The term ‘hardest to reach’ is too fatalistic. It is our job to ensure that we reach disadvantaged citizens (‘Home to Work’ project broker).

A new life

Aung\(^1\) thought he would have peace of mind when he came to live in Australia. After all his family had enough money to eat, a roof over their heads and they could sleep. For the first six months he would wake up every two hours thinking he was still in the refugee camp ready to take his turn watching out for fire bombs which would emerge like hungry dragons from the black jungle. As a young boy he had watched his neighbours burn to death in their hut. He would never forget their screams. That was the last time he had slept through the night.

Aung would always be grateful to the Australian people for his new life. His children had settled in so well; they loved their school and had learned English so quickly. Things were more difficult for him and his wife. Although they could both read and write they had had no formal education in the camps. Mai had even become head of the primary school and he had worked as a nurse. But those years of work meant nothing here. Aung and Mai were now feeling a different form of pressure. In the camps they had been respected, hardworking members of their communities. The community relied on them. In Australia their years of work counted for nothing. If only they could improve their English they could get the qualifications they need and eventually good jobs. The project had given them hope. In a few short months his English had improved and he could look up into people’s eyes and speak some English. He was fed up of looking at the floor all the time...

Aung and Mai, culturally and linguistically diverse participant

\(^1\)The names of these ‘Home to Work’ participants have been fictionalized to protect their anonymity.
Making choices

I don’t feel excluded. I make choices. Social services have always made assumptions about me because I don’t fit neatly into any of their boxes. They think that I spend the day in front of a television set. If they followed me around for the day they would realise that I have a busy life. I do things. I always try to improve myself. Learn new things. The whole system is organised through their eyes, they have no understanding of how we live. Just because we are unemployed it doesn’t mean that we have no commitments. You can be busy and unemployed but they don’t get that. It’s like two tribes. This project is different. They don’t make assumptions. They treat me like a human being...

Don, single middle-aged participant

Managing and recovering

My life has changed so much since I started with ‘Home to Work’. I was in jail with no prospects; only crime. I now have work, new friends, a methadone program and a good place to live. I can now see a better life for my partner and me. ‘Home to Work’ has been the best support; they did not give up on me when I went to jail. They kept in contact the whole time and kept me positive, they also made sure my girlfriend was getting help and was safe until I got out of jail...

Andy, young person participant

Getting a start

I am starting to feel safer. The project has helped. The last year has been unbelievable. If I was on my own I could get by. But he's the most important thing going in my life. He is my life. I will do all I can to keep him safe and give him a good start. After it happened I couldn't find anyone to help me. We slept on floors for quite a while. It was really difficult to find out what help we could get. I now have a better idea of the services I can get. I'm happier, he's happier and I feel we've got a chance. I just hope this feeling lasts. It's been like this for me since I was 10...

Mel, young single parent participant

Starting over

My marriage has been over for a while now. This has been confusing for me and my son but I am now starting to cope. Before this project it was difficult to find help. When I married him, I married into the Australian way of life. My people didn't want to know me anymore. It was not easy because it meant leaving my community. Before I was married I was always asked to embassy events; not anymore.

I really want to work as a chef but child care is so expensive. Many of us on this project want to work but can only do so in jobs that have difficult hours. A chef has to work in the evenings. A cleaner has to work early and late. If you have kids you need minders and they cost. If you have family they can help; if you don't then you really struggle...

Jang, middle aged parent participant
**Being me**

Being me is difficult. I need to spend a long time with somebody before I can feel comfortable. They look at me and know I am different. I can see it in their eyes. So I panic a lot. ‘Home to Work’ has given me confidence. They listen to me and always try and help. My new job allows me to use my art. People treat me well. I no longer see things in their eyes and I can stay longer. I love my work; it makes me feel part of things...

Susan, single middle-aged participant

**Finding peace**

I have a lot of responsibilities; for my children, my family, my people. They all look to me to pick up the pieces when things go wrong. I do the best I can but I get very tired. The project works for me because it takes some pressure off. I get little bits of help that make a difference. It gives me some peace...

Honor, single parent, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander participant
Introduction

The Government believes all Australians have the right to learn, work, be part of their community and be heard on issues which matter to them. The principles of social inclusion have a rich tradition in Australian culture. We think of ourselves as an egalitarian nation that values fairness and equality. We are self-reliant, but offer help to those in need. All Australians should have the opportunity to enjoy their full potential. The Government’s role is to build the right foundations: a strong economy; the opportunity to work, learn, and enjoy life; and the right services for people who need them.


In 2012, there remains a small group of citizens, spread across Canberra, who are living deeply challenging lives. These citizens and their dependents share our communities, our hopes and our own daily interactions with society. Yet many are trapped in a spiral of indebtedness, drug dependency, poor mental health and crime. Others are experiencing other forms of exclusion due to limited language capabilities, the lack of basic education or the absence of social support networks. While others, are recovering from long-term trauma due to child abuse, neglect or domestic violence. All are rebounding between service interventions without ever getting the coordinated help they need. The decline in social capital – the networks of trust, mutual assistance and reciprocity that help connect us as human beings – impacts most dramatically on this group of citizens – people who suffer from multiple exclusions. An increasing number ofCanberrans are in Robert Putnam’s (2002) terms ‘bowling alone’ and it is now recognized both nationally and internationally that the fundamental role of progressive social policy is to reconnect these citizens to civil society through the creation of new support networks to allow them to live full and rewarding lives. The ‘Home to Work’ project attempts to provide a bridge between citizens experiencing multiple exclusions and their community. Hence, the aim of this evaluation is to assess the capacity of the project to perform this bridging role.

Our findings are organised into eight substantive sections and a conclusion.

The Terms of Reference are rehearsed in Section 3 and serve as a standard for identifying the minimum contribution that users can expect from this evaluation. It then provides an overview of the research design which has been developed to meet the Terms of Reference and the constraints which have impacted on the process of data collection.
Section 4 then provides a brief review of the principles of design underpinning international better practice in combating social exclusion through place-based service delivery focusing on social housing. This will provide a benchmark for assessing ‘Home to Work’ project delivery and outcomes in subsequent sections of this report.

Section 5 turns to issues of project design and provides a thick description of the design of the ‘Home to Work’ project encompassing its aims, target groups, why and how the project was conceived; problem definition, project inception and the key features of the delivery system (how the project was coordinated and participants engaged).

Section 6 provides a profile of the four cohorts of participants who have undertaken the project. It draws on data derived from ACT Housing, the deployment of a Common Assessment Framework (CAF) by brokers with participants and qualitative research conducted with participants.

Section 7 presents an assessment of the quality of project delivery from the perspective of participants. It provides an insight into their views on: what they hoped to get out of the project; what they got; what they didn’t get; the quality of support they received; the quality of project coordination they experienced; the degree of influence project participants had on the design of the project; their level of satisfaction with the project as a whole; and, their views on how the project could be improved.

Section 8 provides an account of seven participant journeys which reflect typical pathways through the project. This will allow for professional reflection on the critical interventions necessary to enrich the participant experience.

Section 9 provides an assessment of the role of the Governance Group in project management, coordination and enhancement.

In conclusion, Section 10 is organised into three parts. Part one presents an overview of the project’s achievement. Part two identifies the barriers confronting the ‘Home to Work’ project. Part three reviews some critical interventions which could help ameliorate these barriers drawing partly on the findings of a Delphi survey. Part four completes the evaluation on a positive note by recording the project’s key achievements when benchmarked against international better practice.
3

Terms of reference and research design

3.1. Introduction

This section provides an overview of the Terms of Reference informing the evaluation task, the research design which was developed to meet these terms and the constraints which have emerged in the process of data collection. The discussion is organised into four parts. Part one presents the Terms of Reference. Part two identifies the principles of engagement informing our approach to this evaluation including operational terms and methods. Part three provides an overview of the learning process. Part four poses some ethical issues for consideration. Part five identifies certain constraints on data collection which should be recognised at the outset.

3.2. Terms of reference

The research which follows was commissioned as part of DEEWR’s support to the ‘Home to Work’ pilot project through the Innovation Fund. Our remit is to provide a developmental evaluation of the progress that ‘Home to Work’ has made in realising its objectives with the fundamental aim of enhancing the quality of project management, delivery and outcomes for job seekers in Canberra. By implication it was expected that the evaluator adopt an action research approach to allow for findings to be integrated into decision processes to enhance the quality of delivery as the project progressed:

A comprehensive and independent evaluation of the ‘Home to Work’ project will inform the ongoing development of a responsive, co-ordinated service system and the strategic policy framework which underpins it. The evaluation will assess tenant outcomes as well as the contributing and inhibiting factors to project success at an individual, service and community level. Lessons learned will be extrapolated across other areas in the ACT and contribute to national debates.

The ANZSOG Institute for Governance was selected for this task due to its track record in action based research and its philosophy of integrating theoretical and practice-based concerns (see: ANZSIG, 2011a&b). In sum, this evaluation should be both of intellectual interest and practical value.
3.3. Principles of engagement

The nature of this evaluation required seven principles of engagement.

i. Systematic and objective assessment

We understand evaluation as the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation and outcomes. The aim of an evaluation is normally to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process.

ii. A developmental approach

A developmental approach is adopted anchored in designing an evaluation which has broad ownership amongst core stakeholders. The emphasis in this form of evaluation is placed on organisational learning and lesson-drawing i.e. drawing lessons from best practices nationally and internationally and using them to promote progressive change. This required the creation of a participatory learning environment based on the concepts of mutualism and reciprocity between the evaluation team, project brokers and members of the project Governance Group. Indeed, the Governance Group itself became the key institutional venue for organisational learning and lesson-drawing. In addition, a co-design workshop was held at the outset of the evaluation to establish broad consensus on evaluation design issues.²

iii. ‘Objective-led’ evaluation

The Evaluation Team engaged in an ‘objective-led’ evaluation i.e. the aim of this evaluation is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of ‘Home to Work’ objectives in terms of the ‘effectiveness’, ‘impact/influence’ and ‘sustainability’ of governance objectives.

iv. Collaborative analysis

The evaluation findings have been synthesised through collaborative analysis in Governance group meetings. Hence the learning process has involved iterative processes in which findings have been presented to the Governance Group followed by a process of collaborative analysis and a review of prescriptive possibilities. This process maximises utilisation of the research findings and ensures that the evaluation provides information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the project workplan and broader institutional memory.

v. Best practice guidelines

The evaluation follows best practice guidelines as developed by the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank (see Appendix 1).

vi. Action-based research

The research draws on the best traditions of action-based research. What do we mean by action-based research? Action-based research refers to the production of research which has ‘explanatory’, ‘descriptive’ and ‘prescriptive’ objectives. It differs from applied research in two respects. Firstly, it includes senior practitioners in both the production and the analysis of research findings. Secondly, it aims to produce research which can immediately be integrated within decision processes. This approach recognises that academic knowledge about public administration should be used for its betterment not just because all that we do as scholars of public administration and public policy is rooted in practice but that because the defence of bureaucracy and the achievement of social progress demand it. Furthermore, engaging in ‘enlightened’ prescription founded on strong principles of inclusiveness, academic freedom and social scientific rigour helps to improve explanations and understandings of administrative subjects.

vii. Mixed methods

The success of an evaluation primarily rests on the selection of the appropriate methodology or mixtures of methodologies for assessing the delivery of organisational aims and objectives through the evaluation of the impact of institutional outputs. This evaluation adopted a mixed methods approach and identifies both qualitative and quantitative metrics for measuring the success of the project. We rely heavily on qualitative interviews with key informants, participatory observation and the drawing of lessons from other cases that are similar or comparable. This approach does not require the establishment of given truths (‘proof’ of impact), but seeks to provide a narrative interpretation of the links between an intervention and any impacts that occur.

Measuring project success is not straightforward – it often takes a significant period of time before clear patterns of influence can be established, influence can rarely be attributed to one actor, there are often competing claims to influence which need to be interrogated and, of course, there are outside forces inherent in institutional and political power relations which can make it happen or not. Essentially, success is measured on the basis of the realisation of project goals. The more complex the goals; the more difficult measurement can be. The key to evaluating influence is to draw on a broad range of data and use mixed methods to build a preponderance of evidence in support of a particular narrative of influence.

3.4. The learning process

In keeping with the seven principles of engagement outlined above, this evaluation has involved eight iterative stages of collaborative investigation and analysis (see Figure 3.1).

(i) Co-design workshop on the proposed research design (see Appendix 2).

The purpose of this workshop was to build trust between the evaluation team and core stakeholders and determine the research design for evaluating progress in relation to achieving project objectives. It also provided us with preliminary insight into:

a) the challenges and opportunities confronting the project;
b) the institutional conditions for effective delivery of project objectives;
c) the skills set which brokers require to discharge their responsibilities effectively;
Figure 3.1. The learning process

- d) development needs; and,
- e) identification of innovative practice for further investigation.

(ii) Co-design of participant, governance group and staff questionnaires (see Appendices 4, 5 and 6).

The data derived from this process helped us to develop relevant and nuanced survey tools which allowed for the interrogation of key concepts in social inclusion as well as practice-based issues.

(iii) Interviews with brokers, the project coordinator, the project designer and governance stakeholders.

A series of one-hour ‘one to one’ interviews with the project coordinator, the project brokers and governance stakeholders, helped us to identify implementation patterns and puzzles, and examples of best practice for further investigation. These interviews paid particular attention to project coordination issues in collaborative service delivery.

(iv) Cohort interviews with participants.

The project was delivered in four ‘three-month’ phases to four cohorts of participants. Cohort interviews were organized through the Project Coordinator and brokers to provide us with their perception of the progress that ‘Home to Work’ has made in enhancing community engagement for tenants in addition to improving opportunities to participate in community activities, programs, training and work.
(v) Identification of international best practice.

A review of international best practices in combating social exclusion through place-based service delivery was conducted to identify a benchmark to assess ‘Home to Work’ project delivery and outcomes.

(vi) A focus group with brokers and the project coordinator on critical dilemmas.

A focus group was constituted with brokers and the project coordinator to build a detailed understanding of participant journeys through the project and the key obstacles that they need to negotiate.

(vii) Presentation and collaborative analysis of findings at two Governance Group meetings.

Two progress reports were presented to the Governance Group for collaborative analysis. This allowed us to generate strong data on the critical dilemmas confronting the project and review mitigating strategies.

(viii) Delphi Analysis.

In the final stage of project evaluation we utilised the Delphi survey technique (initially developed by Dalkey and Helmer, 1963, at the Rand Corporation) to distil the views, ideas and germination of potential mitigating strategies for solving project dilemmas.

3.5. Ethics

This evaluation was granted ethics approval by the University of Canberra’s Human Research Ethics Committee. Our submission recognised two ethical guidelines which should inform evaluation work with participants from vulnerable groups. The participatory philosophy underpinning this evaluation recognizes the normative argument that where possible evaluation should be based on principles of co-design and equal relationships between researcher and participants and that evaluation should work to empower beneficiaries (Beresford, 2005). However, we also recognize that this approach needs to be underpinned by clear processes of informed consent to ensure confidentiality and anonymity. Evaluations in this area have to be particularly careful about securing informed consent, and making sure that participants fully understand what is happening and how the information they provide will be used. With this aim in mind all participants received a brief presentation on the purpose and implications of the evaluation at the outset of one-to-one interviews and focus groups and required to sign a consent form. In subsequent reporting processes and outputs all participants will remain anonymous.

3.6. Constraints on data collection

Two key constraints emerged in the process of data collection which tempers the statistical significance of the knowledge claims arising from this evaluation. Firstly, the quantitative component of an outcomes evaluation should ideally involve both pre- and post-project measurement of indicators, collected from both project participants and from a suitable comparison group, adopting a ‘difference of differences’ methodology that would allow tentative conclusions to be drawn about the impact of the ‘Home to Work’ project. However, this approach was not possible within the confines of the project due to: a) the relatively
small number of project participants (81) which made it impossible to detect statistically significant observations; b) problems with matching the project participants with a comparable group not participating in the project (especially given the diversity of outcomes that may be expected for individual participants); and, c) the paucity of pre-project data on participants. Secondly, we were only able to arrange qualitative interviews with 65.4% of participants. However, what is most important about an outcome evaluation is that it measures important achievements, and this has been possible.

