RESEARCH BRIEF

Examining Supports Beyond Rental Assistance for Residents of Affordable Housing Units

Results from a Review of the Literature / *Jenny Hutchison*

URBAN INSTITUTE

FEBRUARY 2026

Why This Matters

The Housing Trust Fund (HTF), in conjunction with federally funded Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) financing, supports households with a range of income levels by setting rents based on a percentage of Area Median Income (AMI). The HTF tracks total units by AMI with units designated for tenants that have incomes that do not exceed 30%, 40%, 50%, 60% and 80% of AMI.[1] Although households in units focused on no more than 60% of the area median income make up the largest percent of multi-family rental units (51%), units for tenants with income 30% or less of the area median income is the second largest group (27%).

With the range in income levels, some residents may only need assistance with rent while others could use support in other ways such as financial literacy, social capital, employment assistance, child care and transportation. In this brief we examine the existing, US based, literature related to affordable housing units and support services provided to residents to understand the types of services delivered, outcomes examined and the effectiveness of the programs.

What We Found

The research team found articles related to three different types of programming associated with affordable housing support:[2]

- **Jobs Plus** – a federally funded program available in public housing developments. The program seeks to assist residents in increasing earnings, thereby fostering a diversity of incomes in the communities, and improving overall quality of life.[3]

- **Family Self Sufficiency** (FSS) – a federally funded program available for residents with a Housing Choice Voucher (HCV), which allows residents to live in rental units where HCVs are accepted. FSS aims to help address barriers to economic self-sufficiency for residents receiving rental assistance.[4]

- **Other support service programs** – An assortment of programs implemented in other types of affordable housing programs. For two of the studies included in this group there are multiple providers of services, so it is difficult to discern a specific program goal. The final study includes properties managed by Mercy Housing which aims to support residents in improving health and well-being, solving problems, supporting youth and strengthening financial standing.[5]

See Appendix A for an overview of the programs included.

[1]Housing Trust Fund. (n.d.). Retrieved November 13, 2025, from https://www.charlottenc.gov/Streets-and-Neighborhoods/Housing/Resources-for-Developers-and-Contractors/Housing-Trust-Fund

[2]The federal program Hope VI also provided funding for support services, but was aimed at supporting residents forced to relocate during redevelopment of public housing sites. Given this included the additional factor of relocation for families we chose not to include these studies in the brief.

[3]Bloom, H. S., Riccio, J. A., Verma, N., & Walter, J. (2005). Promoting Work in Public Housing: The Effectiveness of Jobs-Plus. MDRC.

[4]Freedman, S., Verma, N., & Vermette, J. (2023). Final Report on Program Effects and Lessons from the Family Self-Sufficiency Program Evaluation. MDRC.

[5]Resident Services to Help the Community. (2026). Mercy Housing. Retrieved February 15, 2026, from https://www.mercyhousing.org/partner-with-us/resident-services/

The two programs (Jobs Plus & FSS) implemented within federally funded housing focused on outcomes related to earnings and employment, as employment was viewed as central to improving longer term outcomes such as 'material well-being' and need for government assistance.[6] Alternatively, studies focused on other support service programs examined housing stability and healthcare related outcomes. All services offered through the programs were voluntary for residents. See table 1 for information concerning the services provided and outcomes examined by support service program.

TABLE 1: Services provided and outcomes examined by support service program

Support service program	# of articles	Services provided	Outcomes examined
Job Plus program *(all articles were based on the same study, but at different time periods)*	3	All studies examined the federal program: **Jobs Plus**. Services were voluntary and could vary by site. • Employment-related services & activities: includes job search skills, vocational training; and support services • Financial incentives to minimize rent increases associated w/ higher earnings • Community support for work: fosters neighbor-to-neighbor exchanges of job info and opportunities	• Earnings • Employment • Need for public assistance
Family Self-Sufficiency *(several of the articles are based on the same study at different time periods)*	5	All studies examined the federal program or a variation of: **Family Self Sufficiency**. Services were voluntary and could vary by site: • Life Coaching/Case management & referrals • Financial coaching & literacy • Financial incentives • Job search and skills • Education support & training • Support services	• Earnings • Savings • Credit scores • Need for public assistance • Graduating from FSS program
Other support service programs	3	All services offered were voluntary. • Integrated Health services • Social services • Wellness services • Social capital/companionship • Informational support • Youth programming • Case management • Financial literacy • Job search/skills • GED training • Eviction prevention • Safety • ESL • Support with basic needs	• Healthcare utilization and expenditures • Retaining housing • Tenant turnover • Unit cost associated with tenant stability, vandalism, and tenant wear and tear on units

[6] Freedman, Verma, & Vermette, 2023.

