CEHE

College Focused Rapid Rehousing Evaluation Interim Report

Center for Equitable Higher Education
To study and promote economic, food, and housing justice

Authors

Rashida Crutchfield, EdD, MSW, Co-PI
School of Social Work
Center for Equitable Higher Education
California State University, Long Beach

Jessica Wolin, MPH, MCRP, Co-PI
Department of Public Health
San Francisco State University

Susanna Curry, PhD, MSW
Sacramento State University

Arturo Baiocchi, PhD
Sacramento State University

Susan Roll, PhD
Associate Dean of Graduate Studies/Research
California State University, Chico

Jennifer Wilking, PhD
Department of Political Science and Criminal
Justice
California State University, Chico

Stephanie Machado, DrPH MPH
Department of Public Health & Health Services
Administration
California State University, Chico

Molly Calhoun, PhD
School of Social Work
California State University, Chico

Additional Research Team Members

California State University, Long Beach (CSULB)

Yadira Maldonado
Center for Equitable Higher Education

Virginia Gray, PhD, RD
Family & Consumer Sciences, Nutrition & Dietetics

Kristina Lovato, PhD, MSW
School of Social Work
University of California, Berkeley

Quinn Callicott, MSW, LCSW

Keyon Anderson, EdD, MSW, PPSC

CSULB Student Research Assistants
Dani Alderete Gonzalez
Makayla Burdette
Ann Chan
Mitchell Hale
Stephanie Lezama
Mei Louie
Quang Nguyen
Adriana White

San Francisco State University

Victoria Quijano, MPH, EDD
Department of Public Health

Sarah Wongking Tanuvasa, MPH
College of Ethnic Studies
Department of Public Health

Sacramento State University

Jessica Newham
Center for Health Practice, Policy & Research

Justin C. Morris
Center for Health Practice, Policy & Research

Introduction

This report is intended to inform key stakeholders about the College Focused Rapid Rehousing (CFRR) evaluation and provide some preliminary learnings based on data collected in year one of the three year evaluation. These learnings give us an early glimpse of what has been found thus far about the CFRR programs and helps us better understand how to focus our evaluation work moving forward. It is our hope that this report will be used by stakeholders as they consider how to support and strengthen CFRR programs.

Background

Homelessness in California Public Higher Education

California State University (CSU) and California Community Colleges (CCC) graduation rates steadily increase; however, the gap between students of color and White students persists. Due to persistent structural inequities, students of color, low income, current and former foster youth, and other marginalized students are disproportionately burdened by basic needs insecurity, and addressing these essential needs can have a direct impact on student success. The CSU Study of Student Basic Needs showed that 10.9% of students experience homelessness, and a study of CCCs showed that 19% of students experience homelessness in that year.

Students who experience homelessness report dire consequences to their well-being and acute barriers to their educational progress. Many students who experience food insecurity, homelessness, or both have lower GPAs and

higher academic concerns than students who report basic need security. Students describe a variety of ways in which housing insecurity or homelessness influences their educational outcomes. Struggling to make ends meet has a significant impact on students' mental and physical health. Students who are homeless report poorer mental health than students who are housed. These students report high levels of mental health concerns, such as anxiety, fear, irritability, depression, among other worries. Homelessness also results in heavy tolls for students' physical health as students report more days with negative physical health issues, such as physical illness and injury, than their secure peers. Students who are unhoused also experience the challenges of working multiple jobs to make ends meet while balancing course work and finding time and money to eat.

California Investment to Address Student Homelessness

The State of California Budget Act of 2019 (Assembly Bill 74) granted ongoing funds to the CSU ($6.5 million) and the CCC ($9 million) to develop and implement College Focused Rapid Rehousing (CFRR). In the 2022 budget, the state granted the CCC an additional $10 million in ongoing funds to support these efforts. The CSU Office of the Chancellor held a competitive RFP process and awarded funds to eight campuses to develop CFRR pilot programs to commence at the beginning of the 2020-2021 academic year and continue for three years, later adding an additional campus to begin in 2021. The CCC Chancellor's Office distributed CFRR funds to 14 campuses who responded to a Letter of Interest process and were assessed as having a primary need based on analysis of demographic and geographic indicators.

College Focused Rapid Rehousing Partners

Eight CSU campus programs and two California Community College programs are the focus of this evaluation, including:

California State University, Long Beach
California State University, Northridge
Cal Poly Pomona
Cerritos College
Chico State University
Long Beach City College
Sacramento State University
San Diego State University
San Francisco State University
San José State University

The CFRR programs all involve intensive partnerships between an academic institution and community agencies who work together to identify and support students experiencing homelessness. The community-based agencies partner with local housing providers, including landlords and property owners who receive subsidies in support of housing options until the students can provide for their own housing needs. These community agency partners include:

Bill Wilson Center
Chico Housing Action Team
Home Start, Inc.
Jovenes, Inc.
Lutheran Social Services
Lyric
Sacramento Self-Help Housing
3rd Street Youth Center
True North Housing Alliance

Rapid Rehousing Model

Rapid Rehousing (RRH) is a philosophy of intervention, and also a short-term, crisis homeless assistance model (Culhane et al., 2016). The model is designed to move individuals or families from homelessness into permanent housing as quickly as possible and provide one-time assistance with move-in costs or short-term rental assistance to close the gap between income and housing costs (no longer than 18 months; Burt et al., 2016; Culhane et al., 2016).

Through this traditional model first funded by the U.S. Congress through the Rapid Rehousing for Homeless Families Demonstration (RRHD) program in 2007 and later the Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program in 2009, families received help if they were identified as having some barriers to housing but not likely in need of long-term assistance with housing. Families received case management to help the family stabilize prior to the end of their rental subsidy. The ultimate goal was for families to remain in housing on their own after rental assistance from the program ends (Burt et al., 2016; Cunningham & Batko, 2016). Since this initial demonstration program, other federal agencies such as the U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs have funded RRH programs (Cunningham & Batko, 2016).

In traditional RRH programs, effectiveness of programs is measured by the extent to which they 1) reduce participants' length of homelessness; 2) help households exit the program into permanent housing; and 3) reduce experiences of homelessness within a year after leaving the program (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2016). In studies of the model for families and veterans, participants exit homelessness more quickly through RRH programs than on their own and most do not become homeless again after the program (Cunningham & Batko, 2018). In a large study of an RRH demonstration program for families funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (Culhane, 2016), only 10% of families experienced one or more episodes of homelessness one year after participation in the program. However, over three-fourths (76%) had moved at least once in the year after exit, and these families indicated that they moved for better quality housing and to reduce housing costs. Participants across a number of studies have suggested that RRH participants continue to struggle with housing affordability, much like other low-income renters (Cunningham & Batko, 2018).

