

SPP Impact Study

PHASE 1 – STEP 2 Impact review of the Special Priority Policy for victims of domestic abuse, applying for assisted housing

Tenure status of applicants housed in 2007, 2008 and 2009

SPP Research Task Force:

- Service Managers:
 - The City of Toronto
 - The City of Ottawa
 - The Regional Municipality of Peel
 - The Regional Municipality of Halton
- The Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association (ONPHA)
- The Co-operative Housing Federation – Ontario Region (CHF)
- Centre for Research on Inner City Health (CRICH)
- Housing Services Corporation (HSC)
- Ontario Municipal Social Services Association (OMSSA)—Service Manager Housing Network

October 2012

Contents

- 1. Executive Summary3
- 2. Introduction4
- 3. Methodology5
- 4. Results.....6
 - 4.1 General overview.....6
 - 4.2 Longevity of tenure8
 - 4.3 Communities with high proportion of SPP placements10
 - 4.4 SPP applicants housed by dwelling type11
 - 4.5 Success rate by dwelling type12
 - 4.6 Differences between LHC, NP and Co-op12
 - 4.7 Household composition and success (1-BR vs. 2+-BR)13
 - 4.8 100% RGI and Mixed Housing Communities.....15
- 5. Conclusions15
- APPENDIX 1: Proportion of SPP placements by service manager (based on data related to the STEP 1 part of the study).....19
- APPENDIX 2: Unit Types by Service Manager.....20
- APPENDIX 3: Listing of Local Priorities by Service Manager participating in Step 1 (33)21
- Glossary of Terms22

1. Executive Summary

This paper is the second in the series of publications that arose from our study of Ontario's Special Priority Policy (SPP). Our first publication addressed the ability of the SP Policy to expediently house victims of domestic violence. This paper continues the discussion on the SP policy, specifically investigating the success rates of SPP placements in social housing. Our goal is to provide research-based evidence to assist all social housing stakeholders. It is our hope that this report assists participants in the social housing system—the provincial government, Service Managers and District Social Services Administration Boards (DSSABs), housing providers, support agencies, and tenants. In this paper, we provide evidence that offers a basis for an informed discussion about the role of the policy in helping victims of domestic abuse.

This report on Phase I, Step II of the SP policy study provides exploratory quantitative evidence on the success rates of social housing applicants who have been housed through their local Service Manager's wait list systems. As we are only able to document associations with these data, we do not provide specific policy recommendations. However, we were able to compile data on success rates in seven Ontario service areas that suggests that **SPP placements do not experience lower rates of success (defined as living in or leaving social housing in good standing) than local priority (LP) and chronological placements.** This study builds on the positive findings of Phase I, Step I which found that the SP policy meets its goal of housing SPP applicants at an expedited rate.

In addition to this finding of comparable SPP placement success, the data suggests that **local priority placements who have left social housing may be less likely to do so successfully than SP policy or chronological placements.** This secondary finding has led us toward recommending that additional research be conducted on the wait list dynamics and placement results of local priority applicants, including classifying the various local priorities of all of Ontario's Service Managers. An overview of local priority arrangements used by 17 of the 33 service managers participating in Phase I, Step I of the current study is provided in Appendix 3.

This report summarizes the data collected through Phase I, Step II of the SPP study and provides recommendations for future research. The primary goal of this step was to determine the success rate of housed SPP applicants and compare that with the success rate of the other two wait list categories.

Prior to collecting the data for this study, we hypothesized that the success rate of housed SPP applicants was going to be lower than that of the other categories. The original plan for Phase II was therefore to conduct qualitative research to identify ideal conditions for successful SPP tenancies. In light of the actual findings in this report we have reframed Phase II to focus on two elements:

- Research the rationale for observations made in this report (including recommended research regarding local priority as noted above) and
- In the wake of the new waiting list system options provided under the new Housing Services Act, investigate existing and emerging waiting list composition and management practices.

This study was conducted under the auspices of the Research Task Force, which is a joint project of the City of Toronto, the City of Ottawa, the Regional Municipality of Peel, the Regional Municipality of Halton, the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association (ONPHA), the Co-operative Housing Federation – Ontario Region (CHF), the Centre for Research on Inner City Health (CRICH), Housing Services Corporation (HSC), and the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association (OMSSA).

2. Introduction

This paper outlines the findings from our multi-phase research study on the Special Priority Policy (SP policy), currently formalized by the province of Ontario in the Housing Services Act (2011). Prior to 2011, this policy was prescribed in the Social Housing Reform Act (2000). The policy requires that Service Managers place victims of domestic violence at the top of social housing wait lists and offer priority access to housing units as they become available.