3.7. Summary

In summary then, a ‘realistic evaluation’ approach (see: Pawson and Tilly, 1997 and Arksey in Taylor and Baloch, eds., 2005) was adopted for this project involving all key governance stakeholders and a representative sample of participants to discover what works, for whom and under what circumstances. This approach recognizes the importance of focusing on both project process and outcomes. Qualitative data has been generated to provide a strong understanding of the quality of the process of design and delivery and both qualitative and quantitative data is presented to provide an impact assessment of the extent to which the project achieved intended outcomes for individual participants. The evaluation therefore adopted a mixed methods approach, appropriate to a complex, community-based initiative such as ‘Home to Work’, in which interventions are multi-faceted, individually-tailored and flexible, and goals are not uniform across individual participants. The evaluation was designed to cope with these complexities through a process of collaborative design and analysis with key stakeholders and participants. This type of flexibility reflects best practice in the evaluation of complex initiatives (see, for example, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004).
Better practice design in place-based service delivery: the case of social housing

While politicians have sometimes shied away from tackling the most entrenched issues around people with multiple needs, new YouGov polling shows that the public are very concerned about this group and think government has a responsibility to make a difference. Politicians should stop being nervous of public opinion and embrace people’s desire for real change (Peter Kellner, pollster, quoted in Fabian Society, 2010, p. 9).

4.1. Introduction

This section provides a brief review of the principles of design underpinning international better practice in combating social exclusion through place-based service delivery. This will provide a benchmark for assessing ‘Home to Work’ project delivery and outcomes in subsequent sections of this report. The argument is organized into three parts. Part one identifies the core assumptions underpinning recent practice-based interventions to support citizens’ experiencing multiple needs and exclusions. Part two then constructs 16 better practice design principles from the practice based literature. In part three the evidence on the cost effectiveness of place-based service delivery is interrogated.

4.2. What do we know about citizens’ experiencing multiple needs and exclusions?

Better practice interventions in this area tend to be guided by two claims about citizens’ experiencing multiple needs and exclusions. Firstly, the decline in social capital – the networks of trust, mutual assistance and reciprocity that help connect us – impacts most dramatically on people who suffer from multiple exclusions. By implication, an increasing number of citizens are ‘bowling alone’ (Putnam, 2000) and the role of progressive social policy is to reconnect alienated citizens to civil society through the creation of new support networks. Secondly, it is claimed that stable social housing (a form of place) can provide a bridge between the excluded and civil society because it provides a unique opportunity structure for wrapping a range of appropriate services around a citizen and empowering them to transform their lives. These two claims underpin the ‘Housing First’ (see Gordon, 2010) approach deployed in urban housing policy in the United States and social inclusion/exclusion approaches in the UK. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation report Tackling homelessness and exclusion: understanding complex lives, which was published earlier this year is particularly instructive on the potential role of public housing in combating social
exclusion (see Appendix 4). The ‘Housing First’ approach is presently used in Melbourne and Adelaide and constitutes a departure from the traditional pathways approach typically used in Australia (Box 4.1 provides an overview of first principles and delivery components). It is also noteworthy that the ACT’s (ACT CMD, 2009) own research in this area which was commissioned by the Community Inclusion Board also proceeds from these two claims.

**Box 4.1. ‘Housing First’ principles and delivery components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Homelessness is first and foremost a housing problem and should be treated as such.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Housing is a right to which all are entitled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People who are homeless or on the verge of homelessness should be returned to or stabilised in permanent housing as quickly as possible and connected to resources necessary to sustain that housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Issues that may have contributed to a household’s homelessness can best be addressed once they are housed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery components provided through single or multiple agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Emergency services that address the immediate need for shelter or stabilisation in current housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Housing, resource and support services assessment which focuses on housing needs, preferences, and barriers; resource acquisition (e.g. entitlements); and identification of services needed to sustain housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Housing placement assistance including housing location and placement; financial assistance with housing costs (e.g. security deposit, first month’s rent, move-in and utilities connection, short or long-term housing subsidies; advocacy and assistance in addressing housing barriers (e.g. poor credit history or debt, prior eviction, criminal conviction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Case management services (frequently time limited) specifically focused on maintaining permanent housing or the acquisition and sustainment of permanent housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Gordon (2010)*

### 4.3. Better practice design principles on what works

Sixteen better practice design principles can be constructed from the practice based literature in this area. These design principles proceed from two behavioural assumptions about citizens experiencing multiple needs and exclusions and reflect the virtues of place, personalisation of support, choice and responsibility and collaborative governance.

**Behavioural assumptions**

1. The most socially excluded groups are the hardest to reach and the least able to engage effectively with services (ACT CMD, UK, US).
2. Participants share a strong community identity and a strong antipathy for government (UK, US).
The virtue of place

3. Place based programs only work well if they have full strategic and political support (ACT CMD, UK, US).
4. Place based programs work well because they simplify the complexities associated with joining-up several services (systems change) and the participants’ interaction with those services (system navigation) (ACT CMD, UK, US).
5. Place matters in terms of the availability of ‘key workers’ and the provision of ‘settled accommodation’ (UK, US).

The virtue of personalisation

6. Place based programs work well if they are personalized through a key worker model (ACT CMD, UK, US).
7. The relationship between the key worker and the participant is crucial to achieving progressive outcomes (the key worker or lead provider model) (ACT CMD, UK, US).
8. The quality of the brokerage is crucial to achieving progressive outcomes (ACT CMD, UK, US).
9. The role of the key worker in raising the confidence and self-esteem of the participant is crucial to achieving progressive outcomes (UK, US).
10. Place based programs lend themselves to individual budgets (UK, US).
11. Program success can only be comprehensively measured through the lens of the individual journeys of the participants as they tend to be navigating multiple needs and exclusions (UK, US).

The virtues of choice and responsibility

12. Place based programs work well if they are flexible to the needs and lives of the participants and proceed from a philosophy of co-design with genuine choice. Participants respond well to increased choice and responsibility (UK, US).
13. Participants must opt in for support and thereafter have rights and obligations (mutual obligation) (UK, US).
14. Place based programs offer the opportunity for early intervention (UK, US).
15. Place based programs work well if they are sensitive to the need to help participants to negotiate difficult transition points in their lives (UK, US).

The virtue of collaborative governance

16. Place-based service delivery will only work well if there is a corresponding cultural shift across other local services and agencies (a systems or holistic approach) (ACT CMD, UK, US) which leads to the removal of barriers to joined-up working.

**4.4. Cost effective as well as local and personal?**

There is mounting evidence that dealing with citizens’ experiencing multiple needs and exclusions through traditional service models doesn’t work and leads to significant costs to economy and society (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2011). For example, we know that effective drug treatment and homelessness services reduce public spending in the medium

---

3These design principles could be integrated into a social contract model of public housing.
term. Drug users cost government more than $20,000 per year but every $2 spent on drug treatment saves a minimum of $19 in associated health and crime costs (Godfrey et al., 2004). Many participants suffering from multiple exclusions draw heavily on the repetitive use of public services such as expensive emergency interventions. In the UK’s Making Every Adult Matter report in 2009, it was calculated that one offender alone cost $304,000 in policing, court and prison costs, $80,000 in hospital and drug treatment, $360,000 in accommodation and support and $75,000 on outreach support (2009, p. 22). It is surprising therefore that there has been no attempt to evaluate the costs of social exclusion through traditional service models in Australia.

4.5. Summary – what works needs to be proven

There are now strong clues in the practice-based literature on what works in combating social exclusion. However, we also know from the literature on policy learning that the first law of place is that you should not make the assumption that what will work in one community will necessarily work in another, even if the two communities share certain social, political or cultural characteristics (Evans, 2010). What works always needs to be proven.
Project design

'Home to work' is a partnership of government and community agencies; a purpose-built partnership that shares governance, information and skills between Government and community sector agencies (Project designer).

5.1. Introduction

This section provides a narrative of the design of the 'Home to Work' project encompassing its aims, target groups, why and how the project was conceived; problem definition, project inception and the key features of the delivery system (how the project was coordinated and participants engaged).

5.2. What is 'Home to Work'?

'Home to Work' is a one year place-based pilot project designed to integrate support and employment services for the most disadvantaged job seekers in Canberra: that is, public housing tenants in the inner-north postcode 2612. The project aims to enhance community engagement for tenants in addition to improving opportunities to participate in community activities, programs, training and work. 'Home to Work' is funded through the Australian Government's Innovation Fund which is coordinated by the Department of Education and Workplace Relations (DEEWR). The Innovation Fund was established by the Australian Government to address the needs of the most disadvantaged job seekers by piloting innovative place-based projects to overcome barriers to employment. It is claimed that effective responses to long-term unemployment require collaboration across the Commonwealth and Territory Governments and with non-government organisations. A further advantage afforded to the project through the acquisition of Innovation funding was access to an independent evaluation to provide an assessment of the progress that 'Home to Work' has made in realising its objectives:

*The evaluation will help inform a sustainability strategy (following the end of the pilot project funding) and inform ongoing improvements to service delivery, the strategic policy framework. The evaluation is a key component of the project and will be the foundation for systemic improvements in a number of arenas.*

---

The ‘Home to Work’ bid was deemed to be innovative by the Australian Government’s Innovation Fund because:

- Unlike other Innovation Fund projects, the project team drawn from Anglicare, ACT Housing and Northside Community Services partner directly with the ACT Government and build on existing client relationships with Housing ACT tenants to provide a continuity of service provision.
- The project also builds on existing funding relationships and networks between the ACT Government and community services providers to facilitate the involvement of support providers.
- It is rare in the Australian context that a non-governmental organization, in this case Anglicare Canberra-Goulburn, is placed in a principle agent position in the management of a social program.
- As the owner of asset, Housing ACT also has the capacity to manage the physical environment in which services will be provided and will also be able to explore employment avenues for tenants via its subcontractor base through the use of social procurement activities.
- The project integrates skills development, training and work with the provision of crisis and support services for some of the most disadvantaged individuals in the ACT who have been largely disengaged from the labour market.
- The project uses the secure tenure provided by social housing as a key intervention point to support social and economic participation (including the recently homeless, the long term unemployed, lone parent households, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and members of the culturally and linguistically diverse community).

5.3. Aims

The project aims to ensure that Commonwealth funded services (Job Service Australia and Disability Employment Network providers and Centrelink, for example) and ACT funded services (including public housing, crisis and support services) work together to minimise what public housing tenants have called the ‘service run-around’ and to optimise their opportunities.

5.4. Target groups

The project is place-based and located in the 2612 postcode (which includes the inner-north suburbs of Reid, Braddon and Turner) because of the relatively high levels of socio-economic disadvantage and long-term unemployment experienced in this area. The postcode also has concentrations of multi-unit public housing. An eligible participant for the project is defined as ‘a disadvantaged jobseeker, located in the 2612 postcode’ (Anglicare-Goulburn, 2011a, p.2). Key target groups include: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander individuals (ATSI); Culturally and Linguistically Diverse individuals (CALD); Single Parents; and, Young People (see Table 5.1). The project was designed for four cohorts of 20 participants delivered in four three-month cycles. Cohort 1 was comprised of participants known to Northside Community Services and invited to participate in the project. Participants on Cohorts 2, 3 and 4 were a mixture of referred participants and those who responded to cold calling and marketing.
5.5. Why and how was the project conceived?

The three project partners – the ACT government, Anglicare and Northside Community Services – were motivated to get involved in the ‘Home to Work’ project for a variety of reasons but the most significant was their long-term strategic interest in supporting citizens experiencing multiple exclusions and their belief in place-based service delivery through the conduit of public housing (see Table 5.1). The opportunistic bid to DEEWR’s Innovation Fund formed part of a longer-term strategic interest by the ACT Community Inclusion Board (ACIB) in developing new modes of collaborative governance to combat multiple exclusions experienced by long-term unemployed citizens in Canberra. Anglicare and Northside Community Services were natural partners in this enterprise. The ACIB had commissioned several reports which exposed problems of service run around for long term unemployed citizens and a study by NATSEM pointed to evidence which demonstrated the effectiveness of using public housing as an institutional venue for combating social exclusion (ACTCMD, 2009). As we saw in Section 4, this is in line with leading international thinking in social policy (Fabian Society, 2010).

The bid was written by a strategic policy officer in the ACT Chief Minister’s Department with help from ACT Housing:

We only had three weeks to get the bid together. But we benefited from previous work conducted by the ACTCIB which showed that place in terms of postcode and public housing mattered. Housing was interested in the whole social capital issue.

The successful bid also reflected the importance of having a strategic policy officer focusing on whole of government social policy issues both upward to the Commonwealth and outwards to the community sector. ‘Home to Work’ was the only project submitted to the Innovation Fund that involved a state governmental entity. The critical success factors in the bid included: the utilisation of evidence based research; good partner relations; a broad skills set; and considerable thought was paid to the governance structure.

**Table 5.1. What motivated project partners to get involved in the ‘Home to Work’ project?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivator</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Anglicare</th>
<th>Northside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approached by ACT Chief Minister’s Dept.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in place-based service delivery through public housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrated disadvantage in small trouble-spots in Canberra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attraction of Innovation funding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term strategic interest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social entrepreneurship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The approach underpinning ‘Home to Work’ is best expressed in the following quotes from three group members:
Place-based delivery is about forming a coalition of reliance with the local community’ (Governance Group member).

Place-based delivery is a new model of support for the long-term unemployed who haven’t had success through traditional methods (Governance Group member).

Place-based delivery is about making sure that the support is done in a geographically and socially appropriate setting’ (Governance Group member).

It is also evident that the majority of ‘Home to Work’ partners considered the project to be an experiment in innovation. It was an opportunity to:

‘use resources and opportunities to connect the long-term unemployed with the community’; ‘make new services for the hardest to reach’; ‘build capacities to engage’; ‘of identifying changing cultures and interdependencies’; and, of ‘investigating whether collaboration ripples through to the community and whether it looks or operates differently’ (Project partners).

Table 5.2 describes the distinctive features of Home to Work from the perspective of project partners.

Table 5.2. What are the distinctive features of Home to Work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H2W is innovative because...</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Anglicare</th>
<th>Northside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High profile governance group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of key worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of risk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle agent role for NGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving approach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokering of expertise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on public housing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move from commercial landlord to a social landlord</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A formalised consortium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of how the system flows</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive bending of the rules</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6. Problem definition

The project partners all possess slightly different understandings of the problem but they all recognise the importance of ‘place’ and the role of public housing and acknowledge that citizens suffering from multiple exclusions require personalized support:
'Home to Work' provides comprehensive citizen-centred mentoring and support which ensures that they stay connected with work or training (Project partner and Governance Group member).

'Home to Work' helps Australia’s most disadvantaged unemployed citizens who have faced multiple barriers to employment find and keep a job (Project partner and Governance Group member).

'Home to Work' is different from mainstream employment assistance as it builds a community of support which keeps the most disadvantaged unemployed citizens connected to education, training and sustainable employment (Project partner and Governance Group member).

This lack of clarity is unsurprising given that social exclusion is a multi-dimensional problem reflecting different forms of disadvantage that are less visible in Canberra. Canberra possesses enclaves of disadvantage because of the historic decision made by the City’s founders to distribute public housing across the City rather than in specific areas.

5.7. Project inception and lessons from start-up

As the Project Designer notes, the key challenges confronting ‘Home to Work’ at the outset were: ‘how do we make the collaboration work? How do we build trusting relationships and work out roles and responsibilities?’ The original project design was a three-way negotiation between DEEWR, the ACT Chief Minister’s Department and Anglicare Canberra-Goulburn. However, as the ACT government is Anglicare's primary funding body at the beginning there was a clear sense of a first amongst equals: ‘It took a while before we felt able to say what we really thought’ (Project Broker). As we will see in Section 8, there is evidence to demonstrate significant frustration amongst operational staff at the slow rate of progress at the beginning of the project cycle:

*Set up did take longer than expected. We didn’t have the skills we needed at the beginning. Anglicare was going through a major period of organizational change and it took time to find the right project coordinator* (Project Designer).

Could the project have progressed more quickly? The main constraint on project development was the acquisition of funding. As the Project Designer put it, ‘We couldn’t really put resources into the project until we knew we had the funding’. In hindsight the key tasks to be completed in the design phase would be: working through contractual issues, protocols, and position descriptions; establishing clear roles and responsibilities for the brokers; and, detailed deliberation on issues relating to the project cycle and participant engagement. A body of knowledge now exists in this area to help subsequent projects.

The key area where this may have impacted adversely on the project was in the planning of the project cycle:

*I would have preferred larger cohorts with more time to do the capacity building. Three months is just not long enough to build the relationships and get people into a place where you can make a difference. We could also have used the last four months of the project cycle more effectively* (Project Broker).
Given the positive outcomes which were achieved by participants it is interesting to speculate at what could have been achieved with a longer period of time for capacity building. We will evaluate the costs of this approach in more detail in Section 8.

