

AUDIT AND EVALUATION SERVICES



Shelter Enhancement Program 2007 Evaluation Plan



CMHC—HOME TO CANADIANS

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has been Canada's national housing agency for more than 60 years.

Together with other housing stakeholders, we help ensure that Canada maintains one of the best housing systems in the world. We are committed to helping Canadians access a wide choice of quality, affordable homes, while making vibrant, healthy communities and cities a reality across the country.

For more information, visit our website at **www.cmhc.ca**

You can also reach us by phone at 1-800-668-2642
or by fax at 1-800-245-9274.

Outside Canada call 613-748-2003 or fax to 613-748-2016.

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation supports the Government of Canada policy on access to information for people with disabilities. If you wish to obtain this publication in alternative formats, call 1-800-668-2642.

Shelter Enhancement Program 2007 Evaluation Plan

Canada



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. Background: Highlights of CMHC Family Violence Initiatives	3
2. Purpose of the 2007 SEP Evaluation	6
2.1 Reasons for the 2007 Evaluation	6
2.2 Scope of the 2007 Evaluation	6
3. Shelter Enhancement Program.....	7
3.1 Shelter Enhancement Program Objectives.....	7
3.2 SEP Funding and Expenditures	8
3.3 SEP Program Guidelines.....	9
3.4 Program Logic	10
4. Evaluation Issues	11
4.1 Rationale	11
4.2 Success and Impacts of SEP	14
4.3 Cost-Effectiveness	17
5. Methods, Indicators and Data Sources.....	17
6. Evaluation Timetable.....	19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Background

Canada Mortgage & Housing Corporation (CMHC) has been involved in the development of Canada's shelters to address family violence since the mid-1970s. Many of the earliest shelters were established with financing from CMHC's National Housing Act (NHA) Non-Profit Programs (Special Purpose housing). Since 1988, CMHC has played a key role in the federal Family Violence Initiative (FVI) by significantly expanding the number of shelters across Canada, developing an integrated system of first- and second-stage housing, and enhancing the quality of shelters for abused women and their children through its Project Haven, Next Step and Shelter Enhancement Program (SEP).

CMHC completed an evaluation of SEP in 2002 and issued two reports, one dealing with shelters for women and children, and the other reviewing youth shelters funded in the first two years they were eligible. These reports were provided to Health Canada, and the results were highlighted in the 5-Year Report to Cabinet on the federal Family Violence Initiative. Provision of CMHC evaluations on its family violence activities have established the contribution of CMHC programs to the overall federal Initiative and ensured the on-going funding for CMHC programs under the FVI.

2. Purpose of the 2007 SEP Evaluation

The 2007 SEP Evaluation is intended to meet CMHC's reporting requirements under the federal FVI and accountability requirements related to the CMHC Special Initiatives (Renovation) funding. It will provide an updated assessment of the program following revised funding guidelines in 2003.

The 2007 evaluation will cover the time period since the previous SEP evaluation (2001/02) up to 2006/07. It will examine SEP funding for both new shelters and for renovations, and all types of projects (for women and their children, youth and men) totalling \$105.7M in federal funding since 2001/02.

3. Evaluation Issues

The 2007 Evaluation will examine the rationale, success and impacts, and cost-effectiveness of the Program including assessment of funding for youth and men's shelters as well as for First Nations as follows:

Rationale

Is there a continuing need for a program to fund additional shelters and/or shelter spaces for people experiencing family violence?

1. Is there a continuing need for a program to fund repairs and enhancements of existing shelters?

2. Is there a continuing need for a program to fund shelters for First Nations and other Aboriginal communities?

Success & Impacts

1. To what extent has SEP increased the capacity of the shelter system to address family violence issues since 2001?
2. To what extent has SEP improved shelter conditions to minimum standards?
3. To what extent has SEP met the needs for shelters for youth and men?
4. What have been the impacts of SEP on the ability of First Nations and other Aboriginal communities to address family violence issues?
5. To what extent have SEP expenditures improved client services and contributed to enhanced prevention of and improved community responses to family violence in Canada?

Cost-Effectiveness

1. Is the SEP approach of capital funding for new shelters and repairs a cost-effective means of addressing family violence problems in Canada?

4. Methods

The evaluation will use existing data from program administration systems and from Statistics Canada surveys, and compile data to address the evaluation issues using the following methods:

- Survey of shelter sponsor groups
- Physical inspections of shelters
- Survey of First Nations and Aboriginal communities
- Case studies of First Nations
- Client Survey of shelter users

The evaluation will use comparison methods (for shelters that received SEP funding and other shelters) where this is relevant to assessing program impacts.

5. Timetable

The evaluation study will be conducted over the period from September 2007 to June 2008 with a Final Evaluation Report to be completed by the Fall 2008.

1. Background: Highlights of CMHC Family Violence Initiatives

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has been involved in the development of Canada's shelters to address family violence since the mid-1970s. Many of the earliest shelters were established with financing from CMHC's National Housing Act (NHA) Non-Profit Programs (Special Purpose housing).

