

401 Golden Shore, 5th Floor  
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

**CSU Legislative Reports Website**  
<https://www.calstate.edu/legislativereports/>

**Steve Relyea**  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Financial Officer

562-951-4600  
srelyea@calstate.edu

December 17, 2024

Scott Wiener  
Joint Legislative Budget Committee  
1021 O Street, Suite 8630  
Sacramento, California 95814

Gabriel Petek  
Legislative Analyst Office  
925 L Street, Suite 1000  
Sacramento, California 95814

Joe Stephenshaw, Director  
Department of Finance  
1021 O Street, Suite 3110  
Sacramento, California 95814

Erika Contreras  
Secretary of the Senate  
State Capitol, Room 307  
Sacramento, California 95814

Cara L. Jenkins  
Legislative Counsel  
1021 O Street, Suite 3210  
Sacramento, California 95814

Sue Parker  
Chief Clerk of the Assembly  
State Capitol, Room 319  
Sacramento, California 95814

**RE: College-Focused Rapid Rehousing – Year Four**

The attached report highlights efforts to address students' basic needs insecurities within the CSU system through funding provided in the Amended Budget Act of 2019, Senate Bill 109. Fourteen of 23 campuses submitted a proposal for funding in the fall of 2019 and seven were allocated monies in early 2020 to enhance their current basic needs efforts, with a specific focus on expanding external partnerships to extend the reach of support for students who are experiencing housing insecurity or homelessness. Now in the fourth and final year of implementation, eight participating campuses have completed the pilot program.

Across the eight campuses that received funding for rapid rehousing, partnerships were formed with community-based continuum of care agencies that are experienced in providing rapid rehousing support, and extending the reach of the campus' existing basic needs supports. Efforts included comprehensive case management support such as, but not limited to, emergency grants to secure housing or prevent the imminent loss of housing, utility assistance, financial literacy resources, and academic and personal support. Taken together, the partnership between the campus-based housing liaison and agency-based case manager ensured the needs assessment and support of 3,802 students experiencing housing

---

**CSU Campuses**  
Bakersfield  
Channel Islands  
Chico  
Dominguez Hills  
East Bay

Fresno  
Fullerton  
Humboldt  
Long Beach  
Los Angeles  
Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay  
Northridge  
Pomona  
Sacramento  
San Bernardino  
San Diego

San Francisco  
San José  
San Luis Obispo  
San Marcos  
Sonoma  
Stanislaus

CSU Report: College-Focused Rapid Rehousing  
December 17, 2024  
Page [2](#)

insecurity or homelessness. Long-term effects of the program include a decrease in student homelessness, an increase in wellness and long-term housing stability to facilitate student retention and persistence to graduation.

The amended Budget Act of 2019 (Senate Bill 109) requires the CSU to prepare this systemwide report for the budget committees of the Legislature by July 15, 2024. This report is being submitted later in the year to ensure the data captured are complete.

Should you have any questions about this report, please contact Nathan Dietrich, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Advocacy and State Relations at (916) 445-5983.

Sincerely,



Steven Relyea (Dec 18, 2024 09:01 PST)

Steve Relyea  
Executive Vice Chancellor and  
Chief Financial Officer

SR:dr

Full report posted to <https://www.calstate.edu/impact-of-the-csu/government/Advocacy-and-State-Relations/Pages/legislative-reports.aspx>

c: Members, California State Legislature  
Members, Joint Legislative Budget Committee  
Natalie Gonzalez, Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst Office  
Steve Relyea, Executive Vice Chancellor, California State University  
Dilcie D. Perez, Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs  
Nathan S. Evans, Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs  
Nathan Dietrich, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Advocacy and State Relations  
Ryan Storm, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Budget Planning and Advocacy  
Jeni Kitchell, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Finance and Budget Administration/Controller  
Ray Murillo, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs, Equity, and Belonging  
Carolyn O'Keefe, Systemwide Director, Student Wellness and Basic Needs

**College-Focused Rapid Rehousing  
A Report Pursuant to the Budget Act of 2019 (SB 109)**

**Summary**

This report summarizes the efforts of the fourth year of addressing students' experiences of housing insecurity across the California State University (CSU) system through the "Rapid Rehousing" (RRH) program. Beginning in fall 2019, campuses participated in a competitive application process to apply for \$6.5 million in recurring funds made available through the amended Budget Act of 2019 (SB 109). SB 109 requires the CSU to provide a report annually, including information on the use of the funds. Report variables include the number of housing coordinators hired, the number of students supported with housing resources by each campus, the distribution of funds by campus, and a description of the types of programs funded. Other relevant outcomes may also include the number of students who were able to secure permanent housing and whether students receiving support remained enrolled or graduated.