College Focused Rapid Rehousing (CFRR)

In recent years, universities across the nation have increased efforts to address housing insecurity among students (Goldrick-Rab et al., 2019). Until recently, most of these efforts have centered on homelessness prevention efforts including one-time interventions such as on and off-campus emergency housing, emergency grants, and housing vouchers. However, in 2019 California became the first state to allocate funding to provide RRH specifically to college students experiencing homelessness or housing insecurity in the three public systems of higher education. The College-Focused Rapid Rehousing (CFRR) model is intended to support students in completing college, particularly by helping them

Roles of Campus and Community Partners in CFRR

CAMPUS PARTNER

Provide Basic Needs Services
Conduct Initial CFRR Intake
Refer to CFRR Community Partners
Provide Ongoing Academic and Campus
Support
Provide Student Counseling Services

COMMUNITY PARTNER

Confirm Eligibility
Enroll Student in CFRR
Provide Case Management Services
Secure & Place Student in Housing
Pay Housing Subsidy and Provide Ongoing
Support to Student & Landlord

STUDENT OUTCOMES

Academic Success
Housing Stability
Financial Security
Physical & Emotional Wellbeing

resolve their homelessness by moving into stable housing (John Burton Advocates for Youth, 2022). According to John Burton Advocates for Youth (JBAY, n.d.), CFRR has the following core elements: 1) provide rental assistance and services to support students experiencing homelessness; 2) create partnerships with housing providers in the community, coordinated entry access points, and institutions of higher education, with the college campus as the center of service delivery; 3) provide outreach and assessment, and connect students to housing and services; and 4) provide case management to help students remain in housing while enrolled in college and ensure that they are able to live independently upon completion of the rental subsidy.

A fact sheet about CFRR, (JBAY (n.d.)) notes key differences between the traditional RRH model and the CFRR model. Unlike traditional RRH which is time-limited, the CFRR model has flexibility within its time limits. Furthermore, the CFRR model involves collaboration between a college campus and one or more community partners, typically a community-based housing organization. In most cases, the campus partner conducts the initial CFRR intake with the student and refers eligible students to the community provider. The campus also provides basic needs services and provides ongoing academic and counseling support as needed. The community partner confirms eligibility and enrolls the student. Once enrolled, the student receives case management services, and is placed in housing. The community partner provides a housing subsidy and ongoing support to both the student and landlord.

The goal of CFRR is that students will achieve positive outcomes in the areas of academics, housing stability, financial security, and physical and emotional well-being. While the RRH model has shown to be very effective in addressing homelessness among families and older adults (Burt et al., 2016), less is known about the effectiveness of CFRR. A study of the first three years of a CFRR program run by the organization Jovenes in Southern California, demonstrated that the model has promise in improving student housing stability and continued college enrollment. Among the 62 students in the program, 76% stayed in college, transferred or graduated, a higher rate of retention than the overall rate at community colleges in the same year (2017-2018; JBAY, 2019).

Systemwide Evaluation of College Focused Rapid Rehousing

This evaluation is a critical opportunity to deepen what is known about the process and outcomes of the CFRR model. It goes beyond mandated program monitoring and is designed to develop an evidence base for practice; to understand the difference this initiative makes in the health and wellness of students; and, to show implications of CFRR as a model for other higher education ecosystems across the country. The purpose of this evaluation is to gain a deeper understanding of how programs address homelessness amongst college and university students to reduce equity gaps and increase higher education retention. The evaluation is formative in nature as the CFRR programs are pilots with room to grow. The following evaluation questions guide this study.

Implementation

↗ What is the CFRR model? How was this college-focused model envisioned and modified by campuses?

↗ To what extent are the CFRR programs able to effectively implement the program activities as envisioned?

↗ What challenges and successes did campuses encounter implementing the CFRR model?

↗ How many students were served by homelessness prevention services on campuses (emergency grants & emergency housing) and what do students report about the impact of those programs?

Outcomes

↗ To what extent is participation in the CFRR programs associated with increased housing stability, financial stability, academic success and well-being for students experiencing homelessness?

↗ How effective are these programs at addressing the needs of current and former foster youth?

Rapid Rehousing Program Logic Model

Inputs	Funding	Campus and Community Basic Needs & Support Services
	Coordinator	Campus Admin CSU Admin
	Community Partners Case Managers	Stakeholders (students, community, experts)

Activities

HOUSING
- Conduct housing search/navigation
- Support move-in
- Provide tenant rights & responsibilities education
- Conduct mediation
- Provide subsidies

CASE MANAGEMENT
- Conduct assessments
- Develop Case Management Plan including education & financial plans
- Care coordination
- Provide academic & campus supports
- Provide referrals
- Plan for post-subsidy
- Data Tracking

ENGAGEMENT
- Training & awareness building
- Conduct outreach
- Identify eligible program participants
- Referral & ongoing communication with community partner

Outputs

of students placed in housing

% of students moved into housing in 30 days

# of students provided subsidy

Average time student receives subsidy

$ subsidies dispersed

# of assessments completed

# of Case Management plans

# of students who receive services to support housing & educational stability

# of contacts

# of awareness & outreach activities

# of students in need of program

students accepted into program

of students referred to other services

Short Term Outcomes

STABILIZED HOUSING
- Transition into stable housing
- Understand financial needs & how it relates to their housing

⬆ AWARENESS OF SERVICES & SUPPORTS

Better aware of resources to support housing & educational goals

⬇ BARRIERS TO ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Reduced burden & more able to focus on academic studies

Medium Term Outcomes

MAINTAIN HOUSING FOR 6 MONTHS

Maintain stable housing for 6 continuous months from point of entry into program

⬆ ENGAGEMENT WITH CAMPUS & RESOURCES

Increased use of campus resources &/or feel "better connected to campus"

⬆ FINANCIAL STABILITY
- Increased financial literacy/planning
- Either increased or maintain income
- Increased agency

⬆ RETENTION
- Enrolled a semester after entering housing OR graduated
- GPA &/or enrolled in minimum # of units
- Consistent attendance

⬆ WELL-BEING
- Physical
- Mental
- Food security

Long Term Outcomes

TRANSITION TO PERMANENT HOUSING

Take over the lease or transition into independent housing.

⬆ FINANCIAL STABILITY

Increase or maintain income

⬆ RETENTION
- In school since enrolled in program
- Academic performance
- Graduate

⬆ WELL-BEING
- Physical
- Mental
- Food security

Impacts

⬇ **STUDENT HOMELESSNESS**

⬆ **EQUITY IN STUDENT HOUSING SECURITY**

⬆ **LONG TERM HOUSING STABILITY**

⬆ **STABILITY OF POST GRADUATION**

⬆ **EARNINGS**

⬇ **TIME TO GRADUATION**

⬆ **RETENTION & GRADUATION**

⬆ **WELL-BEING**

Evaluation Methods

This Evaluation of College Focused Rapid Rehousing is a three-year study that employs a mixed methods research design and incorporates both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. The study period spans Academic Years (AY) 2021/2022 - 2023/2024 and will conclude in Fall 2024. This Interim Report is focused on Year 1 of the study (AY 2021/2022). Central to this evaluation are methods to gather data from students, staff, and partners about the process and impact of the CFRR model. Data collection methods are consistent across all 8 CSU campuses and 2 Community Colleges and are implemented by CSU faculty researchers in partnership with campus staff, community agencies and the CSU Chancellor's Office.

