Australian Housing
and Urban Research Institute

Evaluating the Miller Live 'n Learn Campus Pilot

Positioning Paper

prepared by the
Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute
AHURI UNSW/UWS Research Centre

authored by
Bill Randolph, Lillian Pang and Helen Wood

AHURI POSITIONING PAPER SERIES

AHURI Positioning Papers is a refereed series presenting the preliminary findings of original research to a diverse readership of policy makers, researchers and practitioners.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

1   Characteristics of the United Kingdom Foyer Model
2   Definition of a Foyer by the Foyer Federation, UK
3   List of attendees to the Miller 2168 workshop
4   Live 'N Learn Management Board membership organisations
5   Illustration of relationship between the Live 'N Learn Foundation and the Miller Live 'N Learn campus
6   List of youth services in the Liverpool Local Government Area
7   Key findings from reviewed foyer evaluations
8   Memorandum of Understanding between the Urban Frontiers Program and the NSW Department of Housing
9   Program monitoring: A note on method

1   INTRODUCTION

This report presents the first stage of a project to monitor and evaluate the development period and early management phase of the Miller Live 'N Learn Campus located in the suburb of Miller in Liverpool, western Sydney. This initiative, sponsored and supported by the New South Wales Department of Housing and described more fully in Chapter 3, is based on the "foyer" model of integrated accommodation and job skills/search support for young and often homeless people operating in the UK. The Miller Campus is acting as a pilot for the potential development of more projects using the model across NSW and possibly beyond.

The 'market' for an integrated service package offering accommodation and job training is substantial. An estimated 90,700 homeless young people used Supported Accommodation Assistance Program services in 1999 in Australia. Of these 91% were unemployed or not in the labour force (Live 'N Learn Foundation, 2000).

Importantly, the foyer model operates across a range of key welfare policy areas – youth, employment, housing and homelessness and the school-work transition to independent living. But the policy background against which the foyer model is being introduced in NSW is in a state of flux. Fundamental reforms are foreshadowed in the recent Final Report of the Reference Group on Welfare Reform (2000). Here a system of individualised service delivery, mutual obligations on recipients of assistance and social partnerships between public and private and non-government agencies for service delivery and social participation was set out. The Final Report has received broad support from the present Federal Government, although it has recognised that the reforms are complex and challenging and will take several years to complete (Department of Family and Community Services (DfaCS) 2000a). The foyer model fits closely with this view of welfare support. The critical issue of the transition from home or care into independent living is also a major issue within this policy agenda.

In addition, the publication of a National Homelessness Strategy by the Minister for Family and Community Services in May 2000 adds a further element into the developing policy context (DfaCS 2000b). This stressed the importance of collaborative effort to bring community resources to bear on homelessness, as well as the role of prevention, early intervention and supporting the transition into independent living. As we show in Chapter 2, these are also elements in the foyer model.

The renegotiation of the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement in 2003 also has relevance to the potential development of the model, as will the future of the Supported Accommodation Assistance Programme (SAAP) and Crisis Accommodation Programme (CAP) system. At the State level, the NSW Department of Housing (DoH) is currently developing a Supported Housing Strategy which is likely to impact on the development of the model.

Exactly where the foyer model will eventually fit into the emerging welfare and housing policy reform process, or in what form it will be successful, is not yet clear. Its potential is significant however, judging by the success of its European antecedents (Foyer Federation, 2000a). The progress of the Miller Campus will therefore be watched with some interest.

Structure of the report

Chapter 2 sets out the background of the foyer concept in Europe and elsewhere. It details the characteristics of the UK foyer movement, which has provided the basic model for the Miller Pilot.

The background to the Miller Campus is then discussed in detail in Chapter 3, with commentary on the way the model has developed to date.

A brief review of the current policy framework within which the Miller Campus will operate is set out in Chapter 4. This is not meant to be exhaustive or detailed, but indicates the likely policy links that will need to be accommodated in developing the pilot scheme and incorporated into the evaluation process.

Chapter 5 presents a review of the published research on the foyer model, drawn mainly from the UK. The aim here is to review the evaluation and research methods used in these studies to inform the development of the research method for the present study. The key findings from these published studies that may have implications for the way the Miller Campus model develops are presented separately in Appendix 4.

