (HUD, 2002). The goal of this funding was to assist whole communities in need rather than individual shelters and programs. However, few communities applied for these funds (Wong, Park, & Nemon, 2006). In order to encourage cities and towns to restructure programs at a local level, HUD began offering financial incentives with appropriated McKinney-Vento funds to communities that offered services on a Continuum of Care model (HUD, 2002). According to HUD, a Continuum of "a community plan to organize and deliver housing and services to meet the specific needs of people who are homeless as they move to stable housing and maximize self-sufficiency. It includes action steps to end homelessness and prevent a return

to homelessness” (2002, pp 6). While a CoC model should include services toward prevention and outreach, CoC funding from HUD could only be used for emergency housing, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2006).

Emergency shelter programs provide short-term housing, usually 30 to 45 days, and services to meet the immediate needs of individuals who are homeless (Tsemberis, 2010). These shelter programs typically serve any individual and have clients with diverse needs from physical disabilities to substance abuse to mental health needs. Emergency shelters have a predetermined length of stay and focus on critical daily needs like food and shelter from the elements (Kuhn & Culhane, 1998).

Transitional housing programs serve people who no longer need emergency shelter but are not yet ready or able to move into permanent housing. The services at transitional housing programs are intensive and aimed at promoting housing readiness and self-sufficiency through case management, employment, training, and teaching budgeting and other life skills (Wong et al., 2006). These programs are often targeted towards specific groups like women who are pregnant, families, people recovering from substance abuse, youth aging out of foster care, or youth leaving the juvenile justice system (Urban Institute Report, 1999). The goal of transitional living programs is to transition their clients from emergency shelters to independent housing (Tsemberis, 2010).

Permanent supportive housing is targeted toward individuals who have functional limitations so severe that they will need on-going support services for independent housing. Typically, individuals that qualify for permanent supportive housing have serious mental illness, chronic substance abuse problems, physical disabilities, or HIV. Permanent supportive housing programs are not time limited and clients are not expected to move to other programs (Kuhn &

Culhane, 1998). Table 1 identifies the types of programs, length of stay, and the goals of each program in a CoC based on an evaluation of services through HUD (2002).

The CoC model has been the typical model for homeless services across the nation, but attention and funding is now moving toward a different paradigm of services known as Housing First.

Table 1

Continuum of Care Programs

Type of Program	Length of Stay	Clients Served	Program Goals
Emergency Shelter	1-90 days	Any person who is homeless	Basic needs-food, shelter, clothing Linkage to mainstream resources including TANF, Social Security, food stamps, Medicare, Medicaid, substance abuse resources, and mental health resources
Transitional Housing	12-24 months	Homeless individuals or families who are not ready for permanent housing or do not yet have access to permanent housing	Basic needs-food, shelter, clothing Case Management including referrals, assistance obtaining benefits, and coordination of services Tenant stabilization-services to help resident learn to live in housing including daily living skills and budgeting Employment related assistance including resume building and job placement Assistance in accessing housing
Permanent Supportive Housing		Homeless individuals or families who have serious mental illness, chronic substance abuse, physical disabilities, or HIV-related illnesses	Housing through multi-family structures or scattered site apartments Supportive treatment services for medical, mental health, or substance abuse needs Case Management including referrals, assistance obtaining benefits, and coordination of services

Housing First Model

Recently, HUD has begun re-allocating funding from traditional shelters on the CoC model to a Housing First model (United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, 2012). According to the NAEH, Housing First is an approach that centers on providing homeless people with housing quickly and then providing services as needed. The Housing First model is different than traditional models of addressing homelessness in that the immediate focus is on helping individuals and families quickly access and sustain permanent housing (Tsemberis, 2010). Housing First programs focus on helping individuals and families access and sustain rental housing as quickly as possible and subsequent support services are offered with a goal of maintaining housing (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2006). Wraparound or intensive case management services are provided immediately, along with housing in this model to promote accountability and self-sufficiency.

A Housing First approach rests on the belief that helping people access and sustain permanent, affordable housing should be the central goal when working with people experiencing homelessness (Tsemberis, 2010). By providing housing assistance, case management and supportive services responsive to individual or family needs after an individual or family is housed, communities can significantly reduce the time people experience homelessness and prevent further episodes of homelessness (NAEH, 2006). Based on a model pioneered in the 1990's with chronically homeless people who had chronic mental illness or substance abuse problems, Housing First is based on the idea that housing is a basic human right that should not be denied to anyone (Tsemberis, 2010).

The original principles of Housing First were:

1. People should be moved into housing directly from streets and shelters without preconditions of treatment compliance
2. Wraparound, or robust and intensive, support services must be offered to clients based on need and not client coercion
3. Continued assistance with the program must not be dependent on participation in services
4. Harm-reduction should be used rather than mandated abstinence
5. Residents must have leases and protection under the law (Tsemberis, 2010).

As housing first is now being used with all homeless people and not just those experiencing mental illness or substance abuse, the assumption of the Housing First approach is that social services are more effective when people are in their own home (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2006). Program models vary depending on the client population, availability of affordable rental housing and/or housing subsidies and services that can be provided (Tsemberis, 2010). Housing First programs often reflect the needs and preferences of each community. Unfortunately, many Housing First providers are unable to offer wrap-around services, or services addressing an array of needs like education and training, and rely on employment programs for homeless individuals to meet their goals (Law, 2007).

In conclusion, programs to aid and relieve the housing and economic needs of homeless persons have shifted from a local to a national level. At the national level, programs have moved from a Continuum of Care model to a Housing First model with an aim to increase self-sufficiency for the population. However, Housing First providers are often not able to provide

wrap-around services including employment programs. The need for employment programs and services is discussed in the next section.

Statement of the Problem

The state of homelessness continues to be a far reaching national problem impacting groups of varying ages, background, and needs; lack of a sustainable living-wage employment significantly impacts the number of people both currently unhoused and those at imminent risk of displacement. The NAEH report on Homelessness in America in 2012 found incidence of homelessness decreased nationally, however increases occurred in 24 states. The National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty estimates that between 2.3 and 3.5 million people will experience a lack of housing in their lifetime (2011). Currently, shelters and transitional housing facilities are unable to meet the needs of the homeless population. While 60% of people identified as homeless were sheltered in emergency housing, transitional housing, or living with relatives and friends, 40% of people, or over 640,000 people, are unsheltered meaning they live in cars, on the street, under bridges, or in campsites. While the average number of shelter beds in large cities increased by 5% in 2005, an increase of 32% was needed (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2012a). The state of homelessness is largely thought of as an economic issue and the three most commonly cited reasons for living in a transient state are lack of affordable housing, poverty, and unemployment (U.S. Conference of Mayors, 2008).

People who are homeless typically have insufficient financial resources to obtain or maintain housing. Housing is considered affordable when it is 30% or less of monthly household income, however U.S. renters, on average, spend around 40% of their income on rent; households below the poverty line average around 52% of their income spent towards rent (US HUD, 2011). Subsequently, people living in poverty are frequently unable to maintain housing.

According to the National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty most homeless workers find jobs paying minimum wage at about \$16,800 gross yearly income. At this pay rate, one bedroom apartments at fair market rate in every county in the country exceed the 30% or less guideline for affordable housing proposed by HUD (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011). In addition to the problems with affordable housing, the homeless population is also experiencing high levels of underemployment and unemployment.

Currently, 13% of people who are homeless have jobs but are classified as underemployed meaning the wage and hours of their current job are not high enough to allow them to climb out of poverty. From 1981-1990, the minimum wage was frozen at \$3.35 an hour, while the cost of living increased 48% over the same period (U.S. Department of Labor, 2009; National Coalition for the Homeless, 2009). Congress raised the minimum wage to \$5.15 per hour in 1996, and again in 2007 to \$7.25 an hour, incrementally over a two year period. This increase did not keep up with inflation in the same 20 year period; thus, the real value of the minimum wage today is 26% less than in 1979, worth only \$4.42 in real dollars (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011). Additionally, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates the current national unemployment rate at 9% and the average amount of time people are unemployed is 37.1 weeks (2012). In 2009, the number of unemployed people living in poverty grew 59% and the average income of a working person living in poverty fell 2.3% (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2009).

Often, people who are homeless have more barriers to employment than the average worker, including lack of education, lack of competitive work skill, lack of transportation, lack of affordable child care, and disabling conditions (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2009). For those with limited skills or experience, opportunities for jobs that pay a living wage are very

limited. Additionally, many members of the population have to combat barriers such as limited transportation and reduced access to educational and training programs (Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007). In such a competitive environment, the difficulties of job seeking as a displaced person seem an almost insurmountable barriers to employment. Programs that eliminate barriers to employment through a variety of methods including increasing education, skills, and providing needs like uniforms and transportation, may be an effective way to increase the employability of those who are live in a transient state. Most examinations of the effectiveness of these employment programs are basic or anecdotal and more research is needed to see if employment programs actually impact homelessness. Job TREC, an employment program for those who are homeless in Athens, GA, is an example of a homeless employment program aimed at reducing homelessness by eliminating unemployment thus increasing the ability to find stable and affordable housing. This program treats employment as a long term solution to the historically long term and complex problem of homelessness.

In conclusion, homelessness is a significant problem in the United States affecting an estimated 2.3 to 3.5 million people per year (NAEH, 2012). This is often attributed to lack of affordable housing due to unemployment and underemployment. One potential way to combat this growing nation problem is through job programs geared towards the specific needs of the population (Burt, 2004). Job TREC is an example of this type of program and is the focus of this research. A research approach was developed to examine the effectiveness of the Job TREC program.

Development of Research Approach

In 1997, the U.S. Department of Labor, the Employment and Training Administration, and the Office of Policy and Research developed a “how-to” guide for employment and training

agencies to deliver effective training, placement, and job retention services to homeless clients (Beck, Trutko, Isbell, Rothstein, and Barnow, 1997). The major objectives of *Employment and training for America's homeless; Best practices guide* were to improve agencies knowledge of homeless people, identify which members of this population would benefit most and least from employment and job training services, classify the full range of services needed in employment and job training programs, and provide guidance for successful strategies in implementing these services (Beck, Trutko, Isbell, Rothstein, and Barnow, 1997). The guide was arranged into four major areas: initial services, education and training services, job placement maintenance, and housing and other support services. This guide provided the foundation for the development of the research questions in this study.

Initial Client Assessment and Services

The first major area explored in the Best Practices guide is initial services including the recruitment, intake, and initial assessment of clients. It is important to disregard several assumptions about the population when providing initial assessment and services. First, homeless individuals are not a homogenous group (Kusmer, 2002). The only characteristics shared by all members of the population are a lack of a fixed residence and low income. Every homeless person is not in need of the exact same services. Second, individuals without housing are transient and may not be familiar with local services. Thirdly, some members of the population have little to no interest in employment and employment training, or have difficulty making long term commitments to programs due to their transient nature (Beck et al, 1997).

In addition to dispelling assumptions about the population, the best practices guide presented strategies for structuring and providing a range of activities needed to recruit and prepare transient individuals for participation in employment and training activities. The

recommendations in the Best Practice Guide include providing immediate assessment and case management at intake including defining realistic expectations and evaluating support needs beyond employment including housing, physical health, and mental health. Early case management has been proven effective to increasing employment and employment retention in multiple studies (Becker et al., 2001; Drake et al., 2001, Marrone, 1993). Additionally, the early evaluation of support needs was supported by Baggerly and Zalaquett (2006) who found many homeless persons also self-report alcohol use, drug use, and mental health problems. Johnson and Fitzpatrick (2007) reported similar findings and note that without proper assessment, immediate job training and placement proved ineffective.

Education and Training Services

The second main area explored in the best practices guide is education and training services. The high school dropout rate amongst those without stable housing is estimated at 30% highlighting the need for targeted education services in the population (Economic Policy Institute, 2005). Two main challenges exist when offering employment and job training to homeless persons. First, many people who are experiencing a homelessness have an urgent need to obtain employment to meet their basic needs like food, water, and shelter. These necessities may rule out educational needs. Most displaced individuals have very few resources to sustain themselves while in education or job training programs and rate the need for income via employment or short-term solutions as more important than education and training or long-term solutions (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011). This also makes people in this population much more likely to settle for the first job offered rather than wait for a job with an adequate income. When people are unsure of where their next meal is coming from or when they will get to shower again, they tend to agree to the first available job they find, rather

than wait for job offers with higher incomes (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2009). Second, many homeless persons resist typical classroom training settings and rigid structure due to failure in childhood settings or the lack of structure available to the population on a daily basis (Beck et al., 1997). For these challenges, the Best Practices Guide recommends providing for a wide variety of settings, methods, and timing for trainings and including life skills training as part of basic training programs. The need for employment education and training services to increase employment for homeless people is supported by various studies (Beck et al., 1997; Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007; Radey & Wilkins, 2011). Additionally, Radey (2008) found that life skills training dramatically increased the skills and subsequent employability of homeless persons. Furthermore, in a recent quantitative study, McBride (2012) supported the need for various settings for employment and education services to change client perceptions of these services.

Job Placement and Maintenance

The third major area explored in the Best Practices Guide is job placement and maintenance. The ultimate goal of most employment and job training programs is self-sufficiency. Employment and training programs must focus on both the individual needs of the clients and conditions in the labor market (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2009). Some of the challenges of job search and placement for homeless people are availability and contact. Many displaced people lack transportation or are dependent on public transportation. People lacking their own transportation must find employment during public transit schedules or rely on the availability of friends for rides. Additionally, many people staying in shelters must seek employment that will allow them to return each evening at a set curfew (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011). Furthermore, transient people often lack a set address and

phone number to provide to potential employers. Lack of available contact also makes follow-up services difficult for agencies. For these limitations, the Best Practices Guide recommends monitoring self-directed job searches and providing supportive services to participants like transportation and childcare assistance (Beck et al., 1997). Several studies suggest supportive services including transportation and clothing assistance can help individuals find long-term employment quickly and despite limitations including chronic homelessness and mental illness (Becker et al., 2001; Marrone, 2005; Theodore, 2000). In addition, self-directed vocational activities, including job searches and self-directed trainings were found to increase long-term employment (Radey & Wilkins, 2011).

Housing Assistance and Support Services

The fourth and final main area explored in the Best Practices Guide is housing assistance and other support services. The relationship between stable housing and sustained employment has long been established and those who attained stable housing while employed were twice as likely to maintain employment as those who were still lacking a fixed residence (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2009; Shaheen & Rio, 2007, Theodore, 2000). The housing assistance defined by the best practices guide includes emergency shelters, transitional housing or time limited housing intended to bridge the gap between emergency shelters and independent housing, subsidized housing such as the Section 8 Existing Housing Program and local Housing Authorities, and unsubsidized permanent housing which is housing available on the open market (Beck et al., 1997). There are several challenges to providing housing assistance for homeless people. Housing assistance can be costly. The extension of financial assistance for housing limits the amount of services an employment and job training program can provide or limit the amount of clients the program can serve (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty,

2011). The demand for affordable housing in many markets, including Athens, GA, exceeds the supply. Athens has over 300 homeless persons but only has bed space in transitional housing and emergency shelters for about 80 (Northeast Georgia Homeless Coalition, 2012).

Additionally, support services are often wider in scope for homeless persons than other populations. For example, people who are homeless may need entire wardrobes instead of just one outfit or may need eye glasses, dental services, and hearing aids as opposed to needing only one or none of those services (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011).

Homeless people who have been transient may have lost all identifying information like birth certificate, identification, and social security cards, making it impossible to apply for services or employment (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2009). The Best Practices Guide recommends understanding the local housing environment and assessing support needs on an on-going basis (Beck et al., 1997).

In conclusion, the best practices guide highlighted four main areas of focus for employment agencies to deliver effective training, placement, and job retention services to homeless clients. These areas were initial assessment and services, education and training services, job placement and maintenance, and housing assistance and support services. These areas were used by the researcher to form and develop the research questions for this study.

Importance of the Study

As the Housing First Model replaces the traditional Continuum of Care models, federal funding for homeless support service agencies is being scrutinized by HUD. Since adults without children are not qualified for traditional programs like Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or food stamps, and Medicaid through state Departments of Human Services, there is a necessity for employment programs for

those unstably housed. Agencies able to demonstrate effectiveness by assisting clients with finding permanent living wage jobs will continue to receive more funding through federal and state governments than states without a proven track record (Athens-Clarke County Unified Government, n.d.).

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of an employment program for homeless clients in a northeastern Georgia town. Job Training, Resource, Education, and Case management (Job TREC) is an example of this type of employment program in Athens, GA. The Job TREC program is designed to assist all homeless persons in Athens and identifies its program goals as decreasing barriers to housing by increasing employability of clients through case management and supportive services (Athens Area Homeless Shelter, 2011). For this reason, the program was evaluated in the terms of its effectiveness at increasing successful client employment and decreasing barriers to housing.

Athens, GA is a consolidated city and county in northeastern Georgia. According to the 2010 Census, Athens has a total population of around 116,000 and is the sixth largest city in the state (Center for Agribusiness and Economic Development, 2011). The Northeast Georgia Homeless Coalition yearly homeless count in January of 2012 and found 407 people currently homeless in Athens (2012). The unemployment rate in the area is averaging at 7% for the 2012 (Athens-Clarke County Unified Government, n.d). The estimated median income for Athens is \$28,488 and the median gross rent is \$659 (Center for Agribusiness and Economic Development, 2011). While these estimates put the median rent at 30% of the median income, as recommended by HUD, this does not reflect the average income of people who are homeless. Furthermore, the unemployment rate, median income, and median rent may be inaccurate as

Athens is a large university town and students can skew census results (Center for Agribusiness and Economic Development, 2011).

Given the limitations in accurately defining the exact income and financial demographics of Athens, this study defined and assessed the success rate of Job TREC clients in terms of their ability to find full or part time employment with a wage above the federal poverty level as defined in the Table 2 by the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Table 2

Federal Poverty Guideline

Persons in family/household	Poverty guideline
1	\$11,170
2	15,130
3	19,090
4	23,050
5	27,010
6	30,970
7	34,930
8	38,890
For families/households with more than 8 persons, add \$3,960 for each additional person.	

With this purpose in mind, using the best practice guide outlined earlier and the design and program goals of Job TREC, this study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of the individuals served by the Job TREC program?
2. What factors are associated with the successful employment of Job TREC clients and former clients?

3. Did the Job TREC program impact the housing status of clients and former clients?

Conclusion

Homelessness continues to be a social problem affecting millions of Americans each year regardless of age, race, ethnicity, and geography. Early efforts to abate this problem included aid to the worthy poor, anti-vagrancy laws, settlement houses, the New Deal, and programs under the McKinney-Vento Act. Recently, the focus of federal aid for the population has shifted from the CoC model of the McKinney-Vento Act to the Housing First model, an approach that centers on providing housing before any other services. With this shift comes a new need for service providers to offer employment training and support as the reason most often cited for homelessness is unemployment and underemployment. A “how-to” guide was developed by U.S. Department of Labor, the Employment and Training Administration, and the Office of Policy and Research to assist service providers with effective training, placement, and retention services for homeless clients. Using this guide, a research approach was developed to examine the effectiveness of a job training program for homeless clients in Athens, GA. Chapter 2 will review literature on homelessness and explore the national measurement of the population. The different types of employment programs for homeless people will be examined and the specific program in Athens, GA being studied will be detailed.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Chapter Two presents the review of literature on pertinent concepts homelessness and of its relation to employment. The literature review began with three online search databases at the University of Georgia library. The online databases were PsycINFO, Social Work Abstracts, and Academic Search Complete. These databases were selected because each database offered scholarly articles on the subjects searched pertaining to human services, behavioral science, and mental health as dictated by the purpose of the study. Terms searched within the databases included homelessness, unemployment, underemployment, homeless employment programs, history of homelessness, the concept of home, and homeless employment. Results were limited to peer reviewed journals only yielding about 30 articles. Several of these articles led the researcher to other pertinent literature through references. Next, the library catalogue at the University of Georgia was explored using the same terms detailed above. The researcher used the book descriptions to narrow down the books choices into the 15 books that seemed to add the most information to the researcher's base of knowledge. Finally, several United States federal agency websites were used to find up-to-date information on the population of homeless Americans including the Office of Housing and Urban Development and Department of Labor.