Campus and Community Partner Staff Focus Groups

In addition to gathering student perspectives on their housing security and program participation, CFRR and homelessness prevention program staff from the campus (N=21) and community partners (N=15) participated in focus groups. *This Interim Report includes staff focus group data collected in Spring 2022.*

Program Data Analysis

Data collected by each CFRR program will be reviewed and analyzed each year of the evaluation. In addition to data generated by the CFRR programs, the Evaluation Team will work with Institutional Research staff from the CSU Office of the Chancellor and campuses to examine academic performance data for CFRR participants. *This Interim Report includes program data collected in Summer and Fall of 2022.*

Student Program Participant Surveys

All students who have been housed by any CFRR program, as well as students who have received some type of campus-based homeless prevention assistance, will be sent a web-based survey each semester. The goal of this survey is to establish a cross-sectional picture over time of all students who have ever participated in these programs across the 10 campuses. In addition, students who respond to this baseline survey will also receive a second, six-month follow-up, survey to assess longitudinal trends of responses over time. *This Interim Report includes cross-sectional survey data collected from 141 students who were enrolled in CFRR programs at all 10 campuses from August 2020 through March of 2022.*

TABLE 1

Sample of Rapid Rehousing Baseline Survey Participants (N=141)

	#	%
CSU Campuses (10)		
Cal Poly	36	25%
Sacramento State	22	16%
Chico State	19	14%
Long Beach	17	12%
San Diego State	9	6%
San Francisco State	5	4%
San José State	3	2%
Northridge	1	.71%
Subtotal	111	
Community Colleges (2)		
Cerritos College	15	11%
Long Beach City College	14	10%
Subtotal	29	
Total	**141**	

Student Interviews

Over the course of the evaluation students participating in the CFRR program will be interviewed to better understand their experience in the program and its impact on their lives. In addition to interviewing students who have participated in the CFRR programs, students who were eligible for these programs but declined enrollment will be invited to be interviewed. Furthermore, students who have participated in other campus homelessness prevention programs will also be interviewed. *The Interim Report includes data from pilot interviews conducted with 19 students from Chico State and Sacramento State in Spring and Summer of 2021.*

Program Profiles

Information about all CSU and CCC programs in this study were gathered to create initial Program Profiles. These Profiles will be updated throughout this evaluation. *This Interim Report includes data from program profiles compiled in Fall 2021.*

Preliminary Evaluation Learnings

This Interim Report is based on data collected largely in Spring and Summer 2022. Much more data collection will occur in Years 2 and 3 of the evaluation to create a robust picture of the process and impact of CFRR. In addition, data will be collected about homelessness prevention efforts on each campus. However, there are meaningful preliminary learnings from the data collected so far that start to shed light on the strengths and challenges of the CFRR model and the impact it has on the lives of students.

Program Development and Structure

Campus-community partnerships are critical to effectively address student homelessness.

The CFRR model is designed as a campus-community partnership. Campuses are the gatekeeper to the program, and provide academic support and connection to campus services. The community organizations provide linkage to housing, ongoing housing support and case management services. Campus leadership agree that without community partners the CFRR program can not be implemented. One campus leader described *"We at the institution cannot do it ourselves. We don't have the expertise, the financial resources, the infrastructure, we just can't."* Despite challenges that arise, the partnership with a trusted, experienced community partner ensures that the program can meet the needs of students. A campus leader remarked '*This has been messy. This has been a messy, beautiful, chaotic, wonderful collaboration for us and our students, and our partners.*'

> " *We at the institution cannot do it ourselves. We don't have the expertise, the financial resources, the infrastructure, we just can't.*"
>
> **CAMPUS LEADER**

CFRR is not one program that is uniform across CSU and CCC campuses but rather a model with common program components and desired outcomes.

CFRR is a program model that has been implemented across a significant number of CSU and CCC campuses. Campus programs in this study do have many similar program components that reflect the purpose and objectives of the CFRR model. The CSU chose campuses to design and implement the model through a centralized competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process. Although the CSU required common program elements, campuses had the leeway to develop their own policies, procedures and structures. The CCC allowed campuses autonomy in program design and development. As a result, the CFRR programs are not uniform. Contextual factors; campus values and approaches; community partner experiences and skills; and other issues all contribute to programmatic differences.

> " *This has been messy. This has been a messy, beautiful, chaotic, wonderful collaboration for us and our students, and our partners.*"
>
> **CAMPUS LEADER**

The campus-community partner Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) development process is a critical leveraging opportunity to determine program structure and mutual expectations.

Campuses and community partners used an MOU development process to define key program structures, roles and expectations. Although not unique, this process proved essential to the formation of programs that reflect the realities of each campus and community context. One campus leader described *"From the very beginning, from the MOU process, we had*

conversations on looking at their MOUs that they've had with previous campuses, and then we started to have the conversation on what needed to be adjusted to make sure they're serving our population, for example, having a high need for non-traditional students." Given that CFRR is a new program, flexibility in the MOU is highly valued by campuses and community partners as unexpected challenges arise in these early years of program development and implementation. A community partner explained the importance of *"just being flexible, and understanding that, yes, there's an MOU with guidelines and eligibility criteria but this isn't a cookie-cutter approach."*

LEARNING

Co-location of staff, with community partner staff on campus at least several days a week facilitates communication and rapid engagement with students.

The CFRR model envisions that students experiencing homelessness or housing insecurity first come in contact with campus staff who determine if they meet CFRR eligibility criteria. Eligible students are then referred to the community partner for additional assessment and enrollment. To facilitate a smooth and efficient hand-off, some programs co-located campus and community partner staff in campus locations. Campus staff offered, *"We are on-campus in an office area two or three days a week. Now that the pandemic's over I think that's been very successful so that we are accessible to them and we're able to work together with them when they're screening the students to be able to see and help out there. We're in the same office as them. That's been helpful."*

LEARNING

Consistent, open communication is essential to a productive and effective relationship between campus and community partners. At times these relationships can be difficult and values, purpose and program delivery alignment is needed and only achieved through regular, open communication.

> *" I think going back and making sure that they understand that there's a nexus to the campus and it's critically important that while they are managing the day-to-day that we are all involved and need to communicate from our multiple angles of the work that we will do."*
>
> **CAMPUS STAFF**

Many programs have regular meetings between campus and community partner staff with scheduled weekly and monthly meetings common and daily meetings as needed. There have been times when tensions have arisen between campus and community partners and open communication is seen as key to overcoming these challenges. A community partner staff commented, *"In the beginning, we had a lot of challenges with even the definition of homeless for some of our campuses and we're helping them understand that...I will say, I feel we've been very fortunate to have those open conversations with our campus partners."* Campus staff agreed, *"I think going back and making sure that they understand that there's a nexus to the campus and it's critically important that while they are managing the day-to-day that we are all involved and need to communicate from our multiple angles of the work that we will do."*

> *" In the beginning, we had a lot of challenges with even the definition of homeless for some of our campuses and we're helping them understand that...I will say, I feel we've been very fortunate to have those open conversations with our campus partners."*
>
> **CAMPUS STAFF**

Eligibility

LEARNING

The core component of eligibility for all CFRR programs is homelessness defined as an inadequate, unsafe, untenable, or temporary housing situation. However, some campuses have limitations in their capacity to verify student homelessness and rely on community partners to gather information to ascertain student housing status.