Since 1988, CMHC has played a key role in the federal Family Violence Initiative (FVI) by significantly expanding the number of shelters across Canada, developing an integrated system of first- and second-stage housing, and enhancing the quality of shelters for abused women and their children. Through its programs (Project Haven, Next Step and Shelter Enhancement), CMHC created partnerships with other agencies, other levels of government and community organizations to develop and enhance shelters and second-stage housing to address family violence problems in all areas of the country. Since the federal FVI was introduced in 1988, CMHC's total funding for its family violence programs was over \$190 million.¹ CMHC's evaluations of its family violence initiatives have contributed to the knowledge base to improve understanding of Canada's family violence problem. Key milestones in CMHC's family violence initiatives are summarized in Exhibit 1.

Exhibit 1
Milestones in CMHC Family Violence Programs

Time Period	CMHC Programs	Relation to Other Initiatives
1975-1988	<i>NHA Non-Profit Housing Programs</i> (Special Purpose Funding for shelters)	NHA housing for persons with special needs
1988-1992	<i>Project Haven Program</i> for family violence (1 st stage) shelters (\$22.21M over 4 years)	Phase 1, federal Family Violence Initiative (FVI) (\$40M)
1991-1994	<i>Next Step Program</i> for second-stage housing & additional 1 st stage shelters (\$20.6M over 4 years)	Phase 2, federal FVI (\$136M)
1995	<i>Shelter Enhancement Program</i> introduced to fund repairs & improvements to existing shelters & additional 1 st & 2 nd stage housing	Funded from CMHC efficiencies for 3 years (1995-1997)
1997	SEP allocated \$1.9M/year of on-going funding from FVI budget	On-going funding for federal FVI approved (\$7M/year)

¹ \$22,21M for Project Haven Program, \$20.6M for the Next Step Program, and \$147.5M for SEP. These amounts include \$61M in funding from the federal FVI and \$43M from the NHI (1999-2003) with the balance from CMHC sources. (Sources: CMHC evaluation reports (see Footnote 2), and Exhibit 2) for signature in June 2007.

1999	SEP expanded to include shelters for youth (additional \$43M from NHI over 4 years)	Related to National Homelessness Initiative (NHI)
2003 - 2007	SEP assistance levels/project increased in line with Rental RRAP, and program expanded to include shelters for men	Funded from CMHC Special Initiatives (RRAP, SEP, HASI) renewal for 3 years. In 2005, funding renewed for 1 year to March 2007, & in 2006 renewed for a further 2 years to March 2009.

In 1975 there were only 18 women's shelters in Canada. Since the mid-1970s, CMHC programs have increased the capacity of the shelter system in Canada to meet the needs of abused women and their children, financing the development of over 320 family violence shelters and second-stage housing projects in Canada. The Next Step Program (1991-1994) doubled the number of second-stage housing projects in Canada. Overall, CMHC programs have contributed to the development of over two-thirds of the 543 shelters in Canada in the 2004/05 Statistics Canada Transition Home Survey (THS), with 95,326 women and children (58,486 women and 36,840 children) staying in family violence shelters that year. Over the past 15 years, more than 750,000 women have stayed in these shelters with their children. As well, these shelters provided services to up to 4 times as many women on a non-residential basis bringing the total number of women served to over 290,000 per year. Since 1995, CMHC's Shelter Enhancement Program has also financed repairs and enhancements in over 65% of existing shelters (based on the 2002 Shelter Enhancement Program Evaluation).

Evaluations of CMHC programs have shown that they have also helped to improve access to shelters and services for women in communities that had no shelters, including smaller centres, rural areas and for First Nations communities. The Project Haven Program gave priority to communities with no existing shelters, and the Project Haven Program Evaluation (1992) showed that 24 of the 78 shelters funded were on or close to First Nations, and nearly a third of women staying in all Project Haven shelters were Aboriginal women. Since 1992, additional shelters for First Nations have been funded through the Next Step (12 projects) and Shelter Enhancement Programs (16 family violence projects and 5 youth shelters), bringing the total CMHC funded shelters for First Nations communities to 57 projects.

Since 1999, CMHC's program has expanded the scope of clients served to include youth experiencing family violence, and over 40 youth shelters have been financed. The 2002 SEP Evaluation found that about 80% of youth in shelters have a background of family violence and abuse. In 2003, CMHC's program was further expanded to cover shelters for men leaving abusive situations, and the maximum amount of renovation assistance per unit was increased with a limit of two loans per project within a 15-year period in line with the Rental RRAP. The 3-year extension of CMHC's Special Initiatives funding in 2003 was renewed for an additional year in 2005 (providing funding up to March 2007) and renewed for an additional two years in 2006 (providing funding up to March 2009).

Therefore, CMHC family violence programs have made a significant contribution to address family violence problems across Canada in support of federal government initiatives and in partnership with other governmental and community agencies.