The information found is organized in the following manner: First, the idea of home and definitions of homelessness are reviewed. Next, the national measurement of people who are homeless is explored, including the current demographics of the population. The relationship between homelessness and wages are investigated, followed by the relationship between

homelessness and employment. The types of employment programs for homeless persons are explained and examined in terms of the relationship of these programs and current federal funding for housing the homeless population. Finally, a specific employment program for unhoused people in Athens, GA is detailed.

Definition of Homelessness

To understand the current relationship between employment programs for homeless persons and social work practice, it is important to examine homelessness as a general concept. Homelessness is a complex issue with definitions of homelessness that differ from study to study, and there is currently no universal definition. For this research, the state of homelessness is explored through the construct of home, historical description, and the current federal definition.

Home

Homelessness is a historical social issue that has existed in the United States since the nation's founding. While most historical definitions characterize the term in terms of housing instability, few recognize the insecurity or absence of family and social connections (Karabanow, 2004). Home is a construct that can be used to explore the state of homelessness. At its most basic, home refers to a place of residence. Home can denote a building where individuals live and store property, a geographical area where a person grew up or feels a sense of belonging, or a mental or emotional state of refuge or comfort (Scapp, 1999). Furthermore, the boundary between home and homelessness is further complicated by the ideas of mobility, work, and tradition (Hopper, 1997). Those who have irregular forms of accommodations or transient lifestyles can be viewed as homeless, however whole communities such as the Irish travelers and Romanian gypsies are not viewed by anthropologists as homeless (Rossi, 1989). In addition,

uncertain housing is a chosen practice of particular groups or particular occupation like itinerant preachers and religious mendicants (Hopper, 1997). In order to understand what homelessness means as social construct, the idea of home is integral.

A simple thesaurus search of the term home yields results of house, residence, dwelling, abode, habitat, quarters, domicile, and address. These terms highlight home as a physical structure but do not attend to the richness of meaning behind the concept. Thoughts of warmth, safety, comfort, and rest are evoked by the term in some commonplace lyrics and colloquialisms such as “home is where the heart is”, there’s no place like home”, and “a home is a man’s castle.” The concepts of home focus not only to a personal center of reference, but also investments in family, community, work, and politics. Many people conceptualize home as a physical place, others identify it as a state of mind to escape a troubling world (Tamm, 1999).

To speak of home invokes a multitude of associations and feelings that are unique to each person. To some, home is a physical place: their place of birth, country of origin, family home, or favorite vacation spot. To others, home is a sense, a particular smell, a specific feeling, or a memory. While some people can readily pinpoint the place they feel most at home, others bemoan a sensation of homelessness and disconnection in the world. Rapport and Dawson find that to be home in one’s own place, it is necessary to become estranged and alienated mentally or spiritually from the surrounding world to some degree (1998). This paradox is necessary to give a person a vantage point from which to truly understand themselves.

The field of environmental psychology has explored the home environment as a rich source of personal meaning and symbolism as well as a critical medium for communicating identity and status (Becker, 1977; Gosling & Ko, 2002; Walsh, Craik, & Price, 1992). Houses can be viewed as objects that communicate identity, personality, social class, historical

information, and personal feelings about self (Cooper-Marcus, 1995). Additionally, houses can be spaces that serve as an archive for personal possessions and create a private interior space outside of the public eye (Gosling & Ko, 2002). Czikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton (1981) proposed a model of materialism that suggests that objects, including houses, are an important ways to communicate notions of self and group membership to others. As such, these objects play a critical role in identity development by creating behavior opportunities to express and receive feedback about the self. Home is also a space that can be personalized by inhabitants. In many households, the home is the territory of the homemaker and personalizing this space is a way to claim ownership and express important inner and outer aspects of identity (Becker, 1977). The idea of home can be further examined by the importance of the term and its implications. Home can also be explored in relation to the world, society, community, and self.

Importance of home. There are important aspects of both having a home and feeling at home. Maslow described physical home in the first two levels of his initial hierarchy of needs (1943). Physiological needs, the first level of Maslow's hierarchy, are the physical requirements for human survival that must be met so that the body can function. These needs include food, water, air, shelter, and clothing. Once physical needs are relatively satisfied, an individual's safety needs should take precedence and dominate behavior. In addition to fulfilling a physiological need, a place of dwelling provides personal security from the elements and predators necessary for personal security and well-being (Arendt, 1958). While Wahba and Bridewell found no evidence for ranking the needs described by Maslow, they validated the existence of universal human needs including shelter (1976).

In addition to a need for physical housing, there is significance to the internal feeling of being at home. In his work with refugees, Papadopoulos (2002) described the importance of

home and its role as a psychological category that necessitates human development. He found that the fundamental sense of home forms part of a core for identity which is structured as a mosaic consisting of a number of smaller elements that together form a coherent whole. This mosaic includes belonging to a country, due to both the fact that the country exists and that in belonging to this country, one exists in a geographical landscape. When this mosaic is disturbed, the loss is felt as fundamental and leads to nostalgic disorientation, which he describes as sense of loss and lack of confidences in one's own existence and consequently in life which leads to a particular kind of immobility. Fidyk also suggested that the need for home lies deep within all of us (2011). She further found that without a safe place from which to journey forth, resilience is impossible.

In a world of movement and transiency, it is important to maintain both a physical home and a sense of being at home. Necessary for safety and the sense of belonging, the conception of home must be continually assessed as an intersection for the outer and inner reality (Hill, 2010). Referencing the social nature of human beings, Hill further noted that dissociation between the inner and outer home risks a loss of connection with reality. It is in the forming of the relationship between the outer world and inner feelings that a home can serve as a source of comfort, security, privacy, and expression of self (Rapport & Dawson, 1998).

Home and the world. On considering what it means to be home in the world, Jungian analyst Hill addressed the topic in depth in his book, *At Home in the world: Sounds and symmetries of belonging* (2010). According to Hill, the word "home" has significant multidimensional qualities and can refer not only to a place of residence, but also a state of mind where one feels at ease. A place of dwelling does not necessarily lead to a feeling of home if the place is unsafe or has negative associations. For people in these situations, the feeling of being

“at home” may be in a place thousands of miles away. This refers to an internal sense of home that is completely separate from a place of shelter from the elements. Hill further postulates that the word “home” has been traditionally associated with some outer object, place, origin, or destination. However, in current times, loss of or change in physical shelter is almost a certainty and “home” has acquired a new inner significance. Home is now linked to a sense of identity, continuity, and containment. The loss referenced here relates not only to the recent widespread house foreclosures, but also to the contemporary way of life for many Americans that involves movement and instability. Augé (2004) found that people living in such a state are always and never at home, constantly at ease with those whom they share their lives, yet never quite comfortable. Anthropologists Rapport and Dawson have further suggested that for a world of travelers, migrants, and commuters, a more mobile conception of home should be utilized (1998). They establish home to be a set of routine practices and a repetition of habitual interactions, comprised of style of physical address, styles of dress, memories, myths, and stories carried around in each person’s head. Cushman (1995) also emphasized the role of culture in the psychological mean of home. He noted that humans are incomplete without living in a specific cultural matrix embedded in everyday practices.

Humans are socially constructed beings that value the importance of feeling at home in the world (Cushman, 1995). This need for home is rooted in a deep longing to belong (de Vries, 2011). Belonging encompasses many aspects including places, people, and culture; however, the most important need is to be connected to the world in some way (Papadopoulos, 2002). According to Hill, the longing to belong is a dimension of the metaphysical soul, beyond everyday routines (2005). Furthermore, through the metaphor of home, it is possible to discover the structure and intension of humanity. With this in mind, the importance of feeling at home in

the world can be viewed as a need for one's self identity. Without this feeling, the self can become disconnected from the world as Papadopoulos concluded (2002).

Home and society. The idea of home in relation to society can be traced back to Ancient Greece. Aristotle first emphasized the importance of home by postulating that the state of a household lays the foundation of the state (Scapp, 1999). He defined household as family who shares a cupboard with the household being the most basic unit of society (Schrader, 1999). He then connects the evolution of the state as a community with the ability to build and maintain homes. Aristotle further stressed that a person without a state is a bad man or above humanity (Scapp, 1999). As homes and household are antecedents to statehood, it follows that those who are homeless threaten statehood and must be denounced.

Arendt (1958) expanded on Aristotle's connection between home and society by exploring home through the ever-changing cycles and rhythms of nature. Homes, permanently introduced into nature's flux as protection from it, represent the human capacity of fabricating durable goods. Private property, or the ownership of one's home, is an extension of the self exhibited through clothing, food, and household goods enabling the person to master necessity and overcome nature (Betz, 1999). Arendt (1958) further explains law as an extension of the idea of home, as a building protects us from nature; laws protect us from neighbors so property and law exist as defenses of the home with labor serving as a connecting action between the two. A home is a durable and permanent manufactured article that shelters us from nature. In our households we labor to meet our daily needs and go forth to labor and work for others. The home comes from work which creates buildings that exhibit civilization. Once civilization is obtained, political processes follow. Without the initial step of creating a household, nature renders life perilous, civilization cannot evolve, and politics cease to exist (Betz, 1999).

In the United States, the connection between home and society is recognized in the Constitution. The Bill of Rights guarantees all citizens a number of personal freedoms and protections including the protection from quartering of troops in the Third Amendment and protection from unreasonable search and seizure in the Fourth Amendment (U.S. Constitution). These Amendments provide explicit security for homes and establishes each of us as a source of primary law in our households creating a foundation of autonomy (Schrader, 1999). At the civic level, autonomy makes a person a full part of civil society entitled to certain rights recognized by society as a whole. However, someone lacking a home has no place to occupy to build this autonomy. Citizenship involves both a figurative and literal place in society; therefore, a citizen lacking a literal place has a marginalized civic personality and abridged rights and protections (Burkum, 1999).

Home and community. The term community has been defined in many different ways. It can reference a geographical area, people living in a particular place, or an area of shared common values (Cohen, 1985). Frazer (1999) approached community as a value that brought together solidarity, commitment, mutuality, and trust. It can also be viewed as a descriptive category or set of variables (Sommerville, 1998). Cohen (1985) argued that communities are best approached as unity of meaning and the reality of community lies in its members' perception of the vitality of its culture. Thus community plays a crucial symbolic role in generating a person's sense of belonging and attachment (Crow & Allan, 1994).

Homelessness is not just lacking a home; it can also be one who does not participate in the sphere of membership and the condition of not being acknowledged as belonging to society and community (Hopper, 1997). Within Neo-Aristolian views, membership in the community is a necessity for human existence (Schrader, 1999). If homelessness is not just a lack of housing,

but also a condition of disaffiliation from community and its economic, social, political and cultural life it is also a form of nonmembership. This disaffiliation with the usual ties of community life has been described as social exclusion (Sommerville, 1998). Homelessness has been profiled as one of, if not the, most significant forms through which individuals are excluded socially (Horsell, 2006). Furthermore, social exclusion can create an anti-community outside of the main social classes that exists with few rights, few privileges, and a distinct lack of social mobility (Sommerville, 1998).

Home and self. As stated earlier, home constitutes a domain of personal autonomy that influences not only our civic personality, but also our moral personality (Schrader, 1999). Aristotle's definition of household extends beyond a unit of society. He also held it to signal the importance of privacy (Scapp, 1999). This privacy allows people to make their own decisions apart from popular opinions and allows one the opportunity to develop virtues (Schrader, 1999). Mill (1869) reinforced the need for privacy in making determinations for oneself and theorized that a human could only be fully developed if given liberty and independence. Kant also viewed autonomy as the "ground for dignity of human nature and every rational nature" (1964, p. 103). It follows that people who lack some of the conditions of autonomy, therefore lack a full moral personality. The home, as a necessity for autonomy, is a condition necessary for full development as a moral self (Schrader, 1999).

Psychologically, the state of a person's home has been shown to influence their behavior, emotions, and overall mental health (Abbarano, 1999). A state of feeling at home provides a sense of place or belonging needed to give a person sanctuary and stability (Murphy, 1999). Self-identity is vulnerable as the self is always in the process of growing. Intrusion on privacy

from the external world can not only hinder autonomy, but also lead to feelings of shame and vulnerability (Karin-Frank, 1999).

Historical Description

In past literature, definitions of homelessness have been varied and range from those that follow a strict interpretation such as literally not having a roof over head, to those that cover a much broader perspective like lacking a permanent resident or the ability to pay for a permanent residence (Hombs, 2001; Kusmer, 2002). Historical definitions of homelessness often reflect the economic conditions, social values, and legislative issues of each time period.

Early definition. In the early 1600's, America was made up of small, religious colonies along the eastern coast (Jencks, 1994). Homelessness during this time period was seen as a moral deficiency in which a person must have angered God to not allow their needs to be met. While the state of homelessness during this era is not defined in literature, Monkkonen (1981) asserts that the generally accepted definition was a man who could not find his own lodging. In the 1850's, the unhoused were not defined but were counted by those who lodged overnight in police station lodging rooms (Jencks, 1994). With the introduction of the railroad and the upsurge in less secure industries like mills and mines, homeless persons became more transient during the 1800's. Terms like hobo and tramp were used to separate from the local vagrants and the strangers (Kusmer, 2002). The commonality in the definition of homeless persons from the 1600's through the 1800's was gender. Transients were seen as men, who regardless of unemployment, accident, or illness, were expected to be able to work and bring home money. Women and children were part of the "deserving poor" or people living in poverty who deserved charity and help (Rogers, 1978). This view of homelessness did not shift until the Great Depression of the 1930's.

Great Depression era. The decade of the Great Depression saw the number of poor rise to unprecedented levels (Rossi, 1989). While records of people living in poverty were not kept during the great depression, the unemployment rate reached 25%, businesses and families defaulted on record numbers of loans, and more than 5,000 banks failed (Dawley, 1976). During this time, there was an increase of those without housing including migrant families heading westward and transients permanently on the move, however, a new group of homeless, local unemployed men or the “new poor”, developed and grew exponentially (Rogers, 1978). Many local unhoused person made do with family support and private charity, but this “new poor” led to a debate of whether character flaws or the economy caused homelessness (Hopper, 1997). Charities and shelters, originally established in the 1870’s, multiplied and grew during this time period recognizing that homelessness was not only being without a home, but also living in extreme poverty (Barbuto, 1999). This led sociologists to a new definition of homelessness as destitute persons, transient or in the community, who are without a home (Kusmer, 2002). This widely accepted definition allowed for both displaced local and transient persons to be included and highlighted the economic condition of a homeless person, but implied that only people without a roof over their head were homeless. It did not factor in those temporarily living in hotels or the homes or friends or family members (Rossi, 1989). Community based treatment for mental illness was also first developed in the time period leading to eventual deinstitutionalization and the next change in the definition of homelessness.

Deinstitutionalization. Deinstitutionalization is the process of replacing long term psychiatric hospitals with community mental health services for those diagnosed with mental illness or intellectual disabilities. This movement was initiated by a combination of the advent of psychotropic medications, lack of funding, overcrowding, and the exposure of poor living

conditions in institutions (Shipler, 2005). Set in motion by the Community Mental Health Act of 1963, long term psychiatric patients were released from state hospitals and institutions for treatment in community mental health facilities. As noted in the previous chapter, only about half of the needed community facilities materialized due to both lack of funding and opposition from other community residents (Burt, 2004). With inadequate treatment, many of those released from institutions were unable to function independently. Additionally, many former patients were released into urban areas where employment, food, and shelter were not readily available. Although specific numbers are unknown, a majority of those released during the deinstitutionalization movement ended up living on the streets with no sustainable support system (Drake et al., 2001).

In response to the growing number of person with mental illness living on the streets, Robert Hayes, a New York City lawyer, brought a class action suit before the courts against both New York City and New York State arguing for a constitutional right to shelter (Stein & Santos, 1998). The decision was settled as a consent decree and the City and State agreed to provide shelter and board to all homeless men who met the standard need for welfare or who were homeless by reason of physical, mental, or social dysfunction (Wasserman & Clair, 2009). While this decision did not impact the definition of homelessness a physical state, it did influence the notion that causes of transiency were more than economic. This was reiterated and reflected in the changes of definition in the 1980's.

Dramatic growth in the 1980's. In the 1980's, due to a weak economy and cuts in federal aid, the number of person without stable housing grew from three or four hundred thousand to an estimated one to three million (Burt, 1991). Prior to the 1980's, homeless persons were frequently seen as vagrants and men with alcohol problems or mental illness. As the

number of people living on the streets and in shelters began to increase, the view of vagrants and “undeserving poor” started to change (Hopper, 1997). This change was first seen in the media when popular publications, including the New York Times and Life magazine, began using the term “homeless” instead of vagrant or vagrancy (Burt, 1991). Furthermore, HUD’s definition of homelessness during this time as “the state of being without permanent shelter” also reflected this shift in societal views (Hombs, 2001). This definition reflected that homelessness was more than just not having a roof over head as it included people living in shelters. Additionally, this definition held homelessness as a state of being and not just a person, reflecting the issue as a multi-faceted problem beyond individual character (Burt, 1991). With the increase of displaced families in the 1980’s, the federal government passed the first legislative response geared specifically toward homelessness with the McKinney-Vento Act of 1987 (Jencks, 1994). With this legislation came a federal definition of homelessness.

Early federal definition. Financial aid from the McKinney-Vento Act was originally targeted for 15 types of programs providing a range of services to all homeless people including emergency shelter, transitional housing, job training, primary health care, permanent housing, and education (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2006). The Act was amended in 1988, 1992, and 1994 to modify the distribution of funds (Jencks, 1994, Sklar, 1995). In 1988, the Act was amended to expand eligible activities that qualify for funding. The Act was amended to include programs specifically for homeless persons with disabilities, mental illness, AIDS, and drug or alcohol addiction in 1992 (Sklar, 1995). The 1990 amendments also increased funding to program for unhoused children. In 1994, the Act was amendments further required educational authorities to coordinate with housing authorities to provide educational rights for homeless families. Additionally, the 1994 amendments allowed more local agencies to apply for

shelter funding (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2006). With the modifications came an official classification system to differentiate between those living in shelters, multiple families in single family dwellings, the unsheltered who lived in places not meant for human habitation, and unaccompanied youth (Kusmer, 2002). Chronic homelessness, the category of people with a disabling condition who have been homeless for one full year or who have experienced homelessness four times in three years, was added to the definition of homelessness in 2003 when HUD began the Collaborative Initiative to Help End Chronic Homelessness (Burt, 2004). These updates to the definition began to reflect legislation and policy, rather than just the lack of housing.