5.8. The delivery system

The ‘Home to Work’ project is delivered by three brokers and a Project Coordinator drawn from the three operational partners in governance – Anglicare-Canberra-Goulburn, ACT Housing and Northside Community Services. The Project Coordinator or Linkages Broker works for the principle agent for the project; Anglicare-Canberra-Goulburn. The project is governed through two groups – the Broker Group and the Governance Group (for Governance see Section 8). In theory, the former focuses on operational issues and the latter on broader strategic questions such as project design, coordination, sustainability and communications. The Broker group met regularly throughout the project to problem-solve and share lessons and information.

As Figure 5.1 illustrates, the defining characteristics of the delivery system are: the personalisation of participant engagement through the key worker model; identification of personal goals through the use of a Common Assessment Framework, the co-design of a strategy of support around employment, social inclusion, work experience and training and education development activities; ongoing mentoring; and, the provision of up to date information on new opportunities for engagement. The project offers participants a tailored menu of assistance with options, including: monthly counselling, initial employment assistance, ongoing mentoring to overcome barriers to participation, and social networking through 'Jobs Clubs’ and other inclusion activities.

The ‘Home to Work’ brokers engaged in intensive community consultation to identify individual, as well as group needs common to the Cohorts. This enables the project to employ a coordinated approach to determine and facilitate the most appropriate and relevant training and programs for individuals. The Housing Broker provided opportunities for participants to discuss their housing applications and issues, facilitated urgent maintenance work, and supporting participants in meeting their housing obligations and providing relevant documentation. The Linkages Broker liaises with participants regarding their employment support provider needs and boundaries to meet requirements. The Linkages Broker provides participants with phone cards to minimize barriers to communication between participants and Project Brokers. Utilising current ACG programs and supports as well as existing networks in the Community Sector, the Linkages Broker has also facilitated access to “work appropriate“ clothing (including appropriate interview wear) for a number of participants.

The role of the key worker for each participant will differ depending on the quality of the relationship they enjoy with the participant: ‘participants will naturally gravitate towards the broker they feel most comfortable with; as they would in any other social situation (Project Broker)’. In situations where the relationship isn’t working, the Brokers will work together to find an acceptable alternative for the participant. This notion of flexibility to the needs of the participant underpins the delivery system and often creates tensions with existing organisational rules, particularly in the housing arena: ‘We have to bend the rules from time to time to get the outcomes for participants. That’s the reality and the key learning from this project (Project Broker)’.

---

5 This figure was provided by the Project Coordinator.
Figure 5.1. Participant engagement in 'Home to Work'
5.9. Summary – working through ‘the mess’

The design of ‘Home to Work’ is in keeping with better international practices incorporating the virtues of place, personalisation, choice and responsibility and collaborative governance in combating social exclusion. The ‘Home to Work’ project promotes joint working both with participants and other agencies through the establishment of social purpose, clear goals, good will, flexibility, co-problem solving and information sharing. However, as a new mode of governance it does challenge government by the rules and requires new ways of working.
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A profile of ‘Home to Work’ participants

_Social exclusion is where process and outcome conspire to prevent escape_ (Governance group member)

6.1. Introduction

This section provides a profile of the four cohorts of participants who have undertaken the project. It draws on data derived from ACT Housing, the deployment of a Common Assessment Framework (CAF) by brokers with participants and qualitative research conducted with participants (see Appendix 6). It is organised into three substantive parts and a summary. Part one provides a snapshot of participants by group – Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander individuals (ATSI); Culturally and Linguistically Diverse individuals (CALD); Single Parents (SP); and, Young People (YP). Part two turns to issues of inclusion and exclusion and identifies the range of exclusions experienced by different participants and subgroups, and the degree of community integration they exhibit. Part three locates the barriers to effective participation that participants experienced prior to engaging through ‘Home to Work’.

6.2. Cohort profile

Table 1 provides a cohort profile of ‘Home to Work’ participants by gender and sub group. The best term to describe the four cohorts is “diverse”. Typically, the participants are drawn from marginalised groups that have experienced consistent difficulties in securing long term employment for multiple inter-related reasons.

Table 6.1. A snapshot of ‘Home to Work’ participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>ATSI</th>
<th>CALD</th>
<th>Single Parent</th>
<th>Young Person</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2. Issues of inclusion and exclusion

‘Home to Work’ participants experience multiple exclusions. Indeed, most participants are navigating at least four forms of exclusion (see Tables 6.2 and 6.3). The most significant of these are: low educational attainment rates (50% of males; 82% of females); unstable housing (85% of males; 70% of females); limited work experience and skills (50% of males; 80% of females); mental illness (70% of males; 36% of females); family breakdown (60% of males; 42% of females), and, the navigation of racial barriers (60% of males; 58% of females). All of these barriers are particularly acute for ATSI participants who also suffer from high levels of indebtedness (60%). It is noteworthy that the older the participant, the greater the problem of indebtedness (63%). Unsurprisingly, childcare is a particular problem for 84% of single parents, as are language barriers for CALD participants (96%).

Nevertheless, disadvantaged and marginalised groups in the ACT are surprisingly resilient in maintaining social capital and regularly get together socially with friends and relatives who do not live with them (see Tables 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, and 6.7). In short, the majority of participants are able to access social support networks. This provides a reasonably strong basis for finding individuals and organisations to help them which runs counter to the experience of many disadvantaged groups around the world who experience isolation and loneliness (Fabian Society, 2010). Although, it should be noted that there is a significant minority of single parents (40%) and older people (30%) who perceive themselves to be noticeably less well socially supported.
Table 6.3. Self-reported exclusions experienced by ‘Home to Work’ participants by sub group

- Affordable childcare
- CALD
- Child abuse
- Criminal record
- Debt
- Domestic Violence
- Economic dependency
- Family breakdown
- Language
- Mental illness
- Physical health problems
- Police Harassment
- Pregnancy
- Qualifications
- Race
- Security
- Sexuality
- Stable housing
- Substance abuse
- Support networks
- Transport
- Work experience/skills

Legend:
- None of below
- Young Person
- Single Parent
- ATSI
- CALD
Do ‘Home to Work’ participants feel part of their community? (see Tables 6.8. and 6.9). This is normally a strong proxy measure of social inclusion. 50% of males and 47% of females exhibit degrees of dissatisfaction with their communities with 50% of males and 53% of females demonstrating varying degrees of satisfaction with their communities. So men and women are pretty evenly divided on community satisfaction. On the whole ATSI participants exhibit greater dissatisfaction with their communities than other sub groups and CALD participants’ greater satisfaction.
Table 6.6. Participant access to social support networks by gender

Table 6.7. Participants access to social support networks by sub group

How does this compare with issues of life satisfaction; another useful proxy indicator of social inclusion? (see Tables 6.10. and 6.11). A similar pattern is exhibited; with women marginally more satisfied than men (70% of females to 62% of males exhibiting degrees of satisfaction), CALD participants the most satisfied (84%) and ATSI participants the most dissatisfied (63%). This pattern is not replicated in terms of participant perceptions of the job opportunities afforded to them (See Tables 6.12. and 6.13). Men (65%) are markedly more satisfied with the job opportunities they have than women (41%); with ATSI (49%) and single parent (39%) participants the most dissatisfied.
Table 6.8. Community satisfaction by gender

Table 6.9. Community satisfaction by sub group
Table 6.10. Life satisfaction by gender

How satisfied are you with your life in general?

Table 6.11. Life satisfaction by sub group

How satisfied are you with your life in general?
Table 6.12. Satisfaction with job opportunities by gender

Table 6.13. Satisfaction with job opportunities by sub group
6.3. Potential barriers to project participation

What do ‘Home to Work’ participants view to be the major barriers they have experienced with public services prior to the project? Five sets of barriers have been experienced by most participants: lack of belief in participants by service providers; limited help in negotiating services; lack of trust by participants in service providers; competing demands from social services; and, poor communication (see Table 6.14). These barriers have been experienced uniformly across sub-groups, although CALD respondents are unsurprisingly deferential on issues of poor communication.

6.4. Summary – how fragile we are

These data provide strong evidence in support of the principles of intervention identified in Section 5 with the emphasis on the virtues of place, personalisation, choice and responsibility and collaborative governance as a methodology for combating social exclusion. In particular, the importance of designing a delivery system that allows for the building of strong, trusting relationships between participant and provider is evident. Moreover, they demonstrate the need to wrap services around participants through a joined-up delivery system which is flexible to and supportive of their needs. This emphasis on flexibility and organisational agility is critical to the achievement of progressive outcomes.
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Project delivery

Before ‘Home to Work’ I couldn’t afford to do anything with my boy, but X provided me with information about all the support that I can get in terms of childcare and other help. This year we went on holiday for the first time. I’ve come a long way in the last three years but mostly in the last year. My confidence has increased and I feel positive about the future (Cohort 1 participant).

7.1. Introduction

The purpose of this section is to provide an assessment of the quality of project delivery from the perspective of participants. It provides an insight into participant views on: what they hoped to get out of the project; what they got; what they didn’t get; the quality of support they received; the quality of project coordination they experienced; the degree of influence project participants had on the design of the project; their level of satisfaction with the project as a whole; and, their views on how the project could be improved.

7.2. Participant engagement

While some participants were contacted directly by a member of the project team, the majority were referred to the project (see Table 7.1). A referral is an opportunity for participants to gain information about the project and be orientated into the thinking and philosophy behind this type of service provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Engagement</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contacted directly by member of project team</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was referred to the program by member of project team</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted broker</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1. Methods of participant engagement
That so; many participants then self-selected to be involved in the project indicating that a deeper level of engagement is welcomed where the purpose is clear, the structures are in place and expectations can be negotiated on both sides.

7.3. Participant aspirations

The aspirations of 'Home to Work' participants were very practical and results focused (see Table 7.2). Overall, participants sought permanent work and the skills with which to achieve it. A smaller proportion saw it as an educational opportunity or a way of securing stable housing or financial assistance. The journeys outlined by participants’ show that they were not initially seeking advice or personal support or direction as much as securing a specific outcome.

Interestingly, very few of the cohorts saw “mentoring” being of benefit separate from these other aspirations at this early stage. However, the critical role of the key workers as mentors later emerges in the data, suggesting that the notion of “mentoring” may not have been fully understood at the beginning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.2. What ‘Home to Work’ participants hoped to get out of the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact with people, Language assistance, Explore options, Financial Assistance, Better Accommodation, Maintenance, Confidence, Advocacy, Stable housing, Childcare, Permanent work, Work experience, Education, Skills training, Mentoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Bar chart showing the percentage of male and female participants hoping for different outcomes]
7.4. Project outputs

Participants reported the support they received as overwhelmingly positive in skills training and mentoring and work experience (see Table 7.3). Significant outcomes in education, childcare, stable housing and permanent work were also reported. Essentially, the responses show that while key aspirations around skill training and work were met, many wider issues (such as mentoring, childcare and housing) were also delivered which did not form part of their initial aspirations. In short, the group got a lot more from the project than they were initially expecting. This helps to also explain the deeper level of engagement participants reported as the project proceeded and new possibilities emerged. They expanded their personal problem solving toolkit and looking beyond simply securing employment to other aspects of improving their lives with the support of key workers and agencies.

![Table 7.3. Project support provided to ‘Home to Work’ participants](image)

7.5. Project shortcomings

Seventy five per cent of participants reported having their expectations fulfilled (see Table 7.4). Of the 25% who felt they did not get what they expected, their reasons related to very specific needs which were not met e.g. bobcat training, IT training, work experience, childcare, no job (see Table 7.5). One person reported poor communication and another “abused by staff”. It should be noted that securing employment for this group is challenging and obstacles and frustrations should be considered a normal part of the process. In other words conflict is inevitable. When considered from this perspective, a 75% success rate is very high.
7.6. Measures of success

Participant perception of the value of the project can be an important indicator of success. All participants responded positively to participating in a project like this again and that they would recommend it to friends and family. The majority of participants reported that the project was too short with about a third reporting it about right. No one felt it was too long, indicating that participants appreciated the continuing support throughout the process, in many cases even after they had secured employment. The majority of participants were happy with the support they received and this view was common across subgroups with only two participants rating it below 5 out of 10. All participants would participate again and recommend 'Home to Work' to family and friends. Similarly, a general improvement of views on government and community services resulted, with only one participant reporting a deterioration of their view of these services. As a learning opportunity, most participants reported an improvement in their understanding of the services available to them indicating that the project can have longer term impact on the ability of participants to access future services (see Tables 7.6 to 7.11.).
Table 7.6. Participant perceptions on the length of the project

![The length of the project was...](chart)

Table 7.7. Participant perceptions on the quality of support

![How satisfied are you with the support you have received?](chart)
Table 7.8. Participant views on whether they would participate again

![Bar chart showing participation rates for male and female participants.]

Table 7.9. Participant views on whether they would recommend 'Home to Work'

![Bar chart showing recommendation rates for male and female participants.]

Table 7.10. Did participant views on government change for the better?

![Bar chart showing changes in government views.]

As a consequence of my involvement with Home to Work, my views about government and community services have ...

- 1 Changed for better
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 Deteriorated

- female
- male
Table 7.11. Did participant understanding of the services they are eligible for improve?

As a consequence of my involvement with Home to Work, my understanding of the services available to me ...

7.7. The quality of project coordination

A stated element of innovation in this project was the team approach deployed by the service providers, so perceptions by participants is an important indicator of how well the governance partners worked together (see Table 7.12). Cohorts 2, 3 and 4 experienced high quality coordination between service providers. However, the experience of Cohort 1 was patchier with 24% of women and 19% of men participants reporting poor coordination among their service providers. This is not a surprising finding for a pilot project.

Table 7.12. Participant views on the quality of project coordination

Indeed, what is surprising is the degree of warmth exhibited by participants for the work of the brokers and the project coordinator who were clearly enormously successful in building strong working relationships with the vast majority of participants:
I haven’t smoked since the program began, this has much to do with X, and having things to look forward to. I get paid on Thursdays so this is the most vulnerable time. I’m looking to get completely clean (Cohort 3 participant).

In the past I have made a decision not to access services as I don’t want to indulge in a process which can be very un-satisfying. The difference with this program is that it doesn’t have lots of rules; it is all about our needs (Cohort 3 participant).

It is all about the personal contact and the little things they do like helping us get the kids to school so I can get to an interview. It doesn’t seem a lot but it made all the difference to me (Cohort 1 participant).

I’m quiet and shy but they listened carefully to me. I didn’t know what I wanted at first, but they helped me get a focus (Cohort 2 participant).

They helped me to pay off a fine, get a driving license, and complete an IT course. The big difference has been the relationship with X, she has been a big help (Cohort 4 participant).

It all depends on the people, and they are awesome (Cohort 4 participant).

Perceptions of how well service providers are able to focus their coordinated efforts in delivering results is important in building confidence in the project with participants and the project was very successful in this regard.

7.7. Co-design and ‘Home to Work’

How far can ‘Home to Work’ genuinely be considered an exercise in co-design? The “co-design” of a project with participants is difficult in so far as it emerges and develops in line with the contribution of participants. One measure of co-design was to ask whether participants thought “their views or experiences of “Home to Work” influenced how it was run?” (see Table 7.13). The responses were mixed and very divergent. However, the question was open to multiple interpretations – even just as more “consultation” rather than “co-design”. 40% of men and 58% of women considered their views or experiences were influential “all the time” or “often” while 22% of women and 16% of men reported “rarely” or “never”. This suggests that more thought needs to be given to the “co-design” approach of the project and also the reasons for many respondents feeling their views and experiences were not influencing how things were run. Of course, it is also possible that participants were not aware of the extent to which their views were a focus for action by the project team in which case better communication of the co-design elements of the project is needed.

7.8. Communicating with participants

Communication is a key component of co-design projects. Participants overwhelmingly found phone and text messaging as the most effective ways of communicating information
(see Table 7.14). This also needs to be seen as a two-way process and the project team needs to ensure they are in a position to both receive information and record it via phone and text. Email came third highlighting more limited access by participants to the internet. The more traditional noticeboard was useful. However, the development of a website, Facebook and the post were seen as the least effective means of communication.