Below, we describe the findings from the literature by primary outcomes.

Program participation (FSS): While the FSS program provides resident support and financial incentives, tenant participation is limited. One study reported that only 5% of eligible residents were enrolled.[7] Possible barriers to involvement included complexity of programs, length of time and requirements for accessing financial incentives, and household primary language. Once in the program, graduation rates (required to access financial incentives) are less than 50%, with rates ranging from 4% to 44%. Detailed information concerning exits was not collected. However, sub-group analysis indicated participants that were unemployed or had lower earnings were less likely to graduate.[8] Furthermore, leaving the HCV program or moving to another public housing authority resulted in an exit from the FSS program.[9]

In terms of factors associated with retention, studies found that having a lower number of cases per case manager was associated with higher graduation rates.[10] In addition, a variation of the FSS program called MyGoals, experienced stronger sustained engagement relative to other FSS programs, likely a result of the inclusion of shorter term financial incentives tied to meeting with case managers.[11] Lastly, participants with more education and part-time employment were better positioned to experience the benefits of the program such as accruing larger escrow balances, improving earnings and graduating from the program.[12]

Earnings (Jobs Plus & FSS): Overall there were mixed results in terms of increased earnings particularly for FSS programs. Residents of all Jobs Plus sites realized earnings increases during the program, with residents from the stronger implementation sites (consistent leadership that allowed for programmatic, staffing and funding support) realizing larger increases in earnings.[13] At the fifteen year follow up an increase in earnings was evident at the stronger implementation sites, but not the weaker sites.[14] For sites with a stronger implementation, the increase in earnings was prevalent across all sites and across demographic variables such as receiving public assistance, age and time living at the site.[15] Finally, positive outcomes were evident in subsequent generations with the most recent report finding that children who were residents at the strong implementation sites also realized improved earnings and employment rates relative to the control group sites.[16]

For the FSS program, a larger nationwide study and the MyGoals study did not see any difference in earnings for participants enrolled in the program as compared to a control group.[17] However, in a regional study, earnings growth for FSS participants exceeded that of the control group (earnings difference: $6,032; p-value: 0.000) approximately 3 years after FSS enrollment.[18] The regional study may have benefited from a single program administrator[19] who specifically focused on FSS programs for all the sites included versus the other studies which included a range of administrators – some public housing authorities (PHA) and others that were third-party administrators.

Employment (Jobs Plus & FSS): In terms of the rate of employment, there were no statistically significant improvements found when compared to control groups. While there was an increase in employment rate at locations with the Jobs Plus program as compared to the control group, it was not statistically significant.[20] FSS

---

[7] Holgate, B., Tripp, J., Singleton, S., Kabir, P., Mirbel, W., & Friedman, D. H. (2016). Metropolitan Boston Housing Partnership's Family Self-Sufficiency Program Evaluation, July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2015 (No. 80). Center for Social Policy Publications. https://scholarworks.umb.edu/csp_pubs/80/?utm_source=scholarworks.umb.edu%2Fcsp_pubs%2F80&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages

[8] Freedman, Verma, & Vermette, 2023.

[9] Verma, N., & Vermette, J. (2025). *Supporting Economic Mobility Through HUD's Family Self-Sufficiency Program: Findings and Recommendations From the National Impact Evaluation. 27*(1).

[10] Freedman, Verma, & Vermette, 2023. Verma & Vermette, 2025.

[11] Castells, N., Riccio, J., Moore, Q., & Wu, A. (2025). *Emerging Lessons from the MyGoals for Employment Success Program. 27*(1), 55–84.

[12] Ibid

[13] Bloom, 2005;. Riccio, J. A. (2010). *Sustained earnings gains for residents in a public housing jobs program.* MDRC.

[14] Miller, C., Castells, N., Verma, N., Vermette, J., & Kanengiser, H. (2021). *HUD Jobs Plus Outcomes Evaluation—Long-term Effects from the Original Jobs Plus Demonstration: Employment and Earnings for Public Housing Residents after 20 Years.* MDRC; Riccio, J. A. (2010). *Sustained earnings gains for residents in a public housing jobs program.* MDRC.