2. Purpose of the 2007 SEP Evaluation

2.1 Reasons for the 2007 Evaluation

CMHC completed an evaluation of SEP in 2002 and issued two reports, one dealing with shelters for women and children, and the other reviewing youth shelters funded in the first two years they were eligible. These reports were provided to Health Canada, and the results were highlighted in the 5-Year Report to Cabinet on the federal Family Violence Initiative. Provision of CMHC evaluations on its family violence activities have established the contribution of CMHC programs to the overall federal Initiative and ensured the on-going funding for CMHC programs under the FVI.

A further evaluation of the SEP is required in 2006/07 for two reasons. First, to meet its responsibilities as a participating department under the federal FVI, CMHC reports on its family violence activities to the Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC), the lead agency under an existing inter-departmental Accountability Framework (AF). Under this AF, CMHC provides annual activity information and evaluates the outcomes of its programs on a 5-year cycle. The 2007 SEP Evaluation will contribute to reporting on the FVI in 2007/08.

Secondly, the 2006/07 SEP evaluation is required for CMHC program and policy development to assess the impacts of the 2003 changes in assistance levels. In addition to FVI funding, CMHC obtained SEP funding from the CMHC Special Initiatives Renovation funding which has accounted for over 60% of the federal SEP funding since 2001/02. The 2007 SEP Evaluation will consider the impacts of changes in assistance levels since the last evaluation, assess how the funding is being used, and identify unmet needs and program delivery issues. The impacts of past CMHC funding for on-reserve shelters have not been examined since the 1992 Project Haven Evaluation, and an evaluation could help inform decisions about additional shelters on-reserve.

CMHC evaluations of its family violence activities are also regularly used for other purposes such as to report on other initiatives and support Canada's contributions to, for example, United Nations reports.²

2.2 Scope of the 2007 Evaluation

The cut off date for the 2002 SEP Evaluation was 2000/01. To ensure that the CMHC evaluations cover the full term of the SEP to-date, the 2007 SEP Evaluation will cover the period from 2001/02 to 2006/07. The evaluation design will take account of the dates of changes in coverage and program guidelines where these changes are relevant to the

² Such as: Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), UN Convention of the Right of the Child (UNCRC).

issues being assessed. Including the 2001/02 and 2002/03 fiscal years in the 2007 SEP Evaluation will include activity funded from the NHI allocations which were in effect until March 31, 2003.

The FVI Report in 2007/08 will cover the period from 2003 to 2007. Therefore, the 2007 SEP evaluation report will be structured to provide results for this time period (i.e. include a section on results for the FVI reporting) as was done in the 2002 SEP Evaluation Report.

Where a province or territory delivers its own program and cost-shares the federal SEP funding, the province or territory may undertake its own evaluation of its program. The Province of Quebec is undertaking an evaluation of its program and will provide a copy of the results to CMHC. The results of the Provincial evaluation will be incorporated into the overall SEP Evaluation Report to meet accountability and reporting requirements under the federal FVI.

The 2007 Evaluation will cover funding for both 'new' shelters and for renovation of existing shelters and second-stage housing, and include all types of projects funded (i.e. projects for women and their children, youth and men). It will build on previous evaluation results, assess the impacts of program changes since the 2002 evaluation, examine SEP funding for youth and men's shelters³, and consider the need for and access to shelters for First Nations and other Aboriginal communities.

The specific evaluation issues are outlined in Section 4 below.

3. Shelter Enhancement Program

3.1 Shelter Enhancement Program Objectives

The objective of the Shelter Enhancement Program is to assist in repairing, rehabilitating and improving existing shelters for persons who experience family violence, and to assist in the acquisition or construction of new shelters and second stage housing where needed. As it relates to the objectives of the federal FVI, SEP is expected to contribute to the overall objective of the FVI to enhance prevention of and improved community response to family violence problems in Canada.

From 1995/96 to 1998/99 the Program was used for family violence shelters for women and their children. Since 1999/2000, SEP funding has been available to both shelters for women and their children, and to youth shelters. In 2003, program guidelines were revised to allow funding for men's shelters to serve men who experienced family violence.

SEP provides capital assistance in the form of a fully forgivable loan which does not have to be repaid provided the project owner adheres to the conditions of the program.

³ The 2002 SEP Evaluation included a review of 15 youth shelters funded up to 2000/2001 but did not examine the impacts of SEP for youth shelters because it was too soon to assess impacts.

Forgiveness is earned over a one year period for renovation loans and over a 15 year period for new projects funded.

3.2 SEP Funding and Expenditures

The Shelter Enhancement Program was introduced in 1995/96 with funding from CMHC's own sources until 1997/98 when an annual allocation of \$1.9 million was provided from the federal Family Violence Initiative as on-going funding. In 1999/00, SEP was allocated \$43 million over four years from the National Homelessness Initiative (NHI). From 2002/03 to 2006/07, CMHC received additional funding for SEP through the Special Initiatives for its renovation programs.

