## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Research</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Consultations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Synthesis and Analysis</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations in the Available Data</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIBUTIONS AND OUTCOMES</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 1: “Housing First”</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Point to the Service System</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in Finding and Maintaining Housing</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 2: “People-Centred &amp; Inclusive”</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility, Responsiveness, and Low-Barrier Access</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of Individuals’ Dignity and Worth</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Involvement in Service Planning, Evaluation, and Delivery</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2: Formal Mechanisms for Participants to Get Involved</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management and Low Staff-to-Participant Ratios</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Programming for Vulnerable Populations</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Choice</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle 3: “Locally Driven &amp; Partnership Based”</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with Other Homelessness Services and Programs</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rural Day Services
Layers of Integration
Population Outcomes through Systems Integration
Collaboration among Service Providers
Principle 4: “Fiscally Responsible and Outcome Focused”
Strategic Funding to Address Needs and Supplement Resources
Evidence-Based, Outcomes-Focused Programs and Services
Logistics
Network Planning Table
DAY SERVICES IN HAMILTON
Identifying Day Services
Establishing the Scope
Developing the Definition
The Hamilton Context
Stakeholders Survey
Moving Forward with the Definition, List, and Inform Hamilton
Identifying Potential Day Services
Key Considerations
Locations
Geography and Access
Vulnerable Populations
Funding Challenges
Table 2: Sources of Funding
APPENDICES
Appendix 1: Consultations
Appendix 2: Maps
Day Services - Hours of Service
Day Services – Ages of Primary Clients
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Hamilton Day Services System Evaluation
Final Report
Table of Contents
August 22, 2013

This final report provides guidance for City staff, planning groups, service providers, and stakeholders interested in supporting people at risk of and experiencing homelessness with strategies that can improve Day Services, strengthen and support service capacity, and shed light on what is working and not working in the Day Services sector from the perspective of both service providers and consumers.

The term Day Services has been used by the City of Hamilton to describe a group of programs which in other jurisdictions are known as Drop-ins (City of Toronto) and Day Centres (U.K.). In Hamilton there had previously been no common lexicon to identify Day Services. Despite this there are a wide variety of agencies and programs that can be called Day Services, even if they themselves do not identify as such. Day Services are provided by a diverse group of informal and formal agencies, including faith groups, resource centres, health centres, shelters, and other organizations, to respond to unmet needs in their communities. A range of different services are provided depending on the unique needs identified, the skills and mandate of the provider organization, and the resources available.

Hamilton is working towards the vision that “Everybody Has a Home – Home Is the Foundation,” and its Housing and Homelessness Action Plan (HHAP) recognizes that “the strategies and solutions which successfully address affordable housing and homelessness must be integrated with many different sectors and services.” While not all Day Services in Hamilton define their work as contributing to ending homelessness, research from Canada, the U.S., and the U.K. has shown that many of the services provided by Day Services play a significant role in helping people who are marginalized by poverty to maintain their housing.

The potential of Day Services to build on their assets and deepen their impact in preventing homelessness will depend to a large degree on the willingness of funders to appropriately resource the work they do. This can include providing funding to ensure that the appropriate spaces are available to provide Day Services, providing funding for specific programs and
services within the Day Service and supporting the development of the Day Services sector. Potential sources of funding include the Province’s Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI), the federal government’s Homelessness Partnering Strategy (HPS), Community Partnership Program Grants and other municipal funding streams, and local funders like the Hamilton Funders Network.

We have organized our recommendations around the core values articulated in Hamilton’s Housing and Homelessness Action Plan and the key principles articulated in the CHPI Program Guidelines, summarized as “Housing First,” “People-Centred & Inclusive,” “Locally Driven & Partnership Based,” and “Fiscally Responsible & Outcome Focused.” These principles are also aligned with the principles of the federal Homelessness Partnering Strategy (HPS) and are considered best practices by a variety of other funders.

It is important in any system that service providers are clear about their roles and the roles of other service providers; that all providers share an understanding of community needs and resources and that bridges are built between formal and informal services. If individual and autonomous Day Services are to evolve into a coordinated service system, there is a need to increase linkages with informal and formal service providers and to forge agreements that make the best use of local assets and identify and address service gaps. This coordination in no way precludes the diversity of services offered or limits their autonomy.

The City could leverage the strong relationships it has with its service partners to begin a focused engagement to identify core functions and evidence-informed standards for Day Services. Our finding is that many service providers have deep insights and analysis which can be accessed in determining how Day Services can aid in preventing and ending homelessness; how to bridge the gap between today and the next 10 years; and how to resource the developmental needs of service providers as they evolve into a collaborative network of services within their own sector and integrate with the Housing & Homelessness and Human Services systems.

**Background**

Over the last ten years, the City of Hamilton has taken a strong lead in analyzing and coordinating services in the housing and homelessness sector to improve access to housing, shelter, and supports for people. This work has included the following reports, strategies, and action plans:

- *Keys to the Home*, 2004
As the system manager, the City of Hamilton is responsible for administering funding from the Federal, Provincial, and Municipal Governments and collaborating with community-based organizations to support a housing and homelessness service system that will be responsive to people’s needs and support positive outcomes in people’s lives.

The research reports, plans, and strategies listed above provide principles and a framework for action that do not exclude Day Services; however, they do not systematically analyze the role that Day Services play within the housing and homelessness system or identify strategies specific to Day Services. Recognizing this gap, the City of Hamilton hired Paul Dowling & Associates to produce four reports:

1. An inventory of formal and informal Day Services in Hamilton
2. An analysis of formal Day Services in Hamilton
3. A report identifying relevant best practices in Day Services
4. A final report that builds on the inventory and best practices analysis to produce a set of recommendations for developmental opportunities for Day Services

This is the final report. The other reports have been previously submitted.

Purpose

The purpose of the Inventory and Analysis Reports was to provide a descriptive snapshot of Day Services in Hamilton. We aimed to identify key aspects of service delivery in Day Services, describe different models, and paint a picture of the diverse agencies, organizations, faith groups, and informal providers using a Day Services approach to meet the needs of vulnerable populations in Hamilton.

The purpose of the Best Practices Report was to provide a context to locate Hamilton’s Day Services within a framework of best practices for Day Services from other jurisdictions. We reviewed the literature and identified the need to provide benchmarks across key domains of person-centred service system design to enable the City to track its progress as a service system.
manager and ensure alignment with its vision for ending homelessness as outlined in its 10 year plan; and to develop standards to enable stakeholders to track service impacts and progress on ending homelessness as a result of their contributions to this shared goal.

The purpose of the **Final Report** is to provide recommendations on how to maximize assets and opportunities and address developmental issues, including best practices that could be implemented based on the existing strengths of the system or introduced conditional on further focused discussions with the service provider community. The developmental measures can contribute to community health and well-being by building capacity and system effectiveness through coordinated service design and adoption of service standards in certain key areas.

## Methodology

Stakeholder engagement was iterative and ongoing throughout the term of the project and periods of intensive data collection were linked to the project deliverables. We used a mixed methods approach, including quantitative and qualitative data collection with cross-validation to ensure relevance, richness, and data integrity.

## Definitions

**How We Defined “Homelessness”**

In our survey and analysis, we identified three broad locations along the spectrum of housing status:

- Stably housed
- Housed, but struggling (e.g. difficulties paying rent or other bills, issues with roommates or landlord, etc.)
- Homeless (e.g. staying in shelters, on the street, couch-surfing, etc.)

Throughout the report we use the term “homeless or at risk of homelessness” to refer to these latter two categories. We were guided by previous research on the “iceberg” of homelessness, which places people who are unsheltered (“visible homelessness”) on the tip and those who are couch-surfing (“hidden homelessness”), those living in overcrowded, substandard, or inadequate, or unaffordable housing (“precariously housed”) on the invisible bulk of the iceberg below the surface (Wellesley Institute, 2010, p. 32). The Wellesley Institute (2010) estimated that 150,000 to 300,000 Canadians are living unsheltered and those who are experiencing hidden forms of homelessness or who are precariously housed are upwards of 3 million.
In this report, we recognize different forms that homelessness and experiences of precarious housing can take. We also acknowledge that Hamilton has several rural communities with very different experiences of homelessness. Our research and stakeholder engagement included providers from Ancaster, Dundas, Flamborough, Glanbrook, and Stoney Creek.

**How We Defined “Day Services”**

After much discussion and after reviewing the literature from other jurisdictions and in response to themes from our key informant interviews, we agreed on the following working definition: “A Day Service is a space that allows people to come in without an appointment or application and spend time socializing, meeting their basic needs, and, at their own discretion, accessing specialized services designed to meet the needs of people who are homeless or at risk of losing their housing.”

Please see later sections of this report for further details on the process of developing this working definition and defining the scope of this project.

**How We Defined “Best Practices”**

While there are multiple terms such as “leading practice,” “emerging practice,” “good practice,” and “promising practice” used in a variety of sectors, we adopted the term “best practice.” Some best practices from other systems and jurisdictions with unique conditions and factors may not yield the same results in Hamilton. Nonetheless, we relied on our knowledge of homelessness to choose from the literature the options that bear relevance in Hamilton. The “best practices” we discuss in our reports are focused primarily on service delivery principles that are applicable to a wide variety of organizations offering Day Services. In the future, the Day Services sector in Hamilton may want to drill down into more specific standards for individual organizations; in this case, the sector may want to follow Toronto in using the term “good practices.” “Good practices” acknowledges that there may be a range of practices that are appropriate for Day Services with different space capacities, different types of specialized staff, different staff-to-participant ratios, different service delivery models, different funding models, etc.

**Other Definitions**

We did not define vulnerable and marginalized populations, but we were guided by stakeholders’ identification of these groups. During our survey we asked providers to indicate whether there were specific groups for whom they provided targeted programming. Stakeholders used the terms “vulnerable population” and “target population” to refer to groups of people with some common and related risk factors and also to describe programs specifically aimed at a particular population. We followed this practice to reflect community reality and in
addition considered those populations that the literature review deemed to be “known” to benefit from population-specific service models.

We have not differentiated between “person-centred” and “people-centred.” While we found these terms used interchangeably by stakeholders, in the literature, “people-centred” usually referred to population change strategies while “person-centred” referred to individual level change. In practice, we think that strategies aimed at population outcomes are different from strategies aimed at individual outcomes and it cannot be assumed that change at the individual level will translate into a meaningful population outcome. We note that the CHPI Guidelines do not seem to make this distinction, using the term “people-centred” to describe what the broader literature would consider a “person-centred” approach: “A people-centred approach focuses on positive results for individuals and families who are homeless or at risk of homelessness” (CHPI Guidelines, 2012, p. 3).

Web Research

We began with a series of searches on Inform Hamilton using the key words “Day Service,” “day program,” “drop-in,” and “homeless.” We developed a long list of possible Day Services and gathered further information from websites of individual organizations. As we refined our definition (see above), we reduced and revised this list.

Literature Review

We conducted a review of policy documents released by the provincial government and the City of Hamilton. We also reviewed key publications on service innovations that reflect the policy shift from managing homelessness to ending homelessness. The findings of the literature review are summarized in the Best Practices document.

Stakeholder Consultations

The stakeholder engagement strategy cast a wide net and initially contacted all known service providers of formal and informal programs including some programs that were significant to the target population but not necessarily identified as closely connected to the homelessness system. The City shared its list of service providers thought to be possibly providing Day Services and the Inform Hamilton database identified many others. The engagement was iterative and referrals were contacted throughout the process in order to remain as inclusive as possible. We consulted regularly with the City to check in as our focus began to narrow.
Multiple perspectives including those of program participants, people with lived experience and related sectors such as settlement, food security and VAW were collected. Key informant interviews, focus groups and site visits provided deeper insight into the views of providers and program participants on the value of Day Services, how they can be expanded, current challenges, and system gaps.

We conducted 33 interviews, site visits, and focus groups with 79 individuals. Please see Appendix 1 for a detailed list.

As we refined our scope and definition, we generated a short list of 48 service providers in Hamilton whom we believed to be Day Service providers. We sent these service providers a survey to test this assumption and to gather descriptive information about the landscape of Day Services in Hamilton. Of these 48, we determined that 26 met our definition of a “Day Service” and 19 did not (the remaining 3 did not respond to the survey or to follow-up phone calls or emails). Please see the “Stakeholders Survey” section later for further details on this process.

Data Synthesis and Analysis

Information required about Day Services was identified in the City’s RFP. The document and literature reviews provided a framework for analysis and additional categories of information and best practices by which Day Services could be described and assessed. We focused on service delivery design and approach; program practices; administration and operations; partnerships and service integration; and target populations. The literature review brought into focus the role of the system manager in achieving positive outcomes and we pursued this inquiry into service integration; system standards; service pathways; contracting protocols and agreements.

Limitations in the Available Data

The survey data was self-reported and not cross-validated by other methods. Our working definition of Day Services was intended for data analysis and the survey design did not lead those surveyed to respond one way or another.