7.9. Project enhancement

Perceptions on improving the project were sourced from an open question (see Table 7.15). The areas identified reflected both general issues (high score) and more individual needs and experiences typical of such a diverse group. These can be divided into three areas:
1) High score improvements: better information systems, personal communication, more training
2) Medium score improvements: attention to client needs, child care, social support networks, better mapping of skills to employment opportunities and language support.
3) Low score improvements: job clubs, information bulletin, alternative source of key worker support, more job experience, confidence building activities, better accommodation, better BBQs, longer project, better induction process, stronger advocacy, better liaison with job networks and job references.

There is strong evidence here to demonstrate the need for a more effective communication strategy with participants both in terms of conveying service information and maintaining strong relationships. In addition, the Common Assessment Framework used to identify participant needs and monitor progress could be modified to provide more intelligent participant data with particular regard to issues of skills mapping. Particular attention needs to be paid to the issue of affordable child care for single parents. The incentives for them to participate in the labour market are negligible at present. Unfortunately, much of the work that is available to them occurs at anti-social hours (e.g. catering and cleaning) and requires high cost childcare. The majority of ‘Home to Work’ women are desperate to work not least to provide them with a break from their difficult and stressful primary occupations as Mothers. The issue of language support for CALD participants remains a critical concern. The project needs to tap into the resources of the voluntary sector to help participants develop the conversational skills necessary to perform at job interviews and engage effectively in the workplace. Present provision is insufficient.

7.10 Summary – delivering quality services in postcode 2612

In overview, the participants gave very positive responses on the quality of the project and the support they received and this is in stark contrast with their previous experiences with public services. However, their responses suggested that they did not experience the project as fully “co-designed” but rather as providing them with new service options and support they have not previously experienced.
Table 7.15. Participant perceptions of ways to improve the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What could we do to improve the project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More regular meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More case workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better liaison with job networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better induction process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program needs to be longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better BBQs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence-building activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More job experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better mapping of skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key worker support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daycare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Clubs -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to client needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better information systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Graph showing the percentage of male and female responses to each suggestion]
Participant journeys, outcomes and indices of project success

What is the magic? The belief that people can change. (Governance group member)

8.1. Introduction

Effective place-based service delivery requires a strong sense of design thinking; that is the ability to understand the lives of others (Leadbeater, 2010). This involves mapping personal stories (journey maps) about citizen experiences of public services. It has three purposes – to explore, design and evaluate. It is based on the observation that citizens never experience the delivery system as a whole; just pathways through the system. It should therefore be possible to identify a set number of pathways through a project such as ‘Home to Work’. As the role of the brokers is to make the journey a positive one it makes sense to work with citizens who exemplify these different pathways with the aim of enriching their experiences. This requires creating an environment that allows citizens to tell their own stories and not making assumptions about their preferences; spending quality time with a small number of participants, mapping their journeys, identifying obstacles and developing mitigating strategies.

This section is organised into two parts. Part one provides a detailed insight into seven participant journeys as exemplars of typical pathways through the project. This will allow for professional reflection on the critical interventions necessary to enrich the participant experience. Part two provides an overview of project outcomes for participants.

8.2. ‘Home to work’ participant journeys – seven images of exclusion

We began this evaluation report by presenting seven images of exclusion or participant journeys which were typical in the ‘Home to Work’ project. Four of the journeys involved participants seeking support for a new start to escape oppression, addiction, domestic violence or a failed marriage. These included the story of Aung and Mai, recent migrants to Australia escaping a refugee camp, religious persecution and seeking a new life for themselves and their children (see Box 8.1.). The story of Andy, a young person desperately trying to manage a drug addiction and build a good life for himself and his girlfriend (see Box 8.2). Mel, a young single parent who has spent her life since the age of 10 fleeing from domestic violence and trying to find a stable environment to bring up her child (see Box 8.3). And Jang, a middle aged single parent who left her family and friends for a new life in
Australia 20 years ago only to find herself divorced, poor, middle-aged and excluded (see Box 8.4). Then there are the stories of a single middle-aged participant, Don, who is making the choice not to participate (see Box 8.5); Susan, who wants to participate but is still managing her demons from years of abuse and needs her confidence built (see Box 8.6); and, Honor who just wants some peace from her huge community responsibilities (see Box 8.7).

All of these citizens are experiencing multiple exclusions; some are trapped in a spiral of indebtedness, drug dependency, poor mental health and crime. Others are experiencing other forms of exclusion due to limited language capabilities, the lack of formal education or the absence of social support networks. While others, are recovering from long-term trauma due to child abuse, neglect or domestic violence. However, they all have resources to bring to the project; resources of intelligence and skills, the ability to survive and the motivation for a better life. The boxes which follow provide a summary of their journeys and are organised around issues of intervention context, self-reported exclusions, participant resources, future employment, indices of project success or failure and the critical interventions required.

8.3. Project outcomes

In Section 7 we reported that our sample of 'Home to Work’ participants were overwhelmingly positive in terms of the skills training, mentoring and work experience (see Table 7.3). Significant outcomes were also reported in education, childcare, stable housing and permanent work. In short, the data shows that while key aspirations around skill training and work were met, the group got a lot more from the project than they were initially expecting. This helps to also explain the deeper level of engagement participants reported as the project proceeded and new possibilities emerged. They expanded their personal problem solving toolkit and looking beyond simply securing employment to other aspects of improving their lives with the support of key workers and agencies. Table 8.1 provides an overview of the final pilot project outcomes for all participants. These outcomes strongly correlate with our findings, demonstrating significant gains for project participants in employment (47 out of 81 participants), work experience (2), education (4) and training (4).

Table 8.1. Final pilot project outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of 'Home to Work’ participants...</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disengaged</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in employment</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not work ready</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offered but not accepted jobs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in training</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incarcerated</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on a job experience placement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with medical certification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moved interstate or overseas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is also evident that most of the remaining participants were not suitable for the project. This suggests the need for a tool to help brokers diagnose whether a participant is worth investing in. The CLEAR model for example was developed by three ANZSIG researchers (Lawrence Pratchett, Gerry Stoker and Vivien Lowndes, 2006a&b) for understanding the barriers and triggers to effective public participation. It argues that participation is most successful where citizens:

- Can do – that is, have the resources and knowledge to participate;
- Like to – that is, have a sense of attachment that reinforces participation;
- Enabled to – that is, are provided with the opportunity for participation;
- Asked to – that is, are mobilised effectively by governmental or non-governmental organisations;
- Responded to – that is, see evidence that their views have been considered.

The tool is organised around these five headings and provides a frame for diagnosing whether an individual or a community is likely to be responsive to a particular form of social intervention. An important feature of the CLEAR framework is that its five factors are neither hierarchical nor sequential. The presence of one factor is not a precondition for others and effective participation does not necessarily depend on all of the components being present although, in an ideal world, they would be. Furthermore, the model does not attach a specific weight or importance to any particular factor: there is no assumed balance between the different factors that should be expected in any given locality. Rather, the underlying assumption of the diagnostic tool is that it will serve two purposes: it will help those conducting the diagnosis to identify and understand the balance of factors affecting participation in their projects and it will provide an opportunity for all those involved in a diagnosis to reflect upon the relative strengths and gaps in participation in their projects and consider strategies for addressing those gaps.

8.4. **Summary – delivering quality outcomes in postcode 2612**

These journeys demonstrate that the key principles of the ‘Home to Work’ project have been applied effectively – place, personalisation, choice and responsibility. In particular, the building of strong, trusting relationships between the participants and key workers has allowed for a targeted recovery strategy which is flexible to and supportive of their needs and has led to the progressive outcomes listed in Table 8.1, with 47 out of 81 participants finding employment.
Box 8.1. Aung and Mai – a new life in Canberra 26126

**CALD Intervention context** –
granted asylum from political persecution, deprived of a formal education, educated through activism and the process of survival.

**Self reported exclusions** –
Affordable childcare
Economic dependency
Language barriers
Lack of formal qualifications
Race
Transport
Australian work experience/skills

“In the camps they had been respected, hardworking members of their communities. The community relied on them. In Australia their years of work counted for nothing.”

**Participant resources** – highly intelligent and motivated with key professional skills – Mai worked as a teacher and Aung as a nurse.

**Future employment** – at the moment path dependent – cleaning or services.

**Indices of success** – alive, healthy family, ready for low grade work.

**Is ‘success’ attributable to the project:** yes there is evidence to demonstrate that the development strategy is working.

**Shortfall:** appropriate work – both have the capacity to be graduates and professionals but require formal qualifications.

**Critical intervention:** language training.

---

Please note that all of these portraits are posed by models.
Box 8.2. Andy — managing and recovering

**Intervention context** — immigrant structured as an outsider from childhood, identity crisis, drug dependency, violent crime, repeat offender.

**Self reported exclusions**—
- Absence of stable housing
- Criminal record
- Debt
- Mental illness
- Race
- Security
- Substance abuse

**Participant resources** — intelligent and motivated, has a trade in a highly sought after area.

**Future** employment — path dependent (trade).

**Indices of success** — not applicable, re-offending but ready for work.

**Marginal success attributable to the project:** yes, there is evidence to demonstrate that the development strategy is working.

**Shortfall:** appropriate work — employer needs to take a leap of faith.

**Critical intervention:** provision of project activities to prevent boredom and re-offending while he waits for job opportunity. Andy needs to be convinced to relocate to a new job opportunity away from Canberra. This will help him to manage his addiction, recover and rebuild his life.
### 8.3. Mel – getting a start

**Young person, single parent intervention context** – teenage mother escaping from abusive relationship and family situations since the age of 10.

**Self-reported exclusions** –
- Absence of stable housing
- Affordable childcare
- Debt
- Economic dependency
- Family breakdown
- Limited qualifications
- Poor personal security
- Absence of support networks
- Transport
- Limited work experience/skills

**Participant resources** – highly intelligent, independent and motivated.

**Future** – at present path dependent (parenting).

**Indices of success** – alive, consolidating life, attaining skills through training.

**Success attributable to the project:** yes there is evidence to demonstrate that the development strategy is working.

**Shortfall:** should be a graduate but needs to consolidate her life and build from there.

**Critical interventions:** affordable child care and support networks, confidence-building and mentoring on high potential in tertiary education.
### 8.4. Jang – starting over

**Middle-age, single parent intervention context** – divorced Mother of one experiencing severe exclusion.

**Self-reported exclusions** –
- Absence of stable housing
- Affordable childcare
- Debt
- Economic dependency
- Family breakdown
- Limited qualifications
- Absence of support networks

“Before this project it was difficult to find help. When I married him, I married into the Australian way of life. My people didn't want to know me anymore.”

**Participant resources** – intelligent, skilled in catering and motivated.

**Future employment** – at present path dependent (chef).

**Indices of success** – consolidating life, job ready, attaining skills through training.

**Success attributable to the project:** yes there is evidence to demonstrate that the development strategy is working.

**Shortfall:** the absence of affordable childcare for evening workers is a significant problem.

**Critical interventions:** affordable childcare and support networks, confidence-building and mentoring.
## 8.5. Don – making choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Middle-age, single man intervention context</strong> – divorced Father and recovered addict who has opted out but does and is ‘paying his way’.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Self-reported exclusions** –  
  *Absence of stable housing*  
  *Debt*  
  *Economic dependency*  
  *Family breakdown*  
  *Limited qualifications*  
  *Absence of support networks*  

“I don’t feel excluded. I make choices. Social services have always made assumptions about me because I don’t fit neatly into any of their boxes...Just because we are unemployed it doesn’t mean that we have no commitments. You can be busy and unemployed but they don’t get that. It’s like two tribes. This project is different. They don’t make assumptions. They treat me like a human being...”. |
<p>| <strong>Participant resources</strong> – intelligent, diligent and motivated. |
| <strong>Future employment</strong> – at present path dependent (retail). |
| <strong>Indices of success</strong> – consolidating life, new accommodation and in work. |
| <strong>Success attributable to the project:</strong> yes there is evidence to demonstrate that the development strategy has worked. |
| <strong>Shortfall:</strong> the participant is content. |
| <strong>Critical interventions:</strong> employment support and training, support networks, confidence-building and mentoring. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 8.6. Susan – From rural Australia to Canberra 2612</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Middle-aged single woman intervention context** – mental and physical abuse, structured as an outsider from childhood experiencing acute exclusion and anxiety.

**Self reported exclusions** –

- Economic dependency
- Family breakdown
- Mental illness
- Security
- Support networks
- Transport

"Being me is difficult. I need to spend a long time with somebody before I can feel comfortable“.

**Participant resources** – intelligent, artistic with practical skills, clear sense of entitlement.

**Future** – staged approach to permanent full time employment contingent on management of transition.

**Indices of success** – work ready, holding down a part time position, heightened confidence.

**Is success attributable to the project:**
yes there is evidence to demonstrate that Susan’s development strategy is working.

**Shortfall:** appropriate work

**Critical interventions:** work experience with flexible hours and confidence building activities.
### Box 8.7. Honor – finding peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATSI intervention context – respected community member, diligent and compassionate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self reported exclusions –</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of stable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable childcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family breakdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited work experience/skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I have a lot of responsibilities; for my children, my family, my people. They all look to me to pick up the pieces when things go wrong. I do the best I can but I get very tired. The project works for me because it takes some pressure off. I get little bits of help that make a difference. It gives me some peace....”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant resources – intelligent, respected with practical skills, clear understanding of her entitlements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future</strong> – staged approach to permanent full time employment contingent on management of transitions. At the moment she has significant parenting responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indices of success –completed skills training, heightened confidence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is success attributable to the project:</strong> yes there is evidence to demonstrate that Honor’s development strategy is working.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Shortfall:</strong> Honor’s community responsibilities are significant and it is difficult for the project to intervene in this space.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical interventions:</strong> should focus on supporting Honor through child care to allow for education and training, provision of work experience with flexible hours, confidence building activities and mentoring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project Governance

‘Home to Work’ is a metaphor for change (Governance group member)

9.1. Introduction

This section provides an assessment of the role of the Governance Group in project management, coordination and enhancement focusing on its work in relation to project establishment, development, sustainability and communications. The analysis draws mainly on qualitative data derived from interviews with all Governance Group members, participant observation of Governance group meetings and cyclical project reports.

9.2. The role of the Governance Group

As we saw in Section 5, the ‘Home to Work’ project is coordinated through two groups – the Broker Group and the Governance Group. In theory, the former focuses on operational issues and the latter on broader strategic questions such as project design, coordination, sustainability and communications. Its formal role was to oversee the project, facilitate linkages with other levels of governance, deal with systemic issues and oversee the evaluation process. We shall see, however, that in practice there has been an overlap in functions. The Governance Group includes representatives from: the ACT Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services; the ACT Chief Minister’s Department; Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations; Northside Community Service; Anglicare Canberra and Goulburn; and, participant observers from the Australia New Zealand School of Government’s Institute for Governance. The Group has meet monthly, although its original terms of reference allowed for quarterly meetings. Its role is: “to achieve common understanding and ways of working, solidify learnings and maintain engagement”.7 The group does not have formal management authority over the project as this resides with the principle agent (Anglicare Canberra and Goulburn) but it assumes a coordination function, with the purpose of tracking the progress of the project against project milestones.

7Anglicare Canberra & Goulburn (2011), Home to Work Progress Report 1 for DEEWR, Anglicare Canberra & Goulburn, p. 4.
9.3. A profile of the Governance Group

The Governance Group is comprised of all stakeholders plus the project manager and brokers. There have been six male and six female members of the Governance group during the life-time of the project drawn from the project partner organisations – the ACT Chief Minister’s Department (2), ACT Housing (2), Anglicare (4), and Northside Community Services (2). In addition, a representative from the independent evaluation organisation joined the group as a participant observer.

The Governance Group has suffered from significant turn-over in participants from its inception: two of the key partners (Anglicare and Northside Community Services) experienced a change in leadership during the inception period of the project; the project designer from the ACT Chief Minister’s Department and one of the project’s key workers from Northside Community Services left the project six months in. It should also be noted that at the outset Anglicare struggled to find an appropriately skilled project coordinator.

For the first six months of the project, the Governance Group consisted of the highest level personnel including the CEOs of Anglicare, Northside Community Services and the Director of ACT Community Services. However, with the exception of the CEO of Northside Community Services who was recruited at a later date, the senior executives stood down from the Governance Group and were replaced by members of their own executive group.

As one CEO put it:

I had confidence in how the project was progressing and I provided an able replacement who has kept me briefed on how things were going ('Home to Work', Governance group member).

Despite instability in personnel the governance partners have had a strong commitment to the project from the outset tempered by some cynicism about the possibility of securing long term funding.