Resources were allocated to campuses to develop and enhance programs and services for students facing challenges with housing insecurity or homelessness. RRH requires that CSU campuses establish ongoing partnerships with community-based organizations (CBOs) that have a tradition of providing wrap-around services and rental subsidies to individuals experiencing housing insecurity or homelessness. This element of the program is henceforth referred to in this report as "CBO RRH." The seven inaugural campuses selected for the program were awarded funding based on their demonstrated need, strength of their formalized partnership(s), campus readiness for program implementation, planned use of the funds in an efficient manner and an articulated method for evaluation of program outcomes.

During the second year of program implementation, an additional campus was added to the pilot bringing the total number of participating campuses to eight. Resources were allocated to the CBOs identified by the awarded campuses to support CSU students experiencing housing insecurity or homelessness. During the first year of the program 1,127 students were assessed resulting in 146 students enrolling in the RRH program. Despite continued challenges related to implementation during the COVID-19 pandemic, 1,598 students were assessed in the second year of the program, a 42% increase from the previous year. Of those assessed, 262 students were enrolled in the RRH program, a 34% increase from the first year of program implementation.

In the third year of the program, the eight participating campuses developed a sustainable rhythm of housing support processes for their students. Although several of the CBOs experienced high levels of turnover and organizational instability at times, the third year of the program had a well-maintained number of 1,538 students assessed for RRH support services. Of those students, 198 of them were enrolled in the CBO RRH program, and 1,121 students received alternative RRH housing support services. Over the first three years of the program, over 280 students were transitioned into permanent, stable housing. It is evident that the campuses and their CBOs have co-created communication streams and case management processes that have ultimately led to more seamless, supportive transitions for students into temporary housing.

In the fourth year of the program, campuses and CBOs noted significant increases in the variability of support necessary to support students seeking housing resources. All participating service providers

holistically support the students enrolled in their programs, offering case management, referrals to additional services and other resources both on- and off-campus. The fourth year of the program totaled 3,802 students assessed for RRH support services. Of the students assessed, 257 of them were enrolled in the CBO RRH element of the program and 2,595 students received alternative RRH housing support services. The services included on- and off-campus temporary emergency housing that is provided by the campus, as well as one-time emergency housing grants and rental subsidies. Over all four years of the program, a total of **797** students have been housed through the CBO RRH element of the program and over **454** of those students have transitioned into permanent, stable housing across the eight participating campuses. With program structures becoming more efficient, variability in services offered and goals for students becoming clearer as the program has progressed, it is evident that campuses are now better equipped overall to support students facing housing insecurity or homelessness.

### **Background and Overview**

The success of college students can be disrupted when they face uncertainty in meeting their basic needs. In concert with its multi-year strategic effort to support student success, known as Graduation Initiative 2025, the CSU identified the promotion of student engagement and wellbeing as one of six guiding pillars to increase retention and graduation. This pillar includes implementing numerous out-of-classroom supports (including basic needs services) and stipulates that, in conjunction, campuses should:

1. Ensure services are easy for students to identify, locate and access;
2. Ensure that campus communication messages normalize the use of services as a strategy for student success;
3. Employ efficient and consistent methods of communication campuswide to ensure services are widely known and easily referred to; and
4. Work to identify and secure ongoing resources over time to sustain services to support student success.

The CSU has been proactive and innovative in using the funding allocated via the State Budget Act to support campus efforts. The funds have supported the strategic expansion of external partnerships to augment the reach of available campus-based programs and services, promote sustainability of campus efforts and meaningfully impact students' lives. It has been anecdotally reported by some of the community-based organization partners that in return for this meaningful impact, formerly enrolled students often revisit the program staff to express their gratitude and seek opportunities to "pay it forward" to students currently participating in the program.

### **Distribution of Funds by Campus and CBO**

In the first year of program implementation, a total of \$6,079,091 of the \$6.5 million provided by the Budget Act of 2019 was distributed to seven campuses and their CBOs. Three of the seven campuses partnered with two CBOs each, while the other four campuses partnered with one CBO each. The total amount of funds distributed to campuses was \$1,540,000 and the total amount distributed to CBOs was \$4,539,091. Additionally, \$420,909 was allocated to program operations at the Chancellor's Office.