From 2001/02 to 2006/07, CMHC expenditures for SEP totalled \$105.7 million. (Exhibit 2) This represents a substantial increase compared with the previous six year period when CMHC expenditures totalled \$41.8 million⁴, and brings total CMHC expenditures for SEP to \$147.5 million since the Program was introduced. In addition to federal funding, provinces and territories contribute additional cost-shared funding (on a 75/25 (F/P) ratio) in jurisdictions where the province or territory delivers the program.

Exhibit 2
Shelter Enhancement Program
CMHC Expenditures by year 2001/02 to 2006/07

Year	Total Expenditures (Mills)
2001/02	13.50
2002/03	19.17
2003/04	16.79
2004/05	14.88
2005/06	12.90
2006/07	28.46
TOTAL	105.70

Source: CMHC Finance Division (May 2007)

Figures include CMHC administrative expenses.

There is no specific earmarking of the SEP budget by types of loans (renovation versus new), by types of clients (women, youth and men, or for First Nations), or by types of projects (first-stage versus second-stage housing). Funding for first-stage shelters is contingent on the availability of operating funding from other sources (such as provincial/territorial social services programs, INAC social development funds, or non-governmental sources) to cover the costs of services and ensure the financial viability of the project. For second-stage housing, it is expected that the clients will make rental payments to cover operating costs. Generally, second-stage housing is developed in

⁴ Shelter Enhancement Program Evaluation, Audit & Evaluation Services, CMHC, March 2002, P.21.

locations with existing first-stage shelters, and it is expected that support services will be available from the first-stage shelters so that second-stage projects do not require operating funding.

The SEP budget dollars are allocated between loans for repairs/enhancements (i.e. renovation) and loans for 'new' projects (which may include new construction and/or acquisition and renovations) based on applications received and demonstrated need. CMHC delivers SEP in Prince Edward Island, Ontario, Alberta, British Columbia and the Yukon. In other jurisdictions, the province or territory delivers SEP and funding priorities are determined by the P/T agency responsible. CMHC delivers SEP on-reserve across Canada, and funding priorities are determined in collaboration with First Nations and INAC.

The 2002 SEP Evaluation reported that, from 1995/96 to 2000/01, 80% of the SEP budget was expended for women's shelters and 20% for youth shelters (which began receiving funding in 1999). In the case of women's shelters funded, two-thirds of SEP dollars were for renovation and one-third for new shelters (most of which were located on-reserve). In the case of youth shelters, 30% of SEP dollars were for renovation and 70% for new shelters reflecting an emphasis on creating additional shelters for youth. The SEP funding distributions since 2000/01 will need to be examined in the 2007 SEP Evaluation when data are obtained from the P/T agencies delivering the program.

3.3 SEP Program Guidelines

The SEP Renovation guidelines require that units be renovated to minimum standards of health and safety (i.e. completion of all mandatory repairs). Eligible repairs for SEP funding include the 5 RRAP categories plus 3 additional categories: accessibility (for persons with disabilities), children's areas and security. Projects that require work in any one of these 8 areas are eligible for SEP funding, and it is *not* essential that the projects need mandatory repairs as defined in the Rental/Rooming House RRAP standards. For example, projects could receive SEP funding to improve security, or accessibility or children's areas even though they do not require building repairs. However, the guidelines state that priority is to be given to projects that require mandatory repairs.

The maximum loans for SEP renovations were increased in 2003. The loan amount varies with the number of existing units or beds in the project and its location as shown below:

Zone	Maximum Total Loan (per unit/bed unit)
Southern areas	\$24,000
Northern areas	\$28,000
Far Northern areas	\$36,000
Remote areas	+25% supplement

As well, CMHC introduced the second loan guideline for SEP funding that limits assistance to two commitments per project within a 15-year period. Projects that received previous renovation loans *less than 15 years ago* may be eligible for a second loan. However, the combined total forgivable loan amount should not exceed the maximum in effect at the time of the second loan application. After 15 years, projects are eligible for additional assistance provided that the previous forgivable loan has been earned in full, and the amount of the previous assistance is not deducted from the maximum SEP loan currently available.

3.4 Program Logic

The main activities in the SEP are provision of fully-forgivable loans to eligible groups to finance either the provision of additional shelters and shelter spaces or the renovation and enhancement of existing shelters.