It is noteworthy, however, that the project funder, DEEWR, has not been involved in the Governance Group. An important opportunity has therefore been missed to promote the project and seek continuity of funding. Nor were local employers invited to participate despite their importance in terms of securing employment for participants with unconventional life stories.

In terms of the skills, experiences and attributes of the Governance Group, nine out of the 12 group members have five or more years experience in community services and place-based service delivery and exhibit a strong understanding of the requirements of effective place-based service delivery. However, only five group members have been involved in “Home to Work” from its inception – i.e. from the design of the initial proposal.

Table 9.1 provides a list of skills, experiences and attributes that group members believed were important in contributing to “Home to Work”. These also provide us with an insight into the range of skills necessary to deliver a high quality place-based project. Unsurprisingly, the group identified community sector experience, skills in partnership building and transition management and strategic policy capability as the most important attributes of Governance group members. Less emphasis is placed on operational issues.
Table 9.1. The skills, experiences and attributes that group members believe are important in contributing to ‘Home to Work’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective perspective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community sector experience</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and project management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour market knowledge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking appropriate support and services with participants’ needs and aspirations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic level policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding client needs and aspirations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.4. Working norms and values

It is often cited that one of the major barriers to collaborative service delivery is the absence of common norms and values and the tensions arising from competing mandates (FAHCSIA, 2005). In this instance, there is evidence to suggest that there were no significant differences between group members on the project’s purpose and its target audience. The two key principles informing the design of the project – ‘place’ and personalised support were enthusiastically embraced by the Governance Group as a key method for combating social exclusion. The Governance Group’s sound knowledge of the rudiments of place-based service delivery was revealed in response to the question – what does a place based approach to service delivery mean to Governance partners? As Table 9.2 demonstrates, there are no significant differences in approach which would create difficulties for project coordination.

9.5. On the costs and benefits of collaborative service delivery

So what benefits can be attributed to the establishment of ‘Home to Work’? Table 9.4 shows that the fundamental benefit of the project to most Governance Group members lies in the process of lesson-drawing across Governance partners on the merits and demerits of place based service delivery – learning through doing and professional reflection. ‘Home to Work’ can be understood as a process of learning in which the means (place based service delivery through the key worker model) to an end (better employment outcomes) is subject to careful deliberation by informed and reflexive practitioners. In addition to the process of inter-organisational learning, the project also benefited from resource and information sharing and the evaluation process itself.
**Table 9.2.** What do Governance partners think ‘Home to Work’ is trying to achieve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is ‘Home to Work’ trying to achieve?</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Anglicare</th>
<th>Northside</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressing the barriers to being job ready</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing the culture of service delivery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploying community resources to enable citizens to participate in society</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the long-term unemployed out of poverty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting citizens experiencing multiple exclusions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model of support for the long-term unemployed who haven’t had success through traditional methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9.3.** What does a place-based approach to service delivery mean to Governance partners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place-based delivery is about...</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Anglicare</th>
<th>Northside</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forming a coalition of resilience with the local community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the environment we work in, and how we can use it to address the barriers and needs of the client</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing it where people live</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding that knowledge is local</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalisation of service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A way of containing a trial of something</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place shouldn’t be a construct it is more about relationships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.4. What are the benefits of ‘Home to Work’ for Governance partners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The benefits of ‘Home to Work’ include...</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Anglicare</th>
<th>Northside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action research through the evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An understanding of the centrality of stable housing to social inclusion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An understanding of the centrality of the key worker model and personalization to social inclusion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better employment outcomes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-organisational learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An understanding of the centrality of flexible rather than rule bound delivery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An understanding of the ingredients of effective partnership building</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource sharing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the project progressed so did the degree of trust between governance partners:

*I was unsure at the beginning about how this was going to work. In fact I couldn’t see the value of having three brokers. I have now changed my mind completely. The process of working through some really difficult problems and drawing on each other’s expertise has been hugely beneficial. I think we have got better outcomes through working together (Project Broker).*

But what are the negative lessons from this experience of collaborative service delivery? It is evident from Table 9.5 that the project suffered from many of the common obstacles confronting joined-up initiatives or shared services provision such as the initial absence of clear roles and responsibilities, competing mandates and boundary patrolling obstacles (see Halligan, Buik and O’Flynn, 2012). It is equally evident that many of these problems were the product of a tight project establishment phase. This observation was confirmed by several group members:

*We should have stormed and normed earlier (Governance Group member).*

*It took us too long to get the right systems in place and understand what our roles were (Governance Group member).*

*The Governance group spent a lot of time discussing operational issues and exchanging war stories and not enough time thinking about the future. Maybe it was just too difficult and people felt more comfortable focusing on what they knew (Governance group member).*
Table 9.5. What are the negative lessons for Governance group members?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The negative lessons from ‘Home to Work’ include…</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Anglicare</th>
<th>Northside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial institutional suspicion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worries about information sharing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No real set-up time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties of finding the right staff (two or three false starts)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff turnover</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary patrolling problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t make assumptions about what works</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for clear roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for project plan and milestones</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes focus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better steering from the Governance group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more co-design with participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for clearer messaging</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, as one group member put it, ‘Going through the pain helps’. In other words working your way through the problems fosters trusting working relationships which provide the foundation for effective action.

9.6. On the quality of governance

How well has the governance arrangements worked for group members? It is notable that the executive members of the Governance Group have been more satisfied with the work of the group than the brokers or operational staff (see Figure 9.1):

The quality of deliberation on key project issues has been of the highest order (Governance group member).

This observation contrasts with evident frustration amongst brokers and operational actors that sustainability questions should have been attended to earlier.

The key challenge at the beginning was how do we make this system of collaborative governance work? How do we develop trusting relationships? It was about working out roles and responsibilities. You’ve got to like working through the mess and there was a lot of mess (Governance group member).

We spent so much time getting the thing to work that time caught up with us. We have been left with a great project but no funding and lots of learnings (Governance group member).
Could the project have progressed more quickly? It is possible that the Group could have worked through contractual issues, operating protocols, roles and responsibilities and position descriptions more quickly but it would be wrong to suggest that these issues caused a major delay in project delivery. The key delays were a product of recruiting a suitably qualified project coordinator and this couldn’t occur until they knew that they had secured the funding. It is also evident that the three month time-lines identified for project delivery for each cohort was woefully short. As one Broker put it:

*Three months is too short to process participants and build strong meaningful relationships. It would have been better having two groups of 40 for six months each than four groups of 20 for three months.*

Nonetheless, the agencies now have a body of knowledge in this area to help inform the set-up phase of subsequent projects and enhance the effectiveness of the delivery system.

![Figure 9.1. Group satisfaction with governance arrangements](chart.png)
Table 9.6. What would Governance Group members change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Governance group should have...</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Anglicare</th>
<th>Northside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused on sustainability issues earlier</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included employer stakeholder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed a communications strategy earlier</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended to measurement of success issues earlier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been more action oriented</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had fewer meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had shorter meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEEWR participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established common operating principles earlier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, with the benefit of hindsight what would group members change? Table 9.6 clearly demonstrates the argument that sustainability questions encompassing issues such as the measurement and communication of success should have been attended to earlier. In overview, however, all Governance Group members believe that H2W has been successful in promoting joint working. Table 9.7 describes in what ways.

Table 9.7. ‘Home to Work’ and the promotion of joint working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H2W has been successful in promoting joint working through...</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Anglicare</th>
<th>Northside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Broker system</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of risk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of competition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-existing relationships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-problem solving structures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.7. On sustainable futures

It has been mentioned previously that although governance partners have had a strong commitment to the project this has been tempered by some cynicism about the possibility of securing long term funding. When asked the question *is H2W sustainable without Commonwealth funding?* Seven members of the Governance group were of the view that
the project was not sustainable without Commonwealth funding. Five were more optimistic in identifying various co-funding models drawing on state and community sector resources. Table 9.8 provides some strong clues as to the key elements of a sustainability strategy.

9.9. On evaluation
The strength of the ‘Home to Work’ project lies in the professionalism and dedication of its operational staff. It is reflected in the doing. Unsurprisingly, this project did not lend itself easily to ideal-type evaluation processes; largely because of the targeted groups involved who are notoriously difficult to engage and because the project staff focused on getting the outcomes. Hence, while the evaluation sought to follow best practice guidelines as developed by the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank (see Appendix 1) it was unable to fulfil certain of these obligations due to constraints in data collection. The items on the short list that follows would have made for more robust evaluation findings:

- The provision of more rigorous base-line data on participants; the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) includes very limited data on participant journeys particularly their educational history and skills attainment. This makes it very difficult to select appropriate interventions and map skills and experience to job opportunities. It is difficult to derive a reliable narrative of the participants from the CAF.

- The development of statistical information on the cost effectiveness of the intervention.

- The action learning component of the evaluation would have benefited from more targeted deliberations around particular issues in the Governance Group. The findings workshops focused too much time on findings rather than on prescriptive issues.

- The achievement of a larger sample of qualitative interviews with participants; we were only able to interview 65.4% of available participants. We have attempted to make up for this by including an outcomes analysis for all participants.

- The development of a participatory logical framework to guide the intervention; there is no one document that provides an overview of the intervention logic behind the project.

- The provision of an operational manual; this is an important document of institutional memory on delivery issues and how they were managed.

9.10. In summary – governance dilemmas
There is good evidence that the Governance group has played an effective role in working through the puzzles of collaborative service delivery. In particular, it has proved effective in negotiating the governance problems that have traditionally bedevilled multiple-agency initiatives such as establishing common norms and values, sensible role allocation based upon expertise, differing and sometimes contradictory targeting regimes, and operational inflexibility. In short, it has been successful in removing the barriers to joined-up working - no mean feat. It has been less successful in confronting sustainability issues. This is surprising given the composition of the group. The absence of detailed Governance group discussions on the cost effectiveness of the intervention is indicative of this problem. It would also have been prudent to have included key stakeholders in the work of the
Governance group such as Corrections, DEEWR, the AFP and employers to foster project champions. It is not a good idea to leave potential donors or sources of knowledge out of project governance unless you are concerned with the quality of project delivery. It is also noteworthy that a project based on genuine principles of co-design would include project participants on the Governance group itself.

Table 9.8. Sins of omission in strategic focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you were advising on the establishment of the H2W today, what would you do differently?</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Anglicare</th>
<th>Northside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of a more explicit co-design approach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer lead-up time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early focus on sustainability issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early development of communication strategy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of employer stakeholders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of JSAs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to the measurement of success</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer project cycle to February 2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting the right people with the right skills in earlier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater investigation of other sources of funding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of the corrective system and linkages with through care program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A planned approach to the engagement of the clients</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A planned approach to learn from learnings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Conclusion – supporting Canberrans with multiple needs and exclusions

Why does it work? It isn’t totally rule bound and it is run by professionals who understand the problems and are prepared to take calculated risks (Governance group member).

10.1. Introduction

The purpose of this evaluation was to provide a developmental assessment of the progress that the ‘Home to Work’ pilot project has made in realising its objectives with the fundamental aim of enhancing the quality of project management, delivery and outcomes for job seekers in Canberra. This conclusion is organised around four sets of findings that have emerged from the research process. They will be presented in response to four questions:

What outcomes has the ‘Home to Work’ pilot project achieved?

What delivery dilemmas need to be mitigated to enhance project outcomes?

How can they be mitigated?

How has the project performed when benchmarked against international better practice?
10.2. What outcomes has the ‘Home to Work’ pilot project achieved?

This evaluation recognized the importance of focusing on both project process and outcomes. Qualitative data has been generated to provide a strong understanding of the quality of the process of design and delivery and both qualitative and quantitative data is presented to provide an assessment of the extent to which the project achieved intended outcomes for individual participants.

10.2.1. Process outcomes for project partners

So what benefits can be attributed to the establishment of ‘Home to Work’? Table 9.4 shows that the fundamental benefit of the project to most project partners lies in the process of lesson-drawing across the partnership on the merits and demerits of place based service delivery – learning through doing and professional reflection. ‘Home to Work’ can be understood as a process of learning in which the means (place based service delivery through the key worker model) to an end (better employment outcomes) is subject to careful deliberation by informed and reflexive practitioners. In addition to the process of inter-organisational learning, the project also benefited from resource and information sharing and the evaluation process itself. The ‘Home to Work’ project has provided a strong foundation to future joint initiatives in the ACT to combat social exclusion.

10.2.2. Process outcomes for participants

Participant perception of the value of the project can be an important indicator of success. All participants responded positively to participating in a project like this again and would recommend it to friends and family. The majority of participants reported that the project was ‘too short’ with about a third reporting it ‘about right’. No one felt it was ‘too long’, indicating that participants appreciated the continuing support throughout the process, in many cases even after they had secured employment. The majority of participants were happy with the support they received and this view was common across subgroups with only two participants rating it below 5 out of 10. All participants would participate again and recommend ‘Home to Work’ to family and friends. Similarly, a general improvement of views on government and community services resulted, with only one participant reporting a deterioration of their view of these services. As a learning opportunity, most participants reported an improvement in their understanding of the services available to them indicating that the project can have longer term impact on the ability of participants to access future services (see Tables 7.6 to 7.11.).

10.2.3. Project outcomes for participants

Seventy five per cent of participants reported having their expectations fulfilled. Of the 25% who felt they did not get what they expected, their reasons related to very specific needs which were not met e.g. ‘Bobcat training’, ‘IT training’, ‘work experience’, ‘childcare’, ‘no job’ (see Table 7.5).

In Section 7 we reported that our sample of ‘Home to Work’ participants were overwhelmingly positive in terms of the skills training, mentoring and work experience they received (see Table 7.3). Significant outcomes were also reported in education, childcare, stable housing and permanent work. In short, the data shows that while key aspirations
around skill training and work were met, the group got a lot more from the project than they were initially expecting. This helps to also explain the deeper level of engagement participants reported as the project proceeded and new possibilities emerged. They expanded their personal problem solving toolkit and looking beyond simply securing employment to other aspects of improving their lives with the support of key workers and agencies. Table 8.1 provides an overview of the final pilot project outcomes for all participants. These outcomes strongly correlate with our findings, demonstrating significant gains for project participants in employment (47 out of 81 participants), work experience (2), education (4) and training (4).

10.3. What delivery dilemmas need to be mitigated to enhance project outcomes?

The key delivery dilemmas for the 'Home to Work' project are presented in Figure 10.1 and are organised around conceptual (how the project is understood by citizens, brokers and stakeholders), institutional (project design and resources) and environmental constraints and triggers. It is observed that these sets of factors can constrain or facilitate progressive outcomes; interact in often unintended ways; and, need to be carefully managed.

10.4. How can they be mitigated?

The issues requiring attention can be organised around refinements to the delivery system, co-design issues and issues relating to the measurement of success.

10.4.1 Improvements to the delivery system would include:

- the development of a formal but sensitive social contract with the participants;
- the development of a personalised communication strategy for individual participants to ensure effective flow of information;
- the development of effective support systems for the key worker (e.g. back office support, integrated information management system, succession planning);
- the creation of a service information repository;
- the integration of key governance partners (e.g. JSAs, advocacy groups, volunteer organisations and employers) into the delivery system;
- the integration of key governance partners into governance arrangements; and,
- ‘Home to Work’ provides an important starting point to greater cross agency collaboration in relation to resources, training and information sharing and the establishment of a genuine community of practice.

There are some important tasks ahead for this community of practice:

- the community of practice in general and the ACT government in particular must improve its data on services delivered into areas with pockets of deprivation to identify inefficiencies and where shared services are possible.
- Greater focus must be paid to how place-based service delivery can be used as a vehicle for early intervention and transition management.
- Service provision must become more personal to get the outcomes and local service providers are best placed to build longstanding, trusting relationships with participants.
- ACT Housing has proved extremely adept in providing on-site support using assertive engagement methods (e.g. intensive case management; assertive engagement;
Figure 10.1. Critical implementation dilemmas and their interaction

**Conceptual constraints and triggers**
1. Brokers
2. Participants
3. Degree of behavioural change required

**Institutional constraints and triggers**

**Project design**
1. Clear and consistent objectives
2. Incorporation of adequate causal theory of change
3. Effective coordination of brokers
4. Clear roles for implementing agencies
5. Clear decision rules for implementing agencies
6. Effective project instruments (skills mapping tool, participant communication strategy)

**Resources**
6. Adequate allocation of financial resources
7. Effective base-line data and access to knowledge
8. Recruitment of project officers with adequate skills/training
9. Effective and sensitive performance measurement
10. Place
11. Effective case management and support
12. Formal access by participants
13. Communication of success

**Environmental constraints and triggers affecting implementation**
1. Socio-economic conditions and technology
2. Public support
3. Attitudes and resources of constituency groups
4. Support from politicians
5. Commitment and leadership skills of implementing officials
6. Alignment with Commonwealth and State agendas
7. Media perceptions

**The Implementation Process**

| Project outputs of implementing agencies | Compliance with project outputs by target groups | Actual impacts of project outputs | Perceived impacts of project outputs | Major revision in project |

**Key**
Green = trigger  Amber = as yet no gravity of evidence  Red = potential constraint

- personal support with tasks of everyday living; and linking to other specialist services) but acceptance of support through a social contract should be mandatory but sensitively negotiated.
• Quality, affordable (based on a maximum of 30% of income), secure, long term housing which is connected to the community is critical to ensure that no disincentives to remain in the labour market occur.