Consistently, data across student surveys and qualitative data collection from program staff and administrators show that the intent of the California State policy to address homelessness for students is a primary focus. As one community partner leader said, *"Our criteria is that a student has to be unhoused and they have to not have the resources to resolve their homelessness independently....We reserve those slots for students who do not have historical support, who do not have financial backing, community access to resources, generational wealth, those types of things."* Although program eligibility focuses on the need to provide stable housing for those students most in need, some programs enroll CFRR participants who are on the brink of homelessness or struggled managing housing costs rather than actively unhoused.

In order to meet the need to address student homelessness, many campuses utilized the expertise of their housing agencies to determine student housing status. As a campus staff said, *"Basically, if a student comes in and says, "I'm housing insecure," you verify that they're a student, that they have X amount of units and X amount of GPA and then you push them over or not push them over [to the community partner]."*

LEARNING

Though there are general consistencies across campus implementation of eligibility requirements, some campuses impose significant and unique eligibility requirements, processes and services.

In general, campuses choose to focus on the needs of the students, directly related to their homelessness status. In all cases, students are required to be enrolled and in some cases, students are required to have a minimum GPA, though these campuses often discuss flexibility with the academic requirement. However, one campus added an additional requirement that students must exhaust all financial aid, including loans, before accessing housing support. This was mentioned by a community partner, who said, *"...[The] university has this philosophy that you have to exhaust every single one of your financial loans before you can even be referred to a housing program, which has been a huge point of contention between us."* Some CFRR staff suggest an opportunity for establishing consistency in eligibility across all campuses. As one community partner leader shared, *"I'd like to see a little bit more uniformity amongst the program of what eligibility is so that it was very clear across all campuses and there wasn't so much room for power and control over one agency over another or one university over another. I'm looking for a little bit more parity with a lot more conversation*

from the partner's perspective in terms of what we can do."

> *"We were in the meetings advocating for getting rid of some of those barriers because it didn't make sense that if a student who's struggling with housing has a low GPA that they can't be in the housing program because they need housing to get their GPA up. That was just a vicious cycle."*
>
> **COMMUNITY PARTNER**

In addition, programs often initially included minimum GPA eligibility requirements, but some later changed those requirements since students who are in the most need also have difficulty maintaining their academic performance. One community partner pinpointed a particular example of how GPA requirements can be prohibitive stating, *"We had a specific student that was-- dad was dying of cancer had to be a caretaker. Mom ended up having some Alzheimer's and him and his wife are trying to be caretakers and students at the same time and still work, ... he didn't maintain the GPA."* Because the campus on which the student was enrolled requires the minimum academic performance, the partner agency was asked to remove the subsidy. The campus leader said, *"That's against what we do as an agency and organization and as a county, as a whole. Those are some of the things that we had to really work through to make sure that the students' needs are met first."* Another community partner mentioned, *"We were in the meetings advocating for getting rid of some of those barriers because it didn't make sense that if a student who's struggling with housing has a low GPA that they can't be in the housing program because they need housing to get their GPA up. That was just a vicious cycle."*

Outreach and Enrollment

LEARNING

Outreach is needed to educate campus communities about CFRR program eligibility criteria, ensure access to students the program is intending to serve and to direct ineligible students to appropriate resources.

Students find CFRR in a variety of ways, often including referrals from other campus programs or seeking support online. When asked how they had learned about CFRR on their campus, participants most commonly indicated that they had heard about the program through an academic advisor or campus staff (26%). Students also commonly reported that they learned about CFRR through a web search for housing resources on campus (21%). In some cases, students who do not meet eligibility requirements of the CFRR program are diverted to other options. One campus staff stated, *"We find that it's either those students that don't access us are because they think that their need is not great or is not bigger than the other students. Primarily, when we went back into on-campus learning where we had students who were coming to us that were not necessarily homeless... We were having to...reeducate on who we are and what we actually do."* However, program staff and administrators acknowledge that there may be students in need of the program who do not find it, and strategic efforts to bridge this gap are necessary. As a campus staff person said, *"As a team, we have been evaluating ways that we can educate the students and our campus culture as to what our services are for and reevaluating, "How are we advertising our services here on campus that will be welcoming to those students who are in need?"*

Campus leaders also indicated that the CFRR program links students back to other necessary supports. One campus leader said, *"If there's any additional support that us on the campus side can provide, whether that's resources, checking in with communications, helping with the referral process, helping our students get the documents they need, and we're able to support…"*

Quick and efficient handoff of eligible students between campus and community partners followed by immediate communication with students by the community partner is essential to student engagement and trust building. Further, students who self refer to CFRR program through community partners face barriers to enrollment as campus staff need to determine initial eligibility.

Preliminarily, it appears that the collaboration between campus and community partners streamlines the link between students experiencing homelessness and permanent housing. When students are first identified by the campus, they are likely to make a smooth transition to the community partner, which supports engagement and rapport with program participants. As one campus staff said, *"We've also been getting a lot of really good feedback from our students that from the time that we submit the intake into community partner, they're getting outreached within 24 to 48 hours. That's really helpful in that continuity of care. We've gotten a lot of feedback from students who said, 'I didn't think somebody was going to call me, so it's really great to get an email from community partner with all that information of what's going to happen next.'…That really, I think, gives a lot of reassurance to our students that there's*

somebody at the other end." A community partner agreed, saying, *"The plus side of working with the university is it's very direct. As soon as a student needs some help, we can address it immediately. With the CoC [continuum of care], you have to go through this whole intermediate process and there's a gatekeeper and clients could be stuck in the county queue for months to years. It's terrible. That part, I really like."*

> *"The plus side of working with the university is it's very direct. As soon as a student needs some help, we can address it immediately."*
>
> **COMMUNITY PARTNER**

However, in some cases, students find CFRR on their own and contact a community partner first. Given that the vision for the program is that students start CFRR with a referral from the campus, there appears to be an opportunity to address this engagement strategy so that students do not have to seek support from both entities, tying them into a complex back and forth between campus and community partner staff. As one community partner staff said, *"All referrals obviously have to come from the CSU, so if I do get an email from somebody who saw our website and they're like, 'I'm [a university student], I want to be a part of this program,' I can only really give a recommendation and then go to the campus and tell them about the student. I can't actually refer them back to me. I don't really have the power to look into any of their student loans or stuff that they use to decide referrals based on financial aid…I'm checking in and I'm like, 'Hey, have you been able to get to the student?'"*

Student Participants in CFRR Programs

As of mid-August, 2022, CFRR programs across the 10 campuses have housed 357 students.