Our aim was to provide a “service snapshot” and inventory of known Day Service assets within a limited time. We recognize that some service providers may have been missed. Additional validation may be required to confirm specific data on vulnerable populations, critical service gaps, and points of cross-sector intersections. The three focus groups with program participants did not reflect the full diversity of Day Services or of vulnerable populations in Hamilton.
Further consultation may be required to fully understand the consumer experience of the Day Service system from the perspective of access, coordination, seamlessness, and relevance to supporting life goals.

Some of our recommendations are very broad brush strokes and we do not attempt to provide specific and complete guidance to support implementation. Instead we suggest that this research supports the early stages of a focused dialogue between the City and the Day Services community where research evidence can be validated by practitioner knowledge in the areas of service design, adoption of common tools and appropriate scope of Day Services within the homelessness system.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis and the best practices discussed in detail in this report, we make the following specific recommendations for the City of Hamilton:

1. Recognize Day Services as a valuable component of the service system for housing and homelessness.

2. Support the development of information sharing, knowledge transfer, standard setting, resource sharing, and system-wide monitoring and evaluation through the establishment of a Day Services Network Planning Table or Working Group. The Table or Group could take on the following tasks:
   - formalize and affirm the definition and role of Day Services within the system of housing and homelessness services in Hamilton
   - identify gaps and needs, especially among specific vulnerable populations and under-served geographic areas
   - collaborate with other planning tables and organizations in the sector to coordinate service planning and ensure coverage
   - explore expanding capacity in the system through collaborating with the potential Day Services identified in the Inventory
   - establish a standardized keyword (search term) so that Day Services may be easily located using Inform Hamilton (it may also be valuable to generate a PDF list and map that could be added to the “Public Bulletin” column on Inform Hamilton)
   - establish evaluation tools for assessing impact on clients and assessing how well the Day Service is meeting best practices standards (a number of documents may serve as starting points for this work: the Best Practices document created as part of the Hamilton Day Services Evaluation research; the London Housing Foundation’s Day Centre Standards template; Homeless Link’s Outcome Resource; the Toronto Drop-In Network’s Measuring Success; and the TDIN’s Good Practices Toolkit)

3. Provide financial and human resources to support the coordination and operation of the Day Services Network Planning Table or Working Group.
4. Within the funding available to support community-based initiatives to address homelessness, consider providing funding for Day Services, based on adherence to the following 4 principles:

**PRINCIPLE 1: “HOUSING FIRST”**
- Entry Point to the Service System
- Assistance in Finding and Maintaining Housing
- Basic Needs

**PRINCIPLE 2: “PEOPLE-CENTRED & INCLUSIVE”**
- Flexibility, Responsiveness, and Low-Barrier Access
- Recognition of Individuals’ Dignity and Worth
- Participant Involvement in Service Planning, Evaluation, and Delivery
- Targeted Programming for Vulnerable Populations
- Consumer Choice

**PRINCIPLE 3: “LOCALLY DRIVEN & PARTNERSHIP BASED”**
- Coordination with Other Homelessness Services and Programs
- Rural Day Services
- Layers of Integration
- Collaboration among Service Providers

**PRINCIPLE 4: “FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE AND OUTCOME FOCUSED”**
- Strategic Funding to Address Needs and Supplement Resources
- Evidence-Based, Outcomes-Focused Programs and Services

These four principles are considered best practices by most funders. The specific terms quoted here summarize the key values articulated in Hamilton’s 10-Year Housing and Homelessness Action Plan (HHAP) and the Province’s Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI). Potential sources of funding for Day Services in Hamilton include the provincially funded but locally managed CHPI; the federally funded but locally managed HPS; Community Partnership Program Grants and other municipal funding streams; and local funders like the Hamilton Funders Network.

5. Leverage opportunities in the transformation of the health system being led by the Hamilton Niagara Haldimand Brant (HNHB) LHIN that will support service integration initiatives of service partners in developing Community Care Networks with the aim of accelerating positive outcomes for the most vulnerable clients accessing Day Services and homelessness services in general. Take advantage of LHIN partnerships with
academic research centres focused on urban health and marginalized and vulnerable populations.
CONTRIBUTIONS AND OUTCOMES

Principle 1: “Housing First”

Entry Point to the Service System

“Many [participants] had no contact with formal support services other than the day centres. Their main reasons for attending the day centres were for company, to get emotional and practical help and support from the staff, and for cheap food.” ~ Crane et al., 2005

Day Services are ideally situated to serve as an entry point to the homelessness system as they are frequently the first point of contact with services or remain a low barrier and comfortable setting to maintain access to needed services throughout an individual’s journey to stable housing. In addition most Day Services make few demands on their participants and can “engage marginalized people who do not use other services either because they are vulnerable and reluctant users or because their behaviour has caused them to be rejected by other services” (Drop-in Services Sector Literature Review of Good Practices, 2006).

The outreach literature identifies drop-in programs as fixed outreach sites and suggests that outreach is a process that moves through stages of engagement until the individual can be provided with services. These stages reflect the process of engaging marginalized people in drop-in settings in order to encourage them to participate in other services or find housing. Although it is generally accepted that drop-in services should help people move toward permanent housing, it must be recognized that this can be a slow process (one author proposed that it can take up to two years to engage an isolated person in service delivery) and that expected outcomes must measure incremental change” (Bowpitt, Dwyer, Sundin, and Weinstein).

During the consultations, several Day Service providers and community stakeholders expressed frustration that funders often ignore the value of basic needs services and focus exclusively on
the specialized services as the vehicle for effecting positive change. Most of the Day Service
providers we spoke to saw meeting daily needs as a way to both provide an entry point to the
service system and a way to build relationships of trust and accountability.

“You do your best case management when you’re painting nails, or driving
someone somewhere.” ~ Day Service Provider

Assistance in Finding and Maintaining Housing

There is evidence that forming social networks helps people to develop the
confidence and support they need to make a transition to housing and that
social networks help people to maintain housing. Studies that considered
good practices in resettlement work found that loneliness was the most
important factor precipitating tenancy breakdown among formerly
homeless people. While much of this research focuses on the role of social
networks in making the transition to housing, social network development
plays that role incrementally from very early stages, including influencing
rough sleepers to begin to move toward accommodation.

~ TDIN, Measuring Success, 2006

During our consultations, we heard that many low-income households are faced with the
impossible choice of paying their rent or buying food. Income from OW or from some low-wage
or part-time jobs is not enough to cover the household expenses for many individuals and
families. As a result, they rely on food banks, meal programs, and Day Services in order to make
ends meet. Participants living in rooming houses with shared kitchen facilities said that it was
impossible to keep food there, because another person would just eat it.

We heard that a further issue for some housed people, primarily single individuals living in
rooming houses or secondary suites, is social isolation, conflicts with roommates or landlords,
or living environments in poor condition (e.g. mouldy, poorly lit, appliances not working, has
rodents, cockroaches, or bed bugs, etc.). Some people may return to the street because they
have a community there. As a no-cost third space, Day Services can provide an important
support for people in this situation.

“I live in a place nearby [the Day Service]. They have a TV downstairs here.
I can’t afford a TV. I live in a room in a crack house, in a rooming house.
We share a bathroom upstairs if you can get in there, but there’s always
someone in there shooting up or doing other drugs. Right now there are 5
rooms rented out of 15, but there are 20 people in there just crashing. There’s always someone knocking at my door there. Cops are there more than I am. I come here to get some peace and quiet.”

~ Day Service Participant

Several stakeholders expressed some frustration with the “Housing First” concept, noting that the model is supposed to include intensive supports, but these supports are not always adequately funded or implemented. They noted that “Housing First” is not successful when it is “Housing Only”:

“I’m concerned that Housing First can lead to social isolation which leads to poorer health and housing loss. It’s hard to stop this cycle from occurring. The opportunities for socialization that Day Services offer can help to keep people housed.”

~ Community Stakeholder

Our consultations with Day Service providers and other community stakeholders provided the following information about the ways in which Day Services support housing:

**Table 1: Ways That Day Services Support Housing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Housing</th>
<th>Maintaining Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rent subsidy and intensive housing support programs like Transitions to Homes (T2H), Supporting Our Sisters (SOS), or Addictions Supportive Housing (ASH)</td>
<td>• Meals, groceries, and/or food vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Computers and phones to check listings and call landlords</td>
<td>• Laundry and showers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing referral to, warm transfer to, or on-site assistance from Housing Help Centre workers</td>
<td>• Clothing and/or personal care supplies (e.g. toilet paper, soap, toothbrushes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bus tickets to go see apartments</td>
<td>• Opportunities for socialization and recreation that combat isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engaging individuals known to be living unsheltered and encouraging them to think about accessing housing (especially in the fall as winter approaches)</td>
<td>• Counselling supports and low-barrier, non-judgmental access to health, mental health, and addictions services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing a quick turnaround TB test, which is a requirement for people to get into certain kinds of housing and addiction</td>
<td>• Trusteeship programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Life skills programs (cooking, budgeting, credit counselling, setting healthy boundaries with partners/roommates/friends, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocacy and assistance in dealing with housing issues (conflict with landlord, bed bugs, repairs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Finding Housing

- Treatment/rehab programs
- (For youth) A worker may
  - accompany the youth to inspect the apartment, to ensure it’s legal and safe, and to ensure that the landlords is not going to discriminate because of the applicant’s age or experience with homelessness
  - coach the youth on how to talk to landlords and fill out housing applications

### Maintaining Housing

- Workshops to inform clients about their rights under the *Residential Tenancies Act*
- Assistance accessing income supports and completing tax returns
- One Day Service offers a utility subsidy program

### Basic Needs

Meeting basic needs (meals, groceries, clothing, toiletries, laundry, showers, etc.) is a fundamental component of what Day Services do, but is often not adequately supported by funders. However, our consultations and our review of the literature show that basic needs support the principle of “Housing First” by:

- providing an entry point for individuals who may otherwise feel disconnected from services,
- providing an opportunity for building relationships of trust and support with peers and with staff, and
- helping people to maintain and stabilize their housing in various ways (described above).
Principle 2: “People-Centred & Inclusive”

Flexibility, Responsiveness, and Low-Barrier Access

“Addictions and mental health care are not cookie cutter services – you need flexibility, you need to adapt, you need to listen.”

~ Social Service Provider

By definition, all Day Services have a high level of informality. The criterion used to filter which survey respondents were Day Services was that they provided “a space where people can just hang out and socialize without any intention of accessing additional services.”

Low-barrier programs are client-centred and flexible, allowing people to make their own choices while still providing consequences for “antisocial” or unhealthy behavior. There are few if any criteria to access services and no expectations that individuals conform to more than basic rules. “Low-barrier,” “harm reduction” and “low demand” are terms often used synonymously in the literature. This aligns with Core Value #1 of Hamilton’s 10-Year Housing and Homelessness Action Plan, “Person-Centred Supports.”

This service model begins with acceptance that not all individuals seeking services are at a point in their lives where they are ready to give up harmful or unsafe activities but that through acceptance into service, individuals may at a later stage be ready to address their issues and in the short term can be helped to minimize risks and self-harm. “Harm reduction seeks to minimize or eliminate adverse health, social and economic consequences of substance use for all individuals and communities. It involves a pragmatic, multidisciplinary, non-judgmental approach that meets people where they are at right now” (Pauly, et al., 2012). In a service system where the agency’s values may come into conflict with a harm reduction approach, some accommodations may be necessary.

In the survey and during the consultations, all Day Service providers articulated a tolerant approach to use of alcohol and drugs. They emphasized that the presenting behaviours were the main issue rather than the drug or alcohol use on its own. The survey echoed the person-centred, flexible service philosophy articulated by stakeholders during the consultations.
Many stakeholders spoke about a need to balance informality with engagement and intentionality, to balance a client-directed approach with an outcomes focus:

“We have a lot of experience with people telling us to go away – and not very nicely. It can take a very long time – sometimes as long as five years! – but eventually they will engage.”

“I talk to my staff about the art of chatting. Not probing and exploring needs, just chatting about whatever is on the person’s mind. Chatting about sports over a cup of coffee, or just sitting with someone and not chatting, can be purposeful activity, if it is seen as building a relationship that over time can enable change to happen.

“There is a need to balance an outcomes focus with patience. Some of the people we see live with a lot of pain and fear – it can take a long time to arrive at ‘neutral ground.’” ~ Social Service Provider

**Recognition of Individuals’ Dignity and Worth**

The literature emphasizes recognition of each individual’s dignity and worth as a key aspect of Day Services (Drop-In Services Sector Literature Review of Good Practices, 2006; TDIN, Measuring Success, 2006; Paradis et al., 2011). The participants we spoke with as well emphasized that this was one of the primary reasons that they accessed specialized services (e.g. physical health care, mental health care, employment assistance, income support assistance, etc.) from Day Services rather than from mainstream service providers.