In the second year of the program, a total of \$6,949,091 was distributed to the eight participating campuses and their CBOs. Three of the eight campuses formed partnerships with two CBOs each. The total amount of funds distributed to campuses was \$1,760,000. The total amount distributed to the

CBOs was \$5,189,091. The additional funds beyond the \$6.5 million provided by the state Budget were a result of cost savings during the first year.

In the third year of program implementation, a total of \$7,709,559 was allocated to eight campuses and their external partner agencies. Five campuses have agreements with a single external partner agency, and three campuses have agreements with two external partner agencies. The total amount of funds allocated to campuses was \$1,760,000, and the total allocation to external partners was \$5,949,559. Campus-based allocations and external partner allocations are summarized in the following table.

In the fourth year of the program, a total of \$6,118,855 was distributed to eight campuses and their CBOs. The campuses with one CBO as well as those with two CBOs continued as such. The total amount distributed to campuses was \$1,660,000 and the total amount distributed to the CBOs was \$4,518,855. Campus-based allocations and CBO allocations for the fourth year are summarized in the following table. Additionally, \$381,145 was allocated to program operations at the Chancellor’s Office.

CAMPUS	2023-24 TOTAL CAMPUS ALLOCATION	COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION (CBO)	2023-24 TOTAL CBO ALLOCATION	2023-24 TOTAL CAMPUS & CBO ALLOCATION
Chico State	\$ 200,000	Chico Housing Action Team	\$ 249,537	\$ 1,043,488
		True North Housing Alliance	\$ 593,951	
CSU Long Beach	\$ 200,000	Jovenes, Inc.	\$ 451,605	\$ 850,000
		Lutheran Social Services SoCal	\$ 198,395	
CSU Northridge	\$ 200,000	Jovenes, Inc.	\$ 359,061	\$ 559,061
Cal Poly Pomona	\$ 200,000	Jovenes, Inc.	\$ 383,333	\$ 583,333
Sacramento State	\$ 200,000	Lutheran Social Services NorCal	\$ 449,173	\$ 649,173
San Diego State	\$ 200,000	Home Start, Inc.	\$ 674,207	\$ 874,207
San Francisco State	\$ 200,000	3rd St. Youth Center Clinic	\$ 281,593	\$ 1,131,593
		Lyric Center for LGBTQ Youth	\$ 650,000	
San José State	\$ 200,000	Bill Wilson Center	\$ 228,000	\$ 428,000
Total Campus Allocation in 2023-24			\$ 1,600,000	
Total CBO Allocation in 2023-24			\$ 4,518,855	
<b>TOTAL FUNDS FOR USE IN 2023-24</b>			<b>\$ 6,118,855</b>	

**Contextualizing Rapid Rehousing: Funding Criteria and Requirements**

A competitive systemwide Request for Proposals (RFP) process was issued in September 2019 with an application due date of early November 2019. The RFP highlighted the RRH program funding goals. The funds were to be used to:

1. Connect students with community case managers who have knowledge and expertise in accessing safety net resources;
2. Establish ongoing emergency housing procedures, including on-campus and off-campus resources; and
3. Provide emergency grants necessary to secure housing or prevent the imminent loss of housing.

Fourteen of the 23 campuses submitted a funding proposal. The RFP process resulted in the selection of seven CSU campuses to participate in the program from AY 2020-21 through AY 2023-24. The seven original campuses were: Chico State, CSU Long Beach, Cal Poly Pomona, Sacramento State, San Diego State, San Francisco State, and San José State. To make use of residual funds during the first year of the program, CSU Northridge was added as an eighth campus, participating from AY 2021-22 through AY 2023-24. Each campus demonstrated need amongst its students and identified at least one local, external housing provider with the capacity to build a CBO RRH program. Campuses described the strategies they would use to ensure that funding is targeted to those students with the greatest level of need and included a detailed plan for a partnership with a CBO to help with the placement of students into mid- and long-term housing.

Through April 2023, three of the eight campuses worked with two CBOs. After April 2023, two campuses continued with two CBOs until a third campus partnered with a second CBO in late 2023. The CBOs included: Chico Housing Action Team, True North Housing Alliance, Jovenes, Inc. (working with three campuses), Lutheran Social Services Southern California, Lutheran Social Services Northern California, Sacramento Self-Help Housing (until April 2023), Home Start, Inc., 3<sup>rd</sup> St. Youth Center Clinic, Lyric Center for LGBTQ Youth, and the Bill Wilson Center.