Table 2 provides the number of students housed through CFRR programs across each campus. These data do not include those who received only short-term rental assistance for homelessness prevention or who have enrolled in the program but were not yet housed. CSU and CCC campuses provide information to students that estimate the cost of housing and food in their area (Table 3). CFRR rent subsidies cover a significant portion of the cost of rent for program participants. In year 1 data collection, data regarding monthly subsidy received by program participants was provided for slightly more than half of RRH program participants (188). Three campuses were missing subsidy information for all of their RRH participants. Of the 188 data points with monthly subsidy information, the average monthly subsidy is $1018.43, with a standard deviation of $473.78.

CFRR participants have significant complex lived experiences of homelessness and imminent homelessness while in school.

Students enrolled in CFRR report significant challenges with housing while in school (Table 4). Seventy percent recalled a specific period of literal homelessness while at school when they lacked a safe, regular, and adequate nighttime place to stay and sleep. Most of these students

CFRR Student Enrollment August 2020 through August 2022

Campus	#	%
Sacramento State	64	18%
Long Beach State	57	16%
Cal Poly Pomona	48	13%
Long Beach Community College	44	12%
Cerritos Community College	43	12%
Chico State	31	9%
San Francisco State	30	8%
San Diego State	21	6%
Northridge	11	3%
San José State	8	2%
Total	**357**	

Estimated Cost of Food & Housing for Students who Live Off-Campus AY '22/'23

Campus	Estimated Cost
Chico State	$12,724
CSU Long Beach	$13,910
CSU Northridge	$19,728
Cal Poly Pomona	$14,200
Sacramento State	$21,620
San Diego State	$16,144
San Francisco State University	$18,999
San José State	$19,266
Cerritos College	$17,784
Long Beach City College	$17,784

Sources: 2022-23 Estimated Undergraduate Cost of Attendance; Cerritos College 2022-2023 Student Financial Aid Cost of Attendance; and Long Beach City College 2022-23 Aid Year Annual Cost of Attendance

Approximately

70%

of CFRR participants reported that they had experienced at least one period of literal homelessness while in school when they lacked a safe, regular, and adequate nighttime place to stay and sleep.

reported these experiences occured right before entering the CFRR program. The immediate needs for CFRR included staying in a homeless shelter, being unhoused and living in cars or couches, moving from place to place, family estrangement or lack of family support, housing instability due to the landlord and roommate situations, and job loss due to Covid which resulted in homelessness. As one campus case manager said, *"I feel like it comes with the territory for our students who are experiencing homelessness. They've been through more traumatic events. They have a longer history of homelessness."*

> *"I feel like it comes with the territory for our students who are experiencing homelessness. They've been through more traumatic events. They have a longer history of homelessness."*
>
> **CAMPUS STAFF**

Many students experience untenable or difficult financial situations prior to CFRR enrollment.

> *"...The students that go through the program are typically students that require some long-term assistance, more in-depth intervention, wraparound services...the stories that I've heard are not students that are experiencing this for the first time. Usually, there is a history of either housing insecurity in combination with food insecurity."*
>
> **CAMPUS LEADER**

Recalling their household monetary situation three months prior to starting CFRR, 71% of survey respondents chose answers indicating that they did not have enough, saying that they either "had to cut back" (27%) or "could not make ends meet" (44%). Reports of financial distress were slightly higher among the 55% of respondents who were unemployed. Of the unemployed, 77% of survey respondents said that they did not have enough money to get by. Campus leadership observed this as well, saying *"...the students that go through the program are typically students that require some long-term assistance, more in-depth intervention, wraparound services...the stories that I've heard are not students that are experiencing this for the first time. Usually, there is a history of either housing insecurity in combination with food insecurity."* A community partner agreed and said, *"Some of the young people that we serve have had housing instability for a majority of their life, not just when they went to college."*

TABLE 4

CFRR Student Housing Challenges While in School

	#	%
Moved in with other people, even for a little while, because of financial problems?	113	80%
Moved two times or more in the same year?	102	72%
Experienced an increase in rent or mortgage that made it difficult to pay	100	71%
Lacked a safe, regular, and adequate nighttime place to stay and sleep?*	98	70%
Lived with others beyond the expected capacity of the house or apartment?	86	61%
Did not pay or underpaid your rent or mortgage?	63	45%
Reported any of the above responses	137	97%

*This can include couch-surfing in other people's homes for temporary sleeping arrangements, single-occupancy facilities, homeless shelters, campgrounds, motels, vehicles, and living on the street.

71%

of participants reported that while in school they had experienced at least one substantial rent increase that they considered difficult to pay.

Almost half of surveyed CFRR participants (45%) indicated that they had underpaid, or not paid, their monthly rent at least once while in school. Seven one percent (71%) of participants reported that while in school and prior to program enrollment they had experienced at least one substantial rent increase they considered difficult to pay. The majority of participants (80%) reported at least one occasion when they had to move in with other people because of financial problems.

Understanding this has helped some campus staff to rethink their conceptualization of the issues students face. One campus case manager said, *"[Staff have said] they just didn't anticipate that rapid rehousing students would have such complex needs whether it's mental health needs or history of intimate partner violence, or other experiences. I think they just have attached this idea of privilege to the college experience."*

> " *Some of the young people that we serve have had housing instability for a majority of their life, not just when they went to college.*"
>
> **CAMPUS LEADER**

Surveyed participants reported that they were accessing a variety of campus and community

TABLE 5

CFRR Student Enrollment by Race, Ethnicity, or Region of Origin

Race, Ethnicity or Region of Origin	#	%
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	117	33%
Black or African American	93	26%
White	39	11%
Asian or Asian American	26	7%
Biracial or Multiracial	15	4%
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	4	1%
American Indian or Native Alaskan	2	0.6%
MIddle Eastern or Northern African	2	0.6%
Subtotal	298	83%
Note: Race/Ethnicity information was not provided for an additional 59 (17%) students	59	17%
Total Program Participants	357	100%

resources during the time they participated in CFRR. A quarter of CFRR participants surveyed (24%) indicated that they were already receiving some type of assistance from their campus' Basic Needs Center when they were referred into CFRR (and this is how they learned about CFRR). The most common services included: accessing the food pantry on campus (60%); applying for financial aid/loans (48%); applying for CalFresh (43%), visiting a campus mental health provider (28%); attending sessions on budgeting/financial wellness (21%).

LEARNING

Marginalized students are heavily represented as CFRR participants.

Program data collected in early fall from campus and community partner staff provide a snapshot of the race, ethnicities and countries of origin of program participants. Two of the ten campuses did not initially collect race/ethnicity data, and thus race/ethnicity is missing for 59 program participants (17%) (Table 5). These data were provided the programs regarding the race/ethnicity of their participants, in contrast to self-reported race/ethnicity from the survey data.