The key outputs of these activities are:

- Creation of new first-stage shelters (and additional spaces in some pre-existing shelters) and second-stage housing projects
- Repair of existing shelters to meet minimum health and safety requirements
- Provision of more units that are accessible to persons with disabilities
- Provision of more children's facilities in shelters
- Provision of safe and secure shelters and second-stage housing

The intended short-term outcomes of the program include the following:

- Increases in the numbers of clients served in shelters and second-stage housing
- Improved geographic accessibility to shelters and second-stage housing in communities that lack these facilities
- Improved physical quality, accessibility, facilities for children and security/safety of shelters and second-stage housing

In the medium-term, these short-term outcomes are expected to lead to improvements in services for clients experiencing family violence which will assist them to move to abuse-free living situations over time. Clients may tend to stay longer in better quality shelters that are more suitable for their needs, and longer stays have been associated with more use of support services that in turn is associated with improved likelihood of moving to abuse-free living situations. For clients, use of shelters is expected to lead to improvements in personal, physical, mental and social well-being, and for children, improvements are expected in behaviours, school performance and attendance, and social skills. Depending on the clients' circumstances, there may be additional improvements in economic self-sufficiency and reduced dependency on income support programs over time.

Over the longer-term, improved provision of shelters, second-stage housing and support services are expected to enhance the prevention of and improve the community response to family violence problems.

An evaluation is also expected to assess the extent to which the program achieved its objectives without unintended consequences for individuals, agencies, or the community. However, shelters to address family violence are only one element in a larger system of social support and community services to respond to these problems, and the evaluation is not expected to cover the entire social service network. The evaluation may consider findings from previous studies and seek to identify changes over time in these broader impacts.

4. Evaluation Issues

The evaluation will examine the continuing need for the SEP (Rationale), the success of the Program and its impacts, and the cost-effectiveness of the Program.

4.1 Rationale

The evaluation will examine the continuing need for a program to fund additional (new) shelters/shelter spaces and repairs/enhancements of existing shelters for people experiencing family violence including: women and children, youth, and men, for specific target groups, and for First Nations.

The rationale analysis is divided into 3 issues: the need for additional shelters/shelter spaces, the need for repairs and enhancements of existing shelters, and the needs for First Nations and other Aboriginal communities. The needs of First Nations and other Aboriginal communities is included as a separate issue because of the distinct distance, cultural and other challenges of addressing family violence issues in these communities.

Issue #1: Is there a continuing need for a program to fund additional shelters and/or shelter spaces for people experiencing family violence?

After 30 years of shelter development there are, based on the Statistics Canada 2004/5 Transition Home Survey, 543 women's shelters across Canada to address family violence issues. Over 95,000 women and children stayed in these shelters in 2004/05, and they also provided non-residential services to up to four times as many women. In addition, Canada has other shelters that provide support services to youth and men who experience family violence although there is no inventory of this shelter network and the numbers of clients served.

The evaluation will consider trends in the incidence of family violence and utilization of shelters (based on Statistics Canada surveys), and indicators of shortfalls and gaps in the existing shelter capacity to meet the needs (such as the utilization rates of existing shelters and the numbers of people 'turned away' or not able to access services). There are also questions concerning the geographical access and the extent to which people in

need of family violence shelters have access to services in their community (i.e. without moving to a different community/geographic area). The shelter system includes short-term, first-stage shelters and longer-term second stage housing, and the evaluation will assess if the balance of first/second-stage housing is appropriate, that is, whether there is there enough second stage housing to accommodate women when they are ready to leave first stage shelters. Some groups (such as the elderly, persons with disabilities, immigrant women) may have special needs that are not easily met and require more specialized support services. The evaluation needs to consider the extent to which existing shelters are accommodating these types of special needs, and if there is demand for other types of shelters.

Therefore, the evaluation will include a needs assessment to determine the existing supply/capacity in relation to need and demand for shelters overall and to identify 'gaps' in the current shelter system.

Issue #2: Is there a continuing need for a program to fund repairs and enhancements of existing shelters?

The 'need' for repair funding is related to the physical condition of the shelter stock and the availability of funding to ensure adequate upkeep of the buildings as well as for capital improvements as the buildings age. The 2002 SEP evaluation estimated that there was a backlog of repair needs in family violence shelters of \$27 million in 2001. High volume usage of shelters may contribute to higher rates of wear and tear versus other types of housing and greater repair needs in these buildings over time, and the need to providing secure/safe buildings for the client group served.

The evaluation will determine the current (2007) need for repairs and enhancements of the shelter stock. Trends in the need for repairs may be affected by the adequacy of regular maintenance, and the evaluation will examine the adequacy of maintenance budgets in operating funding over time to assess tendencies to deferred maintenance where operating funding declines or is not increased to meet rising expenses. Also, as shown in the 2002 SEP evaluation and data from the 1999/2000 Transition Home Survey, there are also other sources of funds to address repair needs, such as other government funding, the shelters' own reserve funds, and fund-raising. For shelters receiving SEP renovation funding from 1995/96 to 2000/01, SEP provided about 60% of all funds for repairs and enhancements undertaken. The evaluation will examine other sources of funding used for shelters repairs from 2002 to 2006 in assessing the on-going repair funding needs.

Issue #3: Is there a continuing need for a program to fund shelters for First Nations and other Aboriginal communities?