10.4.2 Improvements in co-design would include:

• Improved personal data to allow for more sophisticated skills mapping;
• clearer articulation to participants of project benefits; and,
• careful management of the case work pressure points including early intervention and transition preparedness.

10.4.3 Improvements in the measurement of success would include:

• the development of a measurement tool for evaluating progress for participants experiencing multiple needs and exclusions incorporating a personal development record, journey map and milestones.

We would recommend that the ACT government develops a social return on investment model for determining the effectiveness of interventions such as ‘Home to Work’ and the longer term costs to economy and society of sticking with traditional service models. For example, we know that effective drug treatment and homelessness services reduce public spending in the medium term. Drug users cost government more than $20,000 per year but every $2 spent on drug treatment saves a minimum of $19 in associated health and crime costs (Godfrey et al., 2004). Many participants suffering from multiple exclusions draw heavily on the repetitive use of public services such as expensive emergency interventions. In the UK’s Making Every Adult Matter report in 2009 it was calculated that one offender alone cost $304,000 in policing, court and prison costs, $80,000 in hospital and drug treatment, $360,000 in accommodation and support and $75,000 on outreach support (2009, p. 22).

Our knowledge of the cost effectiveness of the ‘Home to Work’ project is by no means exhaustive as this was not part of our remit. However, as the Project Coordinator notes:

Looking at the budget for the pilot, the Broker model would need to remain in terms of the costs associated with workers. The budget itself is quite lean and if you want to maintain the calibre of brokers then you really need to keep it at the $120 000 mark per broker for the two years. Also, the agency fee has to remain, as the organising agency will still have management costs.

However, if you consider what was included in the entire budget, such as the evaluation and the set up phase of the Project – these costs would not be needed if you were to continue with a project such as this, especially if it was in the form of recurrent funding.

Taking these items of expenditure out, the cost of the Project reduces to approximately $550 000 over 2 years. In terms of other projects/programs that run in the ACT with significantly lesser output/outcome requirements, the cost effectiveness of this project is quite evident. Other considerations that we believe need to be factored in are the numerous savings in other areas such as the reduction in Centrelink benefit claims and the roll-on benefit to the broader community in terms of participant engagement and influence.
In sum, the 'Home to Work' project delivers significant outcomes and is cost effective.

10.4.4 Improvements in monitoring and evaluation would include:

The development of a communication strategy for communicating project success stories; the integration of monitoring and evaluation imperatives into the project workplan; and, the need for a postcode service audit to see what money is being spent and what efficiencies could be made to source additional project funding.

It is also observed that this type of project would benefit more from co-design thinking than formal evaluation. Design thinking is about understanding the lives of others. It involves mapping personal stories (journey maps) about citizen experiences of public services. It has three purposes – to explore, design and evaluate. It is based on the observation that citizens never experience the delivery system as a whole; just pathways through the system. For example, we would argue that it is possible to identify a set number of pathways through a project such as ‘Home to Work’. As the role of the brokers is to make the journey a positive one it makes sense to work with citizens who exemplify these different journeys with the aim of enriching their experiences. This requires creating an environment that allows citizens to tell their own stories and not making assumptions about their preferences. It doesn't require big numbers unlike a statistically significant survey but it does require spending quality time with a small number of participants, mapping their journeys, identifying obstacles and developing mitigating strategies (see Section 8).

10.5 Delphi findings

The Delphi method is used for comparing interventions, identifying better practices and for exploring underlying assumptions or information leading to particular interventions. Delphi is also a useful method for eliminating negative impacts of face-to-face or group discussions (Hsu and Sandford, 2007) by participants not interacting directly with one another. Through email and telephone interviews recommendations are presented to an expert group for their comment and prioritisation. The primary objective of this process is both to test possible strategies for project enhancement and fine-tune the research team’s final recommendations.

Our Delphi group was comprised of individuals with expertise in the fields of place based delivery, social inclusion and labour market policy. Our expert panel was provided with: 1) an understanding of the social policy problem that the 'Home to Work' project seeks to address; 2) an overview of how the 'Home to Work' project addresses the problem; 3) an assessment of leading national and international thinking on the issue; 4) a snapshot of the project’s key findings; and 5), identification of six critical dilemmas confronting the project which emerged from the evaluation findings. We then asked the expert panel to consider each critical dilemma and provide us with feedback on how we could tackle the problem with reference to specific examples of leading practice. A composite analysis of each critical dilemma follows.

Dilemma 1: establishing common norms and values across multiple agencies

What is the best approach for establishing common norms and values to underpin a delivery system involving multiple agencies?
“Establishing clarity of purpose and clear objectives was seen as the essential first step. There then needs to be commitment from each of the agencies (commitment of the whole agencies and the leaders would be beneficial, along with communication within each agency that collaboration on the project is an agency priority). Gaining commitment is probably easier when the project has clear objectives and obvious potential beneficiaries as experience shows that crisis or emergency responses (where these are clearly apparent to all) better galvanize cooperation than other situations.

Then a process of mutual bonding and recognition of joint endeavour must be created through dialogue and, if necessary, by explicit activities. This involves gaining good understanding of where the differing parties are coming from and their expectations. It was considered by some that this may not lead to changed values, but would result in recognition of shared values and goals, and gain collaboration and accommodation of others positions in a well “normed” group.

In addition to maintaining a focus on the shared outcome, differences need to be managed. There needs to be arrangements, forums, discussions and good faith negotiations so the different perceptions, thinking and approaches to problem solving can be conducted openly and respectfully. And these should continue throughout the project as new issues emerge”.

**Dilemma 2: supporting key workers**

*The success of 'Home to Work’ relies heavily on key workers. The evidence demonstrates that they are often prone to burn-out and poor mental health. How are key workers best supported?*

One common reason for burn-out is that government funded projects expect far too much in too little time and are not prepared to fund at the appropriate skill level. In other words, the case load can be unrealistic alongside insufficient funding of required skills and as a result they have high workloads, are shouldering a disproportionate burden at a personal level and end up sharing the frustration of clients.

The expectations of key workers should also be clear. A good example of where the funding and skill level was appropriate was JET advisers. Key workers should be chosen who have the relevant skills in building up trusting relationships with clients and with other agencies. Wherever there is a stressful relationship with clients, then mentoring back up should be immediately available.

Greater organisational support as well is critical – the biggest complaint in the not for profit sector has been that key workers feel abandoned with the burden of trying to solve the “bigger picture” issues through individual client journeys. There needs to be a way of workers flagging the bigger issues and see their organisations as proactive in following up the policy implications or advocacy necessary to address the underlying issues rather than just the symptoms. That way, they feel “heard”, their concerns acknowledged and their daily work part of a greater picture of social change, rather than simply providing band aid solutions to individual dilemmas.
**Dilemma 3: measuring project success**

*How should we measure success in a project aimed at citizens experiencing multiple exclusions?*

The obvious starting point here is with the project objectives. The key issue is to establish from whose point of view the evaluation is occurring. In any partnering arrangement, as well as starting with stated objectives, it is important that all stakeholders can identify what they expect to achieve, including the clients themselves. In this, a simplistic measure of “in employment” is not appropriate to severely marginalised citizens. Equally, measures of “attachment”, “social inclusion” are difficult to measure and calibrate into meaningful measures. What needs to be developed are measures of progress toward becoming a socially connected adult.

Evaluation should not just be about employment outcomes but also clear intermediate outputs e.g. Social engagement of clients. In the process of surveying clients and key workers, they need to be asked why certain things happened. For example, why in their view they did or did not get a job.

The perceptions of both workers and clients are very powerful but are often not given enough credence. People experiencing multiple exclusions and the workers helping them are usually “street smart“. They may be really frustrated, disadvantaged, struggling and feeling discriminated against – but they are usually not helpless and usually understand their immediate environment in some detail. They know when things are working and not working but have trouble articulating it in the variety of “measurements” we traditionally use. The development of a Positive Deviance model could be useful in this regard – focusing on what worked best where we would have expected it to fail – this could help in trying to capture the larger policy lessons.

**Dilemma 4: winning the war of ideas**

*Securing long term project funding rests on winning the war of ideas with Commonwealth and State funders that place-based, personalized service delivery is the way forward for citizens experiencing multiple exclusions. How would you go about doing this?*

“There are three essential elements here. Firstly, understanding the context from which the funders are coming (and networking with key people). As these services are needed only for the most disadvantaged, target (i.e. constrain) the project tightly, so the risk of budget blow-out is reduced. Show the costs of not taking action (they are huge) and show the payback rate of getting modest outcomes from these projects. The second essential element is about pitching the problem to be solved in a way that they understand it. An emphasis should be placed here on “successful outcomes”. It is a good story that people who have experienced multiple exclusions are now in employment – demonstrating that it can be done, without significant investment, is crucial to capturing the political imagination. Thirdly, it is essential to provide strong evidence through robust evaluations of what works and assurance of implementation capability. “Use the ruse” of calling them pilots, not ongoing projects, until the paybacks become demonstrable”.
Dilemma 5: getting job networks involved

A key aim of this project was to develop a strong working relationship with job networks not least because they are funded to provide job opportunities for participants. This has not been successful. How would you get job networks involved?

“Job networks work with mainstream clients even when they are required to divide their clients into streams of difficulty. The most disadvantaged need to be treated as a legitimate but separate stream, and one for which the mainstream does not cater. This would then create a cut-over point between the network and the most disadvantaged providers. The cut-over could be two way, with the network able to identify suitable referees to the key worker stream, and the key worker stream getting access to network opportunities.

Unfortunately, the network is tightly controlled by contracts and there are limited incentives to engage in this way. This will only change if the rules of the network are amended and incentives provided (e.g. if they refer someone and offer some opportunities which result in a positive outcome, they would get a reward payment as if they had handled the case themselves)“.

Dilemma 6: Getting participants to attend evaluation interviews/focus groups

Anglicare was responsible for ensuring that the Evaluator was able to interview all ‘Home to Work’ participants. A 61 per cent response rate has been achieved. How would you get participants to attend evaluation interviews/focus groups?

61 per cent is not bad for this group. One approach that could help is to identify what incentives they have and improve on them. For example, offer a lottery ticket to attendees.8 You can also play on ego and empathy; build on the idea that they are trail-blazers who are doing something remarkable and emphasise that others in their situation will only benefit if they are involved in helping us understand what worked. Alternatively, this could go back to setting mutual obligation requirements on participants being strengthened to include evaluation interviews.

10.4. How has the project performed when benchmarked against international better practice?

In Section 4 we identified 16 principles of design underpinning international better practice in combating social exclusion through place-based service delivery to provide a benchmark for assessing ‘Home to Work’ project delivery and outcomes. Our findings demonstrate the following assumptions about working with socially excluded groups in the ACT:

1. The claim that the most socially excluded groups are the hardest to reach and the least able to engage effectively with services is problematic; this depends on the design of the project and the quality of engagement (contrary to the ACID, UK and the US).
2. The project works well because it has full strategic and political support and a high quality governance group.

8 Participants were given a $50 voucher as an honorarium for completing an interview!
3. The project works well because it simplifies the complexities associated with joining-up several services (systems change) and the participants’ interaction with those services (system navigation).
4. The project works well because it is flexible to the needs and lives of the participants and proceeds from a philosophy of co-design with genuine choice. Participants respond well to increased choice and responsibility.
5. The project works well because it helps participants to negotiate difficult transition points in their lives.
6. The project works well because of the constructive relationship between the key worker and the participant.
7. The quality of the brokerage is crucial to achieving progressive outcomes.
8. Raised self-esteem and confidence of the participant is crucial to achieving progressive outcomes.
9. Project success can only be comprehensively measured through the lens of the individual journeys of the participants as they are all navigating multiple needs and exclusions. All H2W participants are navigating at least four of the following forms of exclusion:

   Affordable childcare
   Child abuse
   Criminal record
   Debt
   Domestic Violence
   Economic dependency
   Family breakdown
   Language problems
   Mental illness
   Physical health problems
   Limited educational qualifications
   Race
   Personal Security
   Police Harassment
   Stable housing
   Substance abuse
   Support networks
   Limited access to transport
   Limited work experience/skills

10. The project lends itself to early intervention logic, personalisation and, in the longer term, to the crafting of individual budgets; all of which make for better outcomes.
11. The project works well because the three brokers have negotiated a corresponding cultural shift (a systems or holistic approach) in working norms and values, however, this has not occurred with the job networks. Hence, asymmetries in working norms and values co-exist in the community of practice.
12. Place matters in terms of the availability of ‘key workers’, ‘place based brokers’ and the provision of ‘settled accommodation’.
13. The importance of participants opting in for support helps to distil the notion of rights and obligations (mutual obligation) and relationship building with the key worker.
14. In the main participants share a strong neighbourhood identity but are not distrustful of government (contrary to the ACID, UK and the US).
10.5. Parting shot – *capturing the political imagination*

In keeping with better place-based practice (CMD, 2009), the ‘Home to Work’ pilot project has benefited from: strong, strategic support; effective community and participant engagement; key worker, place manager or single entry systems; and flexible tailored services and funding structures. It has been able to circumvent traditional problems associated with place-based practices such as: reconciling differences in service culture and values; overcoming entrenched ways of working; and, problems with achieving positive outcomes for all target groups. The project has been less successful in realising its aspiration for a co-design approach although co-designed outputs did increase as the project progressed. Most significantly, however, it has delivered life changing outcomes for ACT citizens in employment (47 out of 81 participants), work experience (2), education (4) and training (4) through a cost-effective, local and personal project. In short, the 'Home to Work' project possesses most of the ingredients of international better practice in place-based service delivery.

Professor Mark Evans

Professorial Fellow Bill Burmester
Epilogue

What happened to me could happen to anyone. I went from having everything to having nothing. One moment I was in love with a baby and a future; the next moment I’m on the streets. I didn’t handle the separation well. I just couldn’t understand what had happened to me. It took me a long-time to cope and I lost everything. Until the project I had no one to turn to. I’ve now got it together. Good job, decent place to live and a girlfriend. I’ve even got access to my daughter now. Back then I never thought I’d get here.

Q. Where would you be now if you hadn’t joined 'Home to Work?'
A. I don’t think I would... be.

(Cohort 2 participant)
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Appendix 1.
Guidelines for ‘Good Evaluation Practice’

The aim, purpose and outcome of an evaluation

- Evaluations offer a chance to reflect on performance and to determine whether procedures can be altered to improve future programming.
- Formal evaluations result in written reports, which contribute to enhancing transparency and accountability, and allow for lessons to be learned across programs and agencies.
- Evaluations provide a means for organisations to retain and build institutional memory.
- Evaluations are a way of examining the effectiveness of interpersonal relationships within an organization. They provide staff with an opportunity to discuss issues of concern without prejudicing their position.
- Evaluations, if correctly carried out with the involvement of target groups can go some way towards improving the policy system’s accountability ‘downwards’.

Planning an evaluation

- It is important for the terms of reference to be grounded in the broader questions concerning the nature of the problem and the effectiveness with which it was addressed. The way in which those questions specific to each evaluation are framed is likely to evolve, as the study proceeds. The terms of reference should, therefore, be treated as negotiable.
- Clarity over evaluation objectives will make the whole process clearer and easier. Evaluation Managers should allow adequate time for this critical stage of identifying the objectives of the study.
- Experience shows that interviews with client groups can be one of the richest sources of information in policy evaluations. Interviews with a sample of the affected population should be a mandatory part of any evaluation.
- Evaluations should comment on policy impact and not focus solely on monitoring the efficiency of project implementation. As a result, qualitative and deductive methods of measuring impact, that involve client groups, are likely, in general, to be more appropriate than methods that seek to be ‘scientifically rigorous.