“Here, everything is open to us. You can carry your coffee around. You don’t need a key to go to the washroom or use the laundry room. Here you have a sense of dignity, self-respect.” ~ Day Service Participant

There was one powerful moment during the focus group at the Wesley Centre when a participant asked us to look at a wall that was covered in small plaques. Each plaque had a person’s name or nickname on it. The participant spoke passionately about what happens when street-involved people pass away: “Those are all former clients, people who passed away here. Our friend, Shane, is on that wall. He’s still in the freezer [morgue] since nobody has claimed the body. Is there any hope for some kind of respectful service? Would you want that to happen to your body? This is just wrong.” The other participants echoed this sentiment and indicated that they sometimes return to the Wesley Centre to visit the wall and feel reconnected with friends who have passed away, friends who otherwise have no markers that acknowledge that they existed and were valued. While the wall of names is not something that
is common to many Day Services, it is a powerful reminder of the fundamental work that Day Services do in acknowledging the worth and dignity of all members of the community.

The role of Day Services is not limited to offering a space where individuals may experience respect and dignity; Day Service staff and volunteers also play a key role in the broader community advocating on behalf of participants, expanding the number of social spaces that include participants, providing warm transfers of participants to mainstream organizations, and counteracting discrimination and prejudice in mainstream society by educating the general public about the experiences, challenges, and barriers faced by participants.

**Participant Involvement in Service Planning, Evaluation, and Delivery**

A person-centred service system is built with contributions from all stakeholders; each stakeholder must have a clear role as a decision maker in system development, service quality and system performance; and each brings unique knowledge and analysis that informs the measures by which the service system can be assessed and retooled to improve its client and service outcomes and community impacts.

The benefit of genuine engagement and involvement of people with lived experience in the planning, delivery, governance, and evaluation of service provisions is well supported. People facing or experiencing homelessness must be significantly involved in providing perspectives and have meaningful roles in the development and delivery of programs and services. Participation is seen as a key principle of harm reduction and social connectedness. It is important in positive mental health and the prevention of a range of health and social problems and a key factor that helps sustain housing (Canadian Mental Health Association BC, 2007; Pauly et al., 2012; Drop-In Services Sector Literature Review of Good Practices, 2006; Crane et al., 2005; TDIN, Measuring Success, 2006).

Research shows that a “participant’s engagement in activities that are valued and which involve independent action and responsibility increases their sense of self-worth and enhances their commitment to the process. Having an opportunity to demonstrate to oneself and to others, one’s capacity for independent, responsible action, and the sense of value and respect that emerges from that experience, are assets for participants” (Conradson 2003, Mulquin 2000, and Cooper 2001). During the consultation process as well, one request we heard from participants was that Day Services should offer more opportunities for meaningful activities, community volunteer work, peer support and mentorship, and paid work.
“We should have a once-a-month garbage pick-up program, or a spray paint clean-up program. Doing things to give back to the community – I really like it when we have programs like that.”

~ Day Service Participant

Involving Participants in Evaluation
Twenty-one (78%) survey respondents reported that they regularly check in with participants about what is working well, what could be improved, and where the gaps in service are. Most used multiple methods of gathering feedback, including surveys, suggestion boxes, focus groups, “town hall” meetings, and participant advisory committees. Five (22%) Day Service providers indicated that they did not have formal mechanisms for gathering participant feedback, but gathered feedback during informal one-on-one discussions.

Figure 1: Mechanisms for Gathering Participant Feedback

Involving Participants in Planning and Service Delivery
Twenty-five (96%) Day Services reported that they involve participants in the planning and delivery of programs and almost all checked more than one of the mechanisms listed. None checked “not applicable.”
Case Management and Low Staff-to-Participant Ratios

The literature suggests that effective homelessness service systems have some form of case management or intensive one-on-one supports that are consistent and ongoing. We heard consistently and repeatedly from both service providers and participants that the most important and effective interventions that Day Services provide is building relationships of trust, caring, investment, and connection. We also heard from Day Service providers that it is rarely financially feasible to provide low caseload (for a case manager) or a low staff-to-participant ratio (for a Day Service frontline worker) that permits the level of intensive one-on-one supports required.

Service participants did not use the term “case management,” but when asked what types of support they found most helpful, almost all identified intensive, focused, one-on-one, long-term supports:

“Here, the staff actually interacts. You know they’ll be here – and if they’re not, they have got someone covering it. They don’t give you the runaround like other places. Other places send you to a hundred different people. You go to A and then send you to B and they send you to C and they send you to D and they send you back to A. They do it so they eat up your time – so you can’t get what you need. Or to buy themselves some time. By the end
you just don’t want to do it anymore. Staff who care really make the difference.” ~ Day Service Participant

“If you go to a shelter or a walk-in clinic, you’re a number. Here there’s a personal connection – they know who you are and they really care. You develop a sense of family with the people who are here.” ~ Day Service Participant (youth)

“Have some people who are social-work oriented who can help address the underlying issues. Then there would be positive changes in people’s lives.” ~ Day Service Participant

We heard that low staff to participant ratios:

• permit relationship-building, problem-solving, warm transfers, “doing what it takes” to help someone navigate the system and achieve their goals,
• permit hiring staff with additional specializations (e.g. mental health, addictions, trauma),
• permit additional case management services and perhaps individualized outcomes measurement (e.g. using the Outcomes Star),
• reduce staff burnout and lower staff turnover, and
• facilitate effective transition planning and client follow-up when a staff does leave.

Targeted Programming for Vulnerable Populations

“Although drop-in centres may have an open-door approach, the needs and challenges facing different populations should be reflected in program design and resources should be allocated to address these needs.” ~ Drop-in Services Sector Literature Review of Good Practices, 2006

Mainstream organizations have the resources and capacity to provide specialized and targeted services to a range of communities with specific needs (e.g. mental health, addictions, employment, etc.), while smaller, culturally based organizations have the knowledge to reach specific communities and provide targeted and culturally informed services. By working together, mainstream and culturally based organizations can provide the resources, knowledge, and capacity to provide individualized and client-centered services to diverse communities. This needs a shared commitment to increasing access to diverse communities in which both
culturally-specific and mainstream agencies play their parts as equal partners so that competitiveness for scarce funding does not impede the desired end goal.

The Drop-In Services Sector Literature Review of Good Practices (2006) notes that “some recommendations about target populations from the literature include: the importance of women-only services; initiatives to better assess of the needs of vulnerably housed people in order to support them to maintain their tenancies and identify whether there are other services better suited to their needs; culturally sensitive programs and service delivery for diverse cultures and ethnicities; an examination of the drop-in services sector role in addressing settlement issues for newcomers; the need to separate populations in order to create safe spaces and avoid oppressive power dynamics among members” (p. 6).

“Perspectives on the Housing First Program with Indigenous Participants” (Bodor et al., 2011) and “We’re Not Asking, We’re Telling: An inventory of Practices Promoting the Dignity, Autonomy, and Self-determination of Women and Families Facing Homelessness” (Paradis et al., 2011) provide detailed experiences and learning for consideration in implementing targeted strategies and practices. Themes echoed in both these reports are conclusive that effective services must be respectful, self-managed, culturally competent, and responsive to diversity. In Hamilton, where HEDAC is leading coordination and development of urban Aboriginal services, there is an opportunity to share knowledge from their experience in culturally responsive service delivery that has relevance for the whole system.

**Consumer Choice**

“There is no ‘one size fits all’ solution to homelessness. We must aspire to understand what works and for who, and research and program evaluation must play a role in identifying issues and determining the most effective responses.” ~ Gaetz, 2010

Consumer choice is fundamental to a person-centred service system. Homelessness is a complicated and unique experience and no two people are going to have the same life vulnerabilities and needs. In addition the experience is influenced by an individual’s capacity and resilience to specific circumstances. Services must respond with a customized approach. In addition to needed services, providers succeed when they engage individuals in making healthy choices and deciding what will work best for them in the short and long term.
In the future, as the Day Services sector begins to plan and coordinate its services, it is important to emphasize consumer choice. In some cases, what may appear to be duplication of services from a top-down perspective may in fact represent consumer choice from a ground-up perspective. It is important to engage service participants to better understand why some services are valued and which specific service components are most valued and why.
Principle 3: “Locally Driven & Partnership Based”

Coordination with Other Homelessness Services and Programs

Service Pathways and system navigation strategies that quickly facilitate access to the right services at the right time for individuals and families experiencing or at risk of homelessness are now being piloted and refined in many jurisdictions and our review of the literature found strong evidence in support of service pathways to enable effective and timely service coordination. This is found to be particularly effective for individuals with multiple and chronic needs where the coordination of care creates complexity and barriers at multiple points of care transitions. During the consultations, we heard from stakeholders that Hamilton has envisioned a No Wrong Door framework, but that it has not been widely implemented. Day Services can play a role as an entry point to these service pathways.

During the consultations, we heard frustrations from some Day Services about their exclusion from processes. We also heard that there are silos within the City; specifically, that the goals and priorities of the Planning Division and those of the Housing & Homelessness Division are not always aligned.

The Canadian Alliance to End Homelessness created A Plan, Not a Dream – How to End Homelessness in 10 Years, which identifies the key planning criteria that must be met if communities are to succeed in ending homelessness (CAEH, 2012):

- Planning;
- Data, research, and best practices;
- Coordinated system of care;
- Income;
- Emergency prevention;
- Systems prevention;
- Housing focused outreach, rapid re-housing, and housing support services; and
- Permanent housing.

While the literature is not explicit about where leadership for ending homelessness resides, in Ontario it is clear that municipal governments are designated as the service system manager for housing and homelessness, with some resources provided by the other levels of government. In
this context, the City of Hamilton has the ability to lead system changes through the articulation of common standards and defining explicit outcomes to be achieved. The City can play a role in connecting housing and homelessness strategies with other health and human services strategies coordinated by the provincial government.

**Rural Day Services**

“Differences between rural and urban settings have given rise to the acknowledgement that rural-focused solutions must be sought to address the needs of those that do not live in urban areas” (Forchuk et al., 2011). The stakeholder consultations and literature review confirmed that access to needed services in rural areas was dependent on other factors such as accessible transportation and privacy concerns specific to close knit communities. Rural providers understand that service priorities are different from those in urban settings and that their communities experience homelessness in different ways including the degree to which it remains hidden relative to the visible homelessness of urban areas. Some services require more place-based service responses and others benefit from supported access to specialized services outside the community. While we heard about many needs in Ancaster, Dundas, Flamborough, Glanbrook, and Stoney Creek, it is not clear whether those needs would be best met by Day Services or by other types of programs and services. For more details, please see “Geography and Access,” later in this report.

**Layers of Integration**

The literature identifies that service integration must be accompanied by systems integration. Systems integration focuses on improving the ways that agencies work together. Integration can occur at the policy, finance, management, and clinical levels. It includes forms of working together, of service linkage, cooperation, coordination, and partnership. Top-down approaches include multi-stakeholder planning and funding allocations, formalized policy, memorandums of understanding, professional integration with interdisciplinary teams and services, and designated coordination roles. Bottom-up approaches include co-working, case consultation, practitioner networks and shared tools and processes; however all focus on a high level of communication and information sharing between practitioners (AHS, 2009; Keast, 2012; World Health Organization, 2008).

The report commissioned by the City of Toronto titled, Drop-in Services Sector Literature Review of Good Practices, states that: “Programs that have been shown to be effective at helping people find and maintain housing feature multi-service approaches where drop-in services are part of an integrated service delivery system that includes: outreach and
engagement, individual support and follow-up, group activities that encourage social networks and mutual support, housing, treatment programs (substance use and mental health), and individual follow-up support for people who have been housed. These services may be provided by one agency or through agency partnerships. Individual service planning and continuous relationships (where workers follow individuals through the system) were identified as mechanisms to promote service integration focused on improving outcomes for clients. Good practices in systems integration include: co-location, joint funding, and interagency coordinating bodies.”

The integration continuum stretches from independent service delivery involving autonomous providers working independently from one another, through to full integration involving a single system of needs assessment, service commissioning and/or service provision (AHS, 2009). For integration to occur; there needs to be a shared understanding across multiple providers and sectors about outcomes; roles and responsibilities; best practices; and community needs. This understanding must be operationalized in concrete actions.

Population Outcomes through Systems Integration

There is much to learn from and partner with in the system transformation in urban LHINs and the newly formed provincial Health Links. HNHB-LHIN (Hamilton, Niagara, Haldimand, Brant) is taking a holistic approach to service system design as evidenced by the new Community Care Networks (Health Links). Their new service focus is “obsessively patient-centred” care. Neighbourhood level service integration with both LHIN-funded and non LHIN-funded service providers is a cornerstone of their transformation strategy. Many service providers receiving homelessness funding from the City will align in service partnerships in the Community Care Networks.

Several urban LHINs have Mental Health & Addictions Working Groups that are grappling with many of the same values and principles of service delivery as the City is facing in its homelessness services; i.e. shared care to achieve high quality service outcomes by respecting choice and supporting recovery. There are opportunities to link with, learn from, and contribute to this service planning as many of the individuals using Day Services come into contact with case management through the work of Community Care Networks (Health Links)

The HNHB-LHIN is beginning to integrate with the community services sector and focus on improving the care journey of the most complex clients and at-risk populations including individuals and seniors living with mental illness, addictions and precarious housing and or homelessness. Community mental health & addictions service providers who have established
effective linkages with the homelessness system will have an opportunity to further integrate services and broker a seamless continuum of comprehensive primary care for these priority populations. An additional opportunity exists for providers to access new funding that will become available to propel these health system outcomes.