[15] Bloom et al., 2005

[16] Miller et al., 2021

[17] Castells et al., 2025; Freedman, Verma, & Vermette, 2023.

[18] Moulton, S., Freiman, L., & Lubell, J. (2021). *Quasi-experimental impacts of Family Self-Sufficiency programs administered by Compass Working Capital in partnership with housing agencies in Cambridge, Boston, and Lynn, MA.* Abt Associates.

[19] Compass Working Capital

[20] Bloom et al, 2005

programs focused more on earnings and not on the rate of employment, except for the MyGoals study, which did not find any improvement in employment. However, results were based on a shorter time period.[21]

Other job related outcomes (FSS): While MyGoals did not find improved earnings or employment relative to the control group, the program found increased job search activities, and evidence of greater job satisfaction such as opportunities for promotion with their job placement as compared to the control group.[22]

Housing stability (Other support service programs): There were mixed results related to tenant stability in the two studies based on general affordable housing. Both studies included a range of services similar to services included in the Jobs Plus program and the FSS program, although actual services provided may vary by location. When examining differences between properties that offered services and those that did not, one study found no differences in the percentage of units turned over, evictions or new homeowners.[23] However, the study did find that properties that offered resident services had lower costs related to tenant turnover, maintenance and bad debt per unit, implying a benefit for housing organizations in offering these services.[24]

In a second study, residents with a prior lease violation who used services were more likely to remain housed than those who did not and the difference was statistically significant.[25] The improved retention was associated with the use of instrumental services (childcare, benefits acquisition, and food).[26] In addition, increased usage of services related to social capital (leadership opportunities, community projects and initiatives, family reconciliation and physical activity) were also associated with improved resident retention.[27] Lastly, informational services (lease education, housing options, eviction prevention coaching, employment support and financial stability education) were not associated with retention rate.[28] While the variation in results may be related to the differing study designs, Plassmeyer et al. (2018) highlights program participation and types of services associated with retention.

Health care (Other support service programs): In one study the presence of integrated health services staff on property (medical, mental or dental) was associated with lower emergency department visits and lower total health care expenditures.[29] There was no statistically significant difference for primary care visits or inpatient visits.[30] In addition, the presence of social services/staff (community health workers or social workers) or wellness services/staff (support residents with access to food, fitness and other residential activities) was not associated with any of the health-care related outcomes.[31]

How We Did It

Given the limited research related to LIHTC properties[32] and the range in income levels, programs associated with all types of affordable housing are included in this literature review focused on support services. LIHTC properties may differ from the two federally funded programs reviewed, particularly public housing, by providing housing among a diversity of incomes. To align with the resident profile of HTF multifamily rental properties, this analysis focused on general-population affordable housing rather than housing designed for specific populations which may require different types of services to meet their needs. *For more information about methods see Appendix B.*

For this study, support services are defined as services provided to residents of an affordable housing rental program. Articles examined individual-level resident

---

[21]Freedman, Verma, & Vermette, 2023.

[22]Ibid

[23]Dunn, A. (2011). *Resident Services in Subsidized Housing for Low-Income Families.* Goldman School of Public Policy.

[24]Ibid

[25]Plassmeyer, M., Brisson, D., & Lechuga-Peña, S. (2018). Impact of services on retaining subsidized housing. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 40*(2), 261–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2017.1324246

[26]Ibid

[27]Ibid

[28]Ibid

[29]Wright, B., Li, G., Weller, M., & Vartanian, K. (2016). Health in Housing: *Exploring the intersection between housing and health care* (pp. 1–44). Center for Outcomes Research and Education. https://www.enterprisecommunity.org/sites/default/files/2021-06/Health%20in%20Housing%20Exploring%20the%20Intersection%20between%20Housing%20and%20Healthcare.pdf

[30]Ibid

[31]Ibid

[32]See brief "Expected Outcomes of Individuals and Families Residing in Multi-Family Rental Properties Supported by LIHTC & the Charlotte Housing Trust Fund"

outcomes, and emphasized findings from studies that use randomized control study designs or a comparison group. *See Appendix C for the list of articles included.*