Statistics have shown that rates of family violence are higher for Aboriginal women than for non-Aboriginal women. As reported by Statistics Canada in 2005⁵, Aboriginal women are three times as likely to experience spousal assault as non-Aboriginal women (21% compared with 8%), and they experienced more severe forms of violence (nearly half reported being beaten, choked, threatened with a knife or gun or sexually assaulted compared with 31% of non-Aboriginal women assaulted by a spouse/partner). Spousal homicide, the most extreme form of family violence, showed rates from 1991 to 1999 that were more than eight times higher for Aboriginal women than non-Aboriginal women.

Since 1988 there has been a substantial increase in the numbers of shelters for Aboriginal women from First Nations and other Aboriginal communities with capital funding from CMHC's family violence programs (Project Haven, Next Step and Shelter Enhancement) and operating funding through INAC programs. In 2005, INAC reports funding for 35 shelters on-reserve south of 60.⁶ In 2003/04, the Statistics Canada THS reported that 26 shelters (5%) responding to its Survey were operated by a band council, and an additional 122 shelters off-reserve (26%) reported serving reserve populations. The Survey found that 1,847 women and 1,672 children stayed in the 26 shelters on-reserve in 2003/04.

However, residents in more than half of the 614 First Nations in Canada do not have access to family violence shelters in or close to their own communities, and women and their children from remote locations often have to travel long distances to access services. For the 3 territories, there are currently only 15 shelters to serve the needs of women who experience family violence.

In July 2006, the federal government announced at the Assembly of First Nations General Assembly that it will take action on a series of initiatives to improve the quality of lives of Aboriginal peoples. In June 2007, the federal government announced an additional investment of \$56M over five years for family violence prevention programs and services on-reserve. This additional funding includes \$53.45M for operational costs of existing programs through INAC's Family Violence Prevention Program, and \$2.2M for new shelters through CMHC's Shelter Enhancement Program.⁷

The evaluation will examine access to shelters for First Nations and Aboriginal communities to assess the gaps in the current system to provide comparable services to those provided off reserve. This assessment will need to take account of higher rates of family violence for Aboriginal women, and geographical access issues, including the service areas (and number of First Nations communities served by) existing shelters located on and off-reserve, and both south and north of 60. The impact of sources and availability of operating funding for First Nations shelters on development and operation

⁵ "Canada's Shelters for Abused Women, 2003/04", Juristat, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada, Catalogue No.85-002-XIE, Vol. 25, no.3, Page 15. Based on data from the 1999 General Social Survey on Victimization.

⁶ 'Evaluation of the Family Violence Prevention Program for First Nations', Departmental Audit & Evaluation Branch, INAC, June 2005.

⁷ INAC website, News release, June 22, 2007. (www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/nr/prs/m-a2007/2-2899-eng.asp)

of these shelters will be assessed. It will also consider the contribution of the Shelter Enhancement Program since 2001 in addressing the need.

4.2 Success & Impacts of SEP

Issue #4: To what extent has SEP increased the capacity of the shelter system to address family violence since 2001?

The evaluation will determine the contribution of the program to increasing the numbers of shelters and shelter spaces since 2001, and the impact of the additional capacity on meeting the needs of women and children, youth and men. It will assess the numbers of shelters developed in communities that lacked first-stage shelters and/or second-stage housing in the past, and the demand for increased capacity in existing shelters.

A range of factors affect the ability of the program to expand the capacity of the shelter system in Canada not least of which is the availability and adequacy of funding to operate the facilities and provide services to clients. In addition, the capacity of the system to meet demands for service relates to the lengths of time that clients may stay in shelters and the housing alternatives available to them when they leave. The evaluation will assess these types of factors that may affect the impact of the program.

Issue #5: To what extent has SEP improved shelter conditions to minimum standards?

The evaluation will examine the average dollar amounts of SEP renovation loans since 2001 and determine the extent to which loan amounts have increased since 2003. It will assess the adequacy of these loan amounts to bring buildings to minimum health and safety standards under the RRAP Rental/Rooming House guidelines and other sources of repair funding that may have been used to cover repair costs. It will assess whether priority was given to mandatory repairs and the use of SEP funding for eligible costs to improve security, accessibility, and children's play areas. The impact of the 'second loan' guideline on the reach and adequacy of SEP repair funding and on the ability to deliver SEP budgets will also be assessed.

The evaluation will assess the impact of SEP renovation funding on the overall physical condition of the shelter stock and the outstanding repair needs of shelters on and off-reserve. This assessment needs to take account of the reach of the SEP renovation funding to shelters in need of repair, and the physical conditions in shelters that did not receive repair funding. The analysis includes assessment of the adequacy of shelter maintenance budgets and the extent to which SEP funding may be meeting shortfalls in operating funding.

Issue #6: To what extent has SEP met the need for shelters for youth and men?

The scope of the SEP has been expanded from women's shelters since 1999 to include funding for youth shelters and, since 2003, for men's shelters. Funding has been provided for the acquisition and renovation or construction of these shelters as well as, in

some cases, for the repair of existing shelters. In practice, there are some overlaps among shelters for women, youth and men depending on the ages of clients served and services provided, and men's shelters may serve men with their children who are leaving family violence situations. The Evaluation will need to develop operational definitions of the different types of shelters.