As noted earlier in the chapter, the definition of homeless can vary across research. While some research considers people doubled up in homes with friend or relatives as homeless, other research disagrees (Bomar, 2004; Hopper, 1997; National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011, Wasserman & Clair, 2009). The same is true of people in jails, hospitals, and foster care homes (Jencks, 1994; Kusmer, 2002). Furthermore, the state of homelessness can be examined through categories household composition, residency, or severity of homelessness (Jencks, 1994). For these reasons, it is purported that “there is no single, generally accepted definition of homelessness” (Hombs, 2001, p. 6).

Current Federal Definition

As there is not a universally accepted definition for homelessness, official definitions often provide the framework for examining the population (Wasserman & Clair, 2009). The most recent definition from the United States Department of Urban and Housing Development office (HUD) defines homelessness as:

- People who are living in a place not meant for human habitation, in emergency shelter, in transitional housing, or are exiting an institution where they temporarily resided. The only significant change from existing practice is that people will be considered homeless if they are exiting an institution where they resided for up to 90 days (it was previously 30 days), and were in shelter or a place not meant for human habitation immediately prior to entering that institution.
- People who are losing their primary nighttime residence, which may include a motel or hotel or a doubled up situation, within 14 days and lack resources or support networks to remain in housing. HUD had previously allowed people who were being displaced within 7 days to be considered homeless. The proposed regulation also describes specific documentation requirements for this category.
- Families with children or unaccompanied youth who are unstably housed and likely to continue in that state. A new category of homelessness, this applies to families with children or unaccompanied youth who have not had a lease or ownership interest in a housing unit in the last 60 or more days, have had two or more moves in the last 60 days, and who are likely to continue to be unstably housed because of disability or multiple barriers to employment.
- People who are fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, have no other residence, and lack the resources or support networks to obtain other permanent housing. This category is similar to the current practice regarding people who are fleeing domestic violence (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2012, para. 2-5).

The National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty notes that this definition focuses solely on the housing aspect of homelessness and not the sociological and psychological

dimension of disassociation or disconnectedness from supportive relationships and traditional systems (2011). Homelessness through the official definition focuses only on what society defines as lack of a “normal” place to live (Stergiopoulos & Hermann, 2003). However, for the purpose of this study, homelessness will be identified using the official HUD definition, as this is the definition used by Job TREC (Athens Area Homeless Shelter, 2011).

In summary, this section explored the state of homelessness through the concept of home, historical description of the unhoused, and the current federal definition. The meaning of term homelessness for this research was also highlighted. The next section will explore how people living without housing are measured.

Counting the Homeless

The actual number of persons who are homeless is difficult to measure. Just as homelessness and poverty are linked, so are homelessness and mobility (Burt, 2004). Counting those who are homeless depends on how and where homeless persons are counted and how homelessness is defined (Kusmer, 2002). There are also inherent flaws and underestimation in measuring this population. This section will review the history of measuring the homeless population and will detail the problem with this measurement. Additionally, the current demographics of the population will be specified.

The United States began measurement of those without homes unofficially in the late 1700’s when the number of homeless was based solely on those with vagrancy convictions (Kusmer, 2002). While it can be assumed that there may be a correlation between the number of people charged with vagrancy and the size of the homeless population, vagrancy conviction can also be influenced by the size and function of the police force, the amount of charities in each town, and attitudes of authorities and townspeople on homelessness (Monkkonen, 1981). In the

1850's, officials in some larger cities began measuring homeless persons based on those who lodged overnight in police station rooms meant specifically for unhoused persons. This measure, while more accurate than the vagrancy conviction counts, still likely vastly underrated the amount of people who were unsheltered since the police house was not the only place to lodge for a night (Jencks, 1994). In the latter 1800's, large cities estimated their homeless by vagrancy convictions, police house lodging, and amount of people using charitable shelters (Rossi, 1989). While this combination was more accurate than previous measures, it only occurred in large cities like Philadelphia, New York, and San Francisco, leaving smaller towns and rural areas with no measure of the population (Kusmer, 2002). Furthermore, this count did not include people living on the streets or in settlements like tent cities and skid rows. One historian suggested that in the middle to late nineteenth century, between 10 and 20% of all American families had at least one member experience homelessness (Monkkonen, 1981).

The first official census of the homeless occurred in 1933 (Jencks, 1994). Led by sociologist Nels Anderson, this count reached 765 cities in 48 states and included measurement at over 3,000 public and private charities (Kusmer, 2005). This census found 304,000 homeless people living across America during the week long survey. While unable to account for the transient or unhoused not using a charity at the time of the count, this survey was the first to study homelessness in terms of gender and age (Jencks, 1994). This was the only major homeless count outside of regular census data until the 1980's.

In 1984, HUD estimated the population count of homeless persons based on a survey of a stratified random sample of shelter managers in 60 cities that contained over 50,000 people (Jencks, 1994). Based on the counts provided by shelter managers, HUD estimated that on an average night in January 1984, 69,000 people were homeless and in shelters. Using the 1980

census data of homeless persons living on the streets and “guesstimates”, HUD estimated that another 141,000 homeless people lived outside of shelters (Wasserman & Clair, 2009). While the 192,000 estimated homeless people from this study is much less than Anderson’s study in 1933, it was a 40% increase in homelessness shown from census data in 1970 (Burt, 1991). However, this study only counted homeless persons sheltered in large cities and guessed homeless persons sheltered in smaller cities and rural areas.

In 1987, the Urban Institute produced another estimate of the homeless population based on a survey in cities with a population over 100,000 (Jencks, 1994). Using both a stratified random sample of users of shelters and soup kitchens, and a nonrandom convenience sampling of people scattered at sites where displaced were known to congregate, this survey found between 500,000 and 600,000 people homeless during a seven day period in March of 1987 (Burt, 1991). While this number more than doubled the number found by the 1984 HUD study, HUD defined homeless persons as literally homeless while the Urban Institute study included those who spent the night with a friend or relative or in an institution or jail (O’Flaherty, 1996). Furthermore, the HUD study measured for only one night while the Urban Institute Study counted those homeless in a seven day period (Burt, 1991).

The U.S. Census Bureau was the next agency to attempt to conduct a nationwide count of homeless persons in 1990. Using local officials, the U.S. Census Bureau attempt to count all shelters and street location where homeless people congregated including street corners, parks, airports, bus depots, all night movie theaters, and emergency waiting rooms at hospitals (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990). Additionally, this study included hotels and motels charging less than \$12 per night. The study identified 249,000 unhoused people, a much lower count than the Urban Institute study (Jencks, 1994). However, this study was based on Census takers

enumerating the number of people who appeared homeless at different location between 2 a.m. and 8 a.m. Thus, one could argue that the number of people living on the streets was likely undercounted (Hombs, 2001).

The Urban Institute attempted another national count of homeless persons in 1996 in 76 geographical areas, including large cities and rural counties. The researchers counted homeless persons through surveys with shelters, housing programs, soup kitchens, food pantries, physical health care programs, mental health care programs, alcohol/drug programs, and homeless outreach centers (Hopper, 1997). The researchers found that on the one night of the survey in October 1996, 440,000 people were without a stable home (Hombs, 2001). The main limitation with the study is that it relies on data from service providers and does not count those who do not seek assistance or service on the day of the survey (Hopper, 1997).

The most recent change to homeless counts are point-in-time counts, also referred to as homeless counts. In 2005, HUD began mandating that all communities receiving federal funds from the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Grants program conduct point-in-time counts at least every other year (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2011). During these counts, communities are required to identify all the homeless people living in their community, and not just accessing services. These point-in-time counts are conducted through surveys of shelters, housing programs, supportive service agencies, and face-to-face contact in areas where unsheltered people are known to congregate (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011). These counts must also identify if each homeless person is an individual, a member of a family, or an unaccompanied youth, and each person's state of chronic homelessness (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2006). Point-in-time counts occur during the last week of January and many communities conduct them annually instead of biannually

(National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2010). These counts currently provide the best estimate of the national homelessness level; however there are still many inherent flaws with measuring the population this way (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011).

Homeless Count Flaws

One of the specific difficulties with counting those who are homeless is that counts often rely on self-reporting (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011). Many people who are unhoused refuse to identify as such because they fear the stigma of being homeless or mistrust people in authority (Wasserman & Clair, 2009). Additionally, some people who meet the HUD definition of homelessness are not aware that they are homeless, particularly those living doubled up with friends or relatives (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2006). These two groups of people, those who do not want to be counted and those who do not know they qualify as homeless, may be missed during point-in-time.

Another difficulty with homeless counts is the transient lifestyle of the population, particularly those who are unsheltered (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011). If those taking the count miss an area where homeless persons congregate, or if the individuals usually staying in one area are not there at the time of the homeless count, they will not be included in the final number (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2011).

Additionally, during the point-in-time counts, officials include places where large numbers of homeless individuals congregate but are unable to count those who are more spread out and living in areas not meant for human habitation like cars and storage units (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2006).

A final problem with measuring homelessness is the season and time limitations of the count. The season of the count can affect the result, particularly when counting unsheltered

individuals as the amount of people who are unsheltered and homeless drops during the winter when they have found temporary shelter in hotels rooms or with friends (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011). Furthermore, families with children qualify for assistance during the school year that they are unable to access during the summertime months like assistance with hotel bill or rent (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2006). Additionally, the homeless count only measures the number of people experiencing homelessness on that particular day, not the number of people who have experienced it during the past month or year. Despite the limits of point-in-time counts, they remain the best way to understand the scale of homelessness on a daily basis (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2011).

Under-estimation of Homeless Counts

Prior to the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act, the definition homeless did not include persons doubled up in housing or families who were unstably housed for 60 or more days. This new definition took effect on January 1, 2012 and increases the amount of people defined as homeless, but no one is yet sure to what extent (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2012). Many studies on the number of people without homes are limited to counting people living in shelters, on streets, under bridges, and in other homeless camp-type areas (Burt, 2004; Hopper, 1997; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011). Most national estimates on homelessness are dated or based on dated information meaning state and federal aid provided based on these counts may not be adequate (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2009). Most surveys are based on information from service providers. The actual number of homeless people is likely higher than estimates since not all people experiencing homelessness use service providers (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011).

2012 Point-in-time Count

The 2012 point-in-time count measure provided the most recent data available at the time of this research. The 2012 point-in-time counts found 633,782 people were homeless on a single night in the United States. HUD (2012) found that population numbers have declined since 2007 but remained stable from 2011 to 2012. Furthermore, the number of homeless veterans decreased but increases in the amount of homelessness were seen among families. 62% of people identified as homeless were individuals and 38% were families. HUD (2012) also found that about 2/3rd of all persons in this population were sheltered in emergency shelters or transition housing facilities and about 1/3rd were unsheltered. The states of California, New York, Florida, Texas, and Georgia accounted for nearly half of the nation's total number of homeless people. Also, 56.8% of those identified as homeless in Georgia were unsheltered.

This section explored the definition of homelessness through the construct of home, historical ideals of homelessness, and the current federal definition. The measurements of the population were reviewed, including inherent problems with the process. Findings of the 2012 point-in-time count were detailed. The next sections will explore the economic state of homelessness.

Economics of Homelessness

As noted earlier, the state of homelessness is largely addressed as an economic issue. Financial stability increases the ability of a displaced person to find housing. The connection between homelessness and economic issues is explored through both wage and employment. Employment programs targeted toward the population are also detailed.

Homelessness and Wage

The recent economic downturn has given way to high unemployment numbers and lowered wages. Since 2007, as unemployment rates have raised, so have the rates of homelessness (Wasserman & Clair, 2009). The state of homelessness is often seen as a complex and inter-related result of poverty, lack of affordable housing, and changes in the labor market (Hopper, 1997). Declining wages have made affordable housing difficult or impossible for many workers, contributing to the increase in homelessness (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2009).

According to the Economic Policy Institute (2005), most people who are homeless seek employment at jobs that provide minimum wage. Minimum wage, held at \$5.15 per hour from 1996 to 2007, was not enough to support a family of two according to federal poverty standards in 2004 (Chasonov, 2004). The minimum wage rose to \$7.25 per hour in 2007 but a full-time, year round employee making minimum wage still earns less than the 2012 poverty line for a family of two. There has recently been a decline in jobs paying above minimum wage and an expansion of service jobs, temporary employment, and part-time job opportunities. These jobs pay even less than the \$15,080 yearly that a full-time minimum-wage employee earns.

The National Coalition for the Homeless found those living in poverty are often unable to pay for housing, food, child care and medical care (2009). Since such a large part of income is spent on housing, many people are just one paycheck or unexpected event away from homelessness (Nies & McEwan, 2003).

Homelessness and Employment

Those who are homeless and unemployed face multiple barriers to employment (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2011). These barriers can be personal or systemic (National

Coalition for the Homeless, 2009). In terms of personal barriers, people who are homeless often lack social skills needed to compete in the current job market (Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007). Those who are homeless tend to have lower stress management coping skills as well as independent living skills needed for employment (Beck et al., 1997). Furthermore, homeless adults typically have poor education and vocation preparation (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2011). Systemically, people who are homeless are more likely to depend on public transportation and have no financial resources for job preparation needs like uniforms and childcare (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2009). Additionally, homeless people have a lower understanding of information technology and are therefore qualified for fewer jobs than those who are familiar with basic computer programs (Economic Policy Institute, 2005). These limitations have pushed homeless people toward continued unemployment and underemployment (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2009).

Although these barriers seem insurmountable, research consistently shows that with the right supportive services, homeless people want to work and can find employment that provides a living wage (Evans, 1998; Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007; National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011; Theodore, 2000). Often, even those who have been homeless for long periods of time can find sustainable employment with training and support (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2011). One of the current initiatives aimed at employing those who are homeless is employment service programs, detailed in the next section.

Employment service programs. Employment service programs are designed to address a unique set of barriers and priorities for people who are homeless and seeking employment (HUD). These programs have different funding sources, different goals, and work with different

groups of people within the population. These programs developed from and follow homeless legislation and policies.

History. As mentioned above, one of the first attempts at comprehensively counting homeless persons in the United States was the Urban Institute study, conducted in 1987 and released to the public in 1989 (Bur, 1994). The Urban Institute study initiated the first nationwide point-in-time count while all previous population counts were based on samples (Kusmer, 2002). Economic restructuring, corporate downsizing, and rapid technological change were all noted as reasons for job loss amongst displaced persons. Additionally, more restrictive eligibility requirements for welfare and disability benefits, reduction in public benefits, and the lack of mental health care services exacerbated the growth of the population (Shipler, 2005).

In response to the Urban Institute study, Congress passed the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act in 1987 (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2006). This Act was purported to be comprehensive legislation for provisions to meet the needs of homeless persons. It provided provisions and funding for shelter, food, healthcare, mental health care, housing, education, job training and other community services for homeless persons through federal and state government agencies and non-profit organizations. The Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program (JTHDP) was authorized under the McKinney Act to provide direction for job training for all homeless Americans (Shipler, 2005).

A program evaluation of the JTHDP conducted by the Employment and Training Administration in 1988 found that slightly more than one-third of all JTHDP participants were placed in jobs; however certain subpopulations including those with dependent children and those with chronic mental illness found employment at a significantly lower rate than other subpopulations. In terms of job retentions, participants in the JTHDP were substantially more

likely to retain their jobs if they received housing assistance and on-going training after employment (U. S. Department of Labor, 1998a).

Despite the successful findings from the program evaluation, funding for the JTHDP program was repealed in FY1995 due to budgetary constraints (Shipler, 2005). However, Congress indicated that the U.S. Department of Labor use the expertise gained from the JTHDP program to enhance the capacity of employment programs to serve homeless individuals (Foscarinas, 1996). The U.S Department of Labor noted that if homeless persons are to benefit from national employment and training programs, those programs must include specific components to meet their needs. In addition to those no longer receiving assistance through the JTHDP, another group of people seeking employment emerged with the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The federal law mandated a workforce development component to welfare legislation, encouraging employment among the poor receiving welfare assistance (Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007). This affected nearly 12 million Americans on welfare and sent at least 40% of those into the labor market (Tsemberis, 2001).

Building on the recommendations of the Department of Labor, the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) was passed in 1998. It replaced the JTHDP and offers a comprehensive range of workforce development activities through statewide and local organizations. The purpose of these activities is to promote an increase in the employment, job retention, earnings, and occupational skills improvement by participants which will improve the quality of the workforce, reduce welfare dependency, and improve the productivity and competitiveness of the nation (Shipler, 2005). It provides flexibility for state and local officials to use federal job training funds for coordination among adult education and literacy programs, vocation education, vocational rehabilitation, and employment services (U.S. Department of Labor, 1998). While

some supports for homeless employment are provided through the Social Security Administration, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and HUD, the WIA is the only federal program designed specifically for this population (Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007).

Many states have used the WIA funds to specifically address the high rate of unemployment and under-employment among homeless persons. Unfortunately, the transition to WIA has not benefited job seekers with multiple, significant barriers to employment (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2011). The limited skills and education levels of homeless persons usually relegate them to temporary employment at very low wages. HUD has recently decreased its funding of employment assistance through local homeless Continuums of Care in order to provide more permanent housing through housing first model programs (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2006). At the same time, the workforce system decreased its funding of training and intensive services for hard-to-serve populations in order to better serve those who would most likely get employment with the least amount of assistance (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2009). Funding for the WIA program shrank 10.8% between 2002 and 2008 (National Coalition for the Homeless, n.d.). Furthermore, the US Department of Labor discourages WIA funded providers from serving job seeker with multiple barriers to employment, including many persons who are homeless.

As a result of the decreased HUD funding and the lack of WIA assistance for homeless individuals, many homeless service providers are finding alternate funding for specialized employment assistance programs. The types of employment programs are explored in the next section.

Types of employment programs. There are many types of employment programs for people who are homeless. Some programs offer in-house assistance, some refer out to

community supports, and some contract with local area businesses. While employment programs often do not categorize themselves, most follow one of the following models defined by the Department of Labor (Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007).

One-stop career centers. Several communities have developed One-Stop Career centers through their federally funded Workforce Investment Boards under the WIA. These centers exist primarily in urban areas with high numbers of chronic homelessness and are coordinated by each local Department of Labor. One-Stop Career Centers offer a full array of employment services including employability workshops, skills trainings, and education opportunities and are built on the idea that collaboration is required due to the changing financial landscape of homeless assistance (HUD). These centers also tend to be built close to other homeless service providers.

One example of a one-stop career center is the Sullivan Jackson Employment Center (SJEC) in Tucson, Arizona, located less than a block away from Tucson's largest soup kitchen (Pima County Community and Economic Development, n.d.). This program provides shelter for men, women, families, and youth and is funded through federal grants, state grants, and private grants. Once sheltered, clients are enrolled in an intensive two week employability workshop with highly structured full-time soft skills training that simulates workplace expectations. Following the training, an individual case plan is developed for each client that includes self-directed job searches, case management, vocational assessment, and vocational training. The SJEC also provides aftercare support for up to one year after client employment. In 2006, the SJEC had 356 enrollment and 75% found full-time employment while in the program (Pima County Community and Economic Development, n.d.).