Campus staff noted that marginalized students are over represented in their programs. Surveyed CFRR participants are more than twice as likely to be a first generation student compared to the general CSU student population (72% vs 32%) [CSU California State Fact Book 2022] or more like than California community colleges (43%) [CCLC Fast Facts 2019]. 41% of survey respondents identified as Hispanic/Latino(x) this is approximately equivalent with the Hispanic population of California Community Colleges (46%) and the CSU Hispanic population (46%).

Thirty five percent (35%) reported having at least one disability. Campus staff mentioned that there is room to grow in determining the best ways to support students with disabilities.

17% CFRR participants reported being a current or former foster youth. Fifty five percent (55%) of CFRR participants are transfer students, which is a substantially higher than the general CSU population which is approximately a third transfer students (CSU Transfer Student). Campus and community partner staff identified a need for expanded engagement with student parents. One campus partner said, *"We have a huge population of students with dependents that are experiencing housing insecurity and homelessness...and that really does impact their eligibility to receive services. There weren't bridge housing options for students with dependents. That was a long conversation that we had with community partner and they were able to adjust their program a little bit to actually offer some affordable housing options for our students with dependents."*

> *"We have a huge population of students with dependents that are experiencing housing insecurity and homelessness..."*
>
> **CAMPUS STAFF**

Many participants receive at least one form of tuition assistance. Of the survey respondents, 45% reported receiving Pell Grants, 26% received a scholarship, and 26% received student loans. Fifty six percent (56%) received at least Pell Grant. The extent to which students are aware of financial aid opportunities is unclear.

The age of survey respondents ranged from 18 to 58 years old; the average age of CFRR participants was 28 with a standard deviation of 9 years. Though the largest group of participants were

between the ages of 18-24 (49%), over half were older than 25 [see Demographics Table].

Older participants described notably worse prior housing conditions than younger participants. Interestingly, students at or over 25 years old were nearly twice as likely to report literal homelessness at the time of entering the program compared to younger students (54% vs 29%). This may partly reflect the fact that older students were less likely to report living with their parents compared to younger students (6% vs. 32%) [See Table 5]. This pinpoints an opportunity to address a specific need, as mentioned by a campus case manager who said, *"We need to look at some avenues for non-traditional students, those that don't fit that traditional model because I think that those are the ones that really come to us with a lot of need, and we find ourselves having to problem solve."*

> *"[Our students are] 18 to early 50s all places in their academic experience. We serve some folks who are undocumented. We have queer students. We have students of color. We have a range of neurodiverse students. Just a really beautiful collection and representation of our campus. I would say what they all have in common; many of them lack social supports … Many of them also come with significant trauma history."*
>
> **CAMPUS STAFF**

Campus and community partners recognized that engagement of marginalized students is necessary to ensure program opportunities are directed to those who most need them, but may not seek them out. One community partner leader said, *"We need to be mindful and serve those who are the most marginalized and those of the*

Black and brown community. That's something that we definitely need to start uplifting." A campus case manager summed up the diversity of representation in the CFRR community. *"[Our students are] 18 to early 50s all places in their academic experience. We serve some folks who are undocumented. We have queer students. We have students of color. We have a range of neurodiverse students. Just a really beautiful collection and representation of our campus. I would say what they all have in common; many of them lack social supports ...Many of them also come with significant trauma history."*

CFRR Services

<div style="background-color:#f5a623;color:white;padding:4px;display:inline-block;">**LEARNING**</div>

The CFRR case manager-student relationship is valued by many students.

> *"[A CFRR student] always mentioned, 'I have no support system. I have no support.'...she calls him and she talks to him and he supports her in all aspects of life regardless of what she's going through in person like academics. I think thats the difference the program has brought again, showing her that she has a support system..."*
>
> **COMMUNITY PARTNER**

The majority of surveyed participants regularly meet with a program case manager. In general, students gave positive responses regarding their case manager with few reporting a negative experience. About 77% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement *"My case manager helped me set short term and long-term goals."* The students who expressed dissatisfaction with case management also reported that they didn't see

their case manager regularly. Students who participated in the pilot interviews reported that the CFRR program gave them an extra level of support and care that was much appreciated. One student shared, *"They were really caring and friendly and polite. And they didn't like...no one was condescending or looked down on you...They didn't treat me differently and they've been just really kind and compassionate, which isn't something that I experienced a lot."* A campus staff recognized the tremendous value of case management services provided by the community partner. *"[A CFRR student] always mentioned, 'I have no support system. I have no support.'...she calls him and she talks to him and he supports her in all aspects of life regardless of what she's going through in person like academics. I think thats the difference the program has brought again, showing her that she has a support system..."*

<div style="background-color:#f5a623;color:white;padding:4px;display:inline-block;">**LEARNING**</div>

For some students the requirement to participate in case management and other services beyond the provision of housing can be a disincentive for participation in CFRR.

> *"A student might be very interested in joining the program and we've talked to them and they are all interested and ready to go, but when it comes to really discussing what are the requirements, as far as having a weekly case management meeting, or making sure that you are working as hard as we're working for you, it becomes an issue where students sometimes might opt-out to not join the program and rather look at other resources."*
>
> **CAMPUS STAFF`**

Campus staff reported that there are students who experience homelessness and are interested in placement in housing but decline participation in CFRR because they do not want to engage with program requirements. *"A student might be very interested in joining the program and we've talked to them and they are all interested and ready to go, but when it comes to really discussing what are the requirements, as far as having a weekly case management meeting, or making sure that you are working as hard as we're working for you, it becomes an issue where students sometimes might opt-out to not join the program and rather look at other resources."*

At times the hesitance to participate in services shows itself once a student is placed in housing. Campus and community partner staff reported that some students do not want to engage in a structured program and push back against regular meetings with a case manager. Community partners explained that when the housing subsidies decrease student disengagement with case management can escalate. *"Students will usually get all the money that we're offering. As soon as that last subsidy check goes out, they don't want to talk to us anymore so they'll ghost all of their case management, which is up to them."* However, some community partners advocate for flexibility in their approach with students and do not want to initially terminate students who do not engage with case management services. This approach is consistent with traditional models of RRH, in which requirements for participation in services is not considered the best practice anymore for serving homeless households. As a community partner said, *"I think for us, we did have a program agreement that was, if the student doesn't reach out for six weeks, you make them inactive. I chose to not do that. I think it's really worked out because students feel like, "I'll be fine," and then something like an emergency will*

happen. *They got COVID, lost a job, they need help, and we're able to just jump back in. I think that being really flexible and always leaning on the lenient side with students has been helpful because we've had multiple students graduating this semester."*

LEARNING

Turnover in case management staff and communication issues between campus and community partners can challenge program implementation and stability.