In Chapter 6 the proposed monitoring and evaluation approach to be used in this study is discussed.

2 THE ORIGINS OF THE FOYER MOVEMENT

2.1 France

Foyer is a French word meaning 'hearth' or 'place of welcome'. Foyers or *Foyers Pour Jeune Travailleurs* began in France following the end of World War 2 when the infrastructure of the country was being rebuilt and there were abundant jobs for young workers coming from the countryside to the towns in search of work, but often no-where for them to stay as they traveled the country following the reconstruction work. There was already a tradition of publicly provided hostels for young people, particularly for young women regarded as being in need of care and protection (Shelter, 1992).

In 1955 L'Union Nationale des Foyers et Services pour Jeunes Travailleurs (UFJT) was set up which drew together existing Foyers and formed a network across the country. The key principle was encouragement and education, rather than the pre-war emphasis on care and protection.

Foyers are now part of the establishment in French towns and in the early 1990s around 470 such projects provide help and support to around 200,000 young people (no specific age restriction is applied) a year who use their services and around 100,000 who are accommodated (Shelter, 1992). Due to the emphasis on accommodation for young workers and trainees, unemployed young people may be under-represented among Foyer residents. Many Foyers in France have restaurants attached to them, open to both residents and others, which make a significant contribution to their running costs and ensure that they are integrated into the general community.

A job search initiative is a relatively recent addition to the French foyer concept, having been adopted by approximately 30 foyers between 1987 and 1991 (Shelter, 1992). The program, backed by European Union funding, helps young unqualified people to look for existing work opportunities and also helps them establish new businesses. The French employment scheme is run jointly by Foyer managers and relevant business professionals. Between them they arrange for feasibility studies, creation of projects, infrastructure, and technical and moral support. It should be noted that more up-to-date information on the French foyer movement has proved difficult to locate.

The principles behind the development and management of French foyers consist of five key elements that form a coherent whole:

- **Local management**: Each foyer is managed by a Steering Group made up of local members of the public, elected representatives, business people and professionals who share the desire to enable young people to take their place in society.

- **Housing**: A foyer is a place to "hang one's hat" on arrival, to find one's feet in the town, to think out one's plan of action and to find a job. A refuge which becomes a springboard.

- **Services**: Training and support, provided without interference (on health, leisure time and personal relationships), together with advice (on employment, administrative paperwork and social security entitlements), enterprise creation, allies and tutors, all in the framework of a mutual contract.

- **Social mix and group living**: Foyers are not social "ghettos", but a broad based microcosm, with peer group support and the opportunity of drawing on a wide range of experiences and training. Here differences are valued and a culture of respect for the individual promoted in the context of group solidarity.

- **Economic requirements**: Nothing is free, but everything is affordable. The service providing organisations are genuine business undertakings offering services direct to the young people (who are the clients, not objects of assistance) and to members of the general public living in the local community or town. About 80% of revenue comes from clients and 15% government subsidy in one form or another. Money is also available from the UFJT for special short-term circumstances (Foyer Federation for Youth, 1997).

The French foyer scheme has been deemed to have been successful in that those who participate as foyer residents tend to leave the foyer on higher monthly incomes than those entering. That is, after only a six week stay, "on average, those who had previously a monthly income of less than 5000 francs had fallen from 70% to 26%." (Shelter 1992, p 40). The foyer sector also acts as a point of reference on a range of issues that effect youth and young people moving from the country areas and between provinces in France. However, it should be noted that very little in the way of formal evaluation of the French foyer movement is available in English, and therefore little is actually known about the success or impact of the program.

2.2   United Kingdom

Given that the Australian interest in foyer has come through UK connections (see Chapter 3), it is worth setting out the UK foyer context in some detail. About ten years ago the concept spread to the UK at a time when the problems of youth homelessness and unemployment were becoming too obvious to ignore. As Anderson and Quilgars have noted, one of the key factors in establishing the foyer pilots in the UK pilot was "…the recognition by all parties that there was a serious problem of youth homelessness and unemployment; that these issues were linked; and that there needed to be a joint approach to addressing the issues." (Anderson and Quilgars 1995, p2). There was also a concern on the part of employment services that homeless young people were not accessing job search services and therefore were falling through the employment services net, considerably reducing their ability to access jobs.