As a first step, the evaluation will examine existing literature on the need for youth and men's shelters to address family violence and determine the numbers of shelters and spaces funded for youth and men where these have been delivered by the provinces and territories.

In 1999, Statistics Canada's General Social Survey compiled information on intimate partner abuse for both men and women for the first time. The GSS data were consistent with several earlier studies that had found similar rates of abuse by women and men in intimate relationships.⁸ However, the severity of abuse was generally more severe for women, and more than a third of women reported being afraid for their lives whereas men are unlikely to report fearing for their lives. Differences in the severity of abuse between women and men are consistent with higher spousal homicide rates for women. In 2004, there were 74 spousal homicides in Canada, 62 women and 12 men, indicating that women were 5 times as likely to be killed by a spouse as men.⁹ Statistics Canada reports declining rates of spousal homicide for both men and women since 1974, and cites improved police and court policies and shelters services for abused women as contributing factors.¹⁰ This report also noted that young persons (aged 15 to 24) are at the highest risk of spousal homicide with rates 3 to 5 times higher than for the population.

There is limited information available in Canada on shelters for youth and men experiencing family violence and the numbers of clients served. In 2006, CMHC sponsored a pilot survey of youth shelters in parallel with the Transition Home Survey conducted by Statistics Canada to provide background information for the SEP evaluation. This survey will provide some information on services provided and clients who use these shelters. In 2004, the National Clearinghouse on Family Violence updated its Directory of Services and Programs for abused men, and identified six shelters for abused men in Canada.¹¹ Available program data indicate that, to-date, 40 youth shelters and 4 men's shelters have been funded through SEP.

⁸ The 1999 GSS data reported that 7% of men and 8% of women reported physical abuse and 18% of men and 19% of women reported psychological abuse by a spouse/partner. These data were based on the same list of 10 questions for men and women (using the Conflict Tactics Scale).

⁹ In contrast in the US, rates of spousal homicide are equal. Some researchers have suggested that easy access to firearms equalizes power between men and women thereby equalizing the gender risk of murder.

¹⁰ Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile 2006, Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada, Cat. No. 85-224-XIE, 2006, p.52.

¹¹ 'Directory of Services and Programs for Abused Men in Canada', National Clearinghouse on Family Violence, Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC), 2004.

The evaluation will include a literature review on the needs for shelters for youth and men to address family violence¹² and a survey of the youth and men's shelters funded to determine the client groups served, their needs related to family violence and the impacts of these shelters on clients. This survey will also assess the needs for additional shelter capacity and services.

Issue #7: What have been the impacts of SEP on the ability of First Nations and other Aboriginal communities to address family violence issues?

The evaluation will examine the contribution of SEP in assisting First Nations and other Aboriginal communities to address family violence issues. This assessment will consider existing shelters and services models and the extent to which these are meeting the needs of the communities, as well as the gaps in services. The evaluation will include a survey of all First Nations and other Aboriginal communities that have shelters and other communities that currently have no shelters, and assess accessibility to shelters in other locations. The survey will address the community needs, access to services, and the adequacy of funding. In addition, some in-depth case studies will be undertaken in selected communities to investigate the impacts of shelters on family violence issues in the community, and the priorities of these communities.

Issue #8: To what extent have SEP expenditures improved client services and contributed to enhanced prevention of and improved community response to family violence in Canada?

Increasing shelter capacity and improving existing shelters has the potential to improve the reach and quality of client services and assist in addressing family violence issues. Previous evaluations have shown that women who stay longer in shelters and use the services in these shelters have higher rates of success in terms of moving to violence-free living situations. Clients have also reported that improved physical conditions in shelters contribute to longer stays for themselves and their children, and increased satisfaction with the help they received. Earlier intervention may also contribute by reducing the severity of violence experienced and the corresponding negative effects on physical and mental health, personal, social and economic well-being.

The evaluation will include surveys of sponsor groups and clients to benchmark indicators of client satisfaction and client outcomes with results from previous evaluations. These indicators will include factors such as the proportion of clients moving to violence-free situations on leaving shelters, the incidence of repeat use of shelters, lengths of stay, use of second-stage housing, and improvements in social and economic well-being. The surveys will also investigate changes in the ability of clients to obtain permanent, affordable housing after using shelters.

¹² Recent literature includes: "Intimate Partner Abuse Against Men- Overview Paper" by Dr. Eugene Lupri and Dr. Elaine Grandin, published by National Clearinghouse on Family Violence, PHAC, 2004; "Husband abuse: An Overview of Research and Perspectives", by Leslie Tutty, published by National Clearinghouse on Family Violence, PHAC, 1999.

4.3 Cost-Effectiveness

Issue #9: Is the SEP approach of capital funding for new shelters and repairs a cost-effective means of addressing family violence problems in Canada?