The Houston-Galveston Area Council recently built SEARCH, a one-stop career center in its mid-town homeless services building. The SEARCH program offers day shelter, night

shelter, mobile outreach, on-site medical and dental care, adult education courses, and job training. Clients at SEARCH receive individual case management and assessment. SEARCH offers job readiness training, skills training, and employment placement. Clients also receive transportation assistance, meals, computer assistance, and point of contact services like a private voicemail and mailing address. Clients must attend job club meetings and meet with their case managers weekly. In 2011, SEARCH enrolled 331 individuals and 77% of these new enrollments became employed within 12 months (SEARCH Homeless Services, 2011).

Despite the reported success of the SJEC and SEARCH, a recent study had in Oakland, California found a local one-stop career center to have little to no impact on assisting homeless persons with finding employment (Henderson-Frakes, 2004). Another recent evaluation of a one-stop career center in Chicago found that 80% of homeless job seekers were unable to find employment with the services they received (Chicago Coalition for the Homeless, 2005). Additionally, many one-stop career centers report that they are not adequately staffed with people who understand all the resources available to homeless clients, particularly those with disabilities (Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007). Furthermore, several one-stop career centers have noted that the state and federal policies, such as WIA performance measures, actually serve as a disincentive to working with hard-to-serve clients, such as homeless persons (Corcoran & Heflin, 2003). One-stop careers centers who are mandated to find jobs for a specific percentage of their clients each year are more likely to serve clients that will become employed easily and not clients who have major limitations in a variety of area like physical health, education, and technology. As examined above, people who are homeless tend to have multiple barriers to employment and may be less attractive to one-stop agencies that must meet a performance measure.

Day labor and intermittent employment. Some communities provide employment for homeless job seekers through direct job placement only. These agencies are similar to “temp” agencies and connect motivated homeless workers with community employers (Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007). Most of these positions are temporary or part-time, but the day labor model encourages building resumes and making community contacts. Ideal clients for these programs are willing and able to work, have an insignificant criminal history, and have no ongoing major mental or physical health needs (Long & Amendolia, 2003).

An example of a day labor model is Primavera Works in Tucson, AZ is a non-profit staffing agency that provides above-minimum wage, temporary employment options and temp-to-hire opportunities for people who are homeless and unemployed or under-employed (Primavera Foundation, n.d.). Case managers refer clients to other agencies for housing, health needs, food, and laundry but assume all responsibility for employment services. Primavera provides assistance with specialized job assessment, placement and training. They also provide a private voicemail, mailing address, and transportation assistance. Case managers place clients in one of over 50 area businesses including janitorial services, assembly, manufacturing, construction, general labor, data entry, restaurant work, and grounds keeping. Clients receive supportive services such as uniforms, equipment, and transportation passes until they are employed full-time. Primavera Works served about 600 clients in 2010 and the program led to successful full time employment about 50% of those served (Primavera, 2011).

Day labor and intermittent employment programs have been found to play a unique role in addressing the needs of disadvantaged job seekers in a way that one-stop career centers do not. Access to jobs with day labor agencies is less difficult for those with barriers to employment than jobs at one-stop career centers (Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007). Additionally, many homeless

people initially hesitant to enter the workforce are more successful at day labor agencies since the jobs offered do not require long-term commitments (Long & Amendolia, 2003).

Furthermore, day labor agencies are able to serve as a buffer between employers and employees and can address and support workers needing additional social or vocational skills (Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007).

Targeted employment. Another employment program model for homelessness is targeted employment. Rather than trying to match specific clients with specific jobs, these program partner with local agencies to fill multiple skilled labor jobs like metal manufacturing (Long & Amendolia, 2003). These agencies provide specialized training and cover initial costs for tools, uniforms, and equipment. Clients are then placed in the open positions. These programs are part of a federal five-year program through the Department of Labor and HUD to end chronic homelessness (Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007). Work Systems, Inc. in Portland, OR uses a targeted employment model for their WIA funded program. Servicing an area of over 2.2 million people, Work systems Inc. provided assistance to 29, 954 chronically homeless people in 2011. Over 48% of their clients found a job while receiving services and 81% maintained employment for at least 9 months (Finnemore, 2011). While the targeted employment model has not reached it five year conclusion yet, little research exists on the overall success of the model.

This section explored economic issues of homelessness including wage and employment. Programs aimed at aiding the population with employment were explored and detailed. The next section will examine the connection between these employment programs and federal housing initiatives.

Employment Programs and Housing

HUD traditionally began housing assistance to homeless persons through a Continuum of Care (CoC) model in 1994 (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2002). Prior to the CoC model, HUD funds were generally restricted to larger urban areas. A CoC is regional system for helping people who are homeless or at imminent risk of homelessness by providing housing and services to a whole range of needs specific to the population (Burt, 2004). A fully developed CoC offers prevention, outreach and assessment, emergency shelter, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing, and affordable housing. HUD awarded funding to local communities based on the amount of homeless people they had and their ability to serve this population on a continuum. Each community structured their CoC's differently with some offering multiple services in one agency or building and some offering only one specific service at each agency. Additionally, some communities only offered two or three services as opposed to the full continuum (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2002).

HUD (2002) evaluated the CoC model and found several issues with the system. First, many local communities had no formal authority or leadership. This meant that any collaboration was strictly on a voluntary basis which violated the purported use of the funds. Second, every community studied had a lack of affordable housing, a key piece of the continuum. Third, the CoC model worked best in smaller areas where there was a hometown feel rather than larger urban areas. In smaller communities, local businesses and corporations interested were locally based leading to more collaboration with CoC providers. Finally, each community had a varying philosophy of homelessness. Some communities spent most of their money and attention on those who were already homeless, while other communities spent their resources on homeless prevention. While HUD (2002) concluded that more people were

received services through the CoC model than through no model, this evaluation served as a catalyst into looking at another approach toward homelessness.

In 2007, HUD completed an exploratory study on a Housing First approach toward providing permanent support housing to single homeless adults experiencing mental illness and/or substance related disorders (Tsemberis, 2010). The Housing First approach proved the direct placement of homeless people into permanent housing. Supportive services are offered and made readily available, but the program does not require participation in these services for housing (Tsemberis, 2010). The Housing First approach developed in the early 1990's through a private agency in New York as a way to combat homelessness among people with mental illness and substance abuse problems (Tsemberis & Eisenberg, 2000). The original program specified low-demand approach meaning treatment for the mental illness or substance abuse was not a mandatory condition of being allowed to participate (Stein & Santos, 1998). Evaluations of the housing first models in New York increased housing stability (Culhane, Metraux, & Hadley, 2002; Tsemberis & Eisenberg, 2000). The exploratory study by HUD found increased housing stability and decreased frequency and severity of psychiatric symptoms, use of drugs and alcohol, and level of impairment related to substance use. It was recommended that HUD allow for more funding to be used by Housing First models (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2007).

The Housing First model was adopted by HUD in 2011 and funding in the Community Development Block Grants for emergency shelters is now being allocated for housing under this model (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011). Several studies have found that the Housing First approach, when linked with intensive wraparound services including employment programs, can have a housing retention rate as high as 88% over 5 years (Shaheen

& Rio, 2007; Stein & Santos, 1998; Tsemberis & Eisenberg, 2000). Employment programs for homeless persons must be able to demonstrate efficacy both to continue to receive federal HUD funding under the new direction of Housing First, and to provide the best quality services based on the newest research available.

Employment Programs in Athens, GA

This section will detail both homelessness and employment program in Athens, GA. The demographics of Athens are explored and the local data from the 2012 homeless count is presented. A local employment program for the homeless population is specified including history of the program, the current funding, and the delivery of services.

Athens demographics. Athens is a consolidated city-county in northeastern Georgia comprised of the city of Athens and Clarke-County. The city is centered around the University of Georgia and is the 6th largest metropolitan area in the state. Athens lies in the humid subtropical climate zone with hot, humid summers and mild to moderately cold winters. The city has 6 U.S. Highways, an airport, a transit system for both the city and the University campus, and bike lanes on most major roads (Athens-Clarke County Unified Government, n.d.)

As of the 2010 census, Athens has a total population of around 116,000 . The population density is 851.5 people per square mile. Racial make-up of the city is 64.71% white, 27.47% African American, 3.15% Asian, and 4.67% other race or mixed races. In addition to various races, 6.39% of the population is Hispanic or Latino ethnicity. Athens-Clarke County's population is widely spread in age and equal in gender (Center for Agribusiness and Economic Development, 2011).

Homelessness count. The homeless count in Athens, GA dropped for the first time in 2001. A point-in-time count was completed on January 19, 2012 (Northeast Georgia Homeless

Coalition, 2012). Several volunteers and service providers counted the number of homeless people at the area shelters, soup kitchens, and in homeless camps. The number counted was 407, down from over 500 in January of 2011 (Johnson, 2011). While the decrease can be attributed to economic stimulus funds, it should also be noted that two shelters in Athens normally open during January were closed. These shelters together housed around 90 people each night. Also, although the overall number of homeless people declined in 2012, the number of unsheltered people did not. In 2011, there were 226 people who were unsheltered, compared to 224 in 2012 (Northeast Georgia Homeless Coalition, 2012).

Employment program funding. Athens has been allocated new funds over the past from 2009 through 2012 under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery.Gov, 2012). This act was passed as a response to the current economic crisis and the money is being used in Athens to address homelessness (Athens-Clarke County Unified Government, n.d.). This money has been assigned to both homeless prevention programs, like rent and utility assistance, and to Housing First programs through the local community mental health center and three area non-profit agencies.

Job TREC. Job TREC (training, referral, education, and case management) is community outreach program designed to help homeless persons obtain and maintain employment and thereby eliminating major barrier to housing stability. While it does not exactly follow any of the work program models defined by the Department of Labor, it is very similar to the one-stop career model. The long term goal of all Job TREC clients is to be independent housing. In order to be eligible for Job TREC, clients must be willing and able to work and must meet the federal definition of homeless as defined by the HUD.

Job TREC provides services in four main areas: transportation, education, child care, and employment. For transportation services, Job TREC provides clients with a limited number of free transit passes to use the local bus lines and cab vouchers for any employment interviews or jobs that occur beyond one mile of the local bus routes or that occur before or after the bus hours of operation. Job TREC also provides a limited number of bicycles to employed clients. With education services, Job TREC provides referrals to financial aid specialists and high school equivalency classes, assistance and computer space for applying for local schools and financial aid, and limited financial assistance with books and fees. Child care assistance includes full costs of child care including registration for clients with small children. Child care is provided by local day cares and summer camp programs and is provided for the full day, before school care, or after school care as needed. Job TREC's employment assistance includes work supplies, uniforms, eyeglasses, and documents needed for employment like birth certificates and state identification or driver's licenses. Job TREC also provides assistance and computer space for clients to apply for jobs, resume assistance, and referrals to agencies specializing in specific barriers for employment like criminal records or illiteracy. All services are provided based on the availability of funds and the needs of the individual client (Athens Area Homeless Shelter, 2011).

History. Job TREC began in 1994. It was funded through a \$20,000 federal grant and was housed at a technical college on the outskirts of Athens. It remained at the technical college until 1998 when it moved. At the time, Job TREC had less than 10 clients per year and it was believed that the location of the school hindered potential clients from seeking services. Athens Area Homeless Shelter became the new home of Job TREC due to its available office space, central location, and willingness to administer the program. The amount of clients at Job TREC

has continued to grow each year before reaching its peak of over 513 clients in 2010. Federal funding through HUD's Community Block Development Grant was cut following the 2010 fiscal year as HUD began awarding money to Housing First Initiatives over supportive service programs. As a result, the amount of clients served by Job TREC in 2011 decreased to around 200. Job TREC restructured their goals following the decrease in funding and now offers more intensive and targeted case management and follow up services to clients (S. Post, personal communication, July 29, 2012).

Funding. Job TREC is still currently administered through the Athens Area Homeless Shelter. The program is funded through both federal and state grants yearly. One of the grants is awarded annually from January to December and two of the grants follow the fiscal year from July 1 to June 30. The Supportive Housing Program Grant (SHP) is a federal grant administered at a local level through the Human and Economic Development Office (HED) that provides \$100,000 in funding to Job TREC for personnel, client education costs, employment assistance, and childcare. This grant was renewed through July, 2013. The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) is state administered grant funded through HUD for specific communities with a high homeless rate. The CDBG funds to Job TREC are also administered through the HED office and provide the program with \$80,000 for employment assistance and transportation assistance. This grant was not awarded to Job TREC for the 2013 fiscal year and the funding ended July 1, 2012. The Department of Community Affairs provides state funds through the Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESGP) and supplies Job TREC with \$40,000 for child care and transportation assistance. This grant was renewed through December, 2012 (S. Post, personal communication, July 29, 2012).

Service delivery. In order to receive Job TREC services, eligible clients are referred from local shelters, or non-profit agencies that specifically work with homeless individuals. All referrals must provide a verification of homelessness before sending clients to Job TREC. A verification of homelessness is a form developed by Job TREC that states that a person's homelessness has been confirmed by the referring agency and must be signed by a trained agency participant. Each agency has their own methods of verifying homelessness. Both of the shelters that refer to Job TREC verify homelessness when a client spends the night at the shelter. All of the supportive service agencies that refer to Job TREC rely on clients' self-report of homelessness as verification. Clients must be willing and able to work and employable within a short amount of time. This means clients may not be eligible if they are currently using illegal drugs, have violent criminal histories, have active severe mental health needs not currently addressed through medication or treatment, and/or have physical health problems that limit their employability. However, clients that are currently receiving treatment for any of the above conditions can receive Job TREC services (Athens Area Homeless Shelter, 2011).

Clients make initial appointments with the Job TREC case manager. In the initial appointment, clients complete intake paperwork and collaboratively complete an individual case plan with the case manager. Clients are given individual tasks to complete in the first week, like updating their resumes or applying for five jobs, before they are able to access financial services through Job TREC. Beginning the second week, clients are eligible for financial assistance with services like bus passes and checks to attain identification. Clients must meet with the case manager at least weekly. Case management includes review of individual case plan and referrals and disbursements as needed. Job TREC services are terminated when clients complete the program, leave voluntarily, or violate the policies and procedures of the program by missing two

weekly appointments, giving false information about work or employment, selling any items purchased through Job TREC, fail to turn in receipts for Job TREC purchases, or have a primary barrier to housing that is not employment such as mental health needs or drug treatment (Athens Area Homeless Shelter, 2011).

Conclusion

This chapter presented a review of the significant literature on homelessness and its relation to employment. Three online databases were used to provide peer reviewed articles on homelessness, unemployment, underemployment, homeless employment programs, history of homelessness, the concept of home, and homeless employment. Additionally, several books addressing these concepts also supplemented the information in this chapter. Finally, several United States federal agency websites were used to find up-to-date information on the population of homeless Americans including the Office of Housing and Urban Development and Department of Labor. The historical and current definitions of homelessness were examined. Next, the types and ways homeless persons have been measured nationally was reviewed. The relationship between homelessness and both wages and employment was explored. Different types of employment programs for homeless persons were detailed and the relationship between these programs and housing resources was highlighted. Finally, Job TREC, an employment program for homeless persons in Athens, GA was examined. In the next chapter, the methodology of the current study will be explained. The chapter will explain the purpose of the study and detail the research questions and hypotheses.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In the previous chapter, literature was reviewed on homelessness including the historical and current definitions and how homelessness is measured. Additionally, the relationship between homelessness, employment, and wages was explored. Next, employment programs for homeless persons and the federal funding for these programs was reviewed. Finally, the Job TREC employment program for homeless persons in Athens, GA was detailed as the focus of this research project.

This chapter explains the methodology of the study. The purpose of this research was to evaluate the effectiveness of the Job TREC at increasing employment and decreasing the homeless state of their clients. The research questions and hypotheses will be detailed. Research design, variable definition, sampling, and data collection procedure will be explained in the following sections.

Research Questions

In order to continue to receive funding and provide best practices for clients, an evaluation of the Job TREC program is necessary. This section presents three research questions, secondary research questions, and hypotheses. The research questions were designed to determine if Job TREC is effective in increasing employment and decreasing homelessness of clients through a variety of services. Therefore, the research questions and secondary research questions that directed this study were as follows:

- Q1. What are the characteristics of the individuals served by the Job TREC program?

Q2. What factors are associated with the successful employment of Job TREC clients and former clients?

- a) What supportive services were accessed by clients who were able to become successfully employed?
- b) How many supportive services were accessed by clients who were able to become successfully employed?
- c) How often was case management given to clients who were able to become successfully employed?

H1. There is a statistically significant relationship between supportive services and successful employment.

Q3. Did the Job TREC program impact the housing status of clients and former clients?

- a) What was the housing status of clients prior to enrollment in the Job TREC program?
- b) What was the housing status of clients upon discharge from the Job TREC program?

H2. Job TREC's clients' housing status will improve from enrollment to discharge

In summary, the research questions, secondary research questions, and hypotheses were created to evaluate the effectiveness of the Job TREC program at reducing barriers to housing by assisting clients with finding employment at a wage above the federal poverty line. The questions address what types of services were accessed by clients and if there was a relationship between these services and successful employment.

Research Design

Program evaluation is widely used in public, nonprofit, and private organizations for assessing the effectiveness of policies and programs (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006). A truly randomized experimental design is beyond the resources and control required for implementation of this program evaluation. Furthermore, secondary data for the population studied in this research is readily available due to current federal policies. In 2002, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development announced that all HUD funded communities would be required to implement Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) as a standard operating procedure (Georgia Department of Community Affairs, 2004). HMIS is used by policy makers at federal, state, and local levels to obtain information about the extent and nature of homelessness over time. The state of Georgia elected to use Pathways Compass System as their statewide HMIS in 2002 (Pathways Community Network, n.d.). The Pathways Compass System will provide the secondary data.

For research question 2, this study will use a correlational research design to test the statistical relationships between the variables defined later in the chapter (Rubin & Babbie, 2006). This research is an explanatory design model using secondary data to investigate a correlation between multiple variables. For research question 3, the design will be a single group pretest-posttest design to test the relationship between housing status before and after Job TREC program enrollment and discharge (Anastas & MacDonald, 2004). This is a quasi-experimental design. Archival research will be performed for both research questions by analyzing secondary data, or data collected by someone else (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006). These are the most appropriate designs given the research questions and data set detailed in this chapter (Rubin & Babbie, 2010).

Variables

The previous sections detailed the research questions, hypotheses, and research design. This section will operationally define the variables from the research questions. The use of the terms response variable and explanatory variable will also be explained.

As this study is an archival data study, no variables are being manipulated. For this reason, rather than use the terms independent variable as the variable being manipulated, and dependent variable as the variable caused by the independent variable, alternate terminology will be used. Independent variable was replaced with the term explanatory variable and dependent variable was replaced with the term response variable. (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006).

Operationalization of Explanatory Variables

In research question 2, hypothesis 1, the response variable was successful employment. The explanatory variables were client use of the following supportive services: resume assistance, mock interviews, job referrals, computer training, GED preparation, GED attainment, referral to education counseling, financial assistance with school fees, child care, bus passes, cab vouchers, clothing vouchers, eye glasses, bicycle, attainment of identification or license, attainment of birth certificate, budget counseling, housing application assistance, rental assistance, referral to low income housing, and case management. All of the explanatory variables except for case management were dichotomous nominal variables, and categorized as a yes or no for services accessed. Case management was an ordinal examined as a frequency count.

