Centre for Homelessness Impact
Better evidence for a world without homelessness

Personal grants protocol addendum

Centre for Homelessness Impact | July 2026

Authors: Michael Sanders, Susannah Hume, Hannah Piggott

1. Reason for this addendum

This addendum to the Personal Grants protocol has been created following an error in the implementation of the survey as set out in the original protocol. The Residential Timeline Follow Back Inventory (RTLFB) was scripted incorrectly in the survey. This meant participants were only able to select higher level options to describe their housing situation, rather than more detailed options. This approach limited our ability to calculate the proportion of days participants spent experiencing homelessness, as higher level categories contain a mix of homeless/non-homeless specific options.

All baseline data collection has been completed with the incorrect outcome measure. A total of 99 participants, who completed the midline survey, were also surveyed using the incorrect outcome measure.

The published protocol specified collection of RTLFB data for the six months preceding baseline. In implementation, the survey instrument collected housing information for the three months preceding baseline. This deviation does not affect treatment allocation or randomisation but should be considered alongside the survey programming error when interpreting the baseline housing measures.

The changes to the protocol set out below are intended to mitigate the impact of this error and strengthen the robustness of the final analysis.

2. Design Changes

There are no substantive changes to the design of the trial. However, due to the reduced predictive power of the baseline RTLFB measure, and the observed level of midline attrition, the planned analysis of the housing security outcome has been revised. Revised power calculations have been completed and are included in the interim report, alongside the updated analytical approach set out below.

3. Changes to data collection

There have been several changes to the data collection prompted by this error. These are:

- 99 Participants had their midline values for the Residential Timeline Follow Back Inventory collected incorrectly between 28 October 2025 and 19 January 2026. These participants were recontacted by the research team and the

embedded researcher with a shortened survey just containing the Residential Timeline Follow Back Inventory, this time without the error; and the OMRA Simplified Tool on housing quality and satisfaction. Participants received an incentive payment for completing this survey. Participants who did not complete this shortened survey will be treated as missing for the RTLFB housing outcome at the midline analysis point. They remain included in the intention-to-treat population for the twelve-month analysis.

- The endline survey, as well as asking participants to recall the 3 to 12 month period for the Residential Timeline Follow Back Inventory, will also ask participants about this outcome in the 0 to 3 month period. If a participant completes this at endline but not midline, then this value will be used in the midline analysis conducted at twelve months. If they complete both then we will prefer their response at midline in the event of disagreement.
- Delivery partners were contacted and asked to provide their data on participants' housing status at the time of recruitment (based on the categories in the Residential Timeline Follow Back Inventory). Delivery partners were provided with a £250 'thank you' payment.

Table 01: Data sources and decision rules for housing outcome analyses

Time period	Original protocol	What actually happened	Additional data collected	Data used in final analysis	Decision rule / priority
Baseline (0-3 months) Protocol specified (0-6 months)	RTLFB collected at baseline	RTLFB collected with incorrect scripting; only high-level housing categories available, and only collected for 0-3 months	Delivery partner housing status at recruitment	Baseline housing covariates and delivery partner information used to adjust analyses (not baseline RTLFB outcome)	Used as an additional variable, null imputed where missing, in the endline analysis as a participant characteristic.
Midline (0-3 months after randomisation)	RTLFB collected	First 99 participants completed incorrect RTLFB; later participants completed	Re-contact survey for affected participants using corrected RTLFB	Corrected midline RTLFB used where available	Correct midline RTLFB takes precedence over other measures.

		corrected RTLFB			
Midline (participants without corrected RTLFB)	Not applicable	Valid midline RTLFB unavailable	Endline survey asks participants to recall months 0-3	Recalled 0-3 month RTLFB used only where corrected midline RTLFB is unavailable	Used only if a corrected midline RTLFB is unavailable. If both corrected midline and endline recall are available but differ, use only corrected midline as less subject to recall biases.
Endline (3-12 months after randomisation)	RTLFB covering months 3-12	No change	Standard endline survey	Primary endline analysis	Standard analysis using the revised analytical specification.

4. Summary of analytical changes

The analysis plan has been revised to account for the incomplete baseline RTLFB measure and to strengthen the credibility of the final housing analysis. Both the three-month and twelve-month housing outcomes will now be treated as primary analyses. As the original baseline RTLFB outcome cannot be used as planned, the adjusted model will instead include a pre-specified set of baseline predictors: housing status, financial stability, housing satisfaction and contact with public services for health. Delivery partner information on participants' baseline housing situation will also be included where available. In addition, exploratory analyses will examine binary homelessness, time spent in one's home, time spent in temporary accommodation, and housing trajectories over time, to triangulate the primary findings and assess whether the pattern of results is consistent across different housing measures.

a) Revised Analytical specification

The primary analysis for this trial will now be conducted through an ordinary least squares regression specified as;

$$Y_{ic1} = \alpha + \beta_1 D_c + \beta_2 \rho_i + \beta_3 \gamma_\gamma + \beta_4 X_i + \beta_5 Y^{\gamma}_{\ i} + \epsilon_c$$

Where Y_{ic1} is the score for the outcome measure at the time being analysed for individual i in cluster c.
α is a regression constant.
D_c is a treatment status of the cluster, c
ρ_i is a vector of baseline control variables for this individual, following analysis specified below (Specification of Controls).
γ is the delivery organisation fixed effect
X_i is a vector of participant characteristics including housing status defined by the delivery partner if non-missing.
Y^{γ}_i is a measure of participants' baseline housing status as identified by delivery organisation, identified for those participants for whom this data is collected successfully, and set to 0 else, with an additional binary indicator for missingness of this variable.