Similarly, opportunities exist for the City to leverage these health system change initiatives and shape population and service impacts through strategic co-funding and integrated funding. They can also leverage academic research partnerships that LHINs have developed with institutes such as CRICH (Centre for Research in Inner City Health) and CAMH (Centre for Addictions & Mental Health) and with McMaster University’s leading research experts in urban health to drive forward evidence-informed service planning within the homelessness service system and within their human services overall.

It also affords the opportunity to integrate Day Services with programs in health, mental health, employment, learning and skills development, social supports and community-building. Hamilton’s integrated human services planning agenda provides a roadmap for determining how Day Services can be most effectively located within the broad human service system.

**Collaboration among Service Providers**

The Inter-agency Services Collaboration Project (Wellesley Institute) has found that collaboration is critical for addressing “wicked” problems such as homelessness. Collaboration is an essential strategy in homelessness prevention. Access to services must be immediate and responsive, ensuring that the right mix of services is offered to ensure that crisis does not deepen and a drift into homelessness can be averted. A deeper service integration response is in development through the Community Care Networks sponsored by the HNHB LHIN.

International policy research on addressing homelessness tends to converge around the recommendation that homeless-serving agencies should strive to embed themselves in an integrated service network or “continuum of care”:

“*The need for settings that are multi-service oriented and integrated within and aware of a network of services or continuum of care is strongly linked to success for participants. Participants engaged in self-managed, systematic, and intentional efforts to alter their circumstances require a broad range of services that are both appropriate and accessible. Drop-ins, no matter how large and multi-service oriented, cannot and likely should not attempt to deliver the full range of services required. Drop-ins are*”
more likely to play an effective role if they are linked to other service providers who can deliver services on site at the drop-in centre or accept referrals from the drop-in centre.”

~ TDIN, Measuring Success, 2006, pp. 34–35

No single agency can provide all aspects of the continuum of care and it is advantageous for some agencies to specialize in serving the needs of particular groups, such as those with mental health or addictions issues.

Ideally a combination of integrated and seamless programs and services; with a breadth of service options ranging from low barrier to intensive case management; delivered in service hubs as well as wherever people congregate; make the most sense from the perspective of people who need services. The literature suggests that this cannot be achieved organically but must be resourced with incentives to drive cooperation, collaboration, and integration.

Collaborations succeed when participating organizations see their self-interests addressed in the collective effort and the individual and shared motivations are transparent and clear. In general funder driven or forced collaboration is harder to get off the ground and can spend too long in unproductive “storming.” For Day Services to be fully integrated within the broader homelessness system, some transfer of resources, skills and funds is required. Financial resources are necessary for both start-up and maintenance as the infrastructure development in inter-organizational relationship building is time and resource intensive
Principle 4: “Fiscally Responsible and Outcome Focused”

Strategic Funding to Address Needs and Supplement Resources

The City of Edinburgh, one of the most progressive and effective systems in homelessness services in the U.K. states the following about its approach to service management, “Our approach to commissioning services is based on how well services meet important outcomes for people, like the prevention or resolution of homelessness. This means less emphasis on the detail of how programs are delivered and more on the outcomes they achieve.”

Effective service systems invest in evidence-based, outcomes-focused programs and services but also reward system goals such as collaborative service planning; knowledge sharing; research and evaluation. Their funding allocations are transparent, criteria-based, vision-driven and predictable. Mutual goals of accountability, consistency and certainty are the rules of the partnership.

The Funders Network in Hamilton is an opportunity to introduce dialogue about co-funding models; pooled funding to increase the size of grants; and evidence informed targeted funding to drive population outcomes forward. Collaboration among funders brings the same benefits to social impact as does the collaboration promoted between agencies which has led to stronger collective achievements in population outcomes than can be possible in a fragmented approach.

Evidence-Based, Outcomes-Focused Programs and Services

“We’re all very good at working with people, but we’re not very good at counting it.” ~ Day Service Provider

“If you come in, you see it happening. If you’re not in here on a regular basis, you don’t know.” ~ Day Service Provider
During consultations, several stakeholders noted that they do not do much data collection or evaluation, and they would like to do more. They identified five main barriers:

1. Lack of funds and lack of staff time
2. Need to develop appropriate indicators and measures (i.e., success measured by the individual’s goal-setting rather than the institution’s goal-setting; change is understood to be incremental and often slow)
3. Concern that funders will want to see immediate results and will not have the patience or understanding to continue investing and believing in individuals over the long term.
4. Concern that evaluation will undermine the relationship of trust, acceptance, and non-judgment between clients and the Day Service providers
5. Software that is cumbersome and onerous

“We’re not neat and tidy on outcomes.... Other programs focus on one thing, but we are dealing with the whole person and trying to help people discover their purpose in life. There was a guy here, [Jeff].¹ He had been homeless, drinking, in and out of jail. From OW’s perspective, [Jeff]’s purpose should be employment; from a hospital’s perspective, [Jeff]’s purpose is staying out of the emergency department; etc. What was [Jeff]’s purpose? He’s taking care of his mother. She’s elderly and has health issues. [Jeff] had been disconnected from her for years. He’s now living with her and is stable. And we think that’s a good outcome.”

~ Day Service Provider

“Some organizations have an ‘organization-centred approach’ that focuses on collecting information and checking boxes to get dollars, rather than really focusing on meeting client needs and taking client-centred approach, where needs are individual and success is defined individually. For one person being housed for a month is amazing. For another person success looks different. It has to be about looking at each client as an individual.”

~ Community Stakeholder

Several stakeholders also noted that there is a lot of discussion about which service models and types of interventions are most effective, but service providers are not sharing their data with each other, and these conversations take place in the absence of good data on what the impacts on clients have been.

¹ Not his real name
Most Day Service providers reported collecting data on outputs (e.g. number of visits); far fewer reported collecting data on outcomes (e.g. number of people who remain housed after a certain number of months have passed). Some Day Service providers reported that they do not collect any data.

“Future research in homelessness interventions would benefit from a focus on evaluating the effectiveness of interventions for a range of sub-groups with different needs. This is particularly relevant in examining permanent independent housing solutions, currently the most studied interventions. The evaluation indicators most frequently used are housing status and client perceptions of interventions. While these are important outcomes, there is a lack of attention to the broader structural conditions that affect access to housing and other resources.” ~ Pauly, et al., 2012

“Thus, we would revise our initial research question of ‘what for whom?’ to ask ‘what works for who under what conditions’? There is a need for future research that focuses on changes in health (both physical and mental) related to housing, and a particular need to better understand what eases transitions out of homelessness for a broad range of people with distinct needs.” ~ Dunn et al., 2012

The literature suggests that in addition to a focus on client outcomes that result in ending homelessness, there must be attention to the interactions between different outcomes across health and life change and how these are promoted by different program interventions. Service planning that brings this lens to understanding outcomes can focus its resources on those program components that are benefitting individuals. Performance measurement frameworks enable system managers to monitor the service outcomes of their investments through funding agreements with their service partners.

Population outcomes require monitoring and evaluation on a system-wide basis. The evidence gathered lends itself to collaborative analysis to inform system cohesion as service partners collaboratively use evidence to understand each other’s core business, practices and areas of expertise and specialization.

Systems approaches that seek to uncover the complex causal relationships between social determinants of health and health outcomes are another opportunity to gain traction on homelessness prevention. Many jurisdictions are tackling health inequities and social determinants including homelessness through strengthening services in community hubs.
Hamilton has strong network and planning tables (e.g. the Poverty Roundtable), engaged neighbourhood associations (e.g. Beasley), and a strong policy framework for coordination (e.g. Integrated Human Services Planning Playbook) that together can contribute the required evidence to inform systems thinking to use for future policy design that has the potential to maximize the benefits of prevention-oriented interventions and population outcomes.

**Logistics**

**Network Planning Table**

In our presentation to community stakeholders we suggested that a network planning table for Day Service providers would be useful as a place to develop standards and performance measurement systems, and as a place to engage in system planning. We got significant push back from those present, who pointed out the number of planning tables already in existence in Hamilton and the resulting pressures on staff resources in community agencies. It was suggested that the development of a Day Services system may be taken up by an existing body.

We are not fully convinced that the work that needs to be done to develop the Day Services sector can be taken up by an existing body. For example, one of the tasks we envisioned for the Network table would be to set clear standards for service provision and accountability for Day Services who may be eligible for CHPI funding. This type of work would benefit from strong grassroots leadership within the Day Services community, and could not be taken on by an existing body.

Rather than a standing table, however, the City may want to proceed with a small Working Group of Day Service providers committed to delivering on a set of specified tasks that will lay the groundwork for working with the City moving forward. Once these tasks are complete, the Working Group may continue as a Network Planning Table or it may disband and the ongoing planning work around Day Services may be taken up in various ways by other planning tables. Those individuals who have committed themselves to a variety of planning tables may choose not join the Day Services Planning Table or Working Group. The group must be task-oriented to avoid the mandate drift that undermines commitment and timely goal achievement. In our consultations we heard some opinions expressed that there are a few planning groups and sector tables that are not delivering value to the service system.

It is worth noting that a number of identified Day Services do not currently sit at established planning tables, so there is untapped capacity within this system. The perspectives of both
small and larger organizations are critical. It may be that a small number of individuals are overly influential at planning tables as they have the staff capacity to dedicate regular staff time away from the front line and can participate in numerous planning initiatives. Smaller agencies may not have this capacity, but may be drawn into the planning process if enabled with additional financial and human resource supports to give voice to their understanding of needs. Finally, we would recommend that a Day Services Planning Table draw in some ethno-cultural organizations who may not currently be offering Day Services, but who may have the capacity and the interest to begin offering Day Services in the future.

“We haven’t fully examined the racialized impact of poverty. We talk about it, but mostly we talk around it. Are housing and homelessness planning tables bringing the voices and experiences of various ethnicities to the table?” ~ Community Stakeholder
DAY SERVICES IN HAMILTON

The evolution of Day Services in the homelessness sector has been a response to persistent needs that have been unmet by others or has evolved organically from other services provided by host agencies. Some informal programs may have begun as a meeting place for social recreation or to give people a warm place to go in the winter, but have evolved to address the needs of participants and to support housing retention or prevent homelessness. In some cases this prevention activity is deliberate and in other cases it is a secondary outcome related to other service goals.

The following types of services and supports are provided by Day Services in Hamilton:

- Basic services such as meals and food vouchers; groceries and personal items; material supports e.g. laundry, showers, clothing, equipment
- Help with money problems including access to OW, ODSP and benefits
- Help with finding and keeping housing
- Mental health, primary health and addiction problems
- Referral to needed services through information sharing, warm transfers, case management and system navigation
- Practical and emotional support that is unique to the individual and may include advocacy, escorting to appointments, mediation with landlords, completing forms, interfacing with government services and supporting social networks

Identifying Day Services

Establishing the Scope

Our research included all potential Day Services within Hamilton, Ancaster, Dundas, Flamborough, Glanbrook, and Stoney Creek.

We excluded:

- Day Services offered to young people under the age of 16, because if children become homeless, it is as dependents of parents, caregivers, or CAS.
• Day Services that charge a market rate and are used by people who are stably housed and economically stable; for example, respite programs for seniors and employment, educational, or recreational day programs for people with developmental disabilities.

• Day Services that are offered exclusively to residents of a particular building or buildings (e.g. supportive housing, residential care facilities, long-term care facilities, domiciliary hostels, or any other kind of housing).

Developing the Definition

We began with the open-ended definition of Day Services articulated by the City in its Request for Proposals: “For the purpose of this evaluation, ‘Day Services’ shall be defined as any mix of activities and/or various levels of supports, taking place in public or private social space, being provided either informally or formally to people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness” (City of Hamilton, Evaluation of Day Services RFP, p. 78).

As the project progressed, it became clear that this definition was too broad. It could include locations like the Tim Horton’s at Main East and Wellington and the Ontario Works Office. When we discussed this with the City’s project managers, we agreed that a more focused definition would generate a more productive analysis.

We agreed to use the following working definition: “A Day Service is a space that allows people to come in without an appointment or application and spend time socializing, meeting their basic needs, and, at their own discretion, accessing specialized services designed to meet the needs of people who are homeless or at risk of losing their housing.”

Day Services are designed to foster a space in which an individual can build relationships, strengthen social skills, set goals, develop self-confidence, feel safe, and experience independence, autonomy, and respect. Many Day Services offer recreational activities (e.g. cards, movies, sports, social events) to foster this type of space. Day Services have a “low barrier” access model; typically participants just walk in and access the space without having to make an appointment or fill out application forms.

Basic needs met by Day Services may include some combination of the following: food, showers, laundry, clothing, toiletries and incidentals, safety, and an accessible climate-controlled environment (somewhere to go when it is too hot or too cold outside).

Most Day Services also offer referrals or on-site access to specialized programs, such as assistance in: addressing or managing an addiction, treating physical health issues and mental
health challenges, finding housing, training for employment, accessing legal aid, replacing ID, accessing settlement services, accessing spiritual support, etc. However, the choice whether or not to access these additional services rests with the participant.