For research question 3, hypothesis 2, the response variable was housing status. The explanatory variable was enrollment and discharge from the Job TREC program. The

explanatory variable was a dichotomous nominal variable and categorized as yes or no for program enrollment and discharge.

Operationalization of Response Variables

The response variable for research question 2 was successful employment. For this study, the definition of successful employment was non-temporary employment earning a wage above the federal poverty level as defined by the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. The chart detailing poverty guidelines can be found in chapter one. The response variable was nominal as clients either did or did not find successful employment.

For research question 3, the response variable was housing status. In the Pathways Compass System detailed later in the chapter, clients are categorized by housing status both at enrollment and at discharge from the Job TREC program. This variable was ordinal and was organized into three categories: 1. Literally homeless meaning unhoused, living in a shelter, or living in a place not meant for human habitation; 2. Imminently homeless meaning eviction within 30 days; 3. Stably housed meaning renting or owning a single family dwelling or space in a multi-family dwelling with or without subsidy or assistance.

Table 3

Summary of Explanatory and Response Variables

<i>Research Question</i>	<i>Hypothesis</i>	<i>Response Variable</i>	<i>Explanatory Variable</i>	<i>Level of Measurement</i>
Q2	H1	Successful employment	Use of supportive services Frequency of case management	Nominal/Nominal Nominal/Ordinal
Q3	H2	Housing Status	Enrollment/discharge from Job TREC program	Ordinal/Nominal

In summary, the response variables and explanatory variables were defined and the levels of measurement were specified. Sampling procedures will be discussed and detailed in the next section.

Data Procedures

The last section operationalized the variables from the research questions. This section will explain the procedures employed in the current research study. Details are given for ethical issues, data collection, and sampling. The data export system used for the data is also described.

Ethical Considerations

Participants of the Job TREC program signed an agreement that their data would be shared with third party groups for research for the purpose of program evaluation. This dissertation research will be conducted in conjunction with the faculty of the University of Georgia School of Social Work. Additionally, this study was reviewed and approved by the University of Georgia's Office for Human Research Protection's Institutional Review Board.

All secondary data used in this study was confidential. To ensure confidentiality, the researchers identifying information was removed from the data by the Job TREC Program Director. Additionally, the data was kept in a secure location.

Job TREC Data

The secondary data was collected from Job TREC case files. As noted in an earlier chapter, Job TREC provides education, training, supportive services and housing assistance services to homeless persons in Athens. To be eligible for services, clients must have been able to prove that they are homeless and be ready, willing, and able to work. Once clients were able to verify that they were homeless and employable, an initial appointment was scheduled with the Job TREC case manager.

In the initial appointment, the Job TREC case manager completed the Job TREC intake with each client, as seen in Appendix. The client intake form first collected basic demographic information on each client including birth date, race, ethnicity, gender, veteran status, pregnancy status, housing status, and status of special needs. Next, the intake form gathered further details on a client's housing status, including zip code of last permanent address, prior night's residence, length of stay in previous night's residence, and status of chronic homelessness defined as being continually homeless for one year or experiencing homelessness four times in three years (Burt, 2004). The next section on the Job TREC intake form garnered information on a client's income including income sources and amounts and non-cash benefit received including benefits from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Medicaid, Medicare, Veterans Administration Services, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Section 8, and the local Housing Authority. The final section of the intake form assessed barriers to housing by collecting details on a client's rental history, eviction history, credit history, criminal history, family composition, physical health, mental health, substance use, domestic violence history, and income related barriers. The intake form was entered into a computer system detailed in the next section. After completion of the Job TREC intake, a second meeting was scheduled to begin case management.

In the second meeting with the Job TREC case manager, the client and case manager worked together to complete a treatment plan. The treatment plan detailed what objectives a client wanted to meet, how those objectives were broken down into goals, and the time period allotted to meet each goal. Additionally, in the second Job TREC meeting, clients began to receive services as needed to meet their specific objectives and goals. These services were divided into three categories. The first category was job training and education services. Services in this category included assistance with creating and editing a resume, participation in

mock interviews, referrals to area jobs, computer training classes, high school equivalency general educational development (GED) preparation classes, financial assistance with testing for the GED, referrals to local educational counseling, and financial assistance with fees or tuition at colleges and technical schools. The second category of services offered by Job TREC was supportive services. These services included financial assistance with child care, bus passes, cab vouchers, vouchers for clothing at local thrift stores, free eye exams and eye glasses at a local eye doctor, financial assistance with attaining an identification card or license, financial assistance with attaining a birth certificate, free bicycles, and case management. The third category of services offered through Job TREC was housing services which included budget counseling and assistance, support with applying for housing, financial assistance towards rent and utilities, and referrals to income-based housing. Each service provided was entered into the Pathways Compass System, detailed in the next section. After the second case management appointment, clients returned to Job TREC for further services as detailed in their individual treatment plan. Services provided in any subsequent Job TREC appointments were recorded in the Pathways Compass System. Additionally, any employment attained and income earned while enrolled in the Job TREC program was tracked in the Pathways Compass System (Athens Area Homeless Shelter, 2011).

Pathways Compass System. Pathways Community Network (PCN) is a nonprofit organization that assists human service providers with working collaboratively with other providers in each community (Pathways Community Network, n.d.). Founded in 1995 in metropolitan Atlanta, PCN aims to help people in need of human services connect to those services while ensuring that those services are appropriate, effective, and able to be evaluated. To achieve these goals, PCN developed and implemented Pathways Compass System in 1999.

The Pathways Compass System is community information sharing system that connects more than 400 public and private human service organizations in seven states.

Pathways Community Network provides direct administration and technical support of the Pathways Compass System and develops new functions and modifications as needed. The Department of Community Affairs liaises between PCN and human service providers to ensure adherence to HUD standards, develop statewide policies, and provide reports and data to agencies. Agencies obtain client consent, enter and update client data, and adhere to privacy and security policies. Additionally, each user from each agency must new user training, confidentiality and ethics training, and other trainings as needed for data entry and reports (Georgia Department of Community Affairs, 2004).

Essentially, Pathways Compass System is online system that allows the management of client records beyond traditional paper files. Agency information is always available to other agencies within the network while client information can be shared between agencies or restricted only to Pathways Compass users within the agency and HUD. Navigation of the Pathways Compass system allows access to general client information as well as any services provided to clients, and change in housing or employment status. The data can be exported through a report setting to appear in an Excel file. The Excel file can be manipulated through normal program functions to allow for a variety of data analysis as needed.

In summary, the data collection procedures of the Job TREC data were defined. This is the source data that was used in the archival research for this study. The information and services tracked in the data were detailed. The Pathways Compass System was explained. In the next section, the variables used in this study will be operationally defined.

Sampling Framework

The sampling procedure used in the research was purposive sampling of archival data. The Job TREC Program Director completed a data export of client records for all Job TREC clients enrolled in the program between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2011. These records included client demographics, program attendance, services accessed, dates of enrollment and discharge, and changes in employment, income, and housing status at enrollment and discharge. Once identifying information was removed, the data was given to the researcher in an Excel file format.

The anticipated size of the population was 900 records based on the amount of Job TREC client enrolled in the program in the five year period specified. From all the records in the population, the researcher randomly selected 300 cases for data analysis. This sample size was chosen as it allowed for a 5% precision level meaning the sampling error, or difference between the sample and the real population, is plus or minus 5% (Royse, Thyer, Padgett, & Logan, 2006). Additionally, a sample of this size assumed a 95% confidence level that presumed that if this population were sampled 100 times in the same manner, 95 of these samples would have the population value within the range of precision specified above. Finally, this sample size allowed for a high degree of variability within each measure to obtain a precision level of 5%. The variability level of each variable cannot be estimated for this study, therefore the sample size allowed for a degree of variability of 50% (Sudman, 1976). In conclusion, a sample size of 277 cases was the appropriate sample with a 5% margin of error and 95% confidence level, assuming a population proportion of 50% (Royse et al, 2006.)

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The inclusion criteria for this sample was clients who were admitted into the Job TREC program, accessed at least one service through Job TREC, and attended case management appointments at least two times with Job TREC. Any clients who met the inclusion criteria but are currently enrolled in Job TREC were excluded from the sample. The inclusion criteria were set so that the data analysis results would not be skewed by clients who attended an initial appointment but did not receive services due to ineligibility or failure to attend follow-up appointments. The exclusion criterion was set as clients currently enrolled and accessing services through Job TREC were not currently representative of the relationship between Job TREC services and employment.

Data Collection

As noted earlier, data was collected from secondary archival records. Prior to enrollment in the Job TREC, participants signed a release of information statement concerning data to be used for program evaluation. Information was collected on all Job TREC participants and entered into the Pathways Compass System. The Job TREC Program Director completed a data export of all Job TREC clients enrolled between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2011. After removing all currently enrolled clients from the data set, the Job TREC Program Director removed names and social security numbers. The data set was given to the researcher. The information in the data set included basic demographics, all services accessed by clients, and changes in employment status while enrolled in the Job TREC program.

Conclusion

This chapter addressed the methodology of the study. The purpose of this research was to evaluate if the Job TREC program is effective at increasing employment of clients and

decreasing barriers to housing. To measure this, the research questions and hypotheses were detailed. The research design was explicated and the explanatory and response variable were articulated. The procedures for sampling and data collection were explained. In the next chapter, the findings of the research study will be presented.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

The previous chapter detailed the methodology of the current study. The research design variable definition, sampling, and data collection procedures were explained. Job TREC was described and the Pathways Compass HMIS system was detailed.

This chapter presents the findings of the research questions. The research questions were designed to determine if the Job TREC program is effective at increasing employment and decreasing homelessness. The three research questions are:

1. What are the characteristics of individuals served by the Job TREC program?
2. What factors are associated with the successful employment of Job TREC clients?
3. Did the Job TREC program impact the housing status of clients and former clients?

The data to answer each of the aforementioned research questions will be presented in the following section. Tables will be provided to enhance the understanding of the data.

Research Question One

This section will report the findings of research question one. The first research question is: What are the characteristics of individuals served by the Job TREC program? The participants' age, gender, marital status, veteran status, race, ethnicity, special needs, and relationship in the household are discussed. Next the participants' housing status is detailed including status before entering Job TREC and after leaving the program. Finally, the services accessed by participants are examined.

Of the 300 participants, 36% were female and 64% were male. The age range of the participants was 18 to 65 and the average age was 40. The majority of participants identified themselves as either Caucasian/White (48%) or African-American/Black (48%), and only 1% self-reported Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity. Most participants were single (59%) or married (21%). Only 9% of the participants identified themselves as veterans. 40% of the participants reported a special need meaning they identified as having or needing treatment for mental health and/or substance abuse. 95% of the sample identified themselves as the head of household. See Table 4.

Table 4

Demographic Characteristics

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Female	107	35.7
Male	193	64.3
Race		
American-Indian/Alaskan	3	1
Asian	1	.3
Black/African American	145	48.3
Other race or multi-race	8	2.7
White	143	47.7
Marital Status		
Divorced	62	20.7
Married	20	6.7
Separated	30	10
Single	179	59.6
Widow	4	1.3
Refused to Answer	5	1.7
Veteran Status		
Yes	28	9.3
No	272	90.7

Special Needs		
Yes	120	40
No	180	60

Most of the participants self-identified as literally homeless (98.7%). Participant's prior night's residences were varied and detailed in Table 5, as was the length of time spent homeless.

Table 5

Housing Demographics

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Prior Night's Residence		
Emergency shelter	107	35.7
Hotel or Motel	1	.3
Place not meant for human habitation	77	25.7
Rental, no ongoing subsidy	1	.3
Rental with subsidy	1	.3
Staying with family	4	1.3
Staying with friend	2	.7
Transitional housing	12	4
Other	3	1
Length of Time Homeless		
One week or less	113	37.7
More than one week, less than one month	98	32.7
One to three months	42	14
More than three months, less than one year	37	12.3
One year or longer	8	2.7
Don't know	2	.7

The average length of stay in the program was 65.63 days (SD=35.87, range 15-274 days).

81% of participants were exited from the program due to lack of compliance with program rules and over 7% of participants disappeared. The destination for the participants was diverse and is

detailed in Table 6. The housing status for participants, or whether they were stably housed, imminently at risk of homelessness, or literally homeless after exiting the program is detailed in research question three.

Table 6

Participant Exit Characteristics

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Reason for leaving		
Completed program	8	2.7
Housing opportunity prior to completion of program	2	.7
Needs outside of program parameters	5	1.7
*Noncompliance with program	243	81
Reached maximum time allowed in program	20	6.7
Unknown/Disappeared	22	7.3
Destination		
Emergency shelter	5	1.6
Rental by client, without subsidy	108	36
Rental by client, with subsidy	3	1
Permanent supportive housing	5	1.7
Place not meant for human habitation	19	6.3
Staying with family	2	.7
Staying with friend	1	.3
Unknown	6	2
Transitional housing	145	48.4
Other (jail, deceased, substance abuse facility)	6	2

*It is important to note that success in this program evaluation (successful employment) is different from reason from leaving program as defined by Job TREC.

There are a variety of supportive services offered by Job TREC. Each service is listed in Table 7 with the amount of participants who utilized it. The most common services accessed were bus passes, accessed by 291 participants (97%) and job referrals used by 265 participants (88.3%). Assistance with housing application was accessed by the least amount of participants

just 14 (4.7 %). The average number of services accessed by each participant was 6.4 (SD=3.45). The average number of case management appointments attended by participants was 9.43 (SD=4.944, range of 2-38).

Table 7

Service Utilization

Service	Frequency	Percentage
Childcare voucher	35	11.7
GED preparation assistance	76	25.3
GED test fee assistance	76	25.3
Assistance obtain birth certificate/ID	226	75.3
Education counseling referral	29	9.7
Education fee assistance	35	11.7
Computer training	56	18.7
Resume assistance	71	23.7
Mock interviews	68	22.7
Eye exam/eyeglass voucher	31	10.3
Clothing voucher	188	62.7
Cab voucher	64	21.3
Bus pass	291	97
Free bicycle	35	11.7
Job referral	265	88.3
Referral to low-income housing	39	13

Housing application assistance	14	4.7
Rent assistance	26	8.7
Budget counseling	26	8.7

In conclusion, the findings of research question one were reported. The demographics of the participants in the Job TREC program were described. Participants were mostly male, mostly White or Black/African American. The average age of the participants was 40 years old. All participants were literally homeless and prior nights' residence was diverse. The average length of stay in the program was 65.3 days and the majority of clients left the program due to noncompliance with program rules. Almost every participant accessed a bus pass and job referral and the utilization of other supportive services varied. The next section will report findings for research question two.

Research Question Two

This section will report the findings of research question two. Research question two seeks to determine effectiveness of Job TREC supportive services. The second research question is: What factors are associated with the successful employment of Job TREC clients? To help determine the success of the program, research question two had three secondary questions:

- a) What supportive services were accessed by clients who were able to become successfully employed?
- b) How many supportive services were accessed by clients who were able to become successfully employed?
- c) How often was case management given to clients who were able to become successfully employed?

The hypothesis for research question two is that there is a statistically significant relationship between supportive services and successful employment.

Secondary Research Question One

The first secondary research question for research question two is: what supportive services were accessed by clients who were able to become successfully employed? 147 clients were successfully employed at a wage above the federal poverty level when they exited the Job TREC program. The demographics of the subset were very similar to the demographics of the sample. Of this subset, 60% were male and 40% were female. The age range of the participants was 19 to 61 and the average age was 40. The majority of participants identified themselves as either Caucasian/White (48%) or African-American/Black (48%). Most participants were single (66%) or divorced (18%). Only 10% of the participants identified themselves as veterans. 41% of the participants reported a special need meaning they identified as having or needing treatment for mental health and/or substance abuse. 96% of the sample identified themselves as the head of household. As with the whole sample of participants, most participants of this subset of the successfully employed accessed bus passes (98.6%) and job referrals (88.4%). The supportive services utilized by successfully employed clients are detailed by a frequency count in Table 8.

Table 8

Services Accessed by Employed Participants

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Childcare voucher	19	29.7
GED preparation assistance	39	26.5
GED test fee assistance	34	23.1

Assistance obtain birth certificate/ID	111	75.5
Education counseling referral	12	8.2
Education fee assistance	16	10.9
Computer training	26	17.7
Resume assistance	35	23.8
Mock interviews	34	23.1
Eye exam/eyeglass voucher	15	10.2
Clothing voucher	89	60.5
Cab voucher	36	24.5
Bus pass	145	98.6
Free bicycle	24	16.3
Job referral	130	88.4
Referral to low-income housing	22	15
Housing application assistance	9	6.1
Rent assistance	15	10.2
Budget counseling	19	12.9

The most notable differences between services accessed by successfully employed Job TREC participants and services utilized by the whole sample were: childcare vouchers used by 11.7% of the entire sample but 29.7% of successfully employed participants. Also, a free bicycle was accessed by 11.7% of entire sample but 16.3% of successfully employed participants. However, a Chi Square Test of Association shows that there is no statistically significant association between childcare vouchers and successful employment, $\chi^2(1)=.443, p=.506$. Similarly, a Chi

Square Test of Association between access of a free bicycle shows no statistically significant association between the two variable, $\chi^2(1)=1.33, p>.05$. In conclusion, these differences are not statistically significant.

Secondary Research Question Two

The second secondary research question for research question two is: How many supportive services were accessed by clients who were able to become successfully employed? The average number of services accessed by clients who became successfully employed was 5.59 (SD=2.08) and the average number of services accessed by participants who did not become successfully employed was 5.61 (SD=1.86). A *t*-test of the mean number of services accessed by participants who became successfully employed and participants who did not failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference, $t(298)=.07, p>.05$. In conclusion, more services were accessed by participants who did not become successfully employed; however, the difference was not statistically significant.

Secondary Research Question Three

The third secondary research question for research question two is: How often was case management given to clients who were able to become successfully employed? The average number of case management appointments attended by clients who became employed was 9.83 (SD=5.133). The average number of case management appointments accessed by participants who did not become successfully employed was 9.05 (SD=4.74). A *t*-test between the mean number of case management appointments attended by participants who became successfully employed and participants who did not failed to reveal a statistically reliable difference, $t(298)=1.375, p>.05$. In conclusion, participants of the program who became employed attended more

case management appointment than those who did not become employed; however, the difference is not statistically significant.

Hypothesis One

The hypothesis for research question two is: there is a statistically significant relationship between supportive services and successful employment (Pearson Correlation, significant at the .05 level).

Results. All supportive services were correlated with the variable successful employment at exit. No significant correlations were found. This means there is a weak relationship between each of the nineteen supportive services offered by Job TREC and successful employment of Job TREC participants. All Pearson r numbers were close to 0 meaning that they are not strongly correlated. The strongest correlations were found between successful employment and bus passes ($r=.094$) and successful employment and budget counseling ($r=.096$) however these correlations are still very weak and not significant at any level. In conclusion, there is no statistically significant relationship between supportive services and successful employment which failed to reject the null hypothesis. The next section will report the findings for research question three.

Research Question Three

The third research question sought to determine the effect of Job TREC on participants housing status. Research question three for this study is: Did the Job TREC program impact the housing status of clients and former clients? To answer this question, two secondary research questions are used:

- a) What was the housing status of clients prior to enrollment in the Job TREC program?

