FIRST TIME USERS OF WOMEN'S SHELTER SERVICES:

A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

Vera Institute
April, 16, 1981

To develop a fuller understanding of the backgrounds and problems of women coming to the Women's Shelter (SCCW) for assistance and to describe how long these women remain at the Shelter and how frequently they return to it, staff of the Vera Institute undertook a survey of a sample of Shelter clients. Using a log book maintained by SCCW staff, we identified the first 100 women[#] who came to the Shelter for the first time in the period immediately following January 1, 1979. Vera staff reviewed the basic 5X8 record and social service case file compiled by SCCW staff for each of these 100 "first timers" and abstracted relevant information concerning the women's demographics, resources, problems, and patterns of shelter service use. All findings presented in this preliminary report thus have been derived from the written records prepared by SCCW staff in the regular course of business.

The selection of a group of women first coming to the Shelter in the first two months of 1979 provides an opportunity to trace their shelter service records over at least a two-year period. This longitudinal element underlies the key analytic perspective developed in this study: the differences and similarities exhibited by single time and by repeat users of shelter services. Accordingly, let us examine first how many women returned to the Shelter and how often they returned after concluding their initial stay.

1. Single Time and Repeat Clients

As summarized in Table 1, 68 of the 100 first timers in the study sample came only once to the Shelter. Only four of the 32 repeat users (13%) were admitted to the Shelter on more than four different occasions

[#] 106 first timers were admitted between January 1 and March 7, 1979, but the records of 6 women could not be located.

during the 27 months from January, 1979 to March, 1981. Almost half (47%) of these repeat users came only for a second stay.

This bi-modal pattern of admission to the Shelter partially confirms the perception shared by most staff that the women are trapped in a revolving door of admission—discharge—re-admission. The subsequent return of a third of all newcomers to the Shelter is notable: these 32 women account for a total of 107 admissions. The bulging files documenting the repeated admissions of less than a third of the first-timers certainly gives them a visibility to staff far out of proportion to their numbers. But the ready recognition of these repeat users should not obscure from Shelter staff the important finding that two-thirds of the first timers will never (in the following two years) return to the Shelter. To what extent these first-timers come from different backgrounds, experience different problems, and require different services is of major concern to shelter administrators seeking to design and deliver improved services. These questions lie at the center of the following inquiry; accordingly, the statistical tables present frequency distributions first for the full sample and second for the 68 women who were single time admissions and the 32 women who were repeat users of shelter services.

2. Race/Ethnicity

This sample of first-time Shelter clients comprise equal proportions of whites (40%) and blacks (43%) (Table 2). This distribution represents a slight increase in the proportion of black women since the 1975 study which found whites accounting for 44% and blacks for 38% of the Shelter's first-time users. Race or ethnicity has no influence on whether a woman uses the Shelter only once or becomes a repeat user: 72% of all white women and 70% of all black women are single users. Black women are more

likely to be sent to the Bushwick Annex, however, as 24 of the 43 blacks
(56%) as compared to 13 of the 40 whites (33%) were referred to Bushwick.
This finding corroborates subjective impressions of the two facilities.

   3. Age

   The survey's findings with respect to client age show a fairly broad
distribution with slightly more than a quarter of the women in each of
the 20 to 29, 30 to 39, and 40 to 59 age groupings (Table 3). While more
than half (54%) of the women were younger than 40, only 16% were 60 years
or older. Age and the likelihood of becoming a repeat user of Shelter
services appear to be directly related. Of the 54 women younger than
40 years, only 20% (11 women) use the Shelter more than once; of the 45
women aged 40 or older, 44% (20 women) are repeat users: thus, the
probability of returning to the Shelter is more than double (44% to 20%)
for women age 40 or older.

   The Bushwick Annex revealed a slightly younger population — 61%
under 40 years as compared to 48% at the Lafayette Street facility --
which again confirms subjective site impressions. This age discrepancy
can be attributed to the almost complete absence of women 60 years or
older at Buswick. Of the 15 women 60 years or older, 12 (80%) remained
at the Lafayette Street facility and only 3 women, who constituted only
7% of the 46 Bushwick clients, were sent to that outlying facility. This
pattern reflects the institutional policy of trying to keep the older and
more infirm clients at Lafayette Street.