Key takeaways & next steps

- The studies include some evidence of success in **improving earnings by offering an array of support services.**[33] A range of services may be necessary to accommodate the many different needs tenants may have.
- **Implementation is important.** In the Jobs Plus program, locations with stronger implementation, particularly in terms of leadership oversight which resulted in consistent funding, staff, and support,[34] were more effective in realizing improved earnings and graduation rates. In addition, better earnings outcomes were realized in the FSS study where one organization, Compass Working Capital (Compass), oversaw all the properties offering the program. Compass has additional funding that helps bolster training and support for case managers, which could contribute to higher participation and improved outcomes.[35]
- **Some residents may be better positioned to improve earnings** as a result of the services provided. A study of the FSS program found residents who had higher educational attainment had better outcomes in terms of savings and employment.[36] What is not clear is whether programming needs to be adjusted to meet more residents where they are.
- **Assess a range of outcomes and relevant services.** All the studies related to federal programming focus on earnings and employment outcomes. The other support services programs considered outcomes such as housing stability and health. However, there is a lack of understanding from residents about what their needs and goals are. An ecosystem study could help understand the needs and goals of residents, and identify other appropriate services and outcomes.
- **Support services are currently provided by INLIVIAN,** who oversees FSS in Charlotte as well as other housing support services for the properties they manage and for households with an HCV. Understanding what support services are being implemented in Charlotte, what has worked well and resident outcomes (housing stability, earnings, etc.) can provide us with greater insight about housing support services in Charlotte.

---

[33]Bloom et al., 2005; Miller et al., 2023; Moulton et al., 2021; Riccio, 2010.

[34]Bloom et al,. 2005.

[35]Sanga, N., Freiman, L., Geyer, J., Thomas, H., & Lubell, J. (2025). Strengthening FSS Program Outcomes: Lessons from Research on Compass FSS Programs. *Cityscape*, *27*(1), 85–114.

[36]Freedman, Verma, & Vermette, 2023.

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

Prepared for the City of Charlotte.

Appendix A - Information Related to Support Service Programs

Jobs Plus program - Public Housing:
The Job Plus program was piloted in 1998 across six PHA sites in six different cities and eventually rolled out to other PHA sites nationwide. All three articles related to the Jobs Plus program are connected to the same study, but report on different time periods. Half the study sites displayed evidence of weak implementation due to leadership priorities and limited implementation of incentives and activities, leading the authors to stratify results by strength of implementation. See Miller et al., 2021, Exhibit B2 for an overview of implementation at each of the six sites.

The Jobs Plus program continues today using the same three components - employment related services, financial incentives, and community supports for work. In 2025, HUD offered $21 million in Jobs Plus program funding to eligible PHAs.

Family Self Sufficiency program - Housing Choice Vouchers:
The FSS program is available for residents receiving HCVs within developments overseen by PHAs who have applied for and received grant funding from the federal government. Services vary by property but always include deposits (funded through the grant) to escrow accounts that match any increase in rent as a result of earnings increases. However, access to the account requires graduating from the program. Graduation requirements can vary, although they generally require the following:

- Resident is employed,
- Resident has achieved their self-sufficiency goals (i.e. attaining education, reducing debt or attending financial literacy program)
- Resident remains in compliance with HCV program
- Residents are no longer receiving cash assistance benefits

The articles included are based on three different studies: a northeast regional study, a nationwide study, and one study based on a variation of the FSS program referred to as MyGoals (see table A1). MyGoals was created when there were initial concerns that the FSS program did not provide sufficient support or short-term incentives to generate expected outcomes.

Table A1: MyGoals Program

MyGoals Program: modifications of FSS program
• Required lower caseloads per case manager • Coaching executive skills (eg: working memory, emotional control, organization) • Coaching based on non-directiveness - participants decide what paths they want to take • Short-term financial incentives tied to engagement in coaching process, and employment and remaining employed • Did not require participants to remain in the housing program

There have been some revisions to the FSS program following the completion of the studies included here. See Freedman et al., 2023, Exhibit 52 for a summary of changes implemented. Locally, INLIVIAN oversees the FSS program in Mecklenburg County. However, since they are also a Moving-to-Work site they have been given more latitude in designing their program. For example, they offer short term incentives for meeting specific goals such as educational attainment or employment versus waiting for a resident to graduate from the program.