- b) What was the housing status of clients upon discharge from the Job TREC program?

Participants housing status both prior to entering Job TREC and upon exit from the program was divided into one of three categories: 1. Literally homeless, 2. Imminently at risk of homelessness, and 3. Stably housed. The hypothesis for research question three is Job TREC's clients' housing status will improve from enrollment to discharge.

Secondary Research Question One

The first secondary research question for research question three is used to determine the housing status of clients prior to enrollment in the Job TREC program. Most participants identified themselves as literally homeless meaning they currently stayed in a shelter, place not meant for human habitation, or transitional housing program. Participants staying with a friend or family member or renting an apartment with or without a subsidy but expected to be evicted formally or informally within 30 days were classified as imminently at risk of homelessness. Clients renting an apartment or room and not expected to face eviction within 30 days were classified as stably housed. See Table 9 for frequency count.

Table 9

Housing Status at Entry

Housing Status	Frequency	Percentage
Literally homeless	296	98.7
Imminently at risk of homelessness	2	.7
Stably housed	2	.7

Secondary Research Question Two

The second secondary research question for research question three is used to determine the housing status of clients after discharge from the Job TREC program. Participants who identified themselves as literally homeless were currently stayed in a shelter, place not meant for human habitation, or transitional housing program. Participants staying with a friend or family member or renting an apartment with or without a subsidy but expected to be evicted formally or informally within 30 days were classified as imminently at risk of homelessness. Clients renting an apartment or room and not expected to face eviction within 30 days were classified as stably housed. See Table 10 for frequency count.

Table 10

Housing Status at Exit

Housing Status	Frequency	Percentage
Literally homeless	41	13.7
Imminently at risk of homelessness	16	5.3
Stably housed	243	81

Hypothesis Two

The hypothesis for research question three is Job TREC's clients' housing status will improve from enrollment to discharge (one-tailed, paired t-test, alpha .05).

Results. A paired-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate whether there was a statistically significant improvement in participants' housing status as measured at enrollment in and exit from Job TREC program. The findings indicate that the results are significantly

different, $t = -39.9, p < .000$. There is a statistically significant difference between housing status of Job TREC participants prior to enrollment and upon discharge. Participants in the Job TREC program had an improvement in housing at a statistically significant rate between entry into the program and exit. In conclusion, Job TREC participants housing status significantly improved.

Summary of Significant Findings

This research sought to determine the effectiveness of the Job TREC program by determining the characteristics of participants served, the supportive services that impact successful employment, and impact of the program on housing status. Participants in the sample and subset of the sample were mostly male and were predominately White or Black/African American. The average age of the participants was 40 years old. Most participants were literally homeless and prior nights' residence was diverse. The average length of stay in the program was 65.3 days and the majority of clients left the program due to noncompliance with program rules. Almost every participant accessed a bus pass and job referral and the utilization of other supportive services varied. Most participants who became successfully employed accessed bus passes and job referrals, and successfully employed participants were more likely to access child care vouchers and bicycles than other participants. Participants who were successfully employed accessed a lower number of services than other participants but both groups averaged a little over nine case management appointments while in the program. There was no statistically significant relationship between any supportive service and successful employment. However, client housing status significantly improved between enrollment in and exit from the Job TREC program. The results will be further discussed in the final chapter. Additionally, areas of future research and the need to re-examine Job TREC's efficacy will be discussed.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Homelessness is a serious problem that affects people of all ages, races, ethnicities, and geographies. Over the course of a year, the odds of a person in the general population becoming displaced are 1 in 194. The odds increase greatly for people recently discharged from jail or prison, aged out of foster care, or live in poverty (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011). The most common cited reason for homelessness is inability to afford housing, which directly ties to increasing unemployment and underemployment rates (NAEH, 2012a; National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2011; Economic Policy Institute, 2005; Burt, 1991).

Job TREC seeks to increase the employability of clients through supportive services and thus eliminate barriers to stable housing. Job TREC is funded the Supportive Housing Grant and Emergency Shelter Grant. Prior to the 2013 fiscal year, Job TREC also received funding through the Community Development Block Grant for communities with high homeless rates. Job TREC estimates that over 2,000 clients have been served since the inception of the program in 1994. Over the past five years, Job TREC has served around 900 clients.

The purpose of this study was to describe and examine effectiveness of the Job TREC program and services in terms of assisting clients with finding employment at a wage above the federal poverty level. The research questions sought to describe characteristics of the participants, determine what supportive services offered by the program were related to successful employment, and evaluate the effect of the program on participants housing status.

Unfortunately, the findings of this study suggest that the supportive services offered by Job TREC have no relationship to participant employment. However, participants housing status was shown to improve between enrollment and discharge in the program.

The following sections will discuss concerns raised over this course of this research including needed supplemental data, participant characteristics, the relationship between supplemental services, and recent changes to the Job TREC program. Next, the limitations of the study will be discussed. Finally, suggestions for futures research will be explored.

Supplemental Data Needed

This research was completed using secondary data. The data was collected by the Job TREC case manager in accordance with HUD standards and tracked through the Pathways Community Network. Although the data collected met standards set by HUD, further information in several key areas would have enhanced this research and could improve HUD base of knowledge on the population.

Data is taken on Job TREC participants marital status (single, married, widowed, and divorces) and relationship in the household (head-of-household, parent, spouse, partner, sibling, child, other), however, no specific data is taken on whether the person is a member of a homeless family. While assumptions could be made that a person is a member of a homeless family if they identify as partner, spouse, child, or sibling, head-of-household could describe a member of a homeless family or a single individual. Additionally, a person who identifies as married may or may not be unhoused with their spouse. Similarly, a person may identify as single because they are not married, however, they may be homeless with a partner and/or children. HUD (2012) is attempting to count homeless families through point-in-time counts, but crucial

opportunity to identify the actual number of homeless families is missing through service providers that only gather information on marital status and relationship in household.

In addition to marital status and relationship in household, supplemental data is needed on Job TREC's supportive services. All of the Job TREC supportive services, except for case management appointments, are measured nominally as yes, a service was provided, or no, a service was not provided. While this is appropriate for some of the services, like eye exam referral and free bicycle, others would benefit from further information like frequency counts. For example, the data for bus pass, only shows whether or not a bus pass was given, not how many were given over the course of a participant's time in the program. Bus passes are given for ten rides, but the average amount of time each participant spent in Job TREC is 63 days, meaning they likely needed more than one bus pass. This also applies to cab vouchers, clothing vouchers, job referrals, and mock interviews. For childcare vouchers, information is needed on both the number of children served by the vouchers and the length of time each child was served. Childcare has been shown to be a hindrance to employment, particularly to impoverished persons, so to study the actual impact of child care assistance more information is needed (Beck et al., 1997; National Coalition for the Homeless, 2009; Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007; Theodore, 2000).

In addition to frequency counts, data is needed on the necessity of supportive services. The data shows how many participants accessed GED preparation and GED testing fee assistance, but it is not known how many of the participants actually needed assistance in either of these areas. The same information is needed for education counseling referrals and education fee assistance. It is impossible to study these variables accurately without first ascertaining whether they were needed for individual participants.

Another variable that would have benefited from additional information is special needs. The current data set included nominal data on whether a client had special needs or not. Special needs include a history of mental illness, a history of substance abuse, a history of domestic violence, or current struggles in any of those areas. Additionally, "special needs" also includes physical disabilities. Specific data is needed on what special need participants self-report as to accurately examine the impact of special needs on supportive services accessed and successful employment. With the current information available only at the nominal level, it is impossible to determine what effect, if any, special needs has on employment and homelessness in the Job TREC program.

Finally, information on successful employment was gathered on a nominal level but the types of employment and wage were not specified. This means all clients with any employment were classified as successfully employed with an income above the federal poverty level. This may not be true. As established earlier, most people who are homeless seek employment at jobs that provide minimum wage (Economic Policy Institute, 2005). Any Job TREC participants making minimum wage but providing for more than themselves are not earning above the federal poverty level. Furthermore, any participants who found employment in temporary employment agencies or at a part-time level likely earns even less yearly than federal poverty line minimum of \$11,170 for one person (Wasserman & Clair, 2009). In addition, it is estimated that most people who are impoverished, including the unhoused, find employment in the service industry or at temporary employment agencies (Economic Policy Institute, 2005). Without data to support or oppose this finding, it is impossible to describe accurately where this population is finding employment in Athens. Knowing where participants find employment and what wage

can be expected could allow the Job TREC program to target job referrals and build relationships with employers in the community.

In conclusion, while the data provided a rich number of variables for study, more information would have enhanced both the current study, and future studies by HUD. The standards set by HUD for gathering clients' data may be adequate for determining basic client information; it is insufficient for determining family demographics and the impact of supportive services on successful employment. Additionally, more information on employment and wage could allow the Job TREC program to focus efforts on specific industries in the community.

Participant Characteristics

On examining the demographic characteristics of the sample, the basic demographics are similar to those found in the 2012 point-in-time counts (HUD, 2012). The supportive services utilized by most participants were assistance obtaining birth certificate or identification, clothing vouchers, and bus passes. Previous literature found that transportation, clothing, and basic documentation are major barriers to employment for the unhoused population (Baggerly & Zalaquett, 2006; Beck et al, 1997; Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007; Marrone, 2005; Theodore, 2000). However, very few participants accessed other transportation assistance services including free bicycle and cab vouchers. While transportation assistance was apparently a need for over 97% of participants, most appeared to choose the bus over other methods. Urban planners investigating the "spatial mismatch" for low-income commuters traveling between inner-city areas and suburban job markets have conducted research on the mobility of disadvantaged populations (Lang, 1999). While Athens does not have traditional inner city and suburban areas, the geography of the city is diverse with a large central business area and smaller business hubs on both the east and west sides of town. With both the spread layout of the city and the expense

of cab fare, Job TREC participants may elect to use the bus over bicycles and cabs for physical and/or financial reasons.

Additionally, the majority of the sample used job referrals. This is not surprising given the goal of the Job TREC program and the findings of previous literature on the use of job referrals to assist homeless clients with finding employment (Becker et al., 2001; Marrone, 2005; Radey & Wilkins, 2011; Theodore, 2000). However, there is no data on the amount of job referrals given to each participant or the success rate. Furthermore, previous literature did not specify the nature of the job referrals. Job referrals could mean that the Job TREC case manager reviewed job openings at several local businesses and targeted specific opportunities for a participant's strengths. At the same time, job referrals could just reference the Job TREC case manager informing a participant that a specific place advertised for an opening. While the majority of successfully employed participants accessed job referrals, it is unknown what the actual ratio of success or how many referrals it took on average before a participant was able to find a job.

In conclusion, the basic demographics of the sample are similar to those in the population as found in most current point-in-time counts (HUD, 2012). Most participants in the program accessed transportation assistance through bus passes. It is of note that other transportation assistance was available but not utilized by participants. Additionally, most participants in Job TREC accessed job referral services. However, more information is needed to determine the amount of referrals made per client and the success rate of this service.

Correlation of Supportive Services

While there was no correlation, and therefore, no relationship between the different supportive services and successful employment, there were correlations between supportive

services themselves. The researcher conducted a Pearson Correlation between each of the supportive services. The researcher found several to be significant at the .05 level (2-tailed) and found some to be significant at the .01 level (2-tailed). Each of the statistically significant correlations will be discussed below.

There was a statistically significant relationship between GED preparation and GED test fee assistance ($r=.844$, significant at the .01 level). On the surface, the relationship is reasonable, as participants without a GED would likely need both preparation assistance and support with the testing fees. However, this correlation shows not only that the same clients needed both services, but also accessed both services. This finding supports Job TREC's goal of eliminating educational barriers to housing and suggests that are receiving wrap-around services in this particular area.

Similar to the correlation between GED variables, there was a strong positive correlation between education counseling referrals and education fee assistance ($r=.760$, significant at the .01 level). Participants who needed education counseling also likely needed assistance with education fees. However, this correlation also shows not only that the same clients needed both services, but also accessed both services. This finding further supports the elimination of educational barriers to housing through Job TREC services.

There was also a correlation between both GED test fees assistance and assistance with education fees ($r=.123$, significant at the .05 level). This correlation shows a relationship between the need for financial assistance in two area of education. The researcher postulates that this correlation shows that some participants in Job TREC specifically seek education help and not just assistance with employment.

There was a strong positive correlation between computer training and resume assistance ($r=.659$, significant at the .01 level), computer training and mock interviews ($r=.640$, significant at the .01 level), and resume assistance and mock interviews ($r=.710$, significant at the .01 level). These findings show that participants who received one of these support services also likely received the other two. All three of these supportive services are basic employment needs for the homeless population (Beck et al, 1997; Long, Rio, & Rosen, 2007; Radey & Wilkins, 2011). The relationship between these variables in the current study suggest participants who need access to one of these services, likely need access to the other two as well. These results can support Job TRECs assertion of their ability to provide wrap-around employment services to Housing First housing providers.

There were statistically significant correlations between job referrals and resume assistance ($r=.202$, significant at the .01 level) and job referrals and mock interviews ($r=.197$, significant at the .01 level). This means there was a relationship between the variables. As noted above, a majority of participants received job referrals. Furthermore, computer training and mock interviews were highly correlated with each other. However, each of these variables is specifically related employment in a very direct way. The relationship between these variables corroborates the focus of wrap around services offered by the program.

There was a strong negative correlation between rent assistance and job referrals ($r= -.405$, significant at the .01 level) meaning clients who received rent assistance were not likely to receive job referrals. There was also a strong negative correlation between rent assistance and case management appointment ($r=-.350$ significant at the .01 level) suggesting that clients who received rent assistance had fewer case management appoints than other participants. Rent assistance was accessed by very few participants in the sample ($n=15$) so it is surprising that it

was so highly correlated with variables in the data set. While every participant in Job TREC was unemployed at entry, 38 participants had some sort of unspecified income source that could be Social Security, Social Security Disability, or unemployment benefits. All of the participants who received rent assistance were in the subset of the sample that had income at entry. This suggests that the participants came to Job TREC specifically seeking assistance with rent and not assistance finding employment. Additionally, the Job TREC program expects participants to meet with the case manager weekly so the negative correlation between case management appointments and rent assistance suggests that clients who received rent assistance were in the program for a shorter amount of time than other participants. The subset of participants who received rent assistance could have just needed assistance with initial fees for housing with the other income used for monthly rent. Additionally, these participants may have not intended to seek employment but needed other supportive services from Job TREC for daily living.

In conclusion, several supportive services offered by Job TREC correlated with each other. There was a strong positive relationship between several of the education related variables and fee related variables. Additionally, variables targeted toward immediate employment strongly positively correlated with each other. There were also strong negative correlations between rent assistance and job referrals and rent assistance and case management appoints. The researcher explored possible reasons for these correlations.

Current Changes to Job TREC Program

As noted in a previous section, funding for the Job TREC program has recently changed. HUD discontinued the CDBG grant, previously awarded to communities with a high rate of homelessness, in the 2013 fiscal year beginning January 1, 2013. This grant previously provided Job TREC with \$80,000. Additionally, in 2012, HUD changed the definition of homelessness to

include person's living in doubled up situations. The federal definition of homeless encompasses more people in Athens and more people qualify for services through Job TREC. This meant that changes had to occur in the Job TREC program to allow the program to serve more clients with less money. Several changes were made beginning July 1, 2012.

The first significant change made in the Job TREC program recently was the inclusion criteria for enrollment that all clients must be employable and willing to work. According to Shea Post, the Executive Director at Athens Area Homeless Shelter, the Job TREC program was originally designed with this criteria, however, it was not being enforced (S. Post, personal communication, July 29, 2012). Prior to July 1, 2012, Job TREC program accepted any person in Athens who could provide documentation proving their homelessness. With the new guidelines, potential clients must be employable. This means that Job TREC refers clients who have violent criminal histories that would make employment difficult to other programs. Additionally, the program categorizes potential participants who need immediate assistance with mental health needs or substance abuse as likely not employable and referred to other programs. Finally, clients who receive financial assistance through Social Security Disability (SSDI) may or may not be employable. SSDI only allows people receiving the benefit to earn a certain level of income through employment and still receive benefits. Job TREC now evaluates potential participants who receive SSDI to determine if they can work and may be accepted or denied from the program.

The second significant change in Job TREC are the limitations for the amount of time a participant can enroll in the program, the amount of time a participant can be enrolled, and the length of time between enrollments. Prior to the new policies at Job TREC, participants could enroll an unlimited number of times and at any given time. Additionally, participants could

enroll in the program indefinitely. The new parameters to enrollment are a lifetime maximum of three separate occasions and they must wait a minimum of 60 days between each enrollment. Furthermore, services are limited to a six month period. These changes were made for several reasons. First, time limited services promote self-sufficiency (Beck et al., 1997). If a participant enters the program knowing that the supports they receive are limited to a deadline, the revisers to the policy believed that participants would be more likely to find employment quickly and use the supportive services efficiently. In addition, time limited services further ensures that clients who seek entry into the program are actually willing and able to work. The Executive Director and Board of Directors at Athens Area Homeless Shelter feared that the Job TREC program had become no more than a place to receive free bus passes. By limiting the length of services and the lifetime total of enrollments, the Job TREC program can ensure that participants use services with the specific intent of employment. Furthermore, the Job TREC program is unable to demonstrate accurate success or failure of the program without time parameters. If participants are not limited to a specific length of enrollment or a lifetime total of enrollments, it is feasible that participants could potentially stay in the program indefinitely to continue to receive services like transportation assistance and rent assistance. Finally, the new policy changes to length of enrollment and total number of enrollments will potentially allow Job TREC to serve a greater number of clients overall at less cost with targeted services (S. Post, personal communication, July 29, 2012).

The final significant change to the Job TREC program is that clients are not eligible for any services until they have attended at least two case management appointments. As stated above, there was concern that the Job TREC program did little more than provide free transportation assistance. As the goal of the program is eliminating barriers to housing through

employment, transportation assistance is just a small part of what Job TREC actually provides to clients. By forcing compelling clients to establish to immediate case plans and to demonstrate their commitment to follow case plans with at least two case management appointment, the program is better able to ensure that the services will be accessed by clients who are ready, willing, and able to find employment. Additionally, this allows the Job TREC case manager to immediately assess client needs, define realistic expectations, and target specific services to these needs and expectations as recommended by Best Practices Guide detailed in Chapter One (Beck et al., 1997).

In conclusion, the Job TREC program recently made several changes to the enrollment and service policies. These changes align with several of the recommendations of the Best Practices Guide for employment and training agencies to deliver effective training, placement, and job retention services to homeless clients (Beck et al., 1997). Both the increased amount of persons eligible for Job TREC services and the decreased funding resulted in these changes. These new policies may affect future findings on the relationship between Job TREC supportive services and successful employment but it is too early to tell.

Limitations of Current Study

As noted in the results section of this research, there was no relationship between supportive services accessed by Job TREC participants and successful employment. However, the housing status of participants showed a statistically significant improvement between enrollment and discharge. There are some limitations to the study that future researchers must examine. The following section discussed the theoretical and practical limitations of the study.