> *"Sometimes there's a misunderstanding of who does what. What does the campus side do in terms of case management versus the partner side?"*
>
> **CAMPUS STAFF`**

At times uncertainty about roles and communication between campus and community partner staff can be confusing. Students in the pilot interviews noted these communication challenges and campus staff pointed it out as well. *"Sometimes there's a misunderstanding of who does what. What does the campus side do in terms of case management versus the partner side?"* Furthermore, turnover amongst case management staff, particularly within the community partner organizations proves unsettling to the program and exacerbates communication difficulties. Campus staff reported, *"I think there has been so much turnover in the case manager role, as you all have said. I think for them...] while I continue to love them and appreciate them, they have grown really quickly, very fast. There's some growing pains that they're going through as they're trying to train."*

In some cases, student co-occurring mental health and substance use issues are beyond the scope of CFRR case management and require significant mental health support.

CFRR is designed to meet the needs of students experiencing homelessness while they are enrolled in school. Campus staff and community partners are well aware that students who are homeless may face other issues that are intertwined with their housing circumstances and that they may extend beyond the scope of the CFRR program. A campus staff shared, *"We've had a small handful of students that are experiencing severe mental health concerns, which is out of the scope of our practice, but we don't want to turn students away who are experiencing those things, but we also aren't the experts or clinicians to be able to help these students."* Campus staff have tried to respond to students' expressed desire for mental health support as a part of the CFRR program. *"We really tried to prioritize student voice given the mental health needs…We're in the process of starting a rapid rehousing peer support group…I think coming from community mental health, I anticipated there would be significant mental health needs but I just think the beauty of the ways that the students have been so expressive about what they want the program to be."* In response to mental health needs of students, community partners implement programs outside of CFRR in which they can engage students who may need a different approach or longer provision of services. CBO leadership explain, *"Providing the services with a trauma-informed lens and realizing that there's different ways that traumas show themselves and the way it can affect grades and attendance and all of those things. Trying to make sure that students are*

supported through that, even if they'll no longer be with our rapid rehousing program. Trying to link those students who we see need maybe more intense services or longer-term…"

> *"We've had a small handful of students that are experiencing severe mental health concerns, which is out of the scope of our practice, but we don't want to turn students away who are experiencing those things, but we also aren't the experts or clinicians to be able to help these students."*
>
> **CAMPUS STAFF`**

Housing

CFRR community partners' expertise in placing individuals in stable, permanent housing options is critical to program success.

The CFRR community partners are a diverse group of organizations with deep experience supporting individuals experiencing homeless access stable housing. For some of the organizations their involvement in CFRR has allowed them to expand existing programs that already serve college students. For others, CFRR has provided a new opportunity to work with CCC and CSU campuses to meet the needs of students who are homeless. They attribute success with students in CFRR to their long standing work with securing housing for individuals experiencing homelessness and relationships with landlords who want to rent to students. *"We've been very successful because*

TABLE 6

Types of Housing for CFRR Participants

Type of Housing	#	%
Individual housing	121	34%
Single room in a shared house	90	25%
Shared room	69	19%
Other	9	3%
Subtotal	289	
Missing	68	19%
Total	357	100%

we've been doing this for many years. We have relationships with landlords and stuff and that's really the ticket is to develop those relationships with property owners and landlords and then to be available to them if there is a problem and be responsive at all times."

LEARNING

CFRR participants were most often placed in individual housing or in a single room in shared housing. Shared housing situations can be challenging for some students and some students will not enroll or remain in the program if it is the only option.

For some students living alone is a priority when seeking out support from campus housing programs. However, many of the community housing options offered through the CFRR programs are shared living situations. *"....As well as for us, the shared living model, we have some units which are four bedrooms. Each student has their own living space, but it might be a shared bathroom between two so those individuals will choose not to live in the shared housing like that."*

Community partners find that for some students this will be their first time living on their own and that shared living situations can prove to be challenging. Community partner staff explained that working with students to focus on agreements and program retention is critical. *"I think that that has been an issue in retaining students in programming as well as setting them up for successful exit plans because they are focusing a lot on who's messing with the air conditioner and the little things that it is to be a roommate when you're young."* One community partner recommended that CFRR programs develop "shared housing best practices" to increase retention of students living in shared housing.

Many of the programs provided information about the types of housing CFRR participants live in during their participation in the program. (See Table 6) (Note, this data is available for 289 of the 357 program participants, and 9 of 10 campuses).

Outcomes

Early results suggest that most students do not run out of CFRR funding prematurely, but are instead able to remain in CFRR until they find other permanent housing or until they are no longer enrolled in school. However, housing beyond graduation is still an area of significant concern.

> *" …[students] just being able to get off of stressing about housing and food, and more focus on school. We've had a lot of students that are able to graduate successfully, get their grades up…This provided some ease to them navigating school, getting on their own feet."*
>
> **CAMPUS STAFF**

Of those whose participation in CFRR has ended and who began CFRR at least one year prior to the survey, most either found other permanent housing (38%) or were no longer in school (31%). One campus staff person noted the result of this housing stability, saying *"…[students] just being able to get off of stressing about housing and food, and more focus on school. We've had a lot of students that are able to graduate successfully, get their grades up…This provided some ease to them navigating school, getting on their own feet."* Similarly, another campus staff person remembered, *"We've had so many students come back to us and say, "You were the reason I was able to graduate. The support was the reason I was able to finish out. You were the only people who didn't give up on me." That's been huge. I think that's the core of why we do these things is to* make sure students can be successful and they don't have to choose."

> *"I mean, it hasn't left my mind that I'm going to need to find a place to live permanently. But the question is, what's affordable?"*
>
> **STUDENT**

Notably, a program strategy to address housing challenges post-graduation remains unclear. At present, CFRR programs are focused on ensuring students have housing until graduation. However, many students worry about what happens after particularly given the tight housing market in California. . As one campus leader said, *"…That's definitely been a concern because once those conversations come up with the student like, "Hey, your time's running out on the subsidies," then they start to have some anxiety and start freaking out like, "Oh, wow. What am I going to do without this extra funding?"…That's going to cause some anxiety."* Despite one student's excitement over her place and stating that she *"couldn't be happier with the outcome,"* she also noted, *"I mean, it hasn't left my mind that I'm going to need to find a place to live permanently. But the question is, what's affordable?"* Thus far, the broader context of an expensive, severely limited housing market poses a significant challenge to long-term housing stability of program graduates beyond enrollment.

Most CFRR participants see notable improvement in their general financial situation, although some still struggle to get by.