The main goal of the SP policy is to quickly secure housing for low-income households that are leaving an abusive environment. In 2007, we struck a research task force to investigate the actual impacts of the SP policy on SPP applicants, local priority applicants and chronological applicants. Although the importance of creating this type of policy was already broadly known, we became aware of the lack of empirical evidence that measures the effectiveness and implications of the SP policy.

Our initial research plan included two phases. Phase I was divided into two steps: Step I provided quantitative, empirical information on wait list statistics, specifically regarding the number of applicants on the list and the number of applicants housed in the various wait list categories, as well as the average wait time of these applicants. We were particularly interested in addressing the impact of the SP policy on housing trends among different applicant groups in different geographical parts of Ontario. This research included 33 of the 47 service areas in Ontario. The report on the Phase I, Step I findings was published and distributed among the participating Service Managers in June 2011. The goal of Phase I, Step II was to measure whether or not the SPP households who were housed

between 2007 and 2009 were successful in their tenancy, compared to local priority and chronological applicants.

The overall conclusion of Phase I, Step I is that the SP policy is doing what the provincial government intended it to do, that is, to quickly house victims of domestic violence. More specifically, the number of SPP placements is relatively high, and most of the SPP applicants are housed within 6 months. As a result of this placement dynamic, the number of SPP applicants on wait lists continues to be low.

The housing opportunities of chronological applicants appear to be reduced as a result of the SP policy. This is particularly the case in the Greater Toronto Area and other urban service areas (where the existence of the SP policy leads to a doubling up of the wait time for chronological applicants). Housing opportunities in rural service areas are relatively better (although community-specific exceptions may exist). While the data indicate that the SP policy has an adverse impact on housing opportunities of chronological applicants, we argue that the root problem is the overall shortfall of social housing units available rather than the SP policy itself. To illustrate this point, if all 2009 SPP placements would have been allocated to chronological all-age community applicants, it would still take 16.3 years to house all these applicants in the GTA and 5.8 years in other (non-GTA) urban service areas.

To further illustrate the wait list footprint differences between SPP and chronological applicants, the Step I report identified that 34% of the province-wide vacancies in 2009 were allocated to SPP applicants, while they only represented 4% of the waiting list that year. In contrast, chronological applicants represented 85% of the wait list applicants and only filled 45% of the 2009 vacancies. From a policy perspective, the question was raised if it is appropriate to insert uncapped targeted programming (SPP) in a universal low-income program design (RGI housing).

Phase I, Step II of this research builds on the findings from Step I. After determining that the primary objective of the SP policy—to house victims of domestic violence within a short period of time—is being met, our research group began the process of investigating whether or not the SPP placements are experiencing success in their social housing tenancies, relative to the success experienced by local priority and chronological placements. Success is measured as remaining in or leaving housing with no arrears owing or as leaving housing after providing proper move out notice.

3. Methodology

Our goal of Phase I, Step II is to assess the tenancy status of SPP, local priority and chronological applicants housed in 2007, 2008 and 2009. The assessment began by

collecting data on the success rate status of these individuals. For the purpose of this research, a household is deemed successful when it is currently residing in housing without arrears owing or when it has moved out with proper notice without owing arrears. Seven (7) service managers were selected to participate in this part of the study (Haldimand-Norfolk, Halton Region, Muskoka, Niagara Region, Ottawa, Peel Region, and Toronto).

We asked the Service Managers to classify the housing communities in their areas. This included specifying whether housing was operated by the Local Housing Corporation (LHC), non-profit housing providers, or cooperative housing providers and whether the communities consisted of townhouses or apartment units. The seven Service Managers then selected a sample of housing communities that accurately represent their housing portfolios and provided lists of all of the SPP, local priority and chronological applicants housed in those communities in 2007, 2008 and 2009 to the housing providers responsible for managing the selected communities. Through this process 120 communities with a total of 2,191 housing placements were selected. The housing providers were then asked to go through the provided lists and indicate whether or not each household had been, or is currently, successful. These lists were provided back to the Service Managers who had the option of removing household identifiers and forwarded the information on to our research group. In order to deal with possible discrepancies in how success was indicated by housing providers, we made sure to draw upon a large enough sample of dwellings from a representative variety of housing providers.

Statistical tests were conducted to verify the significance of observations provided throughout the report.

4. Results

4.1 General overview

To begin this analysis, it is important to understand the tenure status of all applicants housed in the seven service areas between 2007 and 2009¹. Tables 1 and 2 provide a general overview of the tenure status of all 2,191 placements by applicant type (SPP, local priority, and chronological). The tables also indicate household tenure status (moved out or currently residing in social housing). Table 2 provides a summary of the tenancy success findings identified in Table 1.