To facilitate institutionalization of efforts on the campuses, funding was allocated to support the hiring of dedicated housing liaisons, who also function as case managers, to work collaboratively with the CBOs. These staff facilitate program outreach and identification of students who qualify for services through the CBO RRH program. Working in partnership with their CBOs, the housing liaisons provide timely linkages to campus-based resources that provide ongoing social and academic support.

Several campuses used unique program names to make the program relatable to their respective campus community. The campus and CBO partnerships are summarized below, including the name that each campus gave to their iteration of the RRH program.

Campus	CBO Partner	Program Name
Chico State	True North Housing Alliance Chico Housing Action Team	Chico State Basic Needs Rapid Re-Housing
CSU Long Beach	Jovenes, Inc. Lutheran Social Services SoCal (Started September 2023)	Rapid Rehousing Program
CSU Northridge	Jovenes, Inc.	CSUN/Jovenes Rapid-Rehousing Partnership
Cal Poly Pomona	Jovenes, Inc.	College-Focused Rapid Rehousing
Sacramento State	Lutheran Social Services NorCal Sacramento Self-Help Housing (Until April 2023)	Rapid Rehousing Program
San Diego State	Home Start, Inc.	SDSU Rapid Re-Housing Program
San Francisco State	Lyric Center for LGBTQ Youth 3rd St. Youth Center Clinic	PATHS: Providing Assistance to Housing Solutions
San José State	Bill Wilson Center	Rapid Rehousing Program

Campuses that applied for these funds demonstrated that they had taken concrete steps to create a formalized on-campus and/or off-campus emergency housing procedure for students who are in a housing crisis. In addition, campuses addressed how they would continue to support an emergency aid program for students experiencing a housing crisis and how this program is disseminated on their

campus. Finally, campuses addressed in detail how they would assess the programs and services to measure the progress and/or impact the interventions are having on student success. Evaluation efforts included tracking whether students receiving support maintained permanent housing and remained enrolled in school and/or completed their degree.

### **Description of Programs/Activities Funded**

To support students experiencing housing insecurity or homelessness, campuses and CBOs are actively involved in many of the following funded activities to meet the unique needs of the student population:

- Program development (e.g. systems, forms, program strategies, etc.)
- On-campus and campus to community outreach, and promotion of RRH program (e.g. website development, campus emails, etc.)
- Assessment of students for participation in the RRH program
- Housing students in emergency on-campus housing
- Providing one-time funds for housing assistance
- Referrals to on-campus resources (not housing related)
- Referrals to non-housing community resources and services (including Medi-Cal, Vision Screening)
- Referrals to community housing partners for RRH program
- Referrals to alternative housing resources (not RRH placement)
- On-campus case management support
- Case consultations with all staff partners
- Case management support (e.g. educational planning, financial planning, etc.)
- Providing mental health support (such as therapeutic care)
- Vocational support (e.g. job search resources, résumé development, mock interviews, career/job exploration, hands-on paid work experience, etc.)
- Negotiating landlord/tenant leases (e.g. master lease, individual leases, etc.)
- Supporting participants' move in efforts to housing (such as providing support while student moves personal property into home)
- Group activities (such as house meetings or social gatherings)
- Conflict mediation (e.g. with roommate, landlord, etc.)
- Providing exit planning support
- Providing temporary emergency housing using hotel vouchers
- Research and development of future housing inventory
- Outreach and relationship building with potential housing partners (e.g. property owners, landlords, rental companies, etc.)
- Media coverage or promotion (such as news or press coverage) of RRH programs

### **Support Staff: Number of Coordinators and Other Team Members Hired**

#### Campuses

In the first year of program implementation, nine new staff members were hired across the seven participating CSU campuses to support the RRH Program. Due to the variability of existing staff members and staff capacity on the campuses, each campus created new staff positions to meet their student and programmatic needs.

To continue to meet needs during the second year, these positions remained, and an additional six positions were created at the campuses, which then included an eighth campus. Among the eight campuses, at least one full-time equivalent (FTE) staff member serves as a Rapid Rehousing



Liaison/Coordinator. Sample titles/roles for the staff members included the following: Case Manager, Housing Stability Coordinator, Rapid Rehousing Liaison, and Rapid Rehousing Coordinator. These individuals are responsible for the daily operations of the RRH program. They focus on academic success, serve as liaisons with the CBOs and ensure program goals are being met.