Other Affordable Housing Programs

Studies examining support services in other affordable housing developments are more limited and rely on less rigorous study designs. Properties are described as managed by non-profit organizations, which could include PHAs. One article is based on properties developed and managed by a specific organization (Mercy Housing) with locations throughout the US. The remaining two articles rely on an assortment of different developers and managers with all properties located in a single city/state (Portland, Oregon or California). To the extent a property is managed by a PHA it is possible residents are eligible for either the Jobs Plus program or the FSS program.

Unlike the other studies which compare properties that offer services with those that did not, the study based on Mercy Housing locations compares residents that use services versus those who did not use services although services were available. The study categorized services as the following: Social capital/companionship; Instrumental/tangible, and Informational.

For the study based in California, the properties were managed by different organizations that each tailored their services to the budget available and the needs of the residents at the property. Therefore, services varied across all properties with general referrals and health and wellness services the most common services offered. See Dunn, 2011, page 16, for two case studies as examples of differing programs.

The study focused on health was also a group of properties, located in Portland, Oregon, that offered various services with a particular focus on health and wellness. There was no set program, but more of an assortment of different services. Services offered were identified by property staff. The study then used information about the availability of services to devise comparison groups between residents of properties with and without specified services.

Appendix B - Methods

The research team used the search terms listed below in table B1, as well as snowballing to identify academic and institutional research for the study. Articles related to two federally funded programs were identified as well as programs associated with other affordable housing. The federally funded programs allocated funds for program evaluation, allowing for stronger study designs such as a random control design. While the studies included for other types of general affordable housing did not use random control study designs, they relied on matched groups to examine outcomes and provided examples of alternative services and outcomes. Finally, for all the control groups, services can be accessed through the community, so while property-based programs may not be available to tenants in the control groups they may access community-based services.

Table B1: Search Terms

Housing	**Services**
Affordable housing LIHTC Subsidized housing Housing Voucher	Support Service Financial literacy Childcare Case management Employment support Education* support*

Appendix C – Literature Review Table

Full Citation	Research Question	Methods	Sample/Population
Jobs Plus Program			
Bloom, H. S., Riccio, J. A., Verma, N., & Walter, J. (2005). Promoting Work in Public Housing: The Effectiveness of Jobs Plus. MDRC.	Evaluation of Jobs plus programs impact for residents in comparison with residents living in similar developments who did not receive the program.	Random assignment of housing developments to operate Jobs Plus. Examined outcomes for tenants longitudinally as well as by housing development through a comparative interrupted time series analysis.	Six cities were chosen through a national competition sponsored by HUD and the Rockefeller Foundation and managed by MDRC. Qualifying housing authorities had to have at least two such developments and met criteria for types of tenants (30% families w/ employed members, 40% receiving AFDC). Housing authorities were screened for effectiveness to attempt to ensure authorities were up to the task. Several sites were later removed due to developments which changed services offered or resulted in redevelopment of the property. Residents included in the study were between the ages of 21 and 61.
Miller, C., Castells, N., Verma, N., Vermette, J., & Kanengiser, H. (2021). HUD Jobs Plus Outcomes Evaluation—Long-term Effects from the Original Jobs Plus Demonstration: Employment and Earnings for Public Housing Residents after 20 Years. MDRC.	This report examines the long-term effects of the Jobs Plus demonstration on labor market outcomes for working adults and residents who were children at the time of program launch.	Ordinary Least Squares w/ a comparison group based on random assignment. Comparison is at the development level and not the tenant level.	Residents of public housing located in Dayton, LA, & St Paul that were working age and non-disabled. Restricted to those who would not reach retirement age by the end of 2019. Includes all children of workable adults at baseline.
Riccio, J. A. (2010). Sustained earnings gains for residents in a public housing jobs program. MDRC.	Examining the impact of the Job Plus program after the program was no longer operating	Randomly assigned public housing sites in specified locations. Interrupted time series analysis	Working age non-disabled residents of public housing. Located in Dayton, LA, & St Paul.
Family Self-Sufficiency			
Castells, N., Riccio, J., Moore, Q., & Wu, A. (2025). Emerging Lessons from the MyGoals for Employment Success Program. 27(1), 55–84.	To describe MyGoals and present emerging findings from 21 months of the program (total program is 3 years).	Randomized trial at the participant level.	1800 adults who receive a housing subsidy in the form of Public Housing (20%) or HCV (80%) enrolled in the MyGoals study from 2017 to 2019. Individuals had to be an adult and either not employed or employed less than 20 hours a week and not already participating in an FSS program.
Freedman, S., Verma, N., & Vermette, J. (2023). Final Report on Program Effects and Lessons from the Family Self-Sufficiency Program EvaluationH. MDRC.	HUD commissioned an evaluation of FSS to measure the program's impact on a family's progress toward long-term financial stability.	Used randomized assignment w/ participants placed in one of two groups: Intervention group was offered a placement in FSS, and control was not offered a placement.	18 public housing agencies enrolled and randomly assigned 2,556 household (HH). Excludes HHs headed by individuals 62 or older.