In our development of the *Good Practices Toolkit* for the Toronto Drop-in Network, Paul Dowling & Associates noted:

> “Drop-ins are generalists in a landscape of ever more specialized institutions. Their approach involves a certain amount of ‘intentional informality’ that is simply not possible for many other types of organizations. But this informality should not be mistaken for a laissez-faire attitude; it is ‘intentional’ in that it seeks to create a particular kind of environment where participants can establish a level of comfort and trust before sharing sensitive information, can access services in their own time, and can develop supportive relationships with their peers. [...] These two approaches to service provision are not exclusive, but complementary: the drop-in approach is not ‘better,’ but it does respond to needs that cannot be met by the other approach; it is not ‘worse,’ but it should not be replaced by a more formalized model. [...] It is this relaxed environment and respect for autonomy that participants emphasize when they define what a drop-in is. A drop-in is ‘a place where you can sleep or have a coffee and interact with other people, and where nobody lectures you or belittles you.’ It is also ‘a place to get information, self-help, a shower, housing, legal aid, and employment skills’ and ‘deal with self esteem and address health issues.’ A drop-in is ‘a calm area,’ ‘a safe house,’ ‘a refuge,’ and ‘a port in the storm.’”

~ TDIN, Good Practices Toolkit, 2006, p. 1A-3

**The Hamilton Context**

In Toronto and other areas, “Drop-Ins,” “Day Centres,” or “Day Services” are well-defined entities that occupy a unique niche in the continuum of services to people who are homeless or at risk. This continuum includes shelters, food banks, health centres, and resource centres (e.g. housing, employment, settlement, legal, cultural services and programs).

In Hamilton, we saw some organizations that operated as distinct “Day Services” (e.g. Wesley Centre, Living Rock, First Pilgrim, Routes Youth Centre, etc.). We also saw a lot of hybrid models:
• Health Centre / Day Service (e.g. Hamilton Urban Core CHC)
• Food Bank / Day Service (e.g. Neighbour to Neighbour, Welcome Inn)
• Resource Centre / Day Service (e.g. Mental Health Rights Coalition, Good Shepherd Wellness Centre, Elizabeth Fry Society, Hamilton Regional Indian Centre, The Well Trans Services)
• Shelter / Day Service (e.g. Notre Dame)

A variety of organizations provide services to people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. The unique value that Day Services provide is that they offer “a space where people can just hang out and socialize without any intention of accessing additional services” (Survey Q8). Using this rationale, we used Question 8 in the survey we wrote to define the line between respondents who offered “Day Services” and respondents who offered other types of services.

Please see Appendix 1 for the list of identified Day Services in Hamilton. Please refer to the separate Inventory Report for a full list of all organizations reviewed as potential Day Services.

Stakeholders Survey

The survey was designed to provide a “snapshot” of Day Service operations in the City of Hamilton. Greg Witt, policy analyst, and Amanda DiFalco, Program Manager, Housing Services Division, Community Services were asked to comment on the data fields to ensure that the survey tool would meet the City’s information needs. We then asked Renee Wetselaar, Social Planning and Research Council; Dean Waterfield, Wesley Urban Ministries; and Frances Jewell, Mental Health Rights Coalition, to test the survey and provide us with comments on its clarity, length, and acceptability. We revised the survey in accordance with this feedback and launched it using the online software program Survey Monkey on April 26.

We emailed the survey URL to 48 service providers. We sent an individually addressed and tailored email to each prospective respondent to clarify our request for information. This was especially important for organizations to whom we sent multiple surveys. For example, we asked the executive director of the Elizabeth Fry Society to complete a survey on behalf of the drop-in resource centre, and we asked the coordinator of Elizabeth Fry’s STARS program to complete a survey only for that program.

Thirty-nine people completed the survey. We followed up with phone calls and emails to the remaining nine and asked them two questions to determine if they offered a Day Service or not:
• Do you offer an open space (no pressure to participate in specific types of activities) for people to spend time and
• Do you provide some services or programs that have a specific focus on serving people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness?

We were able to contact six of the nine and determine that they did not offer Day Services. We made several efforts to contact the remaining three, but we were unsuccessful. For further details see Appendix 1.

Moving Forward with the Definition, List, and Inform Hamilton

Definition and List
This definition guided the project and allowed us to produce a focused analysis. However, it is important to be clear that this remains a “working” definition rather than a “final” definition, and the list of 26 identified Day Services should not be read as exclusive or definitive. As the City continues to engage the community, the definition may change and the list of Day Service providers may grow or shrink.

One addition may be the King’s Way Outreach Centre. The website and Inform Hamilton information seemed to suggest that the King’s Way offers a Day Service; however, we did not receive a survey response and we were not able to connect with the organization by phone or email.

Inform Hamilton
As the Day Services sector in Hamilton becomes more clearly defined, it will be important to develop a specific keyword that may be searched on Inform Hamilton to locate services of this type. We are suggesting that this may be the work of a Network or Working Group.

Currently the first entry under “Day Service” is the Dundas Denture Clinic (which offers “same Day Service”), followed by a list of fee-for-service day programs for elderly and disabled adults. Under “Drop-In,” the first entry is the Official Website for Child Care in Hamilton, followed by a variety of children’s programming, Boys and Girls’ Clubs, ethnocultural associations, addictions services, and brain injury services. It may be “Homeless” plus “drop-in” or “Homeless Drop-in Centres” (an automatic prompt on Inform Hamilton) reveals 7 of the identified 26 Day Services.

The Network or Working Group may also want to prepare a PDF list of available Day Services with their locations, brief summaries of services provided, contact information, and a map. This
PDF list could be posted in the “Public Bulletin” column of Inform Hamilton’s listings, similar to the “Free Meal Information and Map”\(^2\) and other key service access guides.

**Identifying Potential Day Services**

The Inventory identified a number of spaces and service providers that did not match the current working definition of “Day Service,” but that may offer such services in the future. These organizations either indicated a direct interest in offering these services, or other stakeholders suggested that they would be a good fit:

- Libraries
- Community centres, resource centres, recreation centres
- Cultural and religious organizations
- Social-focus organizations with extra capacity

Moving forward, a Day Services Network Planning Table or Working Group may build on this analysis if it determines that there is a need to expand Day Services, whether through expanding hours, coordinating hours of access across organizations, opening satellite locations in underserved areas, or adding Day Service components to existing agencies and community organizations in underserved areas.

**Key Considerations**

When weighing the option of offering Day Services at these locations, there are two key considerations: Volume of demand and Social exclusion.

**Volume of Demand**

The value inherent in public spaces like libraries and community centres is that they are for all members of the community to enjoy. “All members” should include individuals who are homeless or under-housed, but if the volume of demand is too high, then the focus and purpose of the space will narrow. As in any other sector, a high volume of demand from a segment of the population that has special needs requires a focused response. Social inclusion and integration are principles that underlie much good policy-making; however, providing targeted programming is also an identified best practice (see further discussion below). The bottom line here is that community spaces can expand the reach (e.g. into rural communities)

---

and the overall hours and capacity of Day Service offerings within the system, but they can never fully replace dedicated Day Services.

**Social Inclusion and Social Exclusion**
There is a risk that public spaces may operate Day Services in theory only, but in practice staff may not view the time-intensive and complicated work of welcoming and integrating socially marginalized individuals with other community members in the space as part of their job. Without strong efforts to ensure integration, one group or another may feel forced out. Either individuals experiencing homelessness or deep poverty will feel that they are not welcome to use the space, or other community members may feel uncomfortable using the space or bringing their children into the space. These barriers are not insurmountable; however, they do require staff to be aware of these dynamics and to invest significant time in ensuring that all people feel comfortable in the space and understand each other as members of a shared community.

There is also a value to maintaining some separate spaces for individuals who have been stigmatized and socially marginalized.

> “Drop-ins serve as normalizing spaces, with alternate and more flexible normative environments where clients who do not fit in elsewhere can feel integrated and accepted for who they are. This helps participants recover from the effects of extreme stigmatization.”

> ~ TDIN, Measuring Success, 2006

> “Here, people care about you. Other places, you’re just a number.”

> ~ Day Service Participant

> “We provide a non-judgmental setting for women who are often judged very harshly by society. We see great acts of solidarity and kindness among our clients who support each other emotionally in the drop-in.”

> ~ Day Service Provider

**Locations**

**Libraries**
The Hamilton Public Library is responsive to the needs of individuals who are homeless or precariously housed. The downtown location offers a number of additional specialized services (e.g. immigrant settlement services) and is in the process of hiring a community support worker to engage individuals and connect them with any other community services they may need.
The Library has 23 locations throughout Hamilton, including branches in Hamilton’s rural communities (Ancaster, Dundas, Flamborough, Glanbrook, and Stoney Creek) and in underserved areas of the City’s urban and suburban neighbourhoods. To the extent that Day Services may be required in these locations, libraries may be able to meet some of this need.

**Community Centres, Resource Centres, and Rec Centres**

There are community centres, resource centres, and rec centres throughout the City and Hamilton’s rural communities. Several of these offer programs specific to homeless or at-risk populations and may be willing to expand their offerings to include a Day Service component as needed. Stakeholders suggested that there was a lot of capacity within these centres, particularly during daytime business hours, and suggested that the City should be fostering social inclusion by welcoming more socially marginalized individuals into these spaces.

> “I don’t think we should pick and choose in our community centres – they’re for everybody, homeless people and children. This is also a great opportunity to educate youth.” ~ Community Member

> “We should focus on integration rather than creating separate spaces. People shouldn’t be isolated, segmented away from the rest of the population in one location.” ~ Community Member

The service participants and service providers we spoke with noted that, for people who are experiencing social marginalization, accessing community spaces can be difficult.

> “[Service participants] don’t just go to the fitness centre just because you give them free passes. You need to draw them out, introduce them to the space and help them understand that it is a safe space.” ~ Service Provider

> “I used to supervise [a community centre]. When someone would come in from the shelter system, they would get attention because the staff would want it to be a positive space for kids. We had a lot of kids 8 to 10 years old, seeing someone with a gym bag full of bottles. So we would say, ‘Come dressed appropriately,’ ‘Don’t come with your bag of bottles.’ I think they have a right to be there but not everyone on staff thought that way.” ~ Community Member

We heard that the City has established a Recreation Fee Assistance program to give low-income people access to organized sports and recreation programs, but that there has not been
significant uptake to date. In some cases, the barriers are financial or bureaucratic. In order to qualify for the assistance, individuals must:

- pick up and complete an application form;
- provide a photocopy of a document with their home address (e.g. a property tax bill, utility bill, driver’s licence) dated within the last 60 days; and
- provide either a photocopy of their monthly Drug Benefit Card (evidence that the family receives assistance from Ontario Works or the Ontario Disability Support Program) or a photocopy of the preceding year’s Notice of Assessment from the Canada Revenue Agency (evidence that the family is living below the Low-Income Cut-Off).
- mail the completed package to the City of Hamilton Recreation Division.

Individuals who are sleeping rough, living in shelters, or couch-surfing will not be able to provide a document stating their home address. Individuals who are precariously housed or who cycle in and out of homelessness may not have identification (e.g. driver’s licence) or their previous year’s Notice of Assessment. Individuals may not have the means to pay for photocopies, envelopes, or postage. There may also be literacy or language fluency barriers. Finally, we heard that some individuals may not feel comfortable sharing this information.

The suggestion was made by several stakeholders to simply waive the fees for all City-operated community centres, and for youth in particular.

**Cultural and Religious Organizations**

We heard that newcomers, members of racialized populations, and non-Christian populations feel more comfortable accessing culturally specific services, but (aside from the Aboriginal community’s strong system of supports) there are few of these available. We heard that members of these populations may be avoiding mainstream services and instead seeking supports from informal networks or non-Christian faith- or culture-based organizations. This again is a question of volume of demand – if the need arises a few times a year and consists of providing one-time assistance to individuals who are temporarily homeless, it follows that this need may be adequately met on an ad hoc basis. However, if there are high numbers of people within particular communities who are experiencing cyclical or chronic homelessness, and who may also be facing additional challenges related to trauma, mental health, physical health, addictions, etc., then there is a need for more dedicated culturally specific supports.

We also heard that mosques are meeting the needs of their congregants on an ad hoc basis but that some mosques are interested in doing more and being more proactive, perhaps establishing meal programs. In its response to the survey, the Muslim Association of Hamilton, indicated that the two mosques it represents would like to be able to “have a hot meal ready
[when people come in]; have an inventory of supplies ready in stock; have an inventory of available services in the City; have paid dedicated staff for a few hours each day, including counselors and knowledgeable staff, to monitor the space and provide services; have funds to make resources available such as food, meals, groceries, toiletries, etc.” The Mountain mosque is planning to convert an older portion of its building into a community centre. The centre will be non-denominational (to be used by anybody in the neighbourhood), but will focus on youth.

We did not consult with other religious institutions (e.g. Buddhist, Sikh, Hindu, and others); in the future, a Day Services Network Planning Table or Working Group may want to follow up with other institutions within these communities. We consulted with Micah House and the Muslim Association of Hamilton and sent surveys to the Afro-Canadian Caribbean Association, Jewish Social Services, Micah House, and Montcalm Community House (Immigrant Women’s Centre). None provided services that matched our working definition of Day Services. We also researched a number of other newcomer and ethnocultural associations as we developed the Inventory (see Inventory Report for a full list).