Implications for program monitoring

Monitoring systems should take full account of the needs of evaluations. This will require:

i) the use of data collection systems that facilitate evaluations and cross-agency, cross-program comparisons;
ii) agreement to be reached on the indicators that should be monitored by all agencies; and,
iii) a commitment by implementing agencies to facilitate evaluations through the management of filing and information systems so that key reports showing the decision-making process are easily accessible.

**Effective communication**

- The emergence of key issues throughout the evaluation requires flexibility of approach, with good lines of communication between the Evaluation Manager and the team on an on-going basis.
- In evaluations, qualitative interviews are generally the most important source of information on what happened and why. Evaluators need to talk to a wide range of ‘stakeholders’, to build up as complete and balanced picture of the process as possible.
- For accountability purposes, and for reasons of clarity, evaluators should make sure that the link between their findings and the evidence used is clear. Output data should be presented, whenever available, not only for accountability purposes, but also to allow the reader to make his or her own judgement as to the overall findings of the evaluator. The logic of the evaluator should be clear and convincing. At the same time, it must not be assumed that evaluators are infallible — methodological clarity enhances the accountability of the evaluator to those being evaluated.
- A draft report should always be prepared and circulated for comment to those organisations and individuals involved in the evaluation. Adequate time is needed for it to be considered and for comments to be received.
- Evaluations should include an assessment of the links between costs and performance. Too many evaluations make recommendations in the absence of any sense of the costs associated with alternative approaches.

**Follow-up to an evaluation**

- To maximise the effectiveness of the evaluation process, there needs to be an organised follow-up, that tracks responses to recommendations made in the evaluation report.
- Attention to the dissemination of evaluation results is as important as carrying-out the evaluation in the first place.
- Evaluation reports need to be “sold”. Stakeholders need to be enthused, excited and convinced that the evaluation report is important and should be read. While selling the report is more the responsibility of the management group than the evaluation team, marketing strategies could be included in negotiated follow-up actions in order to help steering committee members sell the evaluation report within their own organization.
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1. Introduction

Home to Work is a pilot project designed to improve coordination and integration between support and employment services for some of the most disadvantaged job seekers in Canberra: that is, public housing tenants in the inner-north postcode 2612. The project aims to enhance community engagement and connection for tenants in addition to improving opportunities to participate in community activities, programs, training and work.

Home to Work is funded through the Australian Government’s Innovation Fund and managed by Anglicare Canberra and Goulburn. The funding application was developed and submitted by the ACT Government (through the Chief Minister’s Department and the Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services). The Innovation Fund was established by the Australian Government to address the needs of the most disadvantaged job seekers by trialing innovative place based projects to overcome barriers to employment.

Effective responses to long term unemployment require collaboration across the Commonwealth and Territory Governments and with non-government organisations (and these sectors are all represented on the project’s Governance Group). The project aims to ensure that Commonwealth funded services (Job Service Australia and Disability Employment Network providers and Centrelink for example) and ACT funded services (including public housing, crisis and support services) work together to minimise what public housing tenants have called the ‘service run-around’ and to optimise their opportunities.

The project is place-based and located in the 2612 postcode (which includes the inner-north suburbs of Reid, Braddon and Turner) because of the relatively high levels of socio-economic disadvantage and long-term unemployment. The postcode also has concentrations of multi-unit public housing.

The project approach and the outcomes for tenants, services and the local community will be assessed as part of this independent evaluation. The evaluation and report will inform a sustainability strategy (following the end of the pilot project funding) and will inform ongoing improvements to service delivery, the strategic policy framework and potentially teaching materials on governance at the University of Canberra. The evaluation is a key component of the project and will be the foundation for systemic improvements in a number of arenas.

H2W is innovative because:

- Unlike other Innovation Fund Projects, the H2W project partners directly with the ACT Government and will build on existing client relationships with Housing ACT tenants to provide a continuity of service provision. This project also builds on existing funding relationships and networks between the ACT Government and community services providers to facilitate the involvement of support providers with the project.
- As the owner of asset, Housing ACT also has capacity to manage the physical environment in which services will be provided and will also be able to explore employment avenues for tenants via its subcontractor base through the use of social procurement activities.
- It is integrating skills development, training and work with the provision of crisis and support services for some of the most disadvantaged individuals in the ACT and a population that has been largely disengaged from the labour market.
• It is using the secure tenure provided by social housing as a key intervention point to support social and economic participation (which will capture people recently exiting homelessness, long term unemployed, lone parent households, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and members of the CALD community).

It is trialing a place-based approach where the ACT Government, Federal Government, crisis and support services and Job Service Australia providers collaborate to target effort in one of the most disadvantaged communities in the ACT. The project will involve program brokers recruiting and working with four groups of 20 individuals each (cohorts 1 – 4), with program objectives developed with each individual. The length of the intervention, and thus the timing of evaluation data collection, will need to be finalized as the program and the evaluation proceed.

2. The Evaluation

A comprehensive and independent evaluation of the H2W project will inform the ongoing development of a responsive, co-ordinated service system and the strategic policy framework which underpins it. The evaluation will assess tenant outcomes as well as the contributing and inhibiting factors to project success at an individual, service and community level. Lessons learned will be extrapolated across other areas in the ACT and contribute to national debates.

The proposed evaluation will adopt a mixed methods approach, appropriate to a complex, community-based initiative such as the H2W program, in which interventions are multifaceted, individually-tailored and flexible, and goals are not uniform across individual participants. The evaluation design reflects these complexities in the sense that it will be co-designed with key stakeholders and participants in the early stages of the project and modified as the program and the evaluation develops.

This type of flexibility reflects best practice in the evaluation of complex initiatives (see, for example, W.K. Kellogg Foundation 2004). The project will adopt a ‘realistic evaluation’ approach (see: Pawson and Tilly, 1997 and Arksey in Taylor and Baloch, eds., 2005); this involves taking the views of all the key stakeholders and a representative sample of participants into account to discover what works, for whom and under what circumstances.

This approach recognizes the importance of focusing on both program outcomes and program process. A strong emphasis on combining data from multiple sources, and engaging with a broad range of program stakeholders and participants are key underlying features of this approach.

3. Principles of Engagement

Given the nature of this evaluation we suggest six principles of engagement:

• A developmental approach will be adopted anchored in designing an evaluation which has broad ownership. The emphasis in this form of evaluation is placed on organisational learning and lesson-drawing i.e. drawing lessons from best practices and using them to promote progressive change.

• This will require the creation of a participatory learning environment based on the concepts of mutualism and reciprocity.
The Evaluation Team will engage in an ‘Objective-led’ evaluation i.e. the aim of this evaluation is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of H2W objectives in terms of their ‘efficiency’, ‘effectiveness’, ‘impact/influence’ and ‘sustainability’.

We also emphasize the importance of synthesizing the evaluation findings through collaborative analysis. Hence the learning process will involve iterative processes in which findings will be presented to the Program Team followed by a process of collaborative analysis and a review of prescriptive possibilities. This process maximizes utilisation of the research and ensures that the evaluation provides information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the workplan of the client.

The evaluation will follow best practice guidelines as developed by the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank.

The research will draw on the best traditions of action-based research.

4. Research Design

The evaluation is organized into three components: 1) the design study; 2) the outcomes evaluation; and 3), the prescriptive analysis. A more detailed investigation of each of these components of the investigation follows.

4.1 The Design Study

As noted above, the design study will adopt a ‘realistic evaluation’ approach (see: Pawson and Tilly, 1997 and Arksey in Taylor and Baloch, eds., 2005) which evaluates the views of all the key stakeholders and a representative sample of participants into account to discover what works, for whom and under what circumstances.

Scope: The core purpose of the evaluation is to facilitate learning the lessons from H2W from the perspective of all stakeholders, clients, the Project team and partnering agencies. An H2W Working Group will fine tune the overall research design, and the construction of four questionnaires – one structured and three semi-structured. The evaluation will use mixed methods to collect both quantitative and qualitative data at various points in time between February and November 2011 as successive cohorts of participants enter and leave the project.

Key questions for this part of the evaluation include the following:

- Was program implementation in accordance with program objectives (in terms of efficiency, meeting schedules, milestones etc)?
- Were there any unintended consequences of actions?
- To what extent was the program implemented through co-design with users?
- What were the major obstacles to delivery of H2W?
- Identify the key governance partners delivering H2W
- To what extent did agencies work together effectively to achieve desired outcomes?
- Has this project added value to the culture of working across organizational boundaries?
- To what extent was the ‘broker model’ helpful in delivering the project?
- To what extent was the project able to engage with Job Service Australia providers, Disability Employment Services and Centrelink and other agencies not funded by the ACT but relevant to the return to work?
- How cost-effective has the H2W program been?
Research methods:

This evaluation will be treated as a form of ‘rational’ analysis in the sense that an ideal-type evaluation framework will be presented. We will understand policy evaluation as the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation and outcomes. The aim of an evaluation of this type is normally to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process. By implication, this evaluation will have three main aspects that are clearly interrelated: the evaluation of the program and its constituent elements; the evaluation of people who work in the organisations that are responsible for implementing the program; and, the evaluation of the impact of program activities on beneficiaries and society. The emphasis in this form of evaluation is placed on policy and program learning/lesson-drawing i.e. drawing lessons from other policies/programs and using them as a context for evaluation. It is therefore both ‘realistic’ and ‘developmental’ in philosophy and approach.

The design study would use primarily qualitative methods of inquiry, gathering and analysing data from both participants and others about the way the program was implemented.

Data sources:

Two sources of data would be utilized. Firstly, from those responsible for the administration of the program – the “Project Administrators” data would be collected from semi structured one on one interviews with members of the project governance group. Secondly for those participating in the program and those involved in the on the ground delivery of H2W, data would be drawn from interviews (either individually or through focus groups) with program participants, program workers and other program stakeholders (eg project brokers). Data from these sources would be de-identified and confidentiality of data assured to those involved. Data collection from program participants would be administered by program workers or by program workers in collaboration with evaluators using interview guides and instruments provided by the evaluators.

Data Collection:

There are four phases of data collection in this aspect of the evaluation.

i) H2W clients (Questionnaire 1):
A self-assessment questionnaire (Questionnaire 1) will collect data from H2W clients. It will cover issues related to joining the program, experiences of, and satisfaction with, different H2W activities and overall appraisal of the effectiveness of H2W.

ii) Face-to-face interviews with Program Team (Semi-Structured Questionnaire 1)
A face-to-face interview will be conducted with the Program Team. This covered the H2W partnership, the project itself, staffing and an overall assessment of the first year of H2W.

iii) Face-to-face interviews with partner agencies (Questionnaire 2)
Topic areas will include involvement with H2W, funding and resource issues, staffing, strengths and weaknesses, improvements and the future development of H2W.
Focus groups with representative sample of clients (Questionnaire 3)

Focus groups will be used to triangulate findings arising from the self-assessment questionnaire with H2W clients.

Topics to be covered in interviews with program participants include the following:

- How did participants find out about the project, and what made them decide to participate?
- What has changed for participants as a consequence of involvement in the program?
- What, if anything, did participants learn from the program, and what do they do differently now as a result?
- What are participants doing now, and would they participate in a project like this again if given the opportunity?
- To what degree did the program meet participants’ needs and address their concerns as individuals?
- Which agencies did participants work with, and who did they like “best”?

Topics to be covered in interviews and/or surveys with other Project stakeholders (eg administrators, workers, brokers) include the following:

- To what degree was the authority to act clear and understood by each player?
- How effective was any process of joint decision making?
- Which program arrangements, practices and attitudes contributed most to effective administration?

Information gathered in this phase will be used to analyse the model of governance and cross agency arrangements that contributed to or hindered the successful execution of the program. All interviewees will be audio-taped, with permission. The analysis of the qualitative data will use the ‘framework’ technique (Ritchie and Spencer, 1994), which involves familiarisation with the material collected, followed by the identification and interpretation of key topics and critical issues that emerge from the accounts.

4.2 The Outcome Evaluation

Scope:

The impact study (or outcome evaluation) would focus on the extent to which the H2W program achieved the intended outcomes for individual participants, and would seek to answer the following research questions:

- Did the program successfully engage individuals in a broader range of social interactions and activities and to what extent did participants remain active in the program; what was the tenants’ perception of the changes, in what areas of their life, and how sustainable do they consider them to be?
- The nature of those activities that were most readily undertaken by participants, and the pathways between activities; what were the enabling factors and what were the barriers;
- Did participants engage in employment or structured training; what were the enabling factors and what were the barriers
- whether the project made any difference to their housing situation or their experiences of the community where they live
• To what extent did other indicators of participant well-being and/or social inclusion relevant to program goals improve; social inclusion is a difficult concept to define and measure however, it can include participation, connectedness, self-reported wellbeing and confidence.

the extent to which other outcome measures included in the H2W contract were able to be achieved and why or why not (answers could relate to individual factors or more systemic factors like the availability of training or entry-level jobs or cultural factors like stigma experienced by prisoners etc);

Research methods:

Ideally, the quantitative component of an outcomes evaluation would involve both pre- and post-program measurement of indicators, collected from both program participants and from a suitable comparison group, adopting a ‘difference of differences’ methodology that would allow tentative conclusions to be drawn about the impact of the Home to Work program. However, this approach may not be realistically achievable within the confines of the program – for example, small sample sizes are likely to make it difficult to detect statistically significant differences between the two groups, and problems with matching the program participants with a comparable group not participating in the program (especially given the diversity of outcomes that may be expected for individual participants) may make it difficult to attribute ‘difference of differences’ to the program itself. It is possible that such an approach may be feasible for some indicators (eg job placements) but not others. What is most important about an outcome evaluation is that it measures important achievements, not just those that are most easily incorporated into a rigorous quantitative approach to evaluation, and final decisions about this component of the evaluation will need to be made in consultation with program stakeholders as the evaluation gets underway.

In the absence of an explicit control study, we propose making use of available published benchmark data relevant to the program participants’ characteristics and expected outcomes in order to create a ‘pseudo-control group’. This phase of the quantitative data collection and analysis process comprises the following two parts:

1. Analysis of basic program participation statistics, using data provided by program workers/brokers. This data could include (for each group within each cohort) some measure of the amount of contact the participant had with the program (eg count of sessions attended); data about program completion or withdrawal; data about housing stability (did the participant’s housing situation remain stable throughout their participation). For participants whose goals included participation in training or work, data about whether this was achieved. All this information could be analysed in relation to participants’ characteristics on commencement of the program (eg demographic data; housing, employment and training status pre-program). Table 1 provides an example of some of the types of data that could be usefully analysed.

2. Collection and analysis of data based on a brief measure of social inclusion, self-worth, confidence or connectedness, to be identified and/or developed as part of the evaluation, and administered to participants as part of the qualitative data collection process. This measure will be finalised during the first phases of the evaluation, and will be informed by a clarification of program goals which we expect will emerge as

---

9 Such an approach would allow some descriptive data to be provided about the program’s success. For example, through such an analysis we might be able to see that some groups across all cohorts were more likely to successfully complete the program than others, or that participants with particular sets of characteristics were more or less likely to have continuously participated in the program than others.
the first cohort moves through the program. Ideally, such a measure should be administered both before and after program participation. This measure would be most useful if it could be matched with existing data sources, so that participant’s post-program outcomes could be compared with benchmark data for a similar population (thus creating a pseudo-control group). Possible sources of such benchmark data would include the Household Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia (HILDA) survey, or possibly data from the Inner North Canberra Social Capital Survey (although sample sizes in the latter may be too small to be able to adequately match with participant characteristics).

This approach would allow some measurement of less easily-quantifiable program outcomes, which would provide useful supporting data for the qualitative data collection and analysis.

**Data Sources:**

Depending on the selected indicators and measures of participation, activities and well-being/social inclusion as defined in the early stages of developing the evaluation plan, data on individual participants would be derived from the following sources:

- Existing background information held by ACT Housing and/or Northside Community Services including age, gender, housing status, employment status and history, social group status (recent migrant, non-English speaker, ATSI, with disability, household composition), income source, and so on.
- Data from semi-structured interviews (conducted either individually or in focus groups) with program participants devised by evaluators in consultation with program workers. These interviews would cover both process and outcome issues and potentially also include the administration of a brief measurement instrument related to social inclusion and/or participant confidence/self-esteem.
- Data available from job network providers or others about employment status and training activities
- Data gathered from key workers involved in administering the program re changes in individual participants’ situation re key indicators.

All data related to or collected from individual participants will be de-identified, and confidentiality and secure storage of data will be assured.