   4. Prior Residential Circumstances

   Although most sample first-timers were born outside of New York State
(59% of total: Table 4), persons familiar with New York City, at least to
the extent of having been in the City for more than a year, account for

close to two-thirds (61%) of the Shelter's new clients (Table 5).
Only 6 of the 100 first-timers had been in the city for an intermediate
period of more than a month but less than a year. But a quarter (25%)
of the women had arrived in the city within a month of their appearances
at the Shelter. Most striking is the finding that only one of these 25
recent arrivals returned to the Shelter after completing their initial
stay. Of the women who had been in the city more than a year, however,
fully 43% (26 out of 61) were repeaters; a ten-fold increase.

Of the 25 recent arrivals, 18 reported their last residence as out
of state , but a large majority of all first-timers --71% -- reported
New York City addresses: 65% of all single time users and 85% of all
repeat users (Table 6).

It was hoped that something could be learned about the types of
housing previously occupied by shelter clients, but the records of more
than half (61%) of the first-timers contained no useful information
(Table 7). For the minority about which some information was available,
we found that 17 lived in an SRO hotel just prior to coming to the Shelter.

5. Social Supports

Almost half (46%) of the sample of first-timers reported having been
married, and many of the 43 women who reported being "single" indicated
that they had lived with men or women in the recent past (Table 8). But
most of the marital links and extra-marital relationships had been broken,
because fully 60% of the women reported no supports available from either
family or friends (Table 9). A quarter (24%) of the women reported some
recent family support and 14% cited support available from friends. In
most of these cases (31 of 38 or 82%) support was of a residential nature.
And it is particularly striking that the abrupt (and sometimes abusive or

violent) withdrawal of these residential supports force the women to the street and precipitate their arrival at the Shelter. All of the 13 women who reported residential support from friends also reported its withdrawal (i.e., they were kicked out) as the immediate cause of their homelessness. Of the 18 women who reported family residential support, at least 12 were similarly kicked out.

6. Financial Resources

Approximately a third (31%) of the first-timers report no financial resources of any kind (Table 10). Exhausted resources or discontinued benefits play a major role in the lives of many homeless women who appear to be caught up in a struggle to obtain such benefits as Home Relief and SSI, to re-establish their eligibility, or to maintain themselves (after having used up their benefits) until the next check arrives. Approximately a fifth (18%) of the women reports the recent or anticipated receipt of HR; another fifth (23%) reports SSI benefits; and six women report social security supplemented by SSI. It is notable that only those women in receipt of SSI are more likely to become repeat users of shelter services: 11 of the 21 SSI recipients (52%) return at least a second time as compared, for example, to 26% of the women with no reported resources, 22% of the women receiving HR,and 12% of the women reporting recent employment. Because of their greater likelihood of return and their SSI status, that could enable them to tap various supportive resources, these women should receive special casework attention.

7. Referral Source

While roughly one in ten women are self-referred to the Shelter, the remainder are sent by a range of public agencies (Table 11). The Department of Social Services itself refers approximately a third of the women: 12% from Income Maintenance centers and 19% from the Emergency Assistance

Unit (EAU). It is striking that while 10 out of 12 (82%) of the women referred by IM do not return a second time to the Shelter; 8 of the 19 (42%) women referred by the EAU become repeat users.

Hospitals referred 13% of the sample of first-timers, with psychiatric units accounting for 5 of the 13 women. Several of these women arrived at the Shelter within a day of their discharge from psychiatric hospitals. One woman, for example, was discharged from Middletown State on January 31, 1979 and put on a bus to New York City. She spent the night in the bus station and applied for shelter the following day. Another woman was discharged from Grasslands Hospital in Westchester on February 26, 1979 and went to an Income Maintenance center, where she was told to return the following day. Without a place to stay or resources, she had to apply for shelter services. Although direct hospital discharges do not account for large numbers of shelter applicants, these particularly glaring examples of "dumping" warrant special attention. But it should be emphasized that the common charges of direct "dumping" usually exaggerate the true incidence. These charges also ignore the complex routes taken by women with histories of psychiatrice hospitalization who wind up at the Shelter. Of the 32 first-timers who reported psychiatric hospitalization, we found that only 5 were referred directly to the SCCW by the hospital.