In the third year of the program, most staff members hired in the prior years were retained and continued to provide housing support services in their roles. To bolster the work of these practitioners and support the program, one additional FTE staff member was hired, and two student staff positions were created.

In the program's fourth year, most staff members hired in prior years were retained. At six out of the eight participating campuses, multiple team members were trained to support the RRH program and dedicate a portion of their time to program operations. Two campuses each hired two graduate students in part-time student staff roles to support the RRH program. Additionally, three out of the eight campuses had leadership transitions over the past academic year.

#### Community-Based Organizations

In the first year of program implementation, the CBOs also hired thirteen new staff members to support the CBO RRH element of the program. During the second year, these positions continued, and another five were created at the CBOs. These staff members work in partnership with the campus RRH program liaisons with whom they meet regularly to discuss student engagement and progress, serve as leads in assisting students to secure housing and provide wrap-around holistic case management. Sample titles/roles for CBO staff members include Housing Locator/Navigator, Youth Advocate, RRH Team Lead, Program Director, Housing Specialist, Case Manager, and Housing Coordinator.

In the third year of the program, all campuses held meetings with their partner CBOs bi-weekly or weekly, via Zoom or in-person. Meeting topics included discussing student cases, referrals, identifying goals and tracking progress. However, campuses and CBOs reported that they typically speak more frequently, via phone calls, texts, emails, and ad-hoc meetings to ensure case management for each student is as up-to-date and attentive as possible. In addition, the CBOs typically schedule check-in meetings with participating students weekly or monthly, depending on student needs. The CBOs expressed their prioritization of availability for meetings upon urgent student need. In the fourth year of the program, the campuses and CBOs maintained this collaborative process and continued to meet on a bi-weekly or weekly basis, with ad-hoc meetings also scheduled as needed.

#### **Number of Students Assessed and Served**

From July 1, 2023, through June 30, 2024, the eight campuses collectively supported 3,802 students through the RRH program. The chart below summarizes the number of students served per campus, the number of students referred to CBOs and the number of students who were placed in long-term housing by CBOs.



Campus	# Students Assessed to Receive Housing Resources	# Students Received Non-CBO RRH Housing Resources	# Students Assessed for CBO RRH Participation	# Students Referred to CBO RRH	# Students Who Enrolled into CBO RRH Program
Chico State	351	116	151	93	93
CSU Long Beach	1,179	656	169	64	32
CSU Northridge	450	355	29	29	21
Cal Poly Pomona	296	236	60	57	17
Sacramento State	309	300	31	28	28
San Diego State	699	676	23	18	15
San Francisco State	213	173	150	150	34
San José State	305	83	30	30	16
	<b>3,802</b>	<b>2,595</b>	<b>643</b>	<b>469</b>	<b>257</b>

The campuses that participated in the program engaged with students experiencing housing insecurity or homelessness in several ways, and staff provided various levels of support to students depending on their unique needs. Although 3,802 students expressed some level of housing insecurity when engaging with program staff, a majority were best served with RRH program temporary and immediate rental assistance or placement in temporary emergency housing. Students provided with this level of support were also connected with other campus resources, including financial literacy services, mental health support, access to the food pantry and CalFresh application assistance. As a result, students are receiving holistic support as they continue their educational journey.

Students generally engage with campus staff first; these staff members then determine whether a student might be best served by a CBO. This process involved a general intake process created in partnership with each CBO. After students are referred and a “warm” hand-off is completed, the staff at the CBO conduct a more thorough intake process to evaluate the needs of each student. This process was more involved and particular attention was paid to ensure that each student’s wellbeing is prioritized.

Not all students who were referred to the CBO were enrolled into the CBO RRH element of the program. This can be due to several reasons. Most often, non-participation was the result of a determination made that a student may benefit from other services and/or programs outside of the CBO RRH program for example, providing temporary financial assistance to pay rent. In rare instances, some students who were fully eligible to benefit from the CBO RRH program and its services, decline to do so for various personal reasons. Such reasons included students feeling most comfortable in their current living situation (even if they were “couch-surfing” or living in their vehicle) or feeling that they are not in need of support. The unique situation of each student varies and, in response, staff at the campuses and CBOs made every effort to ensure that students are aware of the housing resources available to them if they choose to participate.