¹ Note: alternative housing providers do not use the social housing wait list. Therefore, the findings in this paper do not provide a fully complete picture of the homeless or hard-to-house population. However, the number of alternative housing providers in Ontario is relatively small. The data are representative of households applying for and residing in social housing that is matched through the centralized waiting list.

TABLE 1							
	Household has <u>not</u> moved out			Household moved out			TOTAL
	SUCCESS	NO SUCCESS	TOTAL	SUCCESS	NO SUCCESS	TOTAL	
	In good standing	At risk of termination ⁿ²			Gave proper notice and left without arrears		Evicted, skipped / left with notice owing arrears
SPP	645 (88%)	84	729	132 (49%)	135	267	996 (45%)
Local Priority	311 (89%)	37	348	34 (32%)	71	105	453 (21%)
Chronological	501 (92%)	44	545	112 (57%)	85	197	742 (34%)
ALL PLACEMENTS	1,457 (90%)	165	1,622	278 (49%)	291	569	2,191 (100%)

TABLE 2			
	SUCCESS		
	Household has <u>not</u> moved out	Household moved out	Overall (not captured in Table 1)
SPP	88%	49%	78%
Local Priority	89%	32%	76%
Chronological	92%	57%	83%
ALL PLACEMENTS	90%	49%	79%

Key observations

- a. *Proportion of placements:* 45% of the placements had SPP status and 34% had chronological status. This distribution mirrors the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) findings in Step I. This was expected as almost 60% of the sample placements in this study occurred in the GTA. Also, the proportion of SPP placements in the selected communities in Peel Region (84%) impacted the overall numbers in that regard. Appendix 1 provides a detailed province-wide overview of SPP placements in all 33 Service Manager areas that participated in Step I of the study.

² In the survey a distinction was made between households at risk of termination due to arrears and households at risk of termination due to other issues. As 90% of households are at risk due to arrears, we have totaled the sub-categories.

- b. *Success rates of households still living in the housing community:* The vast majority of all households that currently reside in social housing appear to be successful (90% on average). These data also indicate that there is limited variance in success rates based on placement type. The proportion of SPP households in good standing (88%) is 4% less than chronological households (92%) and only 1% less than local priority households (89%). **This observation suggests that SPP placements are not less successful than chronological or local priority placements.** This observation is analyzed in more detail in section 4.2 of this report.
- c. *Success rate of households that moved out:* The overall success rate of households that have moved out is much lower than the success rate of households still residing in housing communities (49%). This means that 51% of these households were evicted, moved out without giving sufficient notice, and/or moved out with arrears owing. Due to the lack of research on private market rentals, it is not clear how these observations compare to the experience in the private rental housing sector.

While the data collected for this study do not provide quantitative details regarding the distribution of reasons for classification of households as unsuccessful among these sub-categories, feedback from various Service Managers indicates that most unsuccessful move-outs are related to households moving out without giving proper notice and/or still owing arrears. Most of these former social housing residents are or could be captured in the province-wide arrears database that contains information about all (or most) provincial rent defaults of households that moved out owing arrears. **The anecdotal evidence suggests that arrears owing are the most problematic part of the move-out process and that the arrears database could be an important tool for future research on tenancy success.**

These findings also suggest the need for additional resources to improve the move-out process. We also need to gain an empirical understanding of whether arrears are the cause or the result of households moving out.

- d. The data indicate that the success rate of local priority residents (32%) moving out of social housing is lower than the overall average (49%), while the success rate of chronological residents is slightly better than average (57%). **This evidence suggests the need for locally designed programs that address tenancy success for local priority households.** Further analysis is provided in sections 4.2, 4.5 and 4.6.

4.2 Longevity of tenure

As shown in Table 1 in the previous section, 1,622 (74%) of the 2,191 housed applicants still lived in the community they originally moved into when the original survey was conducted. The data indicate slight differences between the three applicant types in that regard, as 73% of SPP applicants, 77% of local priority applicants and 73% of the chronological applicants still lived in their original housing communities. **This observation suggests that longevity of housing community tenure is not associated with applicant type.**

Table 3 specifies the outcomes for the years that people were housed (2007, 2008 or 2009):