Of those currently enrolled for at least one month, the percentage of respondents who said they have enough (or more than enough) money to get by almost doubled from 28% in the three months prior to enrollment to 55% at the time of the survey. A community partner mentioned some of the financial benefits they provide, saying *"We have a savings plan with them but helping them increase their income for when they leave programming. We've had a number of students graduate into well-paying jobs. That has been exciting and some successes with that."* Another community agency case manager said, *"Our program provides a refund once the student is paying rent each month. We provide a percentage of that back to the student 30 days prior to exit, to utilize for moving fees for costs that way."*

> *"Our program provides a refund once the student is paying rent each month. We provide a percentage of that back to the student 30 days prior to exit, to utilize for moving fees for costs that way."*
>
> **COMMUNITY PARTNER**

Campus leaders feel that the financial relief supports students' overall well-being. One person stated, *"Not having to worry about your rent or whether your rent is going to get paid, allows them to[focus on] their mental well-being and focus on school. In addition to being able to save some money, and we help them with-- if they need to get help get a job, whatever...It's been very successful for all those areas."*

However, students still face financial hardships while in the program. Of students surveyed, 54% reported current credit card debt related to school expenditures. Even without the burden of rent, many reported still having difficulty with food insecurity. Forty-one percent said that in

the last 30 days they went hungry because they did not have enough money for food and 63% reported using the campus food pantry. However, 43% reported receiving assistance with applying to CalFresh, which may have a positive impact on food security. Furthermore, while CFRR can help relieve the financial burden of rent, some participants still needed to exit the program because their personal or family financial situation would not allow them to remain in school despite the help CFRR provided. Some students reported that they left school to take care of family who could not get by on their own.

<mark>**LEARNING**</mark>

CFRR decreases life stressors, deepens participants' connection to campus and social supports, and grants them the additional time needed to achieve greater academic success.

When asked about the ways in which CFRR may have opened up new opportunities or otherwise contributed to their life, participants were most likely to agree or strongly agree that "My living situation felt more stabilized" (73%),"I was able to avoid some negative/toxic relationships in my life" (21% agree and 44% strongly agree), and "I was better able to manage life's responsibilities" (70%). Overall, students who participated in the pilot interviews reported improvements with physical wellness and feelings of safety for themselves and sometimes family members. A campus partner further explained the positive outcome of the relief of stress, saying, *"A lot of students have been able to use that energy that they're using to just survive to actually be able to go to doctor's appointments or get connected with mental health services on campus and things like that."*

Many campus and community partners reflected

on how social support and campus connection helps address students' stress and perception of available community supports. A case manager said, *"I think the difference that this program makes for them is it gives them a support system. It creates that connection and that anchor to their community and to their campus that allows them to feel that they have a place to go when they have problems."* When discussing the community and campus connection CFRR builds, a community agency case manager said, *"An increased sense of belongingness, emotional wellbeing, and interpersonal relationships... Even if students are not experiencing severe need or crisis, just having someone to be able to check in with them and say like, "I care. How are you doing? Do you need anything?" has made a lot of difference for students...in order to really focus on school and be able to set them up for success outside of programming, whether that's full-time work if they're graduating or not, and be able to give more energy and attention to things that are important to them."*

> *"A lot of students have been able to use that energy that they're using to just survive to actually be able to go to doctor's appointments or get connected with mental health services on campus and things like that."*
>
> **CAMPUS STAFF**

Most CFRR participants agreed or strongly agreed that the program allowed them to "have more time to study for quizzes and exams" (65%), improve their grades (64%), or have time to attend all classes (63%). Largely, pilot participants reported that access to housing through the CFRR allowed them to focus more on school. One student shared, *"Like just the experience with our classes, the same format, and it's a hundred percent*

different now that I'm stable and I have a desk and I always have power and always have wifi."

> *" Like just the experience with our classes, the same format, and it's a hundred percent different now that I'm stable and I have a desk and I always have power and always have wifi."*
>
> **STUDENT**

Conclusion

CFRR is an innovative intervention to address student homelessness. California has invested significant resources to pilot this model in both the CSU and CCC systems. This Interim Report gives stakeholders a preliminary sense of strengths and challenges of the model and further illuminates areas for continued exploration. Moving forward we are particularly interested in examining what program structures are essential to the success of the model; the barriers and facilitators of program enrollment; the needs of parenting students; how CFRR addresses student mental health and the impact of case management; and, how programs address the need to retain stable housing in severely challenging housing markets. This evaluation will continue into 2024 and a final report will lay out all that is discovered through the three year evaluation. The final report will build on the preliminary learnings and will seek to answer more fully the evaluation questions that are guiding this work and provide stakeholders with evidence about the process and impact of CFRR.

References

Burt, M., Wilkins, C., Spellman, B., D'Alanno, T., White, M., & Mathews, N. (2016). *Evaluation of the Rapid Re-Housing for Homeless Families Demonstration (RRHD) Program*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development. Retrieved from: https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sites/default/files/pdf/RRHD-PartI-Process.pdf

California Community Colleges. (n.d.). *Key Facts*. Retrieved October 24, 2022, from https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Key-Facts

Community College League of California. (2019). *Fast Facts* 2019. Retrieved October 24, 2022, from https://ccleague.org/sites/default/files/pdf/state-advocacy/fast_facts_2019_final.pdf

California State University. (2022). *The California State University Factbook 2022*. Retrieved October 24, 2022, from https://www.stage.calstate.edu/csu-system/about-the-csu/facts-about-the-csu/Documents/facts2022.pdf

California State University. (2022). *California State University's Hispanic-Serving Institutions*. Retrieved October 24, 2022, from https://www.calstate.edu/impact-of-the-csu/diversity/Documents/HSI-fact-sheet.pdf

Crutchfield, R. M. & Maguire, J. (2018). *California State University Office of the Chancellor Study of Student Basic Needs*. The California State University Office of the Chancellor. https://www2.calstate.edu/impact-of-the-csu/student-success/basic-needs-initiative/Documents/BasicNeedsStudy_phaseII_withAccessibilityComments.pdf

Culhane et al. (2016). *Rapid Re-Housing for Homeless Families Demonstration Programs evaluation report: Demonstration of Findings-Outcomes Evaluation*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Retrieved from: https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sites/default/files/pdf/RRHD-PartII-Outcomes.pdf

Cunningham, M. & Batko, S. (2018). *Rapid re-housing's role in responding to homelessness: What the evidence says*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute. Retrieved from: https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/99153/rapid_re-housings_role_in_responding_to_homelessness_3.pdf

Goldrick-Rab, S.,Baker-Smith, C., Coca, V., Looker, E., & Williams, T. (2019). *College and university basic needs insecurity: A national #RealCollege survey report*. Philadelphia, PA: The Hope Center. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_files/media/HOPE_realcollege_National_report_EMBARGOED%20UNTIL%20APRIL%2030%203%20AM%20EST%20(1).pdf

John Burton Advocates for Youth (n.d.). *College-Focused Rapid Rehousing: An evidence-based intervention to support housing & educational retention*. San Francisco, CA: author. Retrieved from https://www.jbay.org/wp-content/

uploads/2019/07/College-Focused-Rapid-Rehousing-1-pager-7-16-19.pdf

John Burton Advocates for Youth (2022, April). *Connecting the dots: How colleges can collaborate with homelessness response systems to address student needs*. Retrieved from https://jbayorg.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/connectingdots-FINAL.pdf

National Alliance to End Homelessness (March 2016). Rapid Re-Housing performance benchmarks and program standards. Washington, DC: National Alliance to End Homelessness. Retrieved from https://endhomelessness.org/resource/rapid-re-housingperformance-benchmarks-and-program-standards/

Our Partners