The initial concept was promoted by a partnership between Shelter and Grand Metropolitan Plc. who formed the Foyer Federation for Youth (FFY) in 1992 (see below) and acted in an enabling role to set up a network of such projects in the UK, with perhaps a greater emphasis on housing young people (the target group is 16 to 25 year olds) who were homeless or at risk of becoming homeless (Shelter, 1992). This early intervention from a major national housing charity and a major corporate sponsor is significant. The impetus for foyers in the UK did not come from government in the first instance, although it rapidly became a major player as a funder of the initiative. Moreover, the role of a "championing" agency or consortium in promoting the model and putting funds and stakeholders together has clear parallels with the development of the model in Australia at the present time.

In the early stages of the foyer project Shelter saw its role as being to:

- "Act as a source of information for the European foyer umbrella organisation (OEIL)[1] on specific projects in Britain. Set up a newsletter to keep everyone informed in Britain and to pass on relevant European information.
- Set up a loose network of projects that will eventually grow into a proper Federation.
- Organise the evaluation of proto-type projects and prepare the strategy/policy paper for longer term development of the Foyer network in Britain.
- Set up a project development fund to help proto-type projects get off the ground and co-ordinate (with others) possible sources of capital and revenue funding.
- Set up a licensing system/model for membership of the Foyer Federation.
- Secure funding for new federation and launch into complete independence." (Shelter 1992, p 65).

The national Foyer Federation acts to provide wider support in the form of training, networking and policy development for foyer management teams, as in the French system. It is notable that no formal evaluation of the Foyer Federation, its activities or its accountability, has been undertaken to date.

The role of UK foyers

The foyer scheme in Britain aims at providing an intermediate or transitional step for young people who have left home or care and are trying to attain full independence. It was important for Foyers to be seen to be "…mainstream and normal and young people should be proud to participate." (Shelter 1992, p 53).

Typically foyers in the UK have had the following three key characteristics:

- Focus on *needs of 16 – 25 year olds* who are homeless or in housing need to achieve the *transition from dependence* to independence;

- Based on a *holistic approach* to the person's needs and integrated access to accommodation, training and job search facilities;

- Based on an *individual formal agreement or contract* (Action Plan) between the young person and the foyer management as to the package of activities to be undertaken while resident at the foyer, adherence to which is a condition of continued residence. (Foyer Federation for Youth, 1997)

A wider range of secondary characteristics is also associated with the UK foyer model (see Appendix 1). Importantly, the use of individually negotiated Action Plans embodies much of the mutual obligation and individualised service delivery philosophy to welfare provision now

---

[1] The Organisation Europeene des Associations pour L'insertion et le Logement de la Jeunesse (OEIL) is the European umbrella organisation or peak body for national foyer organisations in France, Germany, UK, Ireland, Portugal ,Italy , Greece and Denmark (Foyer Federation for Youth, 1997). It has three main functions:

- Promoting a holistic approach to services for disadvantaged young people in Europe;
- Networking, sharing of information and encouraging Foyers in new areas e.g. Eastern Europe;
- Linking foyers in different countries.

becoming dominant in Australia as elsewhere (Reference Group for Welfare Reform, 2000). While the role of the UK foyers has evolved since the early 1990s, the above three characteristics appear to be basic to all those developed to date.

The perceived benefits of the foyer model are that it will:

- "…contribute to the prevention of homelessness by providing an important intermediate step on the way to independence
- …break the link between homelessness and unemployment for many young people
- …encourage a positive attitude to wider society and encourage the young to accept responsibility
- …not duplicate existing facilitates but ensure that communities develop coherent and integrated responses to the needs for young people
- …provide a relatively cheap and economically sustainable response to the housing and training needs of young people." (Shelter 1992, p 53-54).

As such, the foyer model in Britain was initially seen to be a workable solution for youth homelessness by breaking the "no home no job no home" cycle. It was clearly not intended to be a mechanism to assist high care individuals as the housing management envisaged would not involve intensive personal support mechanisms. Moreover, each foyer management team was seen to be highly influential in developing the correct management style and ethos for each project.

Crucially, the development of foyers in the UK has been closely associated with the housing association and supported housing sector and funding regime currently managed by the Housing