TABLE 3					
		Housed		Still living there when reviewed in 2011	In good standing
2007	SPP	324	43%	66%	87%
	Local priority	163	22%	67%	88%
	Chronological	266	35%	64%	92%
	TOTAL 2007	753	100%	65%	89%
2008	SPP	343	46%	73%	93%
	Local priority	154	20%	77%	92%
	Chronological	256	34%	72%	91%
	TOTAL 2008	753	100%	73%	92%
2009	SPP	329	48%	81%	85%
	Local priority	136	20%	88%	88%
	Chronological	220	32%	86%	93%
	TOTAL 2009	685	100%	84%	88%
TOTAL		2,191		74%	90%

Key observations

- a. *Proportion of placements:* The proportions of applicants housed in each applicant category in the communities under review are more or less consistent across all three years. As observed in Step I of this study, the proportion of housed SPP applicants has increased slightly, while the proportion of chronological applicants has decreased in a similar fashion.
- b. *The changes in longevity of tenure are generally consistent over time:* **In general, the average proportion of households that still live in the community they originally moved into drops approximately 10% each year.** Given that most housing provider surveys were completed during the last two quarters of 2011, the data suggest that 16% (100% minus 84%) of the households that were housed in 2009 had moved out by 2011. This went

down 11% to 73% for 2008 move-ins and down another 8% to 65% with regard to 2007 move-ins.

The averages by applicant type more or less approximate the yearly averages. **This confirms the earlier observation that longevity of tenure is not associated with applicant type, suggesting that housing longevity, indicative of security of tenure, does not vary based on applicant status.**

- c. *The success rate by “year housed” appears fairly high and consistent for each year:* As identified in Table 1, the overall average of successful households remaining in social housing is 90%. The yearly averages are all fairly close to this overall average. **This observation suggests that the proportion of households residing in social housing in good standing does not deteriorate over time.** It is not clear to what extent eviction prevention practices have impacted successful tenancy outcomes.

In regards to SPP households, the outcomes for households housed in 2009 appear to be slightly less positive. It is not clear why this is. However, **the general conclusion suggests that social housing provides the same level of housing stability for all tenants, regardless of applicant type.** Knowledge about the factors that are driving these results and how these results compare to the private market may provide valuable insights in the benefits of social housing.

4.3 Communities with high proportion of SPP placements

As shown in Appendix 1, the proportion of housed SPP applicants varies significantly across the service areas. Also, it should be noted that some service areas experience significant variance between housing projects with regard to the proportion of SPP applicants housed. While we were not able to collect comprehensive province-wide data about the magnitude of this phenomenon, the Step II data indicate that some Service Managers with average SPP placements around 50 percent administer communities where the SPP placement ratio is much higher (as high as 100%).

In 46 of the 120 housing communities studied, the proportion of SPP placements was 50% or higher (77% on average in the 46 communities). In those 46 communities the overall SPP success rate was 81%. This is slightly higher than the overall SPP success rate, shown in table 2 (78%). However, the success rate for housed SPP applicants was significantly lower in a few communities. **Overall, our findings indicate that the proportion of SPP placements housed in a community does not significantly affect the tenancy success of SPP households.**

4.4 SPP applicants housed by dwelling type

Anecdotal information from Service Managers suggests that SPP applicants are more likely to select townhouse projects on their housing application than local priority or chronological applicants. As SPP applicants have priority on social housing wait lists, it could be logically argued that this alleged preference should result in a higher proportion of SPP placements in townhouse units. However, as illustrated in Table 4, SPP applicants are not more likely than other applicants to be placed in townhouse communities.

	Townhouse		Apartment		TOTAL
SPP	301	30%	695	70%	996
Local Priority	177	39%	276	61%	453
Chronological	268	36%	474	64%	742
TOTAL	746	34%	1,445	66%	2,191

Key Observations

- a. *In general, there are more social housing residents residing in apartments than townhouses:* Table 4 indicates that 66% of the applicants reviewed in this study were placed in apartment units. Only 34% of applicants were housed in townhouse units.
- b. *SPP applicants are not more likely to be placed in townhouse units than other applicants:* The data suggest that the placement ratios of all three applicant categories are more or less consistent with the overall average. SPP applicants are slightly more likely to be placed in apartment dwellings. **Overall, our findings indicate that, contrary to what the anecdotal evidence suggests, SPP applicants are actually slightly less likely to be placed in townhouses than other applicants.**
- c. *The placement results remain consistent across service areas:* We have noted that the findings are consistent between service areas. That is, some service areas may have more townhouse units in their portfolio, resulting in a higher overall proportion of townhouse placements, but there too, no significant differences exist between the three wait list categories.

4.5 Success rate by dwelling type

Our task force determined that it is important to understand the success rates of placements by dwelling type. Originally, we had hypothesized that there are differences in success between apartments and townhouses because the costs associated with living in a townhouse tend to be higher than those in an apartment. Table 5 provides success rates by dwelling type.