### **Relevant Outcomes and Successes**

In its fourth year, the RRH program continued to successfully support students experiencing housing insecurity or homelessness. As an indicator of program success, campuses tracked outcomes related to the number of students assessed, the number of students that received support through the CBO RRH

program and the amount of students that received another form of RRH housing support. The number of students assessed and enrolled steadily increased from the program’s third year into the fourth year.

In year four, the eight campuses piloting the program served 3,802 students with housing support services; 643 students were then specifically assessed for participation in the CBO RRH program; 2,595 students received alternative RRH housing support resources, and 257 students were enrolled in the CBO RRH program.

While the number of students enrolled in the CBO RRH element of the program in year three was very similar to the number of students enrolled in year two, the number of students enrolled in the program in year four increased by nearly **29%** from year three. It is likely that with three or more years of program operation experience, many of the campuses and CBOs were operating at peak efficiency and were able to enroll more students over the course of the academic year. As with year three, it is also likely that the stabilization in the programs on the campuses allowed teams to increase program visibility in their communities, resulting in an increase in the number of students actively seeking out their support.

Summarized in the table below are the number of students who enrolled in the CBO RRH element of the program in the fourth year and either remained in school or graduated. Also listed in the following table is the number of students who moved into permanent housing over the course of the four-year program.

<b>Campus</b>	<b># Students Who Enrolled into CBO RRH Program</b>	<b># Students Enrolled into CBO RRH Program Who Remain in That Housing</b>	<b># Students Anticipated to Stay Enrolled in School<sup>1</sup></b>	<b># Students Who Have Graduated<sup>2</sup></b>
Chico State	93	53	54	4
CSU Long Beach	32	32	32	0
CSU Northridge	21	13	16	3
Cal Poly Pomona	17	15	12	2
Sacramento State	28	4	17	8
San Diego State	15	14	6	8
San Francisco State	35	35	12	10
San José State	16	15	11	0
	<b>257</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>35</b>

<sup>1</sup>Figure includes students who were enrolled into the CBO RRH program in Year 4 and are anticipated to enroll in school in the semester following Year 4.

<sup>2</sup>Figure includes students who were enrolled into the CBO RRH program in Year 4 and graduated in Year 4.

<b>Campus</b>	<b># Students Who Moved in to Permanent Housing<sup>3</sup></b>
Chico State	117
Cal State Long Beach	74
CSU Northridge	23
Cal Poly Pomona	52
Sacramento State	60
San Diego State	49
San Francisco State	55
San José State	>24 *
	<b>&gt;454</b>

<sup>3</sup>Figure includes students who have enrolled in the CBO RRH program in Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, or Year 4. \*Number combines counts from Year 1 and Year 2 of program. Counts from Year 3 and Year 4 unknown due to data tracking error. Confirmed larger combined count by Year 4 of program – unknown exact number.

The fourth year of the RRH program showed the continual strengthening and streamlining of program operations for both the participating campuses and the CBOs. There continued to be staff turnover for both the campuses and the CBOs, as well as challenging factors including limited housing options, exorbitantly high housing costs in California, and high costs for housing each individual student. Amidst these limiting factors, the overall number of students supported with RRH housing resources increased from the third to the fourth year and the number of students enrolled in the CBO RRH element of the program increased.

Although tracking the demographic information of the students served was not a reporting requirement over the last four years, seven out of eight participating campuses either formally or informally tracked student demographics. In the fourth year of the program, campuses were asked to share the demographic information that was collected to more effectively reach the students who are most impacted by housing insecurity and need the support of the RRH program and other housing resources.

Understanding the identities of the students currently accessing the program(s) helps program staff to more effectively provide on- and off-campus resources, connections, and referrals for mental health and wellness that can support the student holistically. For example, given that nearly 70% of participating students are students of color, there might be ethnicity- or culture-based social groups or support groups on campus that can provide a source of community for those specific students. Program staff can forge relationships with these groups on campus, providing stronger connections for students facing housing insecurity, who are also seeking community support.

The table below shows the average percentages of each identity marker across campuses who tracked demographics over the course of the program. Some campuses gave students the option to not answer the demographic questions, therefore some sections might not add up to 100%.

