

What Have We Learned from the Hostel Closure Programme?

Presentation to GHN Annual Conference,
by Suzanne Fitzpatrick,
5th October 2010

Evaluation Aims and Methods

- To examine the resettlement outcomes for ex-residents of JDH and PMH
- Method 1: interviews with service providers (n= 22)
- Method 2: longitudinal survey of 'ring-fenced' ex-residents: Wave 1 (average 19 months after left hostel; n= 89); Wave 2 (average 33 months after left hostel; n= 60)
- Started in July 2007; final report published July 2010
<http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/chp/Projects/glasgowhostels.htm>
- Main 'story'; mainly Wave 1 statistics

Profile of Sample

- Age: 46% under 50; 54% over 50
- Accommodation type: 45% in permanent; 55% in supported
- Hostel - 51% from PMH; 49% JDH
- Homelessness experiences: 53% had stayed 5 or more years in Glasgow hostels; 55% had slept rough
- Health: generally poor; 42% had an alcohol problem (mainly over 50); 29% used drugs (all under 50)
- Personal history: under 50s far more troubled and less likely to have been married/had a steady job

Resettlement Process

- Over 80% happy with accommodation arranged for them; 72% (Wave 1) and 63% (Wave 2) still in the same accommodation
- A minority had experienced homelessness (16%); but very few had slept rough (2%)
- Enough information?: yes - 44%; no - 40%
- Felt supported?: 56% 'always'; 7% 'usually'; 20% 'neglected'; 14% 'mixed feelings'

Outcomes: Housing

- Supported: great majority reported that the staff were 'very helpful' and no problems sharing
- Permanent: 60% said running their own home was 'easy, no problems', 38% said 'mainly ok, but some problems', and 2% found it 'difficult'; no evidence of problems with neighbours
- High levels of satisfaction with safety, neighbourhood, facilities, furnishings and space; especially high in supported accommodation; problems with dirtiness/disrepair in permanent tenancies

Outcomes: Professional Support

- Support workers: 86% seen at least one type of worker (Wave 1), 73% (Wave 2); most commonly housing support workers; these workers were generally highly rated
- Support needs: 75% felt were getting all the help they needed (Wave 1); 83% (Wave 2)
- Self-identified unmet needs varied widely but were mainly practical (such as help with managing money/ debt)

Outcomes: Health, Social Support and Finances

- Drug and alcohol use - declined significantly
- Physical and mental health – substantial net improvements
- Social support - significantly increased from workers (especially for over 50s), and from family (under 50s)
- Financial situation: 61% said better; 14% worse

Outcomes: Work and Other Daily Activities

- Economic status: 3% of under 65s were in work; most were long-term sick/disabled
- Other activities: few engaged in 'structured' activities; many engaged in no regular activities of any kind; repetitive and solitary daily routines
- Loneliness and boredom major problems (though marginally better than in hostel)

Outcomes: Overall Quality of Life

- Changes in quality of life: 61% said life was 'much better'; 22% said it was 'better'; 11% said it was about the same; and 6% thought that it was worse
- One third (32%) missed something about the hostel
- Almost all (90%) said there was at least one thing better about their lives

Conclusions: What Did We Learn?

- Hostel closure succeeded in significantly improving lives of ex-residents of JDH and PMH
- Good outcomes achievable even for those with complex needs and long homelessness histories
- Need political support; strong central coordination; good resources; individual assessments
- 'Housing First' approach broadly endorsed; but also need for 'permanent supportive housing' (older men) and 'transitional accommodation' (younger men)
- Main weakness: lack of attention to work and other purposeful activity (especially for under 50s)

Question!

Was hostel closure good for 'ring-fenced' residents but bad for other single homeless men in Glasgow?