A range of social service agencies running from senior centers to Mary House to the Community Service Society referred almost a fifth (19%) of the first-timers. Among this sub-group of 19 women it is interesting to note that 15 (or 79%) are single time users of shelter services. An equal number of 19 women are referred to the Shelter by the New York Police Department. For these women, however, repeated use of shelter services is likely: 10 of the 19 (53%) return at least once after their initial stay at the Shelter.

These findings concerning the source of referrals for first-time Shelter clients must be used cautiously. The agency listed in the records is presumed to be accurate, but which agency actually sends a woman to the Shelter can be a matter of circumstance, shaped by the situation, the client's characteristics, and the response of different agencies. For example, a woman locked out of her apartment for non-payment of rent could come to the Shelter on her own; could have gotten in a fight with the landlord and been brought by the NYPD; could have gone to IM for aid and been referred; or if IM was closed due to the late hour, could have gone to the EAU and subsequently been referred to the Shelter.

8. Presenting Problems

The precipitating circumstances that compel homeless women to turn to the Shelter are a major concern of service planners: an understanding of what brings women to the Shelter is essential to the design and delivery of appropriate services. Shelter staff categorize the reason for admitting a woman to the Shelter according to one of 13 possible events or presenting problems. The distribution of these presenting problems (Table 12) was abstracted from Shelter records. But in reading the full case records, Vera staff questioned some of the intake staff's classifications and decided to reclassify each admission according to the Shelter's 13 reasons. Only the information documented in the Shelter's own records was used, and we note those instances when we felt that the records were inadequate to classify the admission.# In seven cases where the records indicated a complex sequence

---

In six cases the Shelter staff did not classify the admission and in Table 14 these are entered as "None Recorded." Vera's analysis assigned five of those cases to other classifications, found the record of one too barren to support any decision, and identified five other cases that it believed Shelter staff has classified as various presenting problems without adequate supporting information.

of problems that in no way could fit any of the Shelter's categories, we entered the case in an "Other" category. While we used the Shelter's categories, it is important to state that their simplicity and rigidity often are not compatible with and consequently obscure the complex, tortuous paths taken by many of those women who wind up at the Shelter's front doors.

As Tables 12 and 13 illustrate, women become homeless and come to the Shelter for a broad range of reasons. Approximately a quarter of the 100 first-timers -- those who were discharged from hospitals, lost, or stranded -- were, in effect, very recently injected into the city scene without any means of support or personal resources. Roughly another quarter of the women wind up at the Shelter after having lost or consumed their limited finances: those classified as "Funds Stolen," "Savings Exhausted," "Mismanagement," "Income Support Discontinued," and "Lost Employment."

With respect to the incidence of two general sets of presenting problems -- recent entry and exhausted finances -- the Shelter and Vera findings are in general agreement. When we examine the frequency of women coming to the Shelter for the reasons of "Lockout/Eviction" and "Family or Friend Support Discontinued," however, we find significant disparities. While the Shelter intake staff classified a quarter (26%) of the admissions as stemming from lockouts or evictions, Vera reports only 12%. This reduction reflects Vera findings that many of the lockouts were not commercial, landlord-tenant conflicts, but were, instead, situations in which family members (parents, siblings, children) or friends (male, female) kicked the woman out of the residence.

For 11 of the Shelter's reported 26 cases of lockout/eviction, Vera classified the presenting problem as "Family and Friend Support Discontinued." Homelessness in these cases was precipitated by personal not commercial forces, and would seem to call for a different type of social service intervention.

It is also important to note that several of these expulsions by family and friends were effected with severe abuse and violence, further complicating the status and needs of these women.

The significant number of cases reclassified from "Lockout" leads in turn to a notable increase in the proportion of women suffering from the withdrawal of support from family and friends. More than a quarter (27%) of the women, according to Vera's reading of the records, fall into this category.

As discussed above, the most striking difference between single timers and repeat users of the Shelter is found among those women who first come to the Shelter because they were "stranded." Fourteen of the 17 stranded women (82%) came only once. A comparable incidence of one time users (78%) is found for women who come to the Shelter because of the withdrawal of support from family or friends. It appears that the set of first-timers whose presenting problems are classified as stolen funds, mismanagement, and lockout/eviction run a higher risk of returning: 14 of 25 (56%) return at least a second time to the Shelter.