“Mainstream services are not meeting newcomers’ needs, so they are not accessing them. There are ESL barriers and profound, unique issues. There are nuances that don’t get taken into account.” ~ Shelter Provider

“Mosques don’t have the resources to deal with homelessness. If there is a family crisis occasionally we temporarily give them shelter for a day or two. We don’t have the facilities, but they just use the common prayer areas. Often those that are new to the country are afraid of going to an established shelter. They are afraid of not being able to express themselves due to language or cultural barriers, and they are afraid of the food in shelters – afraid they may be eating something that is not halal.”

~ Community Stakeholder

See “Vulnerable Populations” for more details.

Social-Focus Organizations
The following is a list of organizations we consulted with who were not currently offering Day Services but who expressed interest in doing so in the future.

- The Hamilton Dream Centre has started an outreach program for individuals involved in sex work, providing them with hot food, clean socks and underwear, toiletries, free

---

3 We also heard that the Hamilton Centre for Civic Inclusion may be playing a role in providing ad hoc and informal referrals to services. We reached out to the Hamilton Centre for Civic Inclusion for an interview but were not able to connect by the time of writing.
laundry, and a safe place to be. The Dream Centre is hoping to open its doors one night per week (or more, as resources permit) as a drop-in for these individuals. The Dream Centre also noted that it would like to increase awareness in the broader community of the services it offers. They indicated that, unlike many other food banks, they rarely have shortages of food.

• **Homestead Christian Homes** is a supportive housing provider for people living with mental health challenges. It currently provides some programming and activities for individuals living in its facilities, but is not open to the public. However, it is considering opening the doors of its **Perkins Centre** to provide an open space for people to spend time and to provide programming and activities accessible by broader community (e.g. a community kitchen).

• **The Salvation Army, Family & Community Services / Suicide Prevention** provides a 24/7 hotline and a variety of in-person services and material resources by appointment. In response to the survey, the organization indicated that, if it had additional funds, it would like to provide “crafts for clients; coffee and conversation; and cooking classes for those on a budget.”

• The **Salvation Army, Lawson Ministries’ Freeway Coffee House** currently welcomes homeless, street-involved, or socially marginalized individuals to spend time in its space without purchasing anything. The cafe’s primary role is providing employment opportunities and meaningful activities for individuals with developmental disabilities. The Freeway has expressed some interest in moving towards providing a more intentional or focused Day Service model, but its main focus remains serving individuals with developmental disabilities and the broader community.

**Geography and Access**

**Ancaster, Dundas, Flamborough, Glanbrook, and Stoney Creek**

In speaking with service providers in Hamilton’s rural outlying areas, we heard that there are strong needs for housing stabilization supports, including food and rent supplements. While there are no Day Services in these areas (aside from one youth services in Dundas), it is not clear if dedicated Day Service spaces would be the most effective intervention to meet these needs. In the rural areas, the volume of demand is not as high and so it may be more effective to add some targeted programming and build some additional capacity within the community’s existing infrastructure and services, for example, libraries, community centres, churches and other religious or charitable institutions, community organizations, and social service providers.
However, one challenge that we heard from rural service providers is that they do not have much space to work with:

“We are located in a church facility. Space is very limited in our present location, which we share with two other groups. We would like to have our own facility and move to a more convenient, central location to serve more clients in our community.”

~ Flamborough Food Bank

“(The biggest challenge we face in providing the programs we offer is] space – we are trying to find a new location.”

~ Routes Youth Centre (Dundas)

“We would like to be able to serve more people. We are not able to increase due to limited space – we are the mercy of physical space. We have tried to enhance home supports over the phone and through outreach in people’s homes, but we can’t do anything more in our own space.”

~ Ancaster Community Services

Hamilton Downtown Core
As detailed in the analysis report there is an intense concentration of Day Services in Ward 2. Many providers noted that it is essential to have the services concentrated as this is where people need them “so they do not have to wander all over the city every day.” One provider noted that Ward 2 has the highest rates of poverty in Hamilton so “it makes sense for people to have easy access to all the services they need in one area” (see Appendix 2). The notion that people from outside the City are accessing Day Services regularly does not appear to be substantiated though people are moving into the city for affordable housing and then accessing Day Services.

From many participants we spoke to who were experiencing intense social marginalization, we heard that one of the keys for them is having concentrated access to services. Accessing another service even just a few blocks away could feel like an insurmountable challenge. During one focus group with Day Service participants, one person expressed frustration that the Employment Centre had been moved from the Wesley Centre to a new location on Queen Street. She said it was now two kilometres away from the Wesley Centre and that was too far. A second participant said that if she thought two kilometres was too far, she just didn’t want to work. The first participant argued this point, saying “But people don’t want to go that far for nothing. You go to the Employment Centre and there’s no guarantee you can get work. If someone tells me there’s an air conditioner and it’s two kilometres away, I’ll walk to get it.” This comment summed up many of the comments we heard in the two adult focus groups we
held. They talked about getting “the runaround,” or “having to play their games,” or going through “cycle” or the “revolving door”:

“The term used to be a “rounder” – someone who goes from the street to jail and back again – now they’ve thrown a treatment centre into that cycle, but it’s not helping. Make that revolving door a check in – invest in people – spiral up instead of down. What stops that cycle? Don’t just leave someone on their own. People need personalized intervention, more social workers, more people who care.”

~ Day Service Participant

Participants experienced the system as full of “Catch-22s” and complicated rules. They valued having intensive supports at one location from one or two people who they trusted, who understood their situation, and would continue to support them through the long process of accessing services and achieving particular goals. The most effective supports talked about by participants involved the support staff taking people to appointments and directly to other service providers. They found referrals frustrating, demotivating, and ultimately unhelpful.

“The workers here give referrals, tell you this is where you go. They send you from Person A to Person B and you don’t get anywhere.”

~ Day Service Participant

“The workers used to be really in touch with what folks needed. Now they’re patronistic, kids right out of school, all they know is textbook stuff, they don’t really give a s**t, they just want their paycheck. It’s condescending – ‘Here’s some pamphlets, we can give you a list of numbers, this is something that worked in Vancouver’ – those kids can only go so far.”

~ Day Service Participant

Other Areas of Urban Hamilton
Many people accessing downtown Day Services currently are coming from the east, west and mountain areas of the City. We heard a strong call for Day Services in the Mountain area of Hamilton, and particularly for Day Services for Youth. We also heard from a variety of current Day Services that they are interested in expanding their programming or opening satellite locations in other parts of the City; for example, Out of the Cold, Wesley Teen Drop-Ins, Living Rock, and Mission Services Community Services Opportunity Centre.

Moving forward with System Coverage and Planning
Day Services are particularly effective as multi-service interventions for people experiencing chronic or cyclical homeless who may have a number of complex needs. Looking at a map that
does not have Day Services in one area or another, the question is, “Would a Day Service be the best and most effective intervention to meet the needs in this area?” In some instances, the answer may be yes; in others, the answer may be to provide some additional targeted programming or resources. In yet other instances it may be beneficial to provide both a Day Service and additional programming in a single setting as many Day Service providers currently do.

Vulnerable Populations

This section lists what types of Day Services are available to different vulnerable populations and summarizes the feedback we heard regarding participant needs through the consultations and the surveys. We are reporting the feedback as we heard it; it has not been cross-validated. The opinions and suggestions expressed below are a good starting point for a conversation about gaps in the system moving forward.

Stakeholders identified needs among the following vulnerable populations:

- Newcomers, racialized populations, and non-Christian populations
- Urban Aboriginal people
- Women
- Lesbian, gay, bi, trans, queer, questioning, two-spirited (LGBTQ)
- Youth
- People with addictions
- Sex workers and people who have been involved with the criminal justice system

In the survey, 17 of the 26 identified Day Services (65%) indicated that they targeted some or all of their services to specific populations. Nine (35%) reported that serve “any and all people (no specific population focus).”

Newcomers, Racialized Populations, and Non-Christian Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated Day Service for this population</th>
<th>Other Day Services offering targeted programming for this population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Good Shepherd, Notre Dame Community Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interval House, Women’s Centre and Jared’s Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hamilton Urban Core CHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Neighbour to Neighbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Day Service for this population</td>
<td>Other Day Services offering targeted programming for this population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Urban Arts Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wesley Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our conversations with various community stakeholders (including shelter operators, Micah House, and the Muslim Association of Hamilton, as well as Day Service providers), we heard the following anecdotes about ways in which individuals are accessing services or experiencing barriers to accessing services:

“Service access is coming through informal networking. People from racialized communities are talking to each other about where and how to access services. At the Hamilton Centre for Civic Inclusion, the majority of folks who work there are from racialized communities – they’re not frontline workers but they’ve started to take the phone calls.”

~ Community Stakeholder

“Talking to someone who looks like you is a big thing. It opens that person’s eyes to more services that could be accessed that they might not have ever asked about otherwise.”

~ Community Stakeholder

“Most of the sector is based on charity and a faith-based framework, and I think there are a lot of people who feel excluded. When you walk through the door and you see a picture of the Pope, do you feel like this is a space where you belong and can connect? I’ve heard that some organizations are requiring people to pray before they can get their meal.”

~ Community Stakeholder

One shelter provider felt that “a drop-in with a specific focus on newcomers and refugees could have a lot to offer this population,” particularly if it had a focus on employment supports.

Five Day Service providers indicated that they provide programming for newcomers and refugee claimants on the survey. Wesley Urban Ministries in particular has a Neighbourhood Development & Newcomer Services department and provides some translation and settlement services. The Hamilton Public Library also provides some translation and settlement services. YMCA staff fluent in Arabic, French, Italian, Spanish, Hindi, Urdu, Punjab, Tamil, Chinese, and Malayam work at six library branch locations. St. Joseph’s Immigrant Women’s Centre also operates from four locations in different parts of the city.
However, what we heard during our consultations was that since the Settlement Integration Services Organization (SISO) closed, service providers feel that they no longer have the same kind of access to translation and interpretation services, and newcomers are not always aware of the full range of services available and have found it more difficult to access services.

We heard that SISO did not operate a Day Service, but they did provide a number of programs that took a drop-in approach.

“About half of people living in poverty in Hamilton are newcomers and since SISO disappeared there is a patchwork of services filling in. There is system fragmentation because there is no agency doing service coordination.” ~ Shelter Provider

Neighbour to Neighbour has established a unique response to the question of translation and interpretation. The organization maintains a roster of over 800 volunteers and actively recruits volunteers who speak different languages in order to meet the needs of their participants. These volunteers are trained to work as “community counsellors” and deliver programs and connect people with other community-based resources. Very often, former or current participants become community counsellors. Currently, Neighbour to Neighbour is able to offer services in English, Arabic, Spanish, Assyrian, Kurdish, Swahili, Italian, Turkish, Urdu, Punjabi, and Hungarian. This model is very effective for Neighbour to Neighbour, but it requires an intensive degree of coordination and oversight and so it may not work for other organizations.

See Cultural and Religious Organizations, above, for further details.

**Urban Aboriginal People**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated Day Service for this population</th>
<th>Other Day Services offering targeted programming for this population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hamilton Regional Indian Centre (HRIC)</td>
<td>• Elizabeth Fry Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HRIC Teen Drop-In</td>
<td>• Good Shepherd, Notre Dame Community Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interval House, Women’s Centre and Jared’s Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Urban Arts Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wesley Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We heard that people of Aboriginal heritage continue to be disproportionately impacted by homelessness. We also heard that there is a strong system of culturally informed supports that could provide a model for other vulnerable groups. Stakeholders told us that one key to this model is a “no wrong door,” wraparound system of supports coordinated by HEDAC (the Hamilton Executive Directors’ Aboriginal Coalition) and the Aboriginal CAB (Community Advisory Group). These bodies conduct visioning sessions informed by an extensive data collection and feedback process that includes community surveys and community forums. Specifically in terms of Day Services, the Hamilton Regional Indian Centre (HRIC) offers several services designed to meet the needs of urban Aboriginal people who are homeless or at risk of losing their housing, and they also offer a space where community members can spend time and socialize. The HRIC has recently added a teen drop-in program on Friday and Saturday evenings. We heard that there is also one HRIC staff member who also works with mainstream agencies to provide cultural awareness and sensitivity training.

While we heard that the system of supports is strong, we also heard that there are gaps, including improving mental health supports and establishing an Aboriginal-specific emergency shelter. However, these are outside of the scope of this report on Day Services. While offering overnight shelter or housing is beyond the scope of Day Services as currently defined, Day Services may be able to offer additional culturally informed mental health supports.

Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated Day Service for this population</th>
<th>Other Day Services offering targeted programming for this population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Good Shepherd’s Wellness Centre</td>
<td>• Good Shepherd, Notre Dame Community Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elizabeth Fry Society Resource Centre</td>
<td>• Hamilton Regional Indian Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elizabeth Fry Society, STARS drop-in</td>
<td>• Hamilton Urban Core CHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interval House, Women’s Centre and</td>
<td>• Neighbour to Neighbour Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared’s Place</td>
<td>• Robert Land Community Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We heard from women participants and from staff of women-serving organizations that women experiencing homelessness in Hamilton are under-served. Many have lived through abusive relationships and traumatic events, and many are experiencing violence in the present, but are not always eligible for Violence Against Women (VAW) services.