TABLE 5 - SUCCESS by dwelling type (Townhouse vs. Apartment)						
	Household has <u>not</u> moved out		Household moved out		Overall	
	TH	Apt.	TH	Apt.	TH	Apt.
SPP	83%	91%	40%	54%	70%	81%
Local Priority	85%	92%	21%	41%	68%	82%
Chronological	87%	95%	48%	62%	77%	86%
ALL PLACEMENTS	85%	92%	38%	55%	72%	83%

Key observations

- a. *Success rates in apartments are higher:* Table 5 indicates that with regard to households who have not moved out, the success rate of applicants housed in apartment projects is higher than applicants housed in townhouse projects. This finding was consistent among all three categories and did not vary significantly between individual service areas.

We suggest that possible reasons for higher success rates in apartment accommodations may be financial. Utility costs in apartment units are typically included in the rent. This is typically not the case in townhouse projects. Further, utility costs in townhouses are generally higher than in apartment units.

- b. *Success rates of local priority placements who have moved out are much lower:* A significant deviation pertains to local priority applicants who have moved out after they were originally housed. Their success rate is much lower (as low as 21% with regard to townhouse units) than the other two categories.

4.6 Differences between LHC, NP and Co-op

We were also concerned with the impacts of provider categories on success rates. To better understand the differences in successful tenancy, we explored success rates in non-profit, co-operative, and LHC housing. Table 6 provides success rates by applicant type and provider category.

TABLE 6 - SUCCESS by provider category									
	Household has <u>not</u> moved out			Household moved out			Overall		
	Non-Profit	Co-op	LHC	Non-Profit	Co-op	LHC	Non-Profit	Co-op	LHC
SPP	90%	92%	87%	61%	65%	41%	81%	85%	75%
Local Priority	89%	96%	89%	27%	44%	31%	76%	76%	76%
Chronological	92%	98%	89%	50%	63%	58%	79%	90%	81%
ALL PLACEMENTS	91%	95%	88%	52%	61%	44%	80%	86%	77%

Key observations

- a. *There are no significant differences between provider types with regard to people still living in the community:* We found that the success rates for households did not vary significantly based on project type, with the exception of those residing in co-operative housing. We found that households residing in co-op housing are slightly more successful than those in non-profit or LHC housing.
- b. *The success rate of local priority applicants who moved out of non-profit and LHC communities is much lower:* The data indicate a large variation in success rates between local priority households moving out of co-op, non-profit and LHC housing units. Specifically, we found that local priority placements in non-profit housing were less likely to be successful than other residents. These findings were significant for the group of local priority residents who left housing unsuccessfully. As the data collected for this report are descriptive rather than explanatory in nature, we are not certain of the qualitative reasons for this significant variation.

4.7 Household composition and success (1-BR vs. 2+-BR)

In order to answer questions surrounding SPP resident success, we looked at household composition and unit size as factors that may contribute to variations. Specifically, we were

interested in potential success rate variations between singles or childless couples and families with children. Any potential variations may indicate service gaps, as families often have different needs and circumstances than singles and childless couples.

We collected the available housing placement data on unit size. In the majority of cases, one-bedroom apartment units are allocated to singles and childless couples whereas larger units are generally allocated to families with children.

Table 7 provides an overview of the distribution of unit sizes in the housing placement samples used in Step II.

TABLE 7 – Distribution of unit sizes of sampled 2007-2009 placements in Step II					
	1-BR	2-BR	3-BR	4+-BR	TOTAL
All 7 participating STEP 2 Service Managers (2007-2009)	37%	36%	23%	4%	100.0%
All 33 participating STEP 1 Service Managers (2009)	28%	42%	26%	4%	100.0%

We found that the proportion of one-bedroom units in Step II is 9% higher than the data collected in Step I. However, this difference can be attributed to the variations in sample size. A more detailed overview of the housing portfolio composition in terms of unit size is provided in Appendix 2.

Table 8 provides an overview of the success rates by applicant type, based on number of bedrooms which is –as explained above- indicative of family composition.