**Outputs**

A final evaluation report will be produced at the end of the final data collection and analysis phase of the project, integrating findings from both the process and outcome evaluation components, and including analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, findings on each of the key evaluation questions, and recommendations.

---

10 The draft Social Inclusion Survey is considered unsuitable in its current form for use with the program’s target group by the Program Sponsor, and only a subset of questions from this instrument and/or an alternative instrument for which agreement will be sought from the sponsor/brokers will be now included in the evaluation. However, the project retains an intention to assess ‘inclusion’ through both participants’ own accounts of their experiences and through some measures of connection and participation.
4.3 Prescriptive Analysis - enhancing program design, management and delivery

Scope:

The project evaluation team will utilise the Delphi survey technique (initially developed by Dalkey and Helmer (1963) at the Rand Corporation) to distil the views, ideas and germination of potential strategies. Delphi can be used for determining and developing a range of possible program alternatives and for exploring underlying assumptions or information leading to particular judgements.

Research method:

This is a mechanism for eliminating negative impacts of face-to-face or group discussions (Hsu and Sandford, 2007) by participants not interacting directly with one another. Through email and telephone interviews recommendations will be presented to participants for their comment and prioritisation. The primary objective of this process is to test possible strategies for program enhancement and fine tune the research teams’ recommendations. The Delphi group will be comprised of individuals with expertise in the fields of place based delivery, social inclusion and labour market policy. This component of research will be led by Professorial Fellow Bill Burmester.

5. Ethics Approval

The evaluation proposal will be submitted to the University of Canberra’s Human Research Ethics Committee before the University undertakes the evaluation or collection of data begins. Ethics approval will be sought in two stages. The initial stage will seek approval for the overall research plan and its component parts, and approval to proceed to commence the Design study through the collection of data and observations concerning the projects implementation. This stage would not involve collection of data from or concerning individuals or individual project participants. The second stage would seek approval to proceed to collect individual data once the collection tools, instruments and methodologies have been finalized.

5.1 Conducting Developmental Evaluations with Vulnerable Groups

The participatory philosophy underpinning this evaluation recognizes the normative argument that where possible evaluation should be based on principles of co-design and equal relationships between researcher and participants and that evaluation should work to empower beneficiaries (Beresford, 2005). However, we also recognize that this approach needs to be underpinned by clear processes of informed consent to ensure confidentiality and anonymity. Evaluations in this area have to be particularly careful about securing informed consent, and making sure that participants fully understand what is happening and how the information they provide will be used. With this aim in mind all participants will receive a brief presentation on the purpose and implications of the evaluation at the outset of one-to-one interviews and focus groups and required to sign a consent form. In subsequent reporting processes and outputs all participants will remain anonymous.

As noted at the outset, and reflected in the list of data sources, while outcomes will be evaluated using both quantitative and qualitative research methods, with an emphasis on triangulating data from a range of sources in order to strengthen and add validity to the
overall findings it is expected that the bulk of data collected and analysed will be of a qualitative nature.

Anglicare also has its own ethics approval processes for its undertakings to which this plan will be subject.
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Appendix 3.

The Joseph Rowntree Foundation’s *Tackling homelessness and exclusion: understanding complex lives*

The Joseph Rowntree Foundation’s *Tackling homelessness and exclusion: understanding complex lives*, is a round-up of four research projects investigating the overlap between homelessness and other problems such as mental ill health, drug and alcohol dependency, and experience of prison.

*Understanding complex lives* is the culmination of the four projects of the Multiple Exclusion Homelessness (MEH) Research Programme, a £700,000 research initiative under the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), launched in 2008 in partnership with the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, Communities and Local Government, Tenants Services Authority and Homeless Link (representing the voluntary sector).

The programme aims to provide a “statistically robust” account of the problems facing this group and the causes of those problems, drawing data from seven cities in the UK from February 2009 to September 2011.

**The key points of the report are:**

- There is a strong overlap between homelessness and other support needs. Nearly half of homeless service users experienced institutional care, substance misuse and street activities such as begging.
- Contact with homeless services, i.e. “visible” forms of homelessness, commonly occur after contact with other unrelated agencies such as mental health, drug agencies and the criminal justice system.
- A traumatic childhood featuring abuse or neglect is very common among homeless people and in adulthood the incidence of self-harm and suicide attempts are significant.
- Homeless men aged 20-49, and especially those in their 30s, experienced the most complex needs.
- Homelessness and housing support agency workers can often feel isolated and out of their depth when faced with taking on the primary responsibility for supporting people with multiple needs. There is the suggestion that housing support workers are now filling the gap left by the retreat of social workers from direct work with adults.
- People with multiple, complex needs are at risk of falling through the cracks in service provision. Highlighting the need for an integrated response across health, housing and social care.
The research indicates the majority group of people experiencing multiple exclusion homelessness are men over 30 with substance misuse and depression issues, often resulting from childhood abuse. This group are often placed in a "general needs" group while specialised services focus on young people and women.
Appendix 4.
Participant questionnaire

The Australia and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG) Institute for Governance

*Project title: Understanding the Home to Work Project*
Consent Form for Interviewees

This questionnaire has been co-designed with H2W participants, project staff and stakeholders to provide the evaluation team with a strong knowledge of participant perceptions of the quality of their H2W experience.

‘Home to Work’ is a placed based pilot project designed to integrate support and employment services for the most disadvantaged job seekers in Canberra: that is, public housing tenants in the inner-north postcode 2612. The project aims to enhance community engagement for tenants in addition to improving opportunities to participate in community activities, programs, training and work.

The purpose of this research project is to provide an evaluation of the progress that ‘Home to Work’ has made in realising its objectives with the fundamental aim of enhancing the quality of its management, delivery and outcomes for job seekers in Canberra.

We are asking you to participate in an interview because of your role as a participant in ‘Home to Work’, and, because you possess important information and insights into the performance of the project which are central to improving the quality of service delivery and its impact.

The interview information is for the purposes of this project only. The information you provide will be strictly confidential.
Interviewee Statement:
I hereby consent to participate in an interview on the key factors impacting on the management, delivery and outcomes of the ‘Home to Work’ project. I have read the explanatory statement on the nature of the project and the interview arrangements.

In providing my consent, I note that:

- I have read the Researchers’ Statement.
- I understand the interview is for the purposes of this research project only.
- The project is being sponsored by the ACT government and Anglicare and could be used to inform the development of policy options in this area in the future.
- All information I provide during the interview (and all references to the interviews in the final report) will remain strictly confidential. I will not be identified by name or by inference.
- I understand that participation in the project is voluntary. I am free to withdraw from the interview and the project at any time.

I, ____________________________ of ____________________________

(please print your full name) (address)

as a participant in the ‘Home to Work’ project consent to participating in an interview to assist the research team.

Signed: _______________________________ Dated: ___/___
About you

1. **How often do you get together socially with friends/relatives not living with you?** (scale of 1-7) *Please circle the appropriate response.*

   1. Every day
   2. Several times a week
   3. About once a week
   4. 2 or 3 times a month
   5. About once a month
   6. Once or twice every 3 months
   7. Less often than once every 3 months

2. **When I need to find someone to help me out, I can usually find someone** (scale of 1-7)
   *Please circle the appropriate response.*

   strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  strongly agree

3. **How much do you feel part of your local community?** (scale of 1-10)
   *Please circle the appropriate response.*

   totally dissatisfied 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  totally satisfied

4. **How satisfied are you with your employment opportunities?** (scale of 1-10)
   *Please circle the appropriate response.*

   totally dissatisfied 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  totally satisfied

5. **How satisfied are you with your life in general?** (scale of 1-10)
   *Please circle the appropriate response.*

   totally dissatisfied 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  totally satisfied
The program

6. **How did you get involved with H2W?**
   *Please circle the appropriate response.*

   1. I was contacted directly by a member of the project team.
   2. I was referred to the program by a member of the project team.
   3. Other (please write in).

7. **What did you hope to get out of H2W?**

8. **Did you get what you expected?**
   *Please circle the appropriate response.*

   Yes (go to question 10)
   No (go to question 9)

9. **Why not?**

10. **What support did you get through H2W?**
    *Please circle any of the following.*

    1. Mentoring
    2. Skills training (e.g. first aid, computing, English as a foreign language, driving lessons)
    3. Education
    4. Work experience
    5. Permanent work
    6. Childcare
    7. Other

11. **The length of the project was...**
    *Please circle the appropriate response.*

    1. Too long
    2. Too short
    3. About right
12. How satisfied are you with the support you have received?  
*Please circle the appropriate response.*  
totally dissatisfied 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  totally satisfied

13. How well did the project team work together?  
extremely well 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  poorly

14. Do you think your views or experiences of H2W influenced how it was run? *Please circle the appropriate response.*  
1. All the time  
2. Often  
3. Sometimes  
4. Rarely  
5. Never

15. Would you participate in a project like this again?  
*Please circle the appropriate response.*  
Yes (go to question 17)  
No (go to question 16)

16. Why not? (please write in)

17. Would you recommend H2W to friends and family?  
*Please circle the appropriate response.*  
Yes  
No

18. As a consequence of my involvement with Home to Work my views about government and community services have... (scale of 1-7)  
changed for the better 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 deteriorated
19. As a consequence of my involvement with Home to Work my understanding of the services available to me... (scale of 1-7)

has improved 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 has deteriorated

20. What is the best way to communicate project information with you?

Please circle any of the following.

1. Phone
2. Text
3. Email
4. Website
5. Facebook
6. Post
7. Notice board

21. What could we do to improve the project?

22. Discussion and self-identification of forms of exclusion.

23. What problems have you experienced with similar projects to ‘Home to Work’ in the past?
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Governance group questionnaire

The Home to Work Project

Questionnaire for the Governance Group
00--

This questionnaire has been co-designed with project staff and stakeholders to provide the evaluation team with a rigorous understanding of the perceptions of the Governance Group on the project management and delivery of H2W. It is organised into three parts. Part one asks a range of questions pertaining to the nature of their involvement with H2W. Part two focuses on questions of project design with a particular emphasis on unravelling issues of problem definition, the critical assumptions underpinning the project design, intervention logic, partnering and priority-setting. In part three, the questionnaire investigates different aspects of H2W Governance. The final part of the questionnaire centres on issues arising from the delivery of H2W with a strong focus on assessing the quality of joint working arrangements.

Part One: Background

1. Name and organisation?
2. How long have you worked with your present organisation?
3. What is your position in the organisation?
4. How long have you been involved with H2W and in what capacity?
5. What skills/experiences/attributes do you have that you believe are important in contributing to H2W?

6. What motivated you and your organisation to get involved in the H2W project?

**Part Two: Project design**

7. How is the problem defined by your agency? Or, what do you understand H2W is trying to achieve?

8. What does a place based approach to service delivery mean to you?

9. How was H2W set up?

10. What positive lessons can be drawn from the establishment of H2W?

11. What are the negative lessons?

12. Please identify any characteristics of H2W which distinguish it from other programs you have worked on or with which you have had contact?

**Part three: Governance**

13. Describe the governance arrangements for H2W?

14. How effective are they?

15. What would you change?

**Part four: Program delivery**

16. Does H2W promote joint working?
   Yes/No

17. In what ways?

18. What are the barriers?

19. How can they be navigated?

20. What is the value added from H2W?

21. Is H2W sustainable without Commonwealth funding?
   Yes/No

22. How can it be made sustainable?

23. If you were advising on the establishment of the H2W today, what would you do differently?
24. Is there anything that I haven’t asked you which you were expecting to be asked?

MANY THANKS FOR ALL YOUR HELP!
Appendix 6.
Project team questionnaire

The Home to Work Project

Questionnaire for Project Staff

This questionnaire has been co-designed with project staff and stakeholders to provide the evaluation team with a sound working knowledge of the H2W project, its design, operations and perceived impact. It is organised into three parts. Part one asks a range of questions pertaining to the background of project staff, their capacities and training needs. Part two focuses on questions of project design with a particular emphasis on unravelling issues of problem definition, the critical assumptions underpinning the project design, intervention logic, partnering and priority-setting. The final part of the questionnaire centres on issues arising from the delivery of H2W with a strong focus on assessing the quality of joint working arrangements.

Part One: Background

3. Name and organisation?

4. How long have you worked with your present organisation?

3. What is your position in the organisation?

4. What positions did you hold before joining your present organisation?

5. What is your highest educational qualification and in what discipline?
6. Apart from your formal qualifications, what skills, experiences and attributes do you have that you believe are important in performing well in your current position?

7. Have you received any training to help support you in your work on H2W? If yes, what did it include? If not, would it have been desirable? If yes, in what areas?

8. Would H2W benefit from joint staff development opportunities? If yes, in what areas?

Part Two: Project design

9. How is the problem being addressed by H2W defined by/understood in your agency/organisation? What assumptions were made, and on what basis?

10. What information did you and your organisation use to understand the problem and did this change over the course of the project? How?

11. H2W is targeted in the 2612 postcode. What does a place based approach mean to you in your organisation? Does it change how you approach this project? How?

12. H2W uses a broker model to deliver the project and there is a Governance Group made up of the organisations who have an interest in the outcomes for individuals and the community. Why do you think this methodology was chosen? How has it worked from your perspective?

13. How did you select delivery partners?

14. How did you establish procedures?

15. How do you set priorities?

16. If you were advising on the establishment of the H2W today, what would you do the same way and what would you do differently?

17. The H2W operates in a particular institutional and policy environment. What do you think is important about the environment H2W is operating in?
18. With respect to the structure of governmental portfolios, the priorities of the elected government etc. Have there been any significant changes over the life of the project that have impacted on the H2W’s operations, priorities or objectives? If so, what were those changes and why do you think they came about?

19. If there were changes, what impact do you think they had on the H2W’s capacity to achieve its objectives?

20. Please identify any characteristics of H2W which distinguish it from other projects you have worked on or with which you have had contact?

**Part three: H2W Delivery**

21. How often does the Project team meet?

22. Is this sufficient to cover necessary business?

23. How does the Project team share good practice?

24. Does the Project team share resources?

25. To what degree is the authority to act clearly identified and understood by each partner?

26. How are decisions made?

27. Has this project added value to the culture of working across organizational boundaries? If yes, in what ways?

28. What are the major obstacles to joint working?

29. Which project arrangements, practices and values contributed most to effective administration, as well as good outcomes for individuals and the community that H2W is focused on?

30. What are the major obstacles to the delivery of H2W? Is it possible to overcome them or are they “part of the landscape”? 
31. How well has the project been able to adapt to the changing landscape?

32. Has the project been implemented in accordance with project objectives (in terms of efficiency, meeting schedules, milestones etc)? Has the project achieved the outcomes you think it was after for individuals and the community? How and why?

33. Were there any unintended consequences of action?

34. Have agencies worked together effectively to achieve desired outcomes?

35. Has the ‘broker model’ been helpful in delivering the project? How and why?

36. Has the project been able to engage effectively with Job Service Australia providers, Disability Employment Services and Centrelink and other agencies not funded by the ACT but relevant to engaging with pathways to employment?

38. To what extent has the H2W project been responsive to the views of its participants? Has the project been implemented through co-design with users?

39. What, if anything, did your organisation gain from being part of H2W?

40. Is there anything else you would like to add that we haven’t talked about already?

MANY THANKS FOR ALL YOUR HELP!
Appendix 6.
Participant survey sample for qualitative research

**SAMPLE SIZE** = 40 (30 female and 10 male) constituting 65.4% of participants available for interview noting that 4 participants formally disengaged from the project, 5 were incarcerated, 1 had medical certification and 3 moved interstate or overseas.

**CALD** – 16 in total, of which:
- 9 are Single Women only
- 3 are Single Women and Single Parents
- 2 are Female Other only
- 1 is Male Other only
- 1 is Young Male only

**ATSI** – 8 in total, of which:
- 3 are Single Women only
- 1 is Single Man only
- 1 is Single Woman and Single Parent
- 1 is Single Man and Single Parent
- 1 is Male Other only
- 1 is Young Woman only

**Single Parents** – 10 in total, of which:
- 4 are Single Women Only
- 1 is Young Woman only
- 3 are Single Women and CALD
- 1 is Single Woman and ATSI
- 1 is Single Man and ATSI

**Young People** – 6 in total, of which:
- 1 is Young Man only
- 1 is Young Man and CALD
- 2 are Young Woman only
- 1 is Young Woman and ATSI
- 1 is Young Woman and Single Parent

**None of the above** – 8 in total, of which:
- 2 are Single Women only
- 2 are Single Men only
- 2 are Female Other only
- 2 are Male Other only