Previous evaluations have found that shelter funding programs are more cost-effective than other approaches such as other forms of assisted housing in addressing family violence problems. For example, the Next Step Program Evaluation (1997) found that second-stage housing had more positive outcomes for women leaving abusive situations than a direct move to assisted housing because of the support services provided. The Project Haven Program Evaluation (1992) found that the 15-year forgivable capital financing approach used in Project Haven for new shelters was more cost-effective in present value terms than the financial assistance approach used previously in the non-profit program.

The SEP evaluation will look at the possibilities of examining the financial assistance approach for the non-profit program that was used in the Next Step Program Evaluation as the point of comparison for cost-effectiveness of the SEP funding program for second-stage housing (would not apply to the comparative cost-effectiveness of renovation or for first-stage shelters).

The SEP evaluation will examine the capital costs of SEP funding per project and per client served and the related operating costs of shelters to determine the average costs of the shelter approach to addressing family violence. The comparative cost-effectiveness of renovation (to minimum standards) versus replacement of older existing shelters with new buildings needs to be assessed following recent relocations of long-established shelters in some communities. The contribution of second-stage housing, as a means to 'free-up' capacity in first-stage shelters will be assessed, taking into account the additional service demands on first-stage shelters to support clients in second-stage housing. Given the investment in the existing shelter network, the long-term financial viability of shelters needs to be assessed, especially in light of the revised SEP renovation guidelines in 2003 that limit maximum loan assistance within a 15 year period, and operating funding requirements.

5. Methods, Indicators & Data Sources

Exhibit 3 summarizes the proposed indicators and data sources to address the evaluation issues identified above for the SEP activity in the period from 2001/02 to 2006/07.

Exhibit 3
Summary of Evaluation Issues, Indicators & Data Sources

Evaluation Issues	Key Indicators	Methods & Data Sources
A. Rationale		
1. Need for new units	# clients served # clients turned away	Transition Home Survey (THS) data Sponsor survey
2. Need for repair funding	% stock in need of repair \$ repair needs	THS data Physical inspections Sponsor survey
3. Needs for First Nations & Aboriginal communities	# communities with shelters # clients served Distance to closest shelter	THS data Survey of First Nations & Aboriginal communities
B. Success & Impacts		
4. Increased shelter capacity for women & children, youth & men, & improved access, on- and off-reserve	# additional projects & units # projects in communities lacking facilities Types of shelters funded (FV & other)	Program administration data Sponsor Survey
5. Improved shelter conditions	% shelter stock repaired to minimum standards % stock with improved security, accessibility & children's facilities \$ cost & sources of funding	Program administration data THS data Physical inspections Sponsor survey
6. Impacts on needs for youth & men's shelters	# clients served & services Client satisfaction Client outcomes (1)	Client & sponsor surveys Youth Shelter Pilot Survey
7. Impacts on First Nations communities	# FN with FV services # clients served in FN % with access to services Adequacy of funding	Survey of First Nations Case Studies
8. Impacts on clients & family violence	# clients served & services % clients with FV problems Client satisfaction Client outcomes (1)	Client & sponsor surveys
C. Cost-Effectiveness		
9. Cost-effectiveness of SEP New & Reno funding	SEP \$/project & /client served	Program administration data THS & Sponsor Survey

Note (1): Client outcomes include a range of personal, social & economic indicators of well-being that were used in previous CMHC evaluations of SEP and other CMHC family violence programs.

The evaluation will utilize existing data from program administration systems and from Statistics Canada surveys. In addition, five methods will be used to compile the information required to address the evaluation issues:

1. Sample survey of shelter sponsor groups including up to 60 youth and men's shelters, 100 women's shelters off-reserve, and 45 shelters in First Nations and northern communities.
2. Physical inspections of a sample of shelters (estimated sample size of 100 shelters).
3. Survey of First Nations & Aboriginal communities including communities with and without shelters. Estimated sample of 100 First Nations and 50 other communities in the north.
4. Case studies of 12 First Nations communities including interviews with shelter directors, and representatives of other service providers and agencies.
5. Client surveys (shelter users) to be completed by shelter sponsors as client exit surveys. The estimated sample size will be 400-500 clients.

Survey instruments used in previous evaluations will be used to the extent possible to provide comparable trend data on key indicators.

The methodology will include comparison approaches (i.e. for SEP-funded and non-SEP funded shelters in items 1, 2, and 5, and the Survey of First Nations and Aboriginal communities will include those with and without shelters) where this is relevant to assessments of program impacts.

CMHC will consult with provincial/territorial agencies involved in the provision of shelter funding on the SEP Evaluation. CMHC will coordinate with INAC on the SEP Evaluation activities related to First Nations.

6. Evaluation Timetable

The proposed timetable for the evaluation is as follows:

- Plan approval : July 2007
- RFP to hire consultants : August - September 2007
- Evaluation Study: November 2007 – September 2008
- Final Report : November 2008