TABLE 8 – SUCCESS by unit size				
		Success		
		Overall	Still there	Moved out
SPP	1-BR	79%	93%	40%
	2+BR	78%	87%	52%
Local Priority	1-BR	81%	94%	27%
	2+BR	74%	87%	34%
Chronological	1-BR	93%	97%	78%
	2+BR	78%	90%	51%
Total	1-BR	85%	95%	50%
	2+BR	77%	88%	48%

Key observations

- a. *Households residing in one-bedroom units tend to be more successful than family households:* As indicated in Table 8, our data shows that the overall success of one-bedroom residents is approximately 8% higher than the success rate of households residing in family units. **This is particularly reflective of households who have not moved out yet and suggests that singles or childless couples residing in social housing are more likely to be successful than families.** However, the findings also indicate that the overall one and two-plus bedroom results for SPP households are approximately the same. This is driven by a much lower success rate of one-bedroom SPP tenants who already moved out (40% vs. 52% for SPP households in family units). It is not clear what causes these differences.
- b. *One-bedroom chronological households that moved out tend to be more successful than SPP and local priority households in that unit category:* The largest variation in our findings is the difference between the success rate of one-bedroom SPP applicants and local priority applicants who have moved out. The success rate of these residents is quite a bit lower than chronological applicants (40% and 27% vs. 78%). This may indicate gaps in overall systemic service provision for SPP and local priority applicants.

4.8 100% RGI and Mixed Housing Communities

To further our analysis and better understand the factors that influence SPP placements' success in RGI housing, we were interested in studying the variations in success between the 100% RGI and mixed income communities in our sample.

We analyzed the composition of the housing units in six of the seven participating service areas. Our data indicate that SPP applicants have similar success rates in housing communities where units are 100% RGI (72%) and in housing communities where some units are RGI and others are rented on the private rental market (77%). However, of the housing communities studied, the vast majority were 100% RGI. The only mixed-income communities in this sample were located in Peel Region and Halton Region. In order to accurately compare success rates between these two types of communities, additional data that includes more mixed-income housing units are needed.

5. Conclusions

Overall, our findings conclude that SPP placements have similar success rates as chronological placements. Regardless of applicant type, households that have left housing have lower success rates than those still in housing. Lack of success was largely attributed

to arrears owing at time of eviction or move out. To a lesser degree lack of success was also found to be associated to households moving out without providing sufficient standard notice of 60 days. At present, it is not clear how these results compare to the experience in private rental sector. The findings suggest that it will be beneficial to intensify the use of the province-wide arrears database and possibly develop other tools that are designed to improve the chances that residents move out successfully. It may also be beneficial to develop financial and social programming that is targeted toward reducing housing arrears for all types of social housing applicants.

Our study found that contrary to anecdotal evidence, the proportion of SPP placements in a community does not impact success rates of SPP placements. Despite claims that SPP applicants are likely to request townhouse accommodations, we found that they were more likely to be placed in apartment units. Regardless of applicant type, placements situated in apartment units experience greater levels of success.

The success rate of housed applicants did not deteriorate over time, suggesting that there is no association between longevity of tenure and success. This was true for all three of the wait list categories.

Our study did allude to one factor that contributes to housing success for SPP placements. Placements residing in co-operative housing experienced slightly higher success rates than those residing in LHC or non-profit housing communities.

Singles or childless couples who are still residing in their original placement units were also more successful than families. However, both of these findings were attributed to all three of the applicant categories, not just SPP placements.

We did find that variations exist between the success rates of local priority placements that leave housing and SPP and chronological placements. Our findings indicate that this variation may be due to the low success rates of local priority applicants moving out of townhouse units. This may be due to variations in utility costs. Local priority placements that leave housing are also less successful when they reside in non-profit housing. They experienced the most success in co-operative housing. However, we are unable to draw solid conclusions or make conclusive suggestions for improvements without a better understanding of the characteristics of the housed local priority population and a detailed understanding of area-based local priorities. Appendix 3 provides an overview of local priority arrangements identified in Step I of this study.

A variety of important questions arose from our Phase I research. These questions include:

- How do the findings in this report compare with the private market rental sector? This could particularly help to quantify potential benefits of social housing.

- Are arrears the result or the cause of people moving out?
- To what extent are eviction prevention measures associated with the observation that the success rate of housed applicants remains quite consistent over time?
- To what extent is there causality between utility cost and success rate (in light of observed success rate differences between apartment and townhouse occupancies)?
- Why do applicants housed by co-op providers experience more success than other placements?
- Why do singles and childless couples experience higher levels of success than families?
- Why are local priority placements, particularly those housed in non-profit developments, experiencing lower levels of success upon housing termination than both SPP and chronological placements?
- Are there success rate differences between 100% RGI communities and mixed income communities?
- What additional factors surrounding wait list management and administration contribute to the variations in success found in Phase I, Step II?

As indicated in the introduction of this report, the findings in this report provide a need to reformulate the purpose of Phase II of the study.

Pending necessary funding, we plan to expand our research in Phase II through two additional steps.