Geyer, J., Freiman, L., Lubell, J., & Villarreal, M. (2017). Evaluation of the Compass Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) programs with public housing agencies in Lynn and Cambridge, Massachusetts. Abt Associates.	An evaluation of selected quantitative outcomes of Compass's FSS programs in Lynn and Cambridge, Massachusetts.	Used a comparison group of HCV holders enrolled in other New England PHAs. The comparison group was identified using propensity scores designed to match for likelihood of choosing to enroll in the Compass FSS program.	Treatment group 256 HHs. Comparison group 771 HHs - first matched PHA and then matched HHs.
Moulton, S., Freiman, L., & Lubell, J. (2021). Quasi-experimental impacts of Family Self-Sufficiency programs administered by Compass Working Capital in partnership with housing agencies in Cambridge, Boston, and Lynn, MA. Abt Associates.	The effect of FSS on earned income and use of public benefits.	Used a matched comparison group based on PHA and HH to determine the sample, and difference-in-difference analysis to determine the impact.	HCV recipients in three PHAs in Eastern MA. Treatment group n = 564, all run by the same administer, Compass. The comparison group was drawn from other PHAs who were similar and located in neighboring states and then was weighted to match the size of the treatment group.
Verma, N., & Vermette, J. (2025). Supporting Economic Mobility Through HUD's Family Self-Sufficiency Program: Findings and Recommendations from the National Impact Evaluation. 27(1).	Evaluation of FSS program after 7 years	Randomized control design with households at each site. Analysis used regression-adjusted ordinary least squares, controlling for different member characteristics at the time of random assignment.	18 PHAs enrolled and randomly assigned 2,556 HH. Excludes HHs headed by individuals 62 or older.
Other Affordable Housing			
Dunn, A. (2011). Resident Services in subsidized housing for low-income families. Goldman School of Public Policy.	Examines the effectiveness of resident services across a number of outcomes using a variety of methods, including interviews, case studies, surveys of property owners, and analysis of data on police service calls.	Matched properties with services to those w/o services according to 4 criteria (total units, % of AMI, broad rental market, age of structure).	Samples varied depending on outcome. Based on matched pairs of properties (unit of measurement was the property): Police calls - 17 properties w/ services & 14 without services. Total units across all properties 3,006. Performance of low-income housing and resident turnover - matched pairs of 15 or 13 properties.
Plassmeyer, M., Brisson, D., & Lechuga-Peña, S. (2018). Impact of services on retaining subsidized housing. Journal of Urban Affairs, 40(2), 261–273.	Does use of services predict housing retention for Mercy households? Cumulatively, do more services used predict housing retention for Mercy households?	Used propensity score matching to match households who had received services with those that had not. Used two mixed effects logistic regression models. Controlled for housing site.	Included low-income HHs with at least one lease violation for late rent. Three samples were used depending on the type of services received: Social/Companionship: 757 HHs, 457 HH that used services and 282 that did not; Instrumental/Tangible Support: 777 HH, 509 received services and 268 did not; Information Support: 819 HHs, 538 received services and 281 that did not. All HHs came from 29 sites across 7 states.
Wright, B., Li, G., Weller, M., & Vartanian, K. (2016). Health in housing: Exploring the intersection between housing and health care (pp. 1–44). Center for Outcomes Research and Education.	Does offering healthcare services on site help residents with their health needs?	Used difference-in-difference analysis to measure the difference in pre/post change for residents in units without on-site healthcare services and residents in units with on-site services. Also used multivariate regression to understand the influence of each type of service. The multivariate analysis controlled for the type of property.	145 properties located in Portland, Oregon including family housing, senior housing and permanent supportive housing (PSH). Included a total of 1,625 individuals: 916 families; 278 PSH; and 431 seniors.