ϵ_c is a clustered error term

The term ρ_i replaces the previously specified Y_{ic0} expression of the baseline outcome measure, reflecting that we are no longer conducting a pure AR(1) model. Y^{γ}_i is also added as a term to attempt to offer better explanation of the baseline level of the outcome measure, with data gathered from delivery partners. Where missing, this variable is null imputed, but we note that this null imputation may be perfectly collinear on the γ term denoting the fixed effect.

X_i is an additional term capturing participant characteristics to help compensate for a loss of power resulting from the loss of the pure baseline outcome measure.

Otherwise the analytical approach remains unchanged, and the analytical approach for all secondary measures is unchanged.

b) Specification of Controls

Per the specification above, we have identified the best approach to weighting and including additional variables from the baseline dataset into the analysis for the endline for the RTLFB. This aims to compensate for the lack of a robust baseline measure for this variable, due to the measurement error described above.

This analysis in essence aims to identify which variables, weighted how, should be included in the vector; ρ_i, specified as part of our endline analysis. In order to investigate this, we conducted analysis in which every baseline variable (excluding demographics

which are included by default) is tested to identify its predictive value for the outcome measure, both by itself and in combination with other variables. This is tested for an increasing number of combinations, until the marginal return to adjusted R squared is zero, signifying that although additional explanatory power can be gleaned from additional variables being added (as is mechanically the case), this is negligible.

All explanatory variables are entered linearly into the data, with the exception of participants' housing status at the point of recruitment, which is included as a categorical variable.

For each regression conducted, the R squared is retained, and then the next regression in the sequence is conducted, until all combinations of variables have been regressed. In total, 537,824 regressions were conducted, testing different combinations of baseline outcome measures, up to combinations of five variables. In practice, the adjusted R squared ceased increasing at the point where five variables were introduced, and so only 38,416 regressions were used in this analysis, although some of these are duplicates, with approximately 6,400 unique regressions conducted.

This analysis was then duplicated to test different weights applied to the variables within this regression. Ultimately, this did not affect the quality of the model, and so we prefer the linear addition of variables, as this minimises analytical complexity.

The four variables to be included in the vector ρ_i are;

- Housing status (categorical)
- Financial Stability
- Housing Satisfaction
- Contact with Public Services (Health)

Taken together, these variables provide an R squared of 0.264. In combination with the other explanatory variables, the R squared is 0.358. This indicates that our power calculations (which assume an R squared of combined covariates of 0.25), is potentially conservative.

c) Exploratory analysis

Additional formulations

In order to try and provide additional detail on housing movements, we will undertake a series of pre-specified exploratory analyses using the RTLFB data formulated in different ways which may be less subject to bias, and allow us to triangulate our findings.

- A binary measure (homeless/ not homeless) of whether the participant reported ever being in one of the detailed sub-categories classified as homelessness at the 3-month mark;
- How long they had spent (out of 90 days) in high-level category A (own home); and,
- How long they had spent (out of 90 days) in high-level category C (temporary accommodation).

d) Dynamics

We will attempt to model participants' continuous lived experience of homelessness using the RTLFB Inventory. We will do this graphically, using local polynomial regression for both treatment and control group, plotted with confidence intervals. This approach is necessarily exploratory, due to the number of tests it entails, but it will allow us to map the dynamics of responsiveness to the treatment. This is important, because the current 'proportion of time' analysis implied in the protocol and in the above analytical specification is forced to make potentially arbitrary decisions about the point(s) in time at which analysis should be undertaken.

5. Additional data collection efforts

Data collection for the endline for this survey will begin 16th July 2026. This process will learn the lessons from retention trials currently underway between CHI and KCL, in order to maximise response rates.

In addition, the research team will;

- Monitor response rates weekly and take evasive action as needed.
- Identify priority groups (eg control group) where response levels are low. This will be undertaken on a weekly basis.
- Utilise additional research resource as needed.

An embedded researcher will lead data collection, with priority cases based on characteristics identified to this embedded researcher on a weekly basis.

In addition, research assistants will be engaged whose role is specifically to support the second wave of endline data collection (beginning two weeks after the main data collection for each individual has begun), with the following incentivisation approach for the research assistants:

Finally, participants' incentives to respond will be increased two weeks after (at the start of their third week/on day 15) they started being eligible for data collection from

£20 per person to £30. This approach may be further enhanced, depending on the results of an ongoing trial of this approach, and subject to ethical clearance.