9. Casework Services

Based on information contained in the social service case files of each of the 100 first timers, an attempt was made to measure the amount of casework services — as distinguished from the provision of food, shelter, and clothing — delivered to the women. Casework services are difficult to evaluate either quantitatively or qualitatively. Given a broad range of presenting problems, of individual interest in being served, and of the time available for services (to mention some of the key factors at play), the type and amount of intervention will necessarily vary from case to case. Consequently, data that describe merely the number of documented contacts a shelter client had with a caseworker will not permit a thorough evaluation of

casework services. In the event of a "stranded" case, for example, a single client-worker contact through which the client was referred to Traveller's Aid may be an appropriate and sufficient intervention. A chronically homeless woman with multiple problems might require a more extensive and sustained form of intervention during a fairly protracted stay at the Shelter. The following material, however, describes only the number of contacts — data which can be gleaned from the case records — and must be used cautiously.

Overall, the records indicated no casework services for more than half (59%) of the women and only one recorded casework contact for another 29% (Table 14). Only 12 women received more than one casework contact. With respect to differences between single and repeat shelter clients, a slightly larger proportion of repeat users (66%) received no casework services during their first stay, as compared to 56% of the single timers.

It appears that the absence of casework services has only a marginal association with whether one returns to the Shelter. 21 of the 59 women (36%) who received casework services returned, as did 11 of the 41 women (27%) who received one or more casework contacts.

As would be expected, the longer a client stayed at the Shelter the more likely she was to receive additional casework services. Among this sample of 100 first-timers, 67 women stayed at the Shelter less than two weeks and 33 more than two weeks (Table 15). Almost three-quarters (73%) of the shorter-stay clients received no casework services, and only 4% (3 of the 67) had more than one casework contact. Among the 33 longer-stay clients (2+ weeks), however, 10 women (30%) received no service, while almost as many (9 women, or 27%) had more than one contact.

While a longer stay is associated with the receipt of more casework services, it should be noted that women do stay for long periods without casework intervention.

10. Case Disposition

Data concerning the dispostion of Shelter cases is in the main uneven and uninformative. Vera staff reviewed the case closing categorizations made by Shelter staff in much the same way that it reviewed SSCW reasons for admission. Based on information contained in the case files, Vera staff redetermined the reasons for case closing according to the categories now employed at the Shelter. The distribution of case closings according to Shelter staff is presented in Table 16 and the Vera redetermination in Table 17.

The records reveal that most clients simply up and leave the Shelter — overall roughly 60% of all first-timers. Slightly more than 10% of the first-timers are expelled from the Shelter for failure to comply with regulations; a similar proportion leave after the receipt of an awaited public assistance cash benefit. The remaining 20% of the cases close for reasons ranging from hospitalization (2%) to welfare referrals (5%), and discharge to the care of friends (3%) or social service agencies (3%).

Vera found little cumulative difference in the distribution of case closing reasons with the exception of the reasons attributed to those women who simply left. It appears from the case records that the Shelter actually lost contact with a larger proportion of women (43%) than it recorded (32%). Conversely, fewer women left with some plan of their own: a reduction from 26% to 17%. The Shelter's records, it would seem, exaggerate more positive closings and downplay the extent to which women

simply drift away and disappear from the Shelter.

The distribution of closing reasons for single and repeat users re-
veals that women who leave their first stay at the Shelter because they
failed to comply with regulations or because they received a public
assistance benefit are likely to return for a second admission: 6 of 12
women expelled returned as did 6 of the 11 women who received benefits.
This finding suggests that these individuals constitute a high risk shelter
subpopulation who might benefit from special services.

11. Length of First Stay

Few of the women studied remained at the Shelter for extended periods:
more than half (55%) left within one week, two-thirds (67%) within two
weeks, and fully three-quarters (75%) within three weeks (Table 18). Within
a month of their first arrival, all but 18 of the 100 first-timers had left
the Shelter. Most of these 18 women departed within their second month at
the Shelter (10 of 18), and only one remained after three full months.