One limitation of this study is the actual data. This research used secondary data gathered by the Job TREC case manager under the standards set by HUD. Secondary data has

some natural threats to reliability. As the researcher did not gather the data, the researcher cannot guarantee that the information is completely accurate. Since the data is archival, the researcher is unable to account for sources of error or bias. Furthermore, as discussed in an earlier section, some of the data gathered is vague and does not describe the variable completely. Additionally, Job TREC did not provide some of the definitions of particular variables, like job referrals, which limits the scope of this research.

Next, there are inherent threats to internal validity when the pre-test posttest design is used for research question three (Rubin and Babbie, 2010). History is a threat as it is possible that Job TREC participants found housing due the shift in HUD from a CoC model to a Housing First model. Additionally, participants may have found housing through programs in under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act or other programs specifically designed to help homeless persons attain housing. Maturation is also a threat to internal validity in this research. The data showed that the over 70% of participants were homeless for less than one month. Homelessness could be a temporary condition for participants and attaining housing could be a normal process over time, regardless any services offered by the Job TREC program.

However, the limitations of the research are viewed differently than a traditional experimental design, because this study is a program evaluation (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006). The purpose of a program evaluation is to determine the efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability of a department, program, or agency. For this research, the purpose is to determine the effectiveness of the Job TREC program at increasing successful client employment and decreasing barriers to housing. Use caution if generalizing to other programs or to the homeless population outside of Athens, GA.

This research attempts to provide decisions makers, funders, and consumers with information about the merits of the Job TREC program. At this time, the funding for Job TREC has recently changed, as has the amount of eligible participants. Furthermore, HUD has begun re-allocating funding from traditional shelters on the CoC model to a Housing First model (United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, 2012). Many Housing First providers are unable to offer wrap-around services, or services addressing an array of needs like education and training, and rely on employment programs for homeless individuals to meet their goals (Law, 2007). Due to this recent change, federal funding for homeless support service agencies, like Job TREC, is being closely examined. Job TREC must be able to demonstrate effectiveness by assisting clients with finding permanent living wage jobs to continue to receive funding through federal and state governments. The researcher hopes that the stakeholders of the Job TREC program will use the information from this study to make key decisions about the future of the program and the services offered.

In summary, there were some limitations to this study from both the data collection and the research design. Furthermore, the study is limited by the nature of the program evaluation, itself (McDavid & Hawthorn, 2006). Readers should exercise caution when generalizing the findings of this study to other agencies and the larger population of the unhoused. The next section suggests how future research could address the aforementioned issues.

Future Research

The area of assisting people who are homeless with finding employment needs future research. First, researchers should continue to evaluate the most effective ways for service providers to deliver effective training, placement, and job retention services to homeless clients. The last comprehensive guide to assist social services with this endeavor was in 1997. Multiple

changes have been made since then including changes to the definition of homelessness, changes to the funding for homeless service providers, and changes in the economy (Beck et al., 1997; HUD, 2012; Economic Policy Institute, 2005). Given these changes, the body of knowledge needs to continue to grow to determine the most efficient and effective ways to assist homeless clients with eliminating barriers to housing through employment.

To continue research into the best practices for employment programs for homeless persons, future research needs to consider expanding the type and extent of data collected under HUD guidelines. Data should be gathered on how many participants in programs are members of families to give HUD a more accurate picture of how many families are actually homeless supplementing data found in point-in-time counts. Additionally, more information on employment and wage could allow programs like Job TREC to target specific employment industries in local areas and build relationships that could lead to future employment for homeless clients. Furthermore, additional data on the actual number of times programs provide supportive services and the extent of the services could enhance the ability of employment programs to determine what services actually affect successful employment.

Another area for future study is the impact of employment programs on housing. To research this, participants' specific barriers to housing need exploration. Currently, anyone can assume that in the Job TREC program most participants' major barrier to housing is employment. However, there are multiple other barriers to housing that could exist for clients including tenant barriers like eviction history and poor credit, systemic barriers like felony convictions, personal barriers like family composition and physical health, and special need barriers like mental health needs and substance abuse. Without knowing each participants specific barriers to housing, it is impossible to design services to eliminate these barriers.

A final area for future study particular to this research is to determine what factors actually influence successful employment. The findings of this study show that none of the supportive services offered by Job TREC is related to successful employment; however, there must be factors that are. Additional research is needed to determine what these factors may be. Future researchers could use qualitative research to explore common themes among successfully employed participants. Furthermore, interviews with participants could assist future researchers with determining intrinsic factors that influence client employment beyond supportive services.

Given that the population of homeless persons is not diminishing in any capacity, the community must continue to provide services to assist this population with eliminating barriers to housing in a variety of methods. Society has long seen employment as an effective approach to this problem, but effective research must continue to determine the best ways to encourage and support employment for homeless people through service provision (Beck et al., 1997; Drake et al., 2001, Johnson & Fitzpartrick, 2007; Marrone, 1993, Theodore, 2000). As the landscape of eligibility, definition, and funding continues to change, the viability of successful employment programs remains a concern.

Conclusion

This study is a program evaluation of the Job TREC program, an employment program for homeless people in Athens, GA. This study is both summative and formative as the results will be used to both evaluate the program's success and modify program services. There was no relationship between the supportive services offered by Job TREC and successful participant employment, participants did, on average, improve their housing status between enrollment and discharge. Further data must be gathered to study accurately the relationship between supportive services and successful employment. Future research is needed to determine what factors impact

successful employment in the Job TREC program. Most importantly, researchers must continue to evaluate the efficacy of individual employment program for the population.

REFERENCES

- Abbarno, G. J. M. (1999). Homelessness as Failed rights: The moral plight of the mentally ill homeless. In G. J. M. Abbarno (Eds.), *The Ethics of Homelessness* (pp. 187-198). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Anastas, J. W., & MacDonald, M. L. (1994). *Research design for social work and the human services*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Athens Area Homeless Shelter. (2011). *Job TREC policies and procedures*. Athens, GA: Athens Area Homeless Shelter.
- Athens-Clarke County Unified Government. (n.d.). *About*. Retrieved from <http://www.athensclarkecounty.com/index.aspx?NID=27>
- Athens-Clarke County Unified Government. (n.d.). *Emergency shelter grant/Homeless prevention funds*. Retrieved from <http://athensclarkecounty.com/index.aspx?NID=757>
- Augé, M. (2004). *Oblivion*. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bahr H. & Caplow, T. (1973) *Old men drunk and sober*. New York City: New York University Press.
- Baggerly, J., & Zalaquett, C. P. (2006). A descriptive study of single adults in homeless shelters: Increasing counselors' knowledge and social action. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 34, 115-167.
- Barbuto, D. M. (1999). *American settlement houses and progressive social reform: An encyclopedia of the American settlement movement*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

- Beck, S. K., Trutko, J.W., Isbell, K., Rothstein, F., & Barrnow, B.S. (1997) *Employment and training for America's homeless; Best practices guide* (U.S. Department of Labor Publication). Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED460257.pdf>
- Becker, G. S. (1977). *The economic approach to human behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, D. R., Bond, G. R., McCarthy, D., Thompson, D., Xie, H., McHugo, G. J., & Drake, R. E., (2001). Converting day treatment centers to supported employment programs in Rhode Island. *Psychiatric Services*, 52, 351-357.
- Betz, J. (1999). The homeless Hannah Arendt. In G. J. M. Abbarno (Eds.), *The Ethics of Homelessness* (pp. 217-232). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Bomar, P.J. (2004). *Promoting health in families: Applying family research and theory to nursing practice*. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Burkham, K. (1999). Homelessness, virtue theory, and the creation of community. In G. J. M. Abbarno (Eds.), *The Ethics of Homelessness* (pp. 79-92). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Burt, M.R. (1991). *Over the edge: The growth of homelessness in the 1980s*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation and Urban Institute Press.
- Burt, M.R. (2004). *Strategies for reducing chronic street homelessness: Final report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.
- Center for Agribusiness and Economic Development. (February, 2011). *2011 Georgia County Guide*. Retrieved from <http://www.libs.uga.edu/athens/population.html>
- Chasanov, A. (2004). *No longer getting by: An increase in the minimum wage is long overdue*. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute Press.

- Chicago Coalition for the Homeless. (2005). *Failing to deliver: One-stop employment centers*. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Cohen, A. P. (1985). *The symbolic construction of community*. London: Tavistock.
- Cooper-Marcus, C. (1995). *House as a mirror of self: Exploring the deeper meanings of home*. Berkeley, CA: Conari Press.
- Colonnello, P. (1999). Homelessness as Heimatlosigkeit? In G. J. M. Abbarno (Eds.), *The Ethics of Homelessness* (pp. 41-54). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Corcoran, M., & Heflin, C. (2003). Barriers to work among recipients of housing assistance. *Cityscape Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 6(2), 73-87.
- Cushman, P. (1995). *Constructing the self, constructing America: A cultural history of psychotherapy*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.
- Crow, G., & Allan, G. (1994). *Community life: An introduction to local social relations*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Czikszenmihalyi, M., & Rochberg-Halton, E. (1981). *The meaning of things: Domestic symbols and the self*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dawley, A. (1976). *Class and community: The Industrial Revolution in Lynn*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- de Vries, H. (2011). Rediscovering home: A myth for our time. *A Journal of Archetype and Culture*, 85, 1-16.
- Drake, R. E., Essock, S. M., Shaner, A., Carey, K. B., Minkoff, K., Kola, L., et al. (2001). Implementing dual diagnosis services for clients with severe mental illness. *Psychiatric Services*, 52, 469-476.

- Economic Policy Institute. (2005). *Minimum wage trends: Understanding past and contemporary research*. Retrieved from <http://www.epi.org/publication/bp178/>
- Faust, D. G. (2008). *This republic of suffering: Death and the American Civil War*. New York: Alfred E. Knopf Press.
- Finnemore, B. (2011, January 7). Worksystems Inc. regains credibility. *Portland Business Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.bizjournals.com/portland/print-edition/2011/01/07/worksystems-inc-regains-credibility.html?page=all>
- Foscarinas, M. (1996). *The federal response: The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act*. Washington, D.C.: Orynx Press.
- Frazer, E. (1999). *The problem of communitarian politics: Unity and conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fidyk, A. (2011). On home and identity: Following the way of the Roma. *A Journal of Archetype and Culture*, 85, 75-102.
- Georgia Department of Community Affairs. (2004). *Georgia homeless management information systems policies and procedures manual*. Retrieved from http://www.dca.ga.gov/housing/specialneeds/programs/documents/GaHMIS_SOPmanual.pdf
- Gosling, S.D., & Ko, S.K. (2002). A room with a cue: Personality judgements based on offices and bedrooms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 379-398.
- Henderson, -Frakes, J. (2004). *Serving the homeless through the one-stop system: A case study*. Oakland, CA: Social Policy Research Associates.
- Hill, J. (2010). *At home in the world: Sounds and symmetries of belonging*. Woodstock, CT: Spring Journal.

- Hombs, M. E. (2001). *American homelessness: A reference handbook*. United Kingdom: ABC-CLIO Inc.
- Hopper, K. (1997). Homelessness old and new: The matter of definition. In D.H. Culhane, & S.P. Hornburg (Eds.), *Understanding homelessness: New policy and research perspectives* (pp.9-67). Retrieved from http://www.knowledgeplex.org/kp/report/report/refiles/fmf_understandinghome.
- Horsell, C. (2006). Homelessness and social exclusion: A Foucauldian perspective for social workers. *Australian Social Work, 39*, 213-225.
- Jencks, C. (1994). *The homeless*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Johnson, J. (2011, January 28). Count finds rising number of homeless. *Athens Banner Herald*. Retrieved from http://onlineathens.com/stories/012811/new_777298624.shtml
- Johnson, T. P., & Fitzpatrick, M. (2007). Homelessness and drug use: Evidence from a community sample. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 32*, 211-218.
- Kant, I. (1964). *Groundwork of the metaphysic of morals*, (H. J. Paton, Trans.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Karabanow, J. (2004). Making organization work: Exploring characteristics of anti-oppressive organizational structure in street youth shelters. *Journal of Social Work, 4*, 47-60.
- Kusmer, K.L. (2002). *Down and out, on the road: The homeless in American History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lang, R. (2001). *Transportation GIS*. Redlands, CA: Environmental Systems Research Institute.
- Law, V. (2007). Too much of a good thing? *Shelterforce Online, 149*. Retrieved from <http://nhi.org/online/issues/149/housingfirst.html>

- Long, D.A., & Amendolia, J. (2003). *Next step jobs-Promoting employment for homeless people: A cost-effective analysis of the Next Step Jobs initiative*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- Long, D., Rio, J., and Rosen, J. (2007). Employment and income supports for homeless people. Retrieved from <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/homelessness/symposium07/long/>
- Marrone, J. (2005). Creating hope through employment for people who are homeless or in transitional housing. *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation*, 8, 13-35.
- Marrone, J. (1993). Creating positive vocational outcomes for people with mental illness. *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal*, 17, 43-62.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396.
- McBride, R. G. (2012). Survival on the streets: Experiences of the homeless population and constructive suggestions for assistance. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 40, 49-61.
- McDavid, J. C., & Hawthorn, L. R. L. (2006). *Program evaluation and performance measurement: An introduction to practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mill, J. S. (1869). *On liberty*. London: Longman, Roberts, & Green.
- Monkkonen, E. (1981). *Police in Urban America, 1860-1920*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Murphy, P. A. (1999). The rights of the homeless: An examination of the phenomenology of place. In G. J. M. Abbarno (Eds.), *The Ethics of Homelessness* (pp. 55-62). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- National Alliance to End Homelessness. (2012a). *The state of homelessness in America 2012*. Retrieved from <http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/the-state-of-homelessness-in-america-2012>

National Alliance to End Homelessness. (2012b). *Changes in the HUD definition of “homeless”*.

Retrieved from <http://www.endhomelessness.org/content/article/detail/3006/>

National Alliance to End Homelessness. (2011). *Increases in homelessness on the horizon*.

Retrieved from <http://www.endhomelessness.org/content/article/detail/4226/>

National Alliance to End Homelessness. (2006). *What is housing first*. Retrieved from

<http://www.endhomelessness.org/content/article/detail/1425/>

National Coalition for the Homeless. (n.d.). *Access to workforce services*. Retrieved from

http://www.nationalhomeless.org/advocacy/access_workforce.html

National Coalition for the Homeless. (2009). *Employment and Homelessness*. Retrieved from

<http://www.nationalhomeless.org/factsheets/employment.html>

National Coalition for the Homeless. (2006). *McKinney-Vento Act*. Retrieved from

<http://www.nationalhomeless.org/publications/facts/McKinney.pdf>

National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty (2011). *Simply unacceptable: Homelessness and the human right to housing in the United States*. Retrieved from

<http://www.nlchp.org/content/pubs/SimplyUnacceptableReport.pdf>

Northeast Georgia Homeless Coalition. (2012). *Point in time homeless count 2012*. Retrieved from

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0Aud7455Cf8godEdBWDFJQWVaNktQWTFkeHIydVMwb3c#gid=0>

Nies, M.A., & McEwen, M. (2001). *Community health nursing promoting the health of populations* (3rd ed.). Philadelphia: Saunders.

O’Flaherty, B. (1996). *Making room: The economics of homelessness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Parker, M. (1999). Community, ethics, and homelessness. In G. J. M. Abbaro (Eds.), *The Ethics of Homelessness* (pp. 93-104). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Papadopoulos, R. (2002). *Therapeutic care for refugees: No place like home*. London: Karnac.
- Pathways Community Network. (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved from <http://www.pcni.org/about-us>
- Pima County Community and Economic Development. (n.d.). *Sullivan Jackson County Employment Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.pima.gov/ced/cs/onestop/JacksonEmpCent.html>
- Primavera Foundation (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved from <http://primavera.org/html/aboutus.html>
- Primavera. (2011, Fall). *Springboard*. Retrieved from <http://www.primavera.org/html/documents/PrimaveraSpingboard-Fall2011.pdf>
- Radey, M. (2008). *Meeting employment needs of individuals experiencing homelessness: An evaluation of targeted workforce services*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University.
- Radey, M., & Wilkins, B. (2011). Short-term employment services for homeless individuals: Perceptions from stakeholders in a community partnership. *Journal of Social Service Research, 37*, 19-33.
- Rapport, N., & Dawson, A. (1998a). *Migrants of identity: Perceptions of home in the world of movement*. New York: Berg.
- Recovery.Gov (2012). *Georgia*. Retrieved from <http://www.recovery.gov/Transparency/RecoveryData/Pages/RecipientReportedDataMap.aspx?stateCode=AL&PROJSTATUS=NPC&AWARDDTYPE=CGL>
- Rodgers, D. T. (1978). *The work ethic in Industrial America, 1860-1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Rossi, P. (1989). *Down and out in America: The origins of homelessness*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Royse, D., Thyer, B., Padgett, D., & Logan, T. (2006). *Program Evaluation* (4th ed.). Thompson: Belmont, CA.
- Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. R. (2010). *Research methods for Social Work* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- SEARCH Homeless Services. (2011). *Community impact report*. Retrieved from <http://www.searchhomeless.org/about/community-impact-report/>
- Scapp, R. (1999). Talking about those home improvement blues. In G. J. M. Abbarno (Eds.), *The Ethics of Homelessness* (pp. 233-240). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Schrader, D. E. . (1999). Home is where the heart is: Homelessness and the denial of moral personality. In G. J. M. Abbarno (Eds.), *The Ethics of Homelessness* (pp. 63-78). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Shaheen, G., & Rio, J. (2007). Recognizing work as a priority in preventing or ending homelessness. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 28, 341-358.
- Shipler, D.K. (2005). *The working poor: Invisible in America*. New York: Vintage.
- Sklar, H. (1995). *Jobs, income, and work: Ruinous trends, urgent alternatives*. Philadelphia, PA: American Friends Service Committee
- Skocpol, T. (1992). *Protecting soldiers and mother: The political origins of social policy in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sommerville, P. (1998). Explanation of social exclusion: Where does housing fit in? *Housing Studies*, 13, 761-780.

- Stein, L.I., & Santos, A.B., (1998). *Assertive community treatment of persons with severe mental illness*. New York: WW Norton.
- Stergiopoulos, V., & Hermann, N. (2003). Old and homeless: A review and survey of older adults who use shelters in an urban setting. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 48 (6), 374-380.
- Sudman, S. (1976). *Applied Sampling*. New York: Academic Press.
- Theodore, N. (2000). *Homeless who can't make enough to get ahead*. Chicago, IL: Day Labor Project, Chicago Coalition for the Homeless.
- Tsemberis, S. (2010) Housing first: Ending homelessness, promoting recover, and reducing costs. In I.G. Ellen & B. O'Flaherty (Eds.), *How to house the homeless* (pp. 37-56). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Tsemberis, S., & Eisenberg, R.F. (2000). Pathways to housing: Supported housing for street-dwelling homeless individuals with psychiatric disabilities. *Psychiatric Services*, 51, 487-493.
- Urban Institute Report. (1999). *Homelessness: Programs and the people they serve: An overview of homeless clients*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (1991). *Fact sheet for the 1990 decennial census: Counts of person in the shelters for the homeless and visible street locations..* Washington D. C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Conference of Mayors. (2008) *Status report on hunger & homelessness*. Retrieved from from http://usmayors.org/pressreleases/documents/hungerhomelessnessreport_121208.pdf
- U. S. Constitution. amend III. amend. IV.