Step one will further address some of the questions raised in Phase I, including looking at social housing wait list processes and management. This will also build on the Social Housing Waiting List Research Project that is presently being conducted by the HSC and will aim to answer the formerly listed questions on waiting list management. We hope that our future research will provide a better understanding of how Service Managers manage their SPP, LP and chronological placements and how their social housing waiting lists and social housing policies in general are designed to meet the needs of all social housing applicants. Step one will also include research to enhance our understanding of the applicants who stagnate on the lists, due to the observed wait times.

Step two will continue to address housing stability for social housing placements. Our Phase I research conceptualized success in a systematic fashion in order to allow for measurement. However, despite our findings that housing placements experience similar levels of success regardless of applicant type, we are presently unable to discuss how these households view success. This area of research is currently being investigated by the Centre for Research on Inner City Health in the study "Housing, Health, and Women's Well-Being". Based on the lived experiences of SPP individuals in social housing this study explores patterns and view of housing stability.

In Phase II, step two we will investigate through an exploratory study the effect that access to social housing has had on the health and well-being of local priority applicants, namely homeless, newcomers and youth. The little research available about these priority applicants in social housing has shown that they are more likely to face challenging tenancies that can lead to housing instability. The investigation will seek to examine the mechanisms that lead to housing stability and instability for local priority applicants, the availability and effectiveness of support systems, and the connections between housing, health and well-being of individuals residing in social housing. Although the quantitative analysis conducted in Phase I of this research did not illustrate large variations in success rates among applicant and placement categories, Phase II will focus on gaining a better understanding of the lived experiences of local priority applicants housed. This research will be conducted in collaboration with CRICH, who has collected qualitative data on housing success.

APPENDIX 1: Proportion of SPP placements by service manager (based on data related to the STEP 1 part of the study).

TABLE x:				
		Total Housed 2007-2009	SPP housed 2007-2009	SPP as % of total
GTA	Peel	1,840	1,287	70%
	Durham	883	525	59%
	Halton	669	335	50%
	York	712	330	46%
	Toronto	9,257	3,199	35%
	TOTAL	13,361	5,676	42%
Non-GTA urban	Simcoe	1,077	559	52%
	Brantford	666	253	38%
	Wellington	1,094	389	36%
	Kingston	802	285	36%
	Peterborough	468	149	32%
	London	2,425	692	29%
	Ottawa	4,562	1,276	28%
	Niagara	1,544	421	27%
	Windsor	2,296	313	14%
	TOTAL	14,934	4,337	29%
Rural	Lennox-Addington	183	95	52%
	Haldimand-Norfolk	383	129	34%
	Hastings	691	198	29%
	St. Thomas-Elgin	501	135	27%
	Sault Ste. Marie	788	212	27%
	Thunder Bay	1,416	373	26%
	Cornwall	645	163	25%
	Stratford	479	121	25%
	Oxford	484	121	25%
	Kawartha Lakes	371	87	23%
	Renfrew County	478	106	22%
	Nipissing	467	100	21%
	Northumberland	272	52	19%
	Lambton	549	97	18%
	Grey	470	72	15%
	Leeds	358	52	15%
	Muskoka	170	20	12%
	Prescott-Russell	268	31	12%
	Timiskaming	283	10	4%
	TOTAL	9,256	2,174	23%

APPENDIX 2: Unit Types by Service Manager

Table 7							
	Bachelor	1-BR	2-BR	3-BR	4-BR	5-BR	Total
Haldimand		33%	26%	24%	15%	2.5%	100%
Halton		6%	53%	37%	4%		100%
Muskoka		39%	30%	28%	3%		100%
Niagara	5%	2%	46%	46%	1%		100%
Ottawa	7%	33%	32%	23%	4%	1.2%	100%
Peel		22%	52%	23%	2%		100%
Toronto	7%	27%	43%	21%	2%		100%
TOTAL	4%	24%	42%	26%	3%	0.4%	100%

APPENDIX 3: Listing of Local Priorities by Service Manager participating in Step 1 (33)

	# of (sub) categories	Local Priority housed in 2009	All housed in 2009	%	Home-less	New-comer	Medical (including terminally ill)	Safety (but not SPP)	Health and Safety	Insitu	Social	Youth	Under-housed	Other
Peel	2	66	585	11%			x?			x				
Durham	2	17	254	7%	x					x				
Halton	4	33	290	11%	x	x				x		x		
York	1	5	256	2%						x				
Toronto	3	567	2,945	19%	x		x					x		
TOTAL		688	4,330	16%										
Brantford	1	31	245	13%	x									
Wellington	1	11	343	3%										x
Kingston	1	35	231	15%	x									
London	4	422	657	64%	x		x				x			x
Ottawa	3	593	1,409	42%	x		x	X						
Niagara	2	131	443	30%	x				x					
Windsor	3	149	686	22%	x						x			x
TOTAL		1,372	4,477	31%										
Hastings	3	41	195	21%	x		x							x
St. Thomas-Elgin	1	3	121	2%						x				
Thunder Bay	4	136	447	30%			x			x	x			x
Nipissing	2	31	176	18%									x	x
Muskoka	2	13	56	23%	x		x							
TOTAL		224	3,012	7%	11	1	7	1	1	6	3	2	1	6

Note: only service areas with identified local priorities are included in this chart. Other existing service areas in Ontario have not reported as having formalized recognized local priorities.