A comparison of the single and repeat users revealed the shorter stays
of the single time users: 63% of the singles had left within one week and
78% within two weeks, as compared to 38% and 44%, respectively, for the re-
peat users. All but 10% of the single timers had gone within a month, while
more than a third (34%) of the women who would become repeat users remained
at the Shelter longer than one month during their first stay.

It appears that two weeks is something of a watershed with regard to
the likelihood of return. Fifty-three of the 67 women (79%) who stayed less
than two weeks did not return; 18 of the 33 women (55%) remaining longer
than two weeks on their first stay returned to the Shelter at least once
more in the following two-year period.

Next Steps

This preliminary report has focused on the backgrounds and problems of 100 first time users of shelter services. It also has attempted to take some measure of how long first time clients remain at the Shelter and how many are likely to return again to the Shelter. The initial findings suggest the need to analyze some of the data further, especially those dealing with the repeat users and the long-term users of shelter services. This first-timer analysis should be supplemented by the collection and analysis of data that describe better institutional — as distinct from individual — characteristics. Analyses of the Shelter's client population on a number of specific days (perhaps January 15, April 15, July 15, October 15) in terms of the proportion of first time and repeat clients, recent arrivals and long-term clients, etc. are needed to gain a better understanding of the demands placed on the Shelter.

These research efforts already have identified several programmatic and procedural issues which Vera staff could, with the collaboration of Shelter staff, address during the next two months. Two key issues are: (1) an improved intake process that insures the collection of important information at appropriate times during a woman's stay at the Shelter; and (2) the development of casework strategies and procedures that aim toward more promising case dispositions. The design of a better intake process might focus on the suitability of a two-stage process that provided for a more intensive but delayed client evaluation. The casework issues could involved the identification of particular case types (e.g., NYPD referrals, stranded out of towners) who appear to run different risks (long stays, repeat stays) so that they receive special casework attention. The strategies and resources to be used by caseworkers also would have to be designed.

During the next two months, Vera staff will work with the Shelter director and staff to develop the following work products:

°ᵢa plan for improving the intake process, which would include staff training and the development of new procedures and forms;

° a plan for the development of casework strategies and procedures; and

° a full report on client demographics and the use of Shelter services.

Table 1

NUMBER OF ADMISSIONS

Number of Admissions	TOTAL #/%	SINGLE #	%	REPEAT #	%
			CLIENT TYPE		
1	68	68	(100%)	—	—
2	15	—		15	(47%)
3	9	—		9	(28%)
4	4	—		4	(13%)
5	—	—		—	—
6	—	—		—	—
7	1	—		1	(3%)
8	1	—		1	(3%)
9	1	—		1	(3%)
10	1	—		1	(3%)
N	100	68		32	

Table 2

RACE/ETHNICITY

		CLIENT TYPE			
Race/Ethnicity	TOTAL #/%	SINGLE #	%	REPEAT #	%
White	40	29	(43%)	11	(32%)
Black	43	30	(44%)	13	(41%)
Hispanic	3	3	(4%)	–	–
Other	1	–	–	1	(3%)
Not Recorded	13	6	(9%)	7	(22%)
N	100	68		32	

Table 3

AGE

| | | CLIENT TYPE | | | |
| | TOTAL | SINGLE | | REPEAT | |
Age	#/%	#	%	#	%
20-29	27	23	(34%)	4	(12%)
30-39	27	20	(29%)	7	(22%)
40-49	17	9	(13%)	8	(25%)
50-59	12	7	(10%)	5	(16%)
60-69	11	4	(6%)	7	(22%)
70-79	4	4	(6%)	-	-
80+	1	1	(2%)	-	-
Not Recorded	1	-	-	1	(3%)
Median Age (yrs.)	38	33		43	
N	100	68		32	

Table 4

Place of Birth

		CLIENT TYPE			
	TOTAL	SINGLE		REPEAT	
Place of Birth	#/%	#	%	#	%
New York State	39	21	(31%)	18	(56%)
Not – NYS	59	47	(69%)	12	(38%)
Not Recorded	2	–	–	2	(6%)
N	100	68		32	