Avg. %	Ethnicity						Gender			Sexuality		
	Latinx	Asian/ Pacific Islander	White	Black	Native American	Other	Male	Female	Non- Binary	Heterosexual	Gay/ Lesbian/ Bisexual	Other
	40%	8%	16%	21%	0.75%	9.5%	37%	62%	1%	67.5%	15.5%	17%

Additionally, participating campus reports showed that over 57% of students referred to CBOs in the 2023-24 academic year were transfer students. This specific population of students often has different on- and off-campus experiences from non-transfer students, and it’s important to take this large participating population of students’ needs into consideration when providing support. Regular case management provided for students enrolled in the RRH program allowed program staff to continually maintain communication with these students experiencing housing insecurity who might also be experiencing challenges around transitioning from a community college to a four-year institution – financial, social, or otherwise. Program staff, in many cases, have been invaluable sources of comfort, guidance, and stability for students facing difficult life circumstances while in pursuit of academic success.

Additionally, as mentioned in the report from the third year of the program, it was consistently evident over the course of the four years of the program that the CBO RRH program structure was not always able to accommodate every type of student. Most significantly, students with dependents were often unable to be enrolled in the program as most leases only allow for a single tenant. Fortunately, in the fourth year of the program, the number of students with dependents and their families served by the CBO RRH program more than doubled. This was likely due to the increased understanding of this specific program challenge that informed the need to expand housing options provided. In most cases, campuses were still able to provide alternative housing resources for students with dependents when they did not qualify to be housed through the CBO RRH program. Supporting this population of students within the program remains important to consider and address.

A continually remarkable aspect of the RRH program in its fourth year of operation has been the comprehensive, wrap-around care provided by the campus teams and the CBO teams. A review of the program led to the understanding that a well-structured, multifaceted partnership between the campuses and their CBO partners has been “vital to the continued success of the program,” as stated by one campus representative. This representative continued to share that their CBO’s “expertise in case management, housing navigation, property management, vocational programs and aftercare supports” were integral in the orderly functioning of their CBO RRH program. It became clear throughout a review of the program that the single action of rehousing, while valuable, was not always sufficient in terms of student support. The most effective CBO RRH programs included comprehensive basic needs support structures on both the campus and the CBO sides, with these additional supports addressing food insecurity, mental health, and financial literacy.

Innovation continues to be at the forefront of the CBO RRH program as CBOs and campuses have learned the importance of tailored solutions for different types of students. For example, Jovenes, Inc. operates what is called a “bridge housing” program at CSU Northridge. There are three avenues of support:

1. Rapid rehousing, is short-term and useful in the case of students unable to move into apartments;

2. Bridge housing, facilitates master leases provided by the organization allow 2-3 students to live in an apartment together; and
3. Hybrid-bridge housing, allows students who are open to sharing rooms with other students to live together and share the cost of rent.

Through this version of the CBO RRH program, the two bridge-based avenues of support allowed students to contribute to rent payments and therefore more smoothly transition into post-program independence. In the fourth year of the CBO RRH program, CSU Northridge noted in their reporting that one issue with their CBO's shared bridge housing is its inability to house students with dependents. To mitigate this concern in the future, CSU Northridge plans to dedicate one bridge housing unit to students with dependents to ensure program equitability and accessibility.

Despite continual challenges around organizational turnover at both the campuses and CBOs, both have developed and maintained effective cross-team and internal communication strategies. Practicing comprehensive, student-centered case management allowed for students to feel cared for throughout their time in the program. It is evident that a great deal of time, energy, patience, innovation, and persistence has been dedicated to this program and its student participants by both the campus teams and the CBO teams.

### **Impact and Importance of RRH**

A total of 3,802 students experiencing housing insecurity sufficient to threaten their ability to remain engaged in their academic pursuits were served by the campus teams and connected with housing resources. Of these, 257 students enrolled in the CBO RRH program and 184 of those students are anticipated to enroll in classes in the 2024-25 academic year. Seventy-five students achieved their goal of earning their college degree in the 2023-24 academic year, an accomplishment that will forever change their lives and positively impact their communities.

The state's financial support for the creation and implementation of the RRH program in the CSU advances the mission of Graduation Initiative 2025 and has been an integral, momentum-building aspect of the initiative over the last four years. With the end of year four, it is clear that the practitioners on the campuses and those supporting the campuses through the CBOs are invaluable resources for the students they serve. With the help of these Rapid Rehousing funds, these practitioners have been given the opportunity to provide for CSU students in make-or-break moments that have ultimately helped determine their ability to persist with their education and to graduate. The CSU is immensely grateful for the State's Rapid Rehousing grant and will continue to prioritize the distribution of these funds to ensure CSU students have what they need to succeed.