Glossary of Terms

Consolidated Municipal Service Manager (CMSM)

A Consolidated Municipal Service Manager is a municipal government responsible for carrying out the funding and administrative responsibilities of the Housing Services Act (HSA). A CMSM (also referred to as Service Manager) could be a regional government, a county or a separated city, depending on the local circumstances. The CMSM is also responsible for administering other social service programs such as Ontario Works and child care.

Co-operative social housing

Co-operative social housing is a form of social housing that is not based on a landlord-tenant relationship. The households who live in the project are all members of the cooperative housing provider (corporation) that owns the building. They elect from amongst themselves a board of directors who are responsible for overseeing the management of the building. They are subject to rules in the Co-operative Corporations Act and are not considered to be landlords so are not subject to the Residential Tenancies Act. However, many provincial housing co-ops are devolved providers (see below) and are as such subjected to the HSA. On average, 50% of the member households of devolved housing co-ops receive RGI assistance regulated under the HSA.

District Social Service Administration Board (DSSAB)

A District Social Service Administration Board is a special agency created by the Province and given the funding and administrative responsibilities of a Service Manager. These were created in the north, where there is no existing municipal government with the legal jurisdiction to act as a Service Manager.

Insitu market-to-RGI applicant

This is a local priority arrangement whereby sitting market rent resident households experience an income decrease to the point where they are eligible for rent-geared-to-income assistance. If the household meets the requirements under the local priority rule, they can be added to the centralized waiting list with a ranking date that is typically the date they originally applied for RGI assistance (in case they were once an RGI assisted household) or the move-in date if they originally moved in at market rent. They then become “Insitu market-to-RGI” applicants.

Internal Transfer

An internal transfer is a transfer of a household from one RGI-unit to another within the same project or to another project owned by the same housing provider. Housing providers are required to first offer an RGI vacancy to provincially prescribed internal transfer priority residents (approved internal SPP residents and overhoused residents).

Local Housing Authority

Local Housing Authorities were locally operating agencies of the provincial government that managed public housing owned by the province of Ontario, and carried out other administrative responsibilities such as the rent supplement program for private-sector landlords. The LHAs ceased to exist as of January 1, 2001.

Local priority

The HSA allows service managers to create local priority rules for access to RGI assisted housing. A local priority rule is designed to help locally recognized candidates in urgent RGI housing need. 45% of the service managers have created one or more local rules. Some of these service managers are limiting the number of local priority placements through a proportionate ratio. For instance, a homeless priority rule with a 1-in-10 ratio requires that every tenth RGI vacancy (for which there are no SPP applicants) is filled by an applicant with recognized homeless status.

Non-Profit social housing provider

A Non-Profit social housing provider provides community-based affordable rental housing. It is overseen by a volunteer Board of Directors. A percentage of non-profit housing tenants pay geared-to- income rents and the remaining tenants pay market rents. The percentage of tenants paying RGI ranges from 25% to 100% of tenants in the project; generally the ratio is around 60% RGI: 40% market.

Overhoused applicant

An overhoused applicant is an RGI assisted resident household that occupies a unit that is larger than is allowed under the maximum occupancy standard. For instance, a single person is overhoused when he or she lives in a unit that has more than one-bedroom. People typically become overhoused when household members leave the household. Provincial regulations are

designed to expedite a transfer of overhoused residents who want to retain their RGI assistance to a unit of the appropriate size. This may ultimately require an overhoused resident to be added to the centralized waiting list.

The ranking date in those cases is the date the household originally applied for social housing (thus becoming an overhoused applicant).

Tenancy success rate

Tenancy success rate relates to the proportion of housed residents that are able to retain their tenancy successfully. For the purpose of the study conducted in Step 2 of Phase 1, successful existing tenancies are not at risk of being terminated due to arrears (no eviction order impending) or any other issue that is a permitted ground for termination under the RTA / Coop Act. Former tenancies are considered successful if they were not evicted and gave proper notice and left without arrears.