Table 5

Time in New York City

Time in NYC	TOTAL #/%	CLIENT TYPE			
		SINGLE #	%	REPEAT #	%
Less than 1 month	25	24	(35%)	1	(3%)
One month – 12 months	6	4	(6%)	2	(6%)
12+ months	61	35	(51%)	26	(81%)
Not Recorded	8	5	(7%)	3	(9%)
N	100	68		32	

Table 6

Last Address Reported

| Last Address Reported | TOTAL #/% | CLIENT TYPE | | | |
| | | SINGLE | | REPEAT | |
		#	%	#	%
Manhattan	37	24	(35%)	13	(41%)
Brooklyn	21	12	(18%)	9	(28%)
Bronx	8	5	(8%)	3	(9%)
Queens	4	2	(3%)	2	(6%)
Staten Island	1	1	(2%)	–	–
New York City Total	71	44	(65%)	27	(85%)
Other N. Y. State	4	4	(6%)	–	–
Out-of-State	20	17	(25%)	3	(9%)
Not Recorded	5	3	(4%)	2	(6%)
N	100	68		32	

Table 7

Housing Type

| | | CLIENT TYPE | | | |
Housing Type	TOTAL #/%	SINGLE #	%	REPEAT #	%
Apartment	16	9	(13%)	7	(22%)
Hotel	17	8	(12%)	9	(28%)
Hospital	1	1	(2%)	–	–
Halfway House	3	3	(4%)	–	–
Other	2	2	(3%)	–	–
Not Recorded	61	45	(66%)	16	(50%)
N	100	68		32	

Table 8

Marital Status

Marital Status	TOTAL #/%	CLIENT TYPE			
		SINGLE		REPEAT	
		#	%	#	%
Single	43	29	(43%)	14	(44%)
Separated	10	8	(12%)	2	(6%)
Divorced	23	16	(24%)	7	(22%)
Widowed	10	5	(7%)	5	(16%)
Married	3	2	(3%)	1	(3%)
Not Recorded	11	8	(12%)	3	(9%)
N	100	68		32	

Table 9

Family or Friend Supports

		CLIENT TYPE			
	TOTAL	SINGLE		REPEAT	
Supports Available	#/%	#	%	#	%
None	60	39	(57%)	21	(66%)
Family – Residential	18	12	(18%)	6	(19%)
Family – Other	6	4	(6%)	2	(6%)
Friend – Residential	13	10	(15%)	3	(9%)
Friend – Other	1	1	(2%)	–	–
Not Recorded	2	2	(3%)	–	–
N	100	68		32	

Table 10

Resources

| | | CLIENT TYPE | | | |
| | | SINGLE | | REPEAT | |
Resources Available	TOTAL #/%	#	%	#	%
None	31	23	(34%)	8	(25%)
HR	18	14	(21%)	4	(13%)
HR application	1	1	(1%)	–	–
SSI	21	10	(15%)	11	(34%)
SSI application	2	2	(3%)	–	–
SSA (and SSI)	6	4	(6%)	2	(6%)
Employment	8	7	(10%)	1	(3%)
Other	9	3	(4%)	6	(19%)
Not Recorded	4	4	(6%)	–	–
N	100	68		32	

Table 11

Referral Source

| Referral Source | TOTAL #/% | CLIENT TYPE | | | |
| | | SINGLE | | REPEAT | |
		#	%	#	%
Self	9	7	(10%)	2	(6%)
New York Police Dept.	19	9	(13%)	10	(31%)
Income Maintenance	12	10	(15%)	2	(6%)
EAU	19	11	(16%)	8	(25%)
Social Security Admin.	2	1	(2%)	1	(3%)
Medical Hospital	8	6	(9%)	2	(6%)
Psychiatric Hospital	5	3	(4%)	2	(6%)
Social Service Agency	19	15	(22%)	4	(12%)
Other	1	1	(2%)	-	-
Not Recorded	6	5	(7%)	1	(3%)
N	100	68		32	

