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1. SCIENTIFIC IMPACT

A Please summarise below the scientific impact(s) your project has had. [Max 250 words]

The project has provided a scholarly critique of the international evidence base regarding the effectiveness of Housing First and other housing models (both ‘innovative’ and ‘orthodox’) for homeless people with complex needs. It makes an original contribution to debates surrounding ‘fidelity’ to the Pathways Housing First model, policy transfer, and criteria regarding ‘success’ when working with this vulnerable client group.

Further, in documenting stakeholder reservations regarding the transferability of Housing First to the UK – which contrast with the comparatively enthusiastic manner with which it has been embraced elsewhere – the study has highlighted the important influence of contextual factors (such as housing availability, direction of homelessness policy, and opinion regarding the allocation of resources according to ‘need’ and ‘desert’ etc.) on the policy transfer process.

The review also highlights significant gaps in the existing evidence base, noting that decisions about which interventions are most appropriate for homeless people with complex needs are often guided more by assumption and conjecture than compelling evidence. A number of recommendations for further research are thus made, including for example: longitudinal studies assessing the sustainability of impacts on service users; and greater consideration of outcomes with regard to social networks, financial wellbeing, and community integration.

The review has contributed directly to the PI’s invitation to participate in two international inter-disciplinary networks of researchers: one focusing on the replication and efficacy of the Housing First model across Europe; the other on the ‘ecology of recovery’ from long-term homelessness, mental illness and substance misuse (see below).

B Please outline the findings and outputs from your project which have had the scientific impact(s) outlined in 1A. [Max 250 words]

The findings that have been of greatest value to the academic community (outlined above), include: identification of weaknesses in the evidence base regarding interventions for homeless people with complex support needs; elucidation of the importance of contextual factors in shaping policy transfer; and contributions to debates about fidelity to the Pathways Housing First model.

Key outputs from the review have included a full report (40 pages) and summary (4 pages), both published by Crisis. These have been widely disseminated within the international academic community (see below) and are freely available as pdf downloads from the University of York and Crisis websites.

Further, an academic paper assessing stakeholder receptivity to Housing First in the UK, co-authored by Drs Johnsen and Teixeira, has been submitted to the peer-reviewed International Journal of Housing Policy.
Several UK-based academics with interests in homelessness and social exclusion attended the national report launch event in London, hosted by Crisis (see End of Award Report for details). The full report and summary (see above) were forwarded to key academic contacts overseas, including scholars in Germany, Ireland and the USA, as well as to colleagues at other UK institutions.

The PI was one of six invited speakers at a symposium dedicated to Housing First at the Conference on Social Psychology in Ireland (Limerick, April 2011). She presented a paper entitled “Doing it already?: interpretations of, and receptivity to, Housing First in the UK”.

In addition, Dr Johnsen presented a paper at the Housing Studies Association conference (York, April 2011), titled ‘Staircase or elevator?: Housing First and other housing models for homeless people with complex support needs’.

As a direct result of such dissemination, the PI was invited to contribute to two bids for international collaborative research funds. The first, led by Volker Busch-Geertsema (GISS, Germany), aims to assess how Housing First is being implemented across Europe and promote international transfer of best practice. This proposal was submitted to the European Commission Transnational Actions on Social Experimentation. The second bid, led by Dr Ronni Greenwood (University of Limerick, Ireland), aims to develop a network of academics and build a research programme examining the ‘ecology of recovery’ from homelessness, mental illness, and substance misuse. This was submitted to the European Cooperation of Science and Technology (COST). Both applications are currently under review.

The published outputs have been widely disseminated across the academic community to scholars and research-active clinicians in a range of disciplines, including: social policy, psychology, psychiatry, geography, and housing studies.

The final report is cited in the European Commission funding bid (see above), which includes researchers based in Germany, the Netherlands, Hungary, Denmark, Portugal and the UK (as well as practitioners in those countries plus Ireland, Belgium, Sweden, Finland, and Austria). The COST proposal, in which the PI is also a named participant, represents collaboration between scholars in Ireland, France, Portugal, Finland and the UK.