The women we spoke with expressed frustration with the system and the feeling that men and people with addictions are the focus of services and interventions and women are not receiving
the help that they need. As evidence, some pointed to the lower rent supplement, shorter time period, and less intensive supports attached to the SOS (Supporting Our Sisters) program as compared to the ASH (Addiction Supportive Housing) program. Many said they do not feel safe going to the Wesley Centre or to Hamilton Urban Core CHC to spend time or access services (e.g. food, meals, laundry, showers). However, some also acknowledged the role that these services play within the continuum of services in Hamilton, noting that they had used these spaces when they were using drugs or when they were living on the street. The consensus was that these spaces are “basically for when you are down, down, down and out.”

“If you are a drug addict coming off the street you get everything. Why is it that there is so much money and opportunities for people with addictions? They get housing, food assistance, clothing. They get their hair done before anyone else. They get more sympathy than someone who is ‘capable of doing it on their own.’ You fall into a rut of bad timing and you wind up homeless. I’m not saying close those doors to people with addictions, I’m just saying there should be more investment in people who just need a hand up.” ~ Day Service Participant

Women identified a strong need for more case managers and people who will help them navigate the system to achieve their goals.

“I want to write a rent cheque, I want to be a productive member of society. But it feels so impossible, like I might as well try to fly to the moon. The government hires so many people – why can’t anyone help? They keep saying there are so many resources. But there’s a catch-22 to everything, and when you’re at the bottom, it’s that much more of a struggle. This person is telling me one thing, this person is telling me something else. They’re clashing, and I’m the one in the middle getting pounded.” ~ Day Service Participant

Finally, we heard from service providers that there is a need to bring a gender analysis to the service system to understand how addictions, homelessness, housing, underground employment, and street living affects women differently from men.

In its survey response, Out of the Cold noted that it is considering offering some meal programs for women only. We heard from the Hamilton Dream Center and the Elizabeth Fry Society that they would like to be able to expand their outreach capacity, hours of service, and the amount and quality of food and other material resources that they are able to offer the women that they serve (specifically, women involved in the sex trade and criminalized women).
Lesbian, Gay, Bi, Trans, Queer, Questioning, Two-Spirited (LGBTQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated Day Service for this population</th>
<th>Other Day Services offering targeted programming for this population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The Well, Trans Services Program</td>
<td>• Good Shepherd, Wellness Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hamilton Regional Indian Centre (HRIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interval House, Women’s Centre and Jared’s Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Urban Arts Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While The Well’s Trans Services program is its only “Day Service,” it provides a variety of other programs for LGBTQ individuals as well. However, we heard through several stakeholders that individuals who are homeless or at risk do not feel comfortable accessing these programs. The staff person who runs the Well’s RADAR Youth Drop-In indicated that there is a need for a similar, separate program for street-involved youth. We heard this request from other youth-serving service providers as well.

Within the trans population, we heard that employment discrimination is one of the biggest barriers the community faces. Without stable employment, people may struggle to find and maintain housing. Day Services may be able to play an advocacy role.

Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated Day Service for this population</th>
<th>Other Day Services offering targeted programming for this population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hamilton Regional Indian Centre, Teen Drop-In</td>
<td>• Banyan Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Living Rock</td>
<td>• Robert Land Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Notre Dame Community Resource Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Routes Youth Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Urban Arts Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wesley Teen Drop-Ins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite this variety of services, we heard that there were still some Day Service gaps (see Appendix 2) for young people:
• There are no Day Services available during the day for youth who are disconnected from school and not employed.
• There is a need for an LGBTQ-specific drop-in program for street-involved youth
• There is a need for more housing workers and mental health workers on-site at Day Services
• There is a need for Day Services for youth living on the Mountain

“Transitions for Youth, TY, was a youth drop-in run by Wesley that was open during the day. When that program got shut down about five years ago, the problems it caused for the youth on the streets were crazy. We used to be able to go hang out, play pool, watch TV. It was a place where kids could hang out and be distracted from things like drugs during the day. Now there’s nothing during the day. The Rock has programs, but unless you’re in Resources, Tri-Rock, or doing something for staff, you’re out of luck.” ~ Day Service Participant

“The reality is that we need a separate program for [LGBTQ] youth who are experiencing homelessness. When homeless youth have attended the RADAR group, they have been welcomed, but they often experience challenges that require a higher level of service than a peer support group can provide.” ~ Service Provider

We heard that some community centres and rec centres have free or low-cost youth-specific activities, some designed to connect with at-risk youth. Specifically, the City has established Recreation Assistance Fee program. We heard that youth continue to face barriers to accessing this program. In addition to all the challenges listed in “Community Centres, Resource Centres, and Rec Centres,” above, youth face the additional challenge that they must rely on their parents to complete the application form and provide the supporting documentation. The suggestion was made by several stakeholders to simply waive the fees for all City-operated community centres, and for youth in particular.

We heard from youth participants and from several youth-serving service providers that there is a need for additional youth-specific programs, supports, and Day Services on the Mountain. Living Rock expressed interest in establishing an ongoing presence in a second location in a building on the Mountain. Wesley Teen Drop-ins operates on a satellite model, using community centre facilities to offer Day Services on specific evenings. Wesley expressed interest bringing these services to other parts of the City as well.
People with Addictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated Day Service for this population</th>
<th>Other Day Services offering targeted programming for this population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Wesley Centre</td>
<td>• Good Shepherd, Notre Dame Community Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hamilton Urban Core Community Health Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mental Health Rights Coalition (MHRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good Shepherd, Women’s Services, Wellness Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hamilton Regional Indian Centre (HRIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interval House, Women’s Centre &amp; Jared’s Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the survey and during the consultations, all Day Service providers articulated a tolerant approach to use of alcohol and drugs. They emphasized that the presenting behaviours were the main issue rather than the drug or alcohol use on its own. The survey echoed the person-centred, flexible service philosophy articulated by stakeholders during the consultations. The majority of respondents said that they would “allow the person to come in and monitor their behaviour” before they would make a decision about whether further action was needed. None of the respondents chose the strictest option, to restrict the person’s access to the Centre or Program for a period of days or weeks. Of the four who answered “ask the person to leave and come back later,” three were pre-teen- and teen-focused organizations and one seniors-focused organization.

People with Mental Health Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated Day Service for this population</th>
<th>Other Day Services offering targeted programming for this population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mental Health Rights Coalition (MHRC)</td>
<td>• Good Shepherd, Notre Dame Community Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CMHA, Evening Social Recreation</td>
<td>• Good Shepherd, Women’s Services, Wellness Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Program (ESRRP)</td>
<td>• Hamilton Regional Indian Centre (HRIC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Dedicated Day Service for this population | Other Day Services offering targeted programming for this population
--- | ---
• The Bridge | • Good Shepherd, Notre Dame Community Resource Centre
• Elizabth Fry Society Resource Centre | • Good Shepherd, Wellness Centre
• Elizabeth Fry, STARS (Sex Trade Alternatives and Resource Services) Drop-In | • Hamilton Regional Indian Centre (HRIC)
• Hamilton Urban Core CHC | • Hamilton Urban Core CHC
• Interval House, Women’s Centre & Jared’s Place | • Interval House, Women’s Centre & Jared’s Place
| • Urban Arts Initiative
| • Wesley Centre

Despite the variety of Day Services with targeted mental health programming, we heard from many stakeholders that mental health services and supports remain a key need for the individuals they serve.

**Sex Workers and People Who Have Been Involved with the Criminal Justice System**

We heard that individuals who are involved with sex work or with the criminal justice system are often survivors of abuse and need access to intensive one-on-one counselling and supports. We also heard that there is a need for further pre-employment and training supports to help people gain confidence and build new lives. As with other Day Services, we heard that there is a need for increased funding to support basic needs (laundry machines, showers, a larger supply of hats and mittens in the winter, more fresh vegetables, fruit, and dairy in meals served).

For sex workers in particular, we heard that there is a strong need for additional Day Services providing a “non-judgmental setting for women who are often judged very harshly by society”; a space where peers can “support each other emotionally” and access “a warm meal, community, safety, [and] acceptance.... as well as practical help.”
The Elizabeth Fry Society indicated that it would like to open a satellite location in a storefront on Barton where women involved in sex work could come in for a coffee and a snack. The Hamilton Dream Center indicated that it had begun doing some outreach among sex workers and is hoping to open its doors one night per week (or more) as a drop-in for these individuals. Both indicated they would like to expand their hours of service and the types of resources they are able to offer.

**Funding Challenges**

“Churches are very much taking up the slack where the government is failing. This can’t go on forever. Churches are not wealthy organizations. A minimal expectation for all of us should be adequate nutrition, and enough money should be given to those on Social Services to achieve that expectation. That is not happening. People are being given food by food banks, but not nutritious food. Lack of nutrition causes health issues, which in the long run cost us more money due to health care costs.”

~ Day Service Provider

When asked the open-ended question, “What is the biggest challenge you face in providing the programs you offer?”, 22 of 26 (85%) of survey respondents named insufficient funding and issues related to insufficient funding (e.g. not enough space, limited hours of operation, not enough food to give people, lack of specialized staff, not enough staff to provide as much individualized attention to clients as needed).

Almost all Day Services in Hamilton rely on grants from charitable foundations and donations from community, congregations, and corporations to make up a significant portion of their annual budget. Half of Day Services identified these revenue streams as their primary source of funding. During consultations, Day Service providers expressed a high degree of anxiety and frustration about the precarious nature of this type of funding.

**Table 2: Sources of Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION 22: Which of the above funding sources covers the MAJORITY of your operating budget? (Open-ended responses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donations and Grants (n=13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We heard frustration from many Day Service providers about funding. They told us that most funding sources are time-limited and focus on a mandate or a set of priorities that are subject to change. They said that many new sources of funding focus on new, innovative, high-impact programs in which there is an expectation that clients will move on quickly to independence.

“It is a real challenge to provide social activities. These are a way for us to offer hope, a healthy environment, a chance to break the cycle. But there’s pressure from funders to count widgets.” ~ Day Service Provider

“People used to say [Amy] was hopeless. Some staff used to say it too, privately. In the end she managed to quit using drugs, but seeing things through with her took 5 or 6 years.” ~ Day Service Provider

Day Service providers told us that they rarely fit neatly into one funder’s mandate. We heard from Day Service participants that meals, showers, laundry facilities, and a space to spend time socializing are key priorities, but that these are not priorities for any funder, so it is a struggle to obtain and then maintain funding for these services. Sometimes the case can be successfully made; a number of Day Services noted that they got health dollars from the LHIN to provide food. In other cases, organizations may stretch program dollars to cover core costs or infrastructure costs.

4 Not her real name.
“I’ve seen programming dollars spent on capital infrastructure. People will say, ‘Well, the clients need the program, and the program needs space, and this space needs fire doors, so it’s an appropriate use of programming dollars to put in fire doors.’” ~ Community Stakeholder

“We need to raise almost four million every year. We get 20% of that from the City; the other 80% of our funding comes from direct mail campaigns and special events, and we go after schools and churches to do third party fundraising. The community has been very supportive – we feel like, if they believe in us, we can continue.” ~ Day Service Provider

The specialized programs and services that many Day Services offer, including health, mental health, employment, housing, addictions, and settlement supports, may be eligible for funding, but then, providers explained, they are relying on complicated patchwork of funding sources. Many Day Service providers told us that they must spend hours of often unremunerated time conducting fundraising campaigns in the community and completing multiple application forms, collecting data, and reporting on outputs and outcomes for funders, all without any guarantee that they will be able to continue keep the doors open, or maintain a full complement of staff, or provide the same number of meals each week.

The Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative (CHPI) offers much more flexibility to Service Managers allocating funds. However, as one stakeholder pointed out, “there is a long, backed-up queue of agencies wanting to address historical underfunding issues – the City will find it hard to do anything new.”
Appendix 1: Consultations

Surveys
We invited 48 organizations to complete a survey; 39 completed surveys, 6 responded to questions by telephone that eliminated them as Day Services, and 3 did not respond. The figures and tables presented in the Day Services Analysis Report use data from only the identified Day Services. The discussion of service system assets and gaps, review of best practices, and analysis of vulnerable population needs presented in the Final Report draw on the qualitative responses from all survey respondents.

DAY SERVICES (n=26)
(Answered “Yes” to Q8: Do you offer a space where people can just hang out and socialize without any intention of accessing additional services?)