Table 12

Admission Reason: SCCW

| | | CLIENT TYPE | | | |
| | TOTAL | SINGLE | | REPEAT | |
Reason	#/%	#	%	#	%
Hospital Discharge	4	2	(3%)	2	(6%)
Lost Person	3	3	(4%)	–	–
Stranded	18	15	(22%)	3	(9%)
Funds Stolen	7	3	(4%)	4	(13%)
Savings Exhausted	5	2	(3%)	3	(9%)
Mismanagement	4	1	(1%)	3	(9%)
Income Support Discontinued	8	6	(9%)	2	(6%)
Lost Employment	2	1	(1%)	1	(3%)
Lockout/Eviction	26	18	(26%)	8	(25%)
Family or Friend Support Discontinued	17	13	(19%)	4	(13%)
Other	–	–	–	–	–
None Recorded	6	4	(6%)	2	(6%)
N	100	68		32	

Table 13

Admission Reason: Vera

| | | CLIENT TYPE | | | |
| | TOTAL | SINGLE | | REPEAT | |
Reason	#/%	#	%	#	%
Hospital Discharge	8	5	(7%)	3	(9%)
Lost Person	1	1	(1%)	—	—
Stranded	17	14	(21%)	3	(9%)
Funds Stolen	11	5	(7%)	6	(19%)
Savings Exhausted	3	2	(3%)	1	(3%)
Mismanagement	2	—	—	2	(6%)
Income Support Discontinued	2	2	(3%)	—	—
Lost Employment	4	4	(6%)	—	—
Lockout/Eviction	12	6	(9%)	6	(19%)
Family or Friend Support Discontinued	27	21	(31%)	6	(19%)
Other	7	4	(6%)	3	(9%)
Inadequate Information	6	4	(6%)	2	(6%)
N	100	68		32	

Table 14

Casework Services

No. of Casework Contacts	TOTAL #/%	CLIENT TYPE			
		SINGLE #	%	REPEAT #	%
None	59	38	(56%)	21	(66%)
One	29	22	(32%)	7	(22%)
More than one	12	8	(12%)	4	(12%)
N	100	68		32	

Table 15

Casework Services by Length of Stay

Length of Stay	Total #/%	No. of Contacts					
		None		One		More than One	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
1-14 days	67	49	(73%)	15	(22%)	3	(5%)
15+ days	33	10	(30%)	14	(42%)	9	(27%)
N	100	59		29		12	

Table 16

Case Closing Reason: SCCW

		CLIENT TYPE			
	TOTAL	SINGLE		REPEAT	
Reason	#/%	#	%	#	%
Employment	1	1	(1%)	-	-
Failed to Comply	11	7	(10%)	4	(13%)
Hospitalized	2	2	(3%)	-	-
No Further Contact	32	21	(31%)	11	(34%)
Own Adjustment	26	19	(28%)	7	(22%)
Other Agency	2	2	(3%)	-	-
Relative - Friend	6	4	(6%)	2	(6%)
Referral to Welfare	4	4	(6%)	-	-
Received Benefit	15	7	(10%)	8	(25%)
Not Recorded	1	1	(1%)	-	-
N	100	68		32	

Table 17

Case Closing Reason: Vera

| | | CLIENT TYPE | | | |
| | TOTAL | SINGLE | | REPEAT | |
Reason	#/%	#	%	#	%
Employment	1	1	(1%)	-	-
Failed to Comply	12	6	(9%)	6	(19%)
Hospitalized	2	2	(3%)	-	-
No Further Contact	43	30	(44%)	13	(41%)
Own Adjustment	17	13	(19%)	4	(13%)
Other Agency	3	3	(4%)	-	-
Relative Friend	3	2	(3%)	1	(3%)
Referred to Welfare	5	4	(6%)	1	(3%)
Received Benefit	11	5	(7%)	6	(19%)
Not Recorded	3	2	(3%)	1	(3%)
N	100	68		32	

Table 18

Length of First Stay

| | | CLIENT TYPE | | | |
Length of First Stay	TOTAL #/%	SINGLE #	%	REPEAT #	%
0-7 days	55	43	(63%)	12	(38%)
8-14 days	12	10	(15%)	2	(6%)
15-21 days	8	4	(6%)	4	(13%)
22-28 days	7	4	(6%)	3	(9%)
One month	82	61	(90%)	21	(66%)
Two months (29-60 days)	10	4	(6%)	6	(19%)
Three months (61-90 days)	7	2	(3%)	5	(16%)
More than 3 months (90+)days)	1	1	(1%)	-	-
N	100	68		32	