Development of these bids has forged links between academics with mutual research interests, thus providing a valuable network for future collaboration and knowledge exchange.
2. ECONOMIC AND SOCIETAL IMPACT

A Please summarise below the economic and societal impact(s) your project has had. [Max 250 words]

The review has rejuvenated debate amongst policy makers and practitioners regarding the strengths and weaknesses of different housing models for homeless people with complex support needs in the UK. Most notably, the findings have been used to challenge some of the assumptions underpinning resistance to the Housing First model amongst key stakeholders within the homelessness sector. Such discussions have proved very timely in light of the aim to end rough sleeping in England by 2012, and especially the Mayor of London’s Delivery Board’s coordination of responses for ‘entrenched’ rough sleepers in the capital. Findings from the review have fed directly into these debates (see below), and contributed to an increased appetite to trial a Housing First approach, or elements thereof, for the most ‘service resistant’ rough sleepers.

The review has also played a key role in shaping the development of the UK’s first Housing First pilot project, in Glasgow, by Turning Point Scotland (see below). The PI and a colleague at Heriot-Watt University (Prof Suzanne Fitzpatrick) have been commissioned to evaluate that pilot as a direct result of the review. Dr Johnsen has presented findings from the review to the pilot project staff and steering group (see below), thus ensuring contributors are fully cognizant of the philosophy underpinning the Housing First model, and raising awareness of potential challenges in project implementation. The evaluation will provide crucial evidence regarding the model’s effectiveness outside the USA, from where almost all existing evidence derives at present.

B Please outline the findings and outputs from your project which have had the economic and societal impact(s) outlined in 2A. [Max 250 words]

The review provides a comprehensive assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of different housing models for the client group of interest, thus providing a valuable resource for policy makers and practitioners making decisions about appropriate interventions at the national and local levels. Feedback received to date indicates that they have found the review’s clear articulation of the key principles of Housing First, and influence of fidelity to the Pathways model on programme outcomes, to be particularly helpful.

With regard to outputs, the full report (40 pages) and summary (4 pages) are both written in accessible language and have been widely circulated to practitioners and policy makers (see below).

In addition, two short articles aimed specifically at practitioner and policy audiences were produced, including:

a) a one-page summary, entitled “Housing First: challenging the status quo?” in Connect (2010, Issue 41, p.37), a quarterly magazine published by the national umbrella organisation Homeless Link, with a readership of 5,000; and

b) a 700-word comment published under ‘Issue of the month’ in The Voice (2010, August, pp.4-5), a monthly policy bulletin produced by the homelessness charity Broadway.
C Please outline how these impacts were achieved. [Max 250 words]

More than 70 delegates representing a range of central government departments, local authorities, and third sector agencies attended the national report launch and seminar hosted by Crisis in London. All attendees were given complimentary hard copies of the full report and summary.

The full report and summary are also freely available as downloads from the University of York and Crisis websites. Details of these were advertised via Crisis’ ‘new publications alert’ and weekly ‘policy bulletin’ which have 2,000 and 1,600 subscribers respectively. Electronic copies of the reports were forwarded to all study participants, including those based overseas.

Dr Teixeira has played a key role in assessing the London Delivery Board’s progress toward accommodating the capital’s most entrenched rough sleepers (the so-called ‘205’ group), and has thus fed findings from the review directly into deliberations regarding potential interventions for those most ‘service resistant’ individuals. The Board includes key representatives from central and local government, the police, and voluntary sector service providers.

Dr Johnsen has been invited to present a plenary about Housing First at the Shelter Cymru annual conference in Swansea, 30 June – 1 July 2011. The plenary is provisionally titled ‘Housing First: challenging mainstream approaches to homelessness’.

Dr Johnsen has also presented findings at two events hosted by Turning Point Scotland (see above): once to members of the Housing First pilot project steering group, including representatives of the Scottish Government, Police, Housing Associations and social care providers in Glasgow; and also to Turning Point Scotland staff at a training/away day.