1. Banyan Community Services
2. The Bridge From Prison to Community
3. Canadian Mental Health Association (CMHA), Evening Social Recreation and Rehabilitation Program (ESRRP)*
4. Elizabeth Fry Society Hamilton Branch, Resource Centre for Criminalized Women
5. Elizabeth Fry, Sex Trade Alternatives and Resource Services (STARS)
6. First Pilgrim United Church ‡
7. Good Shepherd, Women’s Services* ‡
8. Hamilton Out of the Cold Program* ‡
9. Hamilton Regional Indian Centre*
10. Hamilton Urban Core Community Health Centre* ‡
11. Interval House, Women’s Centre and Jared’s Place *
12. Living Rock ‡
13. Mental Health Rights Coalition (MHRC) Drop-In and Resource Centre
14. Neighbour to Neighbour Centre*
15. The Olive Branch ‡
16. Robert Land Community Association ‡
17. Routes Youth Centre
18. St. Matthew’s House, Roxborough Seniors’ Centre
19. St. Matthew’s House, Seniors’ Drop-In
20. Urban Arts Initiative ‡
21. Welcome Inn Community Centre
22. The Well, Trans Services
23. Wentworth Baptist Church ‡
24. Wesley Urban Ministries, Wesley Centre* ‡
25. Wesley Urban Ministries, Teen Drop-Ins *
26. Good Shepherd, Youth Services (Notre Dame Community Resource Centre) * ‡

[In our consultation and research process, we believed Notre Dame Community Resource Centre to be a Day Service. However, Notre Dame answered “No” to Question 8 on the survey and although we attempted to follow up, we were not able to connect with Notre Dame before completing the Analysis Report was due. As a result, the Analysis Report aggregates the data and reviews the results of only 25 Day Services. We subsequently clarified the error with Notre Dame and in the Final Report, we have included Notre Dame as a Day Service.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT DAY SERVICES (n=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Answered “No” to Q8: Do you offer a space where people can just hang out and socialize without any intention of accessing additional services?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Ancaster Community Services, Let’s Do Lunch
28. The Cottage Studio
29. Flamborough Food Bank *
30. Good Shepherd, Family Services, Food Bank & Clothing Room
31. Good Shepherd, Good Shepherd Centre (men’s shelter) * ‡
32. The Hamilton Dream Center
33. Hamilton Jewish Social Services
34. Mission Services, Community Services Opportunity Centre ‡
35. Mission Services, Men’s Residence ‡
36. Muslim Association of Hamilton (Hamilton Mountain Mosque and Umar Mosque) *
37. The Salvation Army, Family & Community Services / Suicide Prevention ‡
38. St. Matthew’s House, Emergency Food and Basic Needs and Assistance (414 Barton St. E.)
39. Wesley Urban Ministries, Transitions to Home (recreation program)* ‡

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVITED TO COMPLETE SURVEYS BUT DID NOT (n=9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contacted by telephone or email and confirmed not a Day Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Afro-Canadian Caribbean Association (ACCA) of Hamilton and District Inc Community Centre and Social Club
41. Ancaster Community Services (ACS), Let’s Do Lunch
42. Dominic Agostino Riverdale Community Centre
43. Glanbrook Home Support Programme, Congregate Dining Program
44. The Well, RADAR Youth Social Drop-In Night
45. Montcalm Community House
46. The King’s Way Outreach Centre
47. Salvation Army, Booth Centre Men’s Shelter

46. The King’s Way Outreach Centre
47. Salvation Army, Booth Centre Men’s Shelter
Consultations

We conducted 33 interviews and focus groups, consulting with a total of 79 individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Daljit Garry, Executive Director, Wesley Urban Ministries</td>
<td>February 11, 2013</td>
<td>In-person interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dean Waterfield, Director of Housing and Homelessness Services, Wesley Urban Ministries</td>
<td>February 12, 2013</td>
<td>In-person interview and site visit to Wesley Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Matt Thompson, Cafe Manager, Freeway Cafe*</td>
<td>February 12, 2012</td>
<td>In-person interview and site visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Renee Wetselaar, Social Planner, Social Planning and Research Council (SPRC)</td>
<td>February 12, 2013</td>
<td>In-person interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Daphne Prinzen, Program Director, Homestead Christian Care</td>
<td>February 13, 2013</td>
<td>Telephone interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Larry Huibers, Executive Director, Housing Help Centre</td>
<td>February 13, 2013</td>
<td>In-person interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 8, 2013</td>
<td>Telephone interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Brian Kreps, Manager, Homelessness, City of Hamilton</td>
<td>February 15, 2013</td>
<td>In-person interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Cindy Sue McCormack, Social Planner, Social Planning and Research Council (SPRC)</td>
<td>February 19, 2013</td>
<td>Telephone interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Paul Takala, CEO and Head Librarian, Hamilton Public Library*</td>
<td>February 20, 2013</td>
<td>In-person interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Sandra Duden, Rural Outreach Coordinator, Flamborough Women’s Resource Centre</td>
<td>March 5, 2012</td>
<td>Telephone interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Shelley Scott, Executive Director, Flamborough Information and Community Services</td>
<td>March 5, 2012</td>
<td>Telephone interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Scott Jones, Executive Director, Micah House</td>
<td>March 7, 2013</td>
<td>In-person interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* We also spoke with staff from this organization. See Consultations, below.
‡ We also spoke with participants using this organization’s services. See Consultations, below.
### INTERVIEWS, MEETINGS, AND FOCUS GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Stephanie Taylor, Director, Neighbourhood Development &amp; Newcomer Services, Wesley Urban Ministries</td>
<td>March 7, 2013</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Clare Freeman, Executive Director, Interval House</td>
<td>March 11, 2013</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Joanna Stubbs, Manager, Transitions to Homes</td>
<td>March 11, 2013</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Carmen Salciccioli, Director, Good Shepherd Centre; Brother Sean Mclsaac, Manager, Good Shepherd Centre; and Ryan McCoomb, Shelter Worker, Good Shepherd Centre</td>
<td>March 12, 2013</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Sheryl Green, Youth Outreach Worker, Hamilton Regional Indian Centre (HRIC) and Wesley Urban Ministries' Youth Outreach</td>
<td>March 13, 2013</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Day Services Task Force network meeting</td>
<td>March 15, 2013</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gillian Hendry, Housing &amp; Homelessness Division, City of Hamilton; Greg Witt, Housing &amp; Homelessness Division, City of Hamilton; David [?], Housing &amp; Homelessness Division, City of Hamilton; David Clinton, Parks and Recreation Division, City of Hamilton; Dean Waterfield, Wesley Urban Ministries; Paul Curtis, Social Recreation Manager, Canadian Mental Health Association (CMHA); Graham Cubitt, Homestead Christian Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Ali Taher Ghouse, President, Muslim Association of Hamilton</td>
<td>March 15, 2013</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Kristene Viljasoo, Director, Women’s Services; Loretta Hill-Finamore, Director, Youth Services; John Lee, Director HOMES Mobile and Support Services</td>
<td>March 15, 2013</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Denise Arkell, Executive Director, Neighbour to Neighbour Centre</td>
<td>March 20, 2013</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Victor Cyr, Community Services Director,</td>
<td>March 21, 2013</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INTERVIEWS, MEETINGS, AND FOCUS GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Denise Brooks, Executive Director, Hamilton Urban Core Community Health Centre</td>
<td>March 25, 2013</td>
<td>Telephone interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pauline Kajiura, Executive Director Community Information Hamilton</td>
<td>March 26, 2013</td>
<td>Telephone interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wesley Centre participants and members of the T2H Participant Advisory Committee (n=9)</td>
<td>April 11, 2013</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Food &amp; Shelter Committee network meeting (n=8)</td>
<td>April 11, 2013</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Youth members of the Street Youth Planning Collaborative, youth who live in Wesley Housing, youth staying at Notre Dame, and youth participants of Living Rock (n=11)</td>
<td>April 11, 2013</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Women living in the YWCA residence (n=12)</td>
<td>April 25, 2013</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Medora Uppal, Director of Operations, YWCA*</td>
<td>April 26, 2013</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Genevieve Hladys, Senior Regional Manager, Hamilton Downtown YMCA*</td>
<td>April 26, 2013</td>
<td>Email communications to assess whether YWCA and YMCA locations are being used as incidental Day Services or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Jacki Kostuk, General Manager, Les Chater YMCA*</td>
<td>April 29, 2013</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Chris Burr, Interim Manager, Flamborough Family YMCA*</td>
<td>April 30, 2013</td>
<td>Telephone interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Valine Vaillancourt, Manager, Mental Health and Street Outreach Service, Public Health Services, City of Hamilton and Member of the Complex Care Working Group</td>
<td>May 3, 2013</td>
<td>Telephone interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Maps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID on Map</th>
<th>Agency and Program</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Hours of service</th>
<th>Primary clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Banyan Community Services</td>
<td>785 Britannia Avenue</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays and weekends</td>
<td>All ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CMHA, ESRRP, Central Memorial Recreation Centre</td>
<td>92 West Avenue South</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays and weekends</td>
<td>Adults and Older Adults (16-65+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CMHA, ESRRP, Norman Pinky Lewis Recreation Centre</td>
<td>192 Wentworth Street North</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>Adults and Older Adults (16-65+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CMHA, ESRRP, St. Gilles United Church</td>
<td>85 Holton Ave South</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>Adults and Older Adults (16-65+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CMHA, Evening Social Recreation Rehabilitation Program, CMHA Office</td>
<td>131 John Street South</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>Adults and Older Adults (16-65+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elizabeth Fry Society, Hamilton Branch, Resource Centre for Criminalized Women</td>
<td>85 Holton Ave South, 1st Floor Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>Adults (26-55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Elizabeth Fry, Sex Trade Alternatives and Resource Services (STARS) Drop In Centre (St. Gilles United Church)</td>
<td>85 Holton Ave South, 1st Floor Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays and weekends</td>
<td>Adults (26-55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>First Pilgrim United Church</td>
<td>200 Main St East</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>All ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Good Shepherd, Women’s Services</td>
<td>30 Pearl St North</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>All ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hamilton Regional Indian Centre</td>
<td>34 Ottawa St N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>All ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hamilton Urban Core Community Health Centre</td>
<td>Rebecca St.</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays and weekends</td>
<td>All ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Interval House of Hamilton (Women’s Centre &amp; Jared’s Place)</td>
<td>100 Main St. East Ste 205</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays and weekends</td>
<td>Adults and Older Adults (16-65+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Living Rock Ministries</td>
<td>30 Wilson St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>Youth (12-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mental Health Rights Coalition Drop-In and Resource Centre</td>
<td>20 Emerald St South</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>Adults and Older Adults (16-65+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Neighbour to Neighbour Centre</td>
<td>28 Athens St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>All ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hamilton Out of the Cold Coalition, Central Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>165 Chariton St. West</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>Older Adults (55+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hamilton Out of the Cold Coalition, Christ’s Church Cathedral</td>
<td>252 James St. N.</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>Older Adults (55+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hamilton Out of the Cold Coalition, Enkine Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>19 Pearl St. North</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>Older Adults (55+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hamilton Out of the Cold Coalition, MacNab Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>116 McNab St. South</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>Older Adults (55+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hamilton Out of the Cold Coalition, St. Stephen of Hungary Roman Catholic Church</td>
<td>130 Barton St. East</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>Older Adults (55+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hamilton Out of the Cold Coalition, Wentworth Baptist Church</td>
<td>120 Wentworth St. North</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>Older Adults (55+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hamilton Out of the Cold Coalition, Wesley Urban Ministries</td>
<td>195 Ferguson Ave N.</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>Older Adults (55+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Robert Land Community Association</td>
<td>460 Wentworth St. North</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays and weekends</td>
<td>Older Adults (55+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Routes Youth Centre</td>
<td>150 King St. West</td>
<td>Dundas</td>
<td>Weekdays and weekends</td>
<td>Youth (12-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>St. Matthew’s House, Roxborough Senior Centre</td>
<td>785 Britannia Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays and weekends</td>
<td>Older Adults (55+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>St. Matthew’s House, Seniors’ Drop-In</td>
<td>402 Barton St. East</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays and weekends</td>
<td>Older Adults (55+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The Bridge from Prison to Community Hamilton</td>
<td>315 Barton St East</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>Adults (26-55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The Olive Branch Christian Centre</td>
<td>195 Rebecca St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>Adults (26-55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The Well</td>
<td>27 King William St.</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>All ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Urban Arts Initiative</td>
<td>126 James St North</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>Youth (12-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Welcome Inn Community Centre</td>
<td>40 Wood St. East</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays, weekends and weekends</td>
<td>All ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Wentworth Baptist Church</td>
<td>120 Wentworth St N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>All ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Wesley Urban Ministries, Teen Drop-In, Beasley Child and Family Centre</td>
<td>145 Wilson St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>Youth (13-28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Wesley Urban Ministries, Teen Drop-In, Betty Brook Community Centre</td>
<td>155 Queen Street North</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>Youth (13-28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Wesley Urban Ministries, Teen Drop-In, Wesley Neighbourhood Centre</td>
<td>93 Delhi Avenue North</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>Youth (13-28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Wesley Urban Ministries, Wesley Day Centre</td>
<td>195 Ferguson Ave N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Weekdays and weekends</td>
<td>Adults (26-55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Day Services - Hours of Service

Map 2: Day services in Wards 1, 2 and 3

Hours of service
- Neighbourhoods
- Weekdays
- Weeknights
- Weekends

Day Services – Ages of Primary Clients
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