- U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2012). *2012 HHS Poverty Guidelines*. Retrieved from http://www.huduser.org/publications/pdf/continuums_of_care.pdf
- U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2002). *Evaluation of Continuums of Care for Homeless People*. Retrieved from <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/12poverty.shtml>
- U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2007). *The applicability of housing first models to homeless persons with serious mental illness*. Retrieved from <http://www.huduser.org/portal/publications/hsgfirst.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2011). *Obama administration announces decline in homelessness in 2011*. (HUD Publication No. 11-288). Retrieved from http://www.hudportal.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/press/press_releases_media_advisories/2011/HUDNo.11-288
- U. S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2012). *Employment situation summary*. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.nr0.htm/>
- U. S. Department of Labor. (2009). *History of federal minimum wage rates under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938-3009*. Retrieved from <http://www.dol.gov/whd/minwage/chart.htm>
- U.S. Department of Labor. (1998a). *Employment and training for America's homeless: Final report on the job training for the homeless demonstration program*. Retrieved from <http://wdr.doleta.gov/opr/FULLTEXT/jthdp/jthdp.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Labor. (1998b). *The "plain English" version of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998*. Retrieved from <http://www.doleta.gov/usworkforce/wia/Runningtext.cfm>
- United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2012). *New HUD HEARTH continuum of care rule and guidance posted*. Retrieved from

http://www.usich.gov/media_center/news/new_hud_hearth_continuum_of_care_rule_and_guidance_posted/

- Wahba, M. A., & Bridwell, L. G. (1976). Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15(2), 212–240.
- Wasserman, J. A., & Clair, J. M. (2009). *At home on the street: People, poverty, and a hidden culture of homelessness*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reinner Publishers
- Walsh, W., Craik, K., & Price, R. (1992). *Person-environmental psychology: Models and perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Watson, F. D. (1922) *The charity organization movement in the United States*. NY: Macmillan.
- Wong, Y.I., Park, J.M., & Nemon, H. (2006). Homeless service delivery in the context of continuum of care. *Administration in Social Work*, 30(1), 67-94.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A



Pathways Community Network Client Authorization Form

I understand that Athens Area Homeless Shelter/JobTREC Program is part of the Pathways Community Network, a computer network designed to reduce the amount of time and effort it takes for me to obtain the social services I need. This agency has my permission to:

- Look at information about me in the Pathways system
- Enter in the system information concerning my situation and need for assistance.

I understand that:

- Agencies in the Pathways system will keep this information confidential
- Other agencies will be able to look at this information only if I give each of these agencies my permission
- Staff at each agency receives regular training on client confidentiality and their legal responsibility to keep my information private
- The Pathways systems uses passwords and computerized codes to protect my privacy
- Shared information may include my name, age, gender, marital status, veteran status, address, housing status, and basic information about my goals and services I receive
- I can obtain a copy of information about me collected by the Pathways system, except for psychotherapy notes and other information kept private by law.

I also understand that under certain circumstances, this agency of Pathways may be legally required to disclose some or all of my confidential information, This may happen if there is any evidence of child abuse, if there is evidence that I may harm others or myself, or if a court order that my information be disclosed.

In order to improve services for persons in need, experts may study data from the Pathways system and other sources. As a result, an independent researcher may need to view personal information, such as names and social security numbers, to make sure that records are not counted twice. This researcher will remove all personally identifiable information before anyone else examines that data, so that privacy of those who received services is protected. This procedure is done in accordance with professional standards, under strict government and research institution supervision, and in compliance with all regulations that specifically address those who have received services for mental health, substance abuse, HIV/AIDS, and domestic violence.

I authorize this agency to view my information, and to place information about me in the Pathways system.

I am signing this form freely and have not been forced or coerced to do so. This consent form has been read by me or to me, and I have received a copy of this form. I have been given the opportunity to discuss the content of this form and the Consent being granted under it, and I have been given the opportunity to ask any questions regarding such content and Consent. Any such questions have been answered to my full satisfaction, and I understand the Consent that I am granting by signing below.

By: _____
 (my signature) Date _____

Print Name:

To ensure there is no fraudulent use of this consent form, a head of household must be specified, and the names and dates of birth for any and all minor children for whom I am legally responsible must be listed below.

Head of Household (please print):

NAME	DOB	SSN
------	-----	-----

Minors' Names, Dates of Birth, and SSN (please print):

NAME	DOB	SSN
------	-----	-----

NAME	DOB	SSN
------	-----	-----

NAME	DOB	SSN
------	-----	-----

NAME	DOB	SSN
------	-----	-----

NAME	DOB	SSN
------	-----	-----

APPENDIX B

Client Intake Form

Client Key: _____

file: () Y () N

Client Authorization on

Current Client Information

Last Name: _____ **First Name:** _____ **Middle Initial:** _____

Identification: ____/____/____ () Full SSN Reported () Partial SSN Reported () Don't Know () Refused

Date of Birth: ____/____/____ () Full DOB Reported () Approximate or Partial DOB () Don't Know () Refused

Relationship: Head of household () Other ()

Ethnicity: () Hispanic/Latino () Non-Hispanic/Non-Latino () Don't Know () Refused

Race: () White () Black () American Indian () Asian () Don't Know () Refused

Gender: () Male () Female () Transgender Male to Female () Transgender Female to Male () Other () Don't Know () Refused

Veteran: () No () Yes () Don't Know () Refused

Disabling Condition: () No () Yes () Don't Know () Refused If yes, please explain

Housing Status: () Literally homeless () Imminently losing housing () Unstably housed / at-risk of losing housing

() Stably housed () Don't Know () Refused

Chronically Homeless: () Y () N *4 episodes of homelessness in last three years, or continuously homeless for one year or more

Zip Code of Last Permanent Address: _____ () Full or Partial Zip Code Reported () Don't Know () Refused

Prior Night's Residence:

- | | |
|--|---|
| () Emergency shelter, including hotel or motel paid for with emergency shelter voucher | () Foster care home or foster care group home |
| () Transitional housing for homeless persons (including homeless youth) | () Place not meant for habitation (e.g., a vehicle, an abandoned building, bus/train/subway station/airport or anywhere outside); inclusive of "non-housing service site (outreach programs only)" |
| () Permanent housing for formerly homeless persons (such as SHP, S+C, or SRO Mod Rehab) | () Other |
| () Psychiatric hospital or other psychiatric facility | () Safe Haven |
| () Substance abuse treatment facility or detox center | () Rental by client, with VASH housing subsidy |
| () Hospital (non-psychiatric) | () Rental by client, with other (non VASH) housing subsidy |
| () Jail, prison or juvenile detention facility | () Owned by client, with housing subsidy |
| () Rental by client, no ongoing housing subsidy | () Don't Know |
| () Owned by client, no ongoing housing subsidy | () Refused |
| () Staying or living in a family member's room, apartment or house | |
| () Staying or living in a friend's room, apartment or house | |
| () Hotel or motel paid for without emergency shelter voucher | |

Length of Stay (in last night's residence): Check One

- one week or less more than one week, but less than one month one to three months
 more than three months, but less than a year one year or longer

Family Type: (Check One)

- Single/Unaccompanied Female Single/Unaccompanied Male Female w/ children

Contact information:

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Last Permanent Residence:

Residence Type: _____

Date Entered: _____

Date Left: _____

Zip Code: _____

City: _____

State: _____

County: _____

Special Needs

- Chronic Health Condition: Developmental Disability HIV/AIDS Related Illiterate or marginally literate (
 Physical disability
 Substance abuse Mental illness _____ if selected, Long/indefinite duration plus substantial
impairment? _____
 Domestic Violence: Within past 3 months 3 to 6 months ago 6-12 months ago more than a year ago
Don't Know
 Refused

Income information:**Financial Resources: Head of Household should record any information for members under the age of 18.**Income received from any source in past 30 days? No Yes Don't Know Refused**Income Sources and Amount**

Started	No/Yes	Amount	Date
<input type="checkbox"/> Earned Income: _____/_____/_____	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	_____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Unemployment Insurance: _____/_____/_____	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	_____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Insurance Security (SSI) _____/_____/_____	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	_____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Social Security Disability Income (SSDI) _____/_____/_____	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	_____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Veteran Disability Payment _____/_____/_____	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	_____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Private Disability Insurance _____/_____/_____	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	_____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Workers Comp _____/_____/_____	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	_____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Temporary Assistance for Needy Families _____/_____/_____	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	_____	

- () General Assistance _____/_____/_____ () No () Yes _____
- () Retirement Income from SS _____/_____/_____ () No () Yes _____
- () Veteran's Pension _____/_____/_____ () No () Yes _____
- () Pension from former job _____/_____/_____ () No () Yes _____
- () Child Support _____/_____/_____ () No () Yes _____
- () Alimony or other special support _____/_____/_____ () No () Yes _____
- () Other source _____/_____/_____ () No () Yes _____

Total Monthly Income _____

Non-Cash Benefits

Non-Cash Benefits received from any source in past 30 days: () No () Yes () Don't Know () Refused

Source of Non-Cash Benefit	Receiving Benefit	Date Started
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)	() No () Yes	_____/_____/_____
Medicaid Health Insurance Program	() No () Yes	_____/_____/_____
Medicare Health Insurance	() No () Yes	_____/_____/_____
State Children's Health Insurance	() No () Yes	_____/_____/_____
Special Supplemental Nutrition for Women, Infants And Children	() No () Yes	_____/_____/_____
Veterans Administration (VA) Medical Services	() No () Yes	_____/_____/_____
TANF Child Care Services	() No () Yes	_____/_____/_____
TANF Transportation	() No () Yes	_____/_____/_____
Other TANF funded services	() No () Yes	_____/_____/_____
Section 8, public housing, or other ongoing rental assistance	() No () Yes	_____/_____/_____
Other Source	() No () Yes	_____/_____/_____
Temporary Rental Assistance	() No () Yes	_____/_____/_____
Don't Know / Refused	() No () Yes	_____/_____/_____

Program Enrollment

Program Name: Almost Home () JobTREC () Childcare Assistance (Nancy Travis) ()
 Program Entry Date: _____
 Housing Status: _____
 County: _____

Household Members Information

1) Relationship to Head of Household: _____
Last Name: _____ **First Name:** _____ **Middle Initial:** _____
Identification: _____/_____/_____ **Date of Birth:** _____/_____/_____

Gender: _____ **Race:** _____

Ethnicity: () Hispanic/Latino () Non-Hispanic/Non-Latino () Don't Know () Refused

Disabling Condition: () No () Yes () Don't Know () Refused

2) Relationship to Head of Household: _____

Last Name: _____ **First Name:** _____ **Middle Initial:** _____

Identification: ____/____/____

Date of Birth: ____/____/____

Gender: _____

Race: _____

Ethnicity: () Hispanic/Latino () Non-Hispanic/Non-Latino () Don't Know () Refused

Disabling Condition: () No () Yes () Don't Know () Refused

3) Relationship to Head of Household: _____

Last Name: _____ **First Name:** _____ **Middle Initial:** _____

Identification: ____/____/____

Date of Birth: ____/____/____

Gender: _____

Race: _____

Ethnicity: () Hispanic/Latino () Non-Hispanic/Non-Latino () Don't Know () Refused

Disabling Condition: () No () Yes () Don't Know () Refuse

Barriers to Housing Stability Assessment Name: _____ Today's Date: ____/____/____

TENANT BARRIERS

Rental History

Have you ever had a lease for an apartment or home in your name? _____ Yes
 _____ No

Have you had utilities in your name? _____ Yes
 _____ No

How many times have you been evicted from housing? ____0 ____1 ____2-3 ____4-9
 ____10 or more

Would a prior landlord(s) give you a bad reference? _____ Yes
 _____ No

Credit History

Do you have unpaid rent or utility bills in your name? _____ Yes
 _____ No

Do you have a credit history? _____ Yes
 _____ No

Do you have poor credit? _____ Yes
 _____ No

Criminal History

Have you ever been convicted of one or more misdemeanors? _____ Yes
 _____ No

Have you ever been convicted of a felony? _____ Yes
 _____ No

What were you convicted of? _____ What date was your most recent conviction? _____

Are you currently on probation? _____ Yes
 _____ No

If yes, what is the date your probation expires? _____/____/____
 /_____

PERSONAL BARRIERS

Family Connection

Do you currently have more than four individuals in your household? Yes
 No

Do you currently have a male between 12-18 in your household? Yes
 No

Physical Health

Have your physical abilities or physical health ever caused you to lose your housing? Yes
 No

Does your physical health or abilities currently affect your ability to get housing? Yes
 No

Mental Health

Do you have mental health issues that have caused you to lose your housing in the past?
 Yes No

Do you have mental health issues that currently affect your ability to get housing? Yes
 No

Substance Use

Has substance use (drugs or alcohol) caused you to lose your housing in the past? Yes
 No

Does current substance use affect your ability to get housing? Yes
 No

Domestic Violence/Abuse

Has domestic violence or abuse ever caused you to lose your housing in the past? Yes
 No

Does domestic violence or abuse currently affect your ability to get housing? Yes
 No

Income

Do you have regular income (from a job, TANF, disability, child support, etc.) at this time?
 Yes No

Do you need temporary assistance to get housing? Yes No Permanent Assistance?
 Yes No

If you are not living in your own house or apartment, how much money could you spend on housing each month? \$0 \$1-100 \$101-200 \$201-300 \$301-400
 \$401-500

\$501-600 \$601-700 \$701-800 \$801 or more

Other Income Related

Are you currently receiving Social Security or Disability? Yes No I
 am not eligible

Are you currently receiving TANF? Yes No I
 am not eligible

Are you currently receiving assistance from the public housing authority? Yes No I
 am not eligible

Are you currently receiving food stamps? Yes No I
 am not eligible

Do you have a steady, full time job? Yes No

Do you have a high school diploma or GED? Yes No

Is English your second language? Yes No

Do you have a working car or other reliable transportation to get to work? Yes No

If you have small children, do you have affordable childcare? ___Yes ___No
 ___N/A

Child Care Assistance Services Enrollment

(Please initial.)

- I wish to enroll in the Child Care Assistance Services (CCAS). I have received a copy of the CCAS Policies & Procedures. I understand the commitment required and the consequences if policies and procedures are violated. I also understand that these services are paid for by a grant from HUD, and are subject to change or cancellation at any time.
- I hereby release the Staff, Board of Directors, and Volunteers of the CCAS and the Athens Area Homeless Shelter from any liability that may be incurred through the provision of the supportive services offered by the Job TREC Program.

I agree to:

- Follow the case plan established during the CCAS Intake.
- Choose a day care for my child(ren) and complete all necessary paperwork.
- Contact CCAS staff at least once a month to keep them informed and up-to-date on my current situation.
- Contact a CCAS case manager immediately if I leave the shelter or streets to move into a residence. Failure to do so will result my case being closed and I will not be eligible for any follow-up services.

I understand that:

- Each child must attend childcare services at least four days a week, or my services will be terminated.
- I must be working, attending school, or actively seeking employment in order for childcare services to be paid for through CCAS
- Failure to maintain contact for more than 30 days will result in my case being closed and I will no longer be eligible for services.
- If I leave the Athens-Clarke County area, I am no longer eligible for CCAS services and my case will be closed.
- If I willfully and deliberately violate any of the CCAS policies and procedures, I may no longer be eligible for CCAS services and my case may be closed.
- CCAS will cover the full cost of my childcare services for the first 3 months of enrollment and partial costs for the following 6 months.
- My child(ren) is/are expected to attend daycare regularly (average of at least 4 times per week) and that if my child misses more than 1 day I am expected to notify the CCAS case manager or my case may be closed.

Job TREC Program
Athens Area Homeless Shelter
Release of Information/Waiver of Confidentiality

I, _____, authorize the Athens Area Homeless Shelter and Job TREC Program to obtain and share information and documents regarding myself and my situation with the following persons, agencies, and programs that they may assist me in obtaining housing, employment, and appropriate social services:

- Athens Urban Ministries
AIDS Athens
Mercy Health Clinic
Clarke Co. School District
Catholic Social Services
Community Connection
Department of Labor
GA Legal Services
Habitat for Humanity
Atlanta Union Mission Services
St. Joseph's Charities
The Healing Place
Sparrow's Nest Affairs
Advantage Behavioral Health Systems
The ARK/Emergency Food Bank
Athens Housing Authority
Athens Neighborhood Health Clinic
Northeast GA Homeless Coalition
Dept. of Family and Children Services
Empty Stocking Fund
Interfaith Hospitality Network
Salvation Army
Samaritan Counseling Center
Social Security Administration
St. Mary's Industrial Medicine
Dept. of Housing & Urban Development
Dept. of Human and Economic Development
Athens Justice Project
Athens-Clarke Police Dept.
Athens Nurses Clinic
Athens Regional Medical Center
Clarke Co. Health Dept.
St. Mary's Hospital
Council on Aging
Goodwill Career Center
Project Safe
Family Counseling
One-Way Eyeglasses
UGA Public Interest Project
Dept. of Community

My Landlord: _____
My Probation Officer: _____
My Attorney: _____
My Employer: _____
Other: _____

Listed below are any exceptions to the confidentiality waiver agreement as stated above:

All the information I hereby authorize to be released to or obtained by Athens Area Homeless Shelter and Job TREC will be held strictly confidential. I understand that unless otherwise limited by state or federal regulation, and except to the extent that some action has already been taken based on my consent, I may withdraw this consent at any time by making a written withdrawal. Unless my consent is withdrawn, this release remains in effect for ONE (1) year from the date signed below.

Client Signature Date Case Manager Signature Date

~~~~~
~~~~~

USE THIS SPACE ONLY IF CLIENT WITHDRAWS CONSENT

I withdraw my consent to authorize Athens Area Homeless Shelter and Job TREC Program to obtain and share my information with the above named agencies and persons effective the date signed below.

Client Signature Date

Case Manager Signature Date

HOMELESS VERIFICATION FORM

_____ has been determined to be and verified as homeless according to the following: (Check one):

___ In places not meant for human habitation, such as cars, parks, sidewalks, and abandoned buildings. Please attach a signed and dated letter verifying collateral contacts with other agencies, a signed statement by the client, or other verifying documentation.

___ In an emergency shelter. Please attach a signed and dated letter for a shelter staff person or other social service agency that can verify shelter stay.

___ In transitional or supportive housing (for homeless persons who originally came from the streets or emergency shelter). Please attach a signed and dated letter from the transitional provider verifying the current stay and the client’s homeless status prior to transitional housing.

___ In any of the above places, but is spending a short time (up to 30 consecutive days) in a hospital or other institution. Please attach a signed and dated letter.

___ Is being evicted within a week from a private dwelling unit and no subsequent residence has been identified and the person lacks the resources and support networks needed to obtain housing. Please attach a signed and dated letter verifying the eviction proceedings and unsuccessful attempts to secure other housing options. Include information regarding income and lack of resources.

___ Is being discharged within a week from an institution in which the person has been a resident for more than 30 consecutive days and no subsequent residence has been identified and he/she lacks the resources and the support networks needed to obtain housing. Please attach a signed and dated letter verifying unsuccessful attempts to secure other housing options. Include information regarding income and lack of resources.

This form and the appropriate verification must be filed in each case record and be available for review. (Please also include client income verification in each case record.)

Name of staff verifying homelessness

Agency

Date