D Please outline who the findings and outputs outlined above had an impact upon. This can be at a broad societal level through to specific individuals or groups. [Max 250 words]

As noted above, key beneficiaries from the research have included:

- at the national level – central government policy makers, umbrella organisations and national-level voluntary sector organisations devising strategies and interventions to meet the needs of this often ‘hard to reach’ client group; and

- at the local level – organisations and individuals working with homeless people who have complex support needs, including local authorities, housing providers, street outreach teams, substance misuse agencies, mental health practitioners, and the police.
3. UNEXPECTED AND POTENTIAL FUTURE IMPACTS

A Unexpected Impacts

Please note which, if any, of the impacts that your research has had were unexpected at the outset of the research, explaining where possible why you think this was the case. [Max 250 words]

The review has had a greater international impact than had been anticipated. It coincided with a surge of interest in the Housing First model across Europe, meaning that there was a higher than envisaged level of overseas interest in review findings. As a direct consequence, the PI has been invited to contribute to emerging international networks of academics with interests in Housing First.

Moreover, the review’s timeliness enabled it to have a much more immediate impact on policy and practice within the UK homelessness sector than had been anticipated. It has directly shaped development of the first Housing First pilot project in the UK (see above). Furthermore, its concomitance with debates regarding how best to meet the needs of the most ‘entrenched’ rough sleepers in London meant that findings have fed into the deliberations of the highly influential Mayor of London’s Delivery Board.

B Potential Future Impacts

If you have a clear idea of the impact your research is likely to have in the future please detail these below. [Max 250 words]

The review has elevated levels of interest in innovative models of housing for homeless people with complex support needs in the UK and challenged some of the assumptions underpinning stakeholders’ reservations about Housing First. Appetite for trialling Housing First has increased, especially for the most ‘service resistant’ rough sleepers. It thus seems likely that the review will feed into the development of any future pilot initiatives, as well as the ongoing Turning Point Scotland Housing First pilot evaluation.
4. IMPACT LIMITATIONS

A Limited scientific impact

Please state below any major scientific difficulties that have limited the scientific impact of your research. The statement should refer to an effect on impact rather than simply detail research difficulties. [Max 250 words]

N/A

B Limited economic and societal impact

ESRC recognises that some of the research it funds will not have an economic or societal impact in the short term. Please explain briefly below if this is the case for your project, and refer to your grant application where relevant. [Max 250 words]

N/A

C No impact to date

This project has had no impact to date

Please note that ESRC projects are evaluated on the basis of their scientific and/or economic and societal impact. Grant holders are expected to report any future impacts as they occur using the Impact Record, downloadable from the ESRC website.

If you have no impacts at this stage, please give reasons below. [Max 250 words]

N/A
5. DECLARATIONS

Please read the statements below. Submitting this Impact Report to reportsofficer@esrc.ac.uk confirms your agreement.

i) This Impact Report is an accurate statement of the impacts of the research project to date. All co-investigators named in the proposal to ESRC or appointed subsequently have seen and approved the Report.

ii) Details of any subsequent impacts will be submitted via an Impact Record as they occur.

Thank you for completing this Impact Report. Your Impact Report will be considered along with your End of Award Report in the evaluation of your research.

You are now invited to complete the confidential Nominations form, which will assist with the evaluation of your project.
NOMINATED OUTPUTS

Please nominate a maximum of two outputs from your research which you would like to be considered as part of the evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output type</th>
<th>Publication details</th>
<th>Uploaded to ESRC website?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed international journal paper (under review)</td>
<td>Johnsen, S. &amp; Teixeira, L. (under review) “Doing it already”?: stakeholder perceptions of Housing First in the UK, International Journal of Housing Policy.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please email your completed Impact Report with electronic copies of your nominated outputs to reportsofficer@esrc.ac.uk, using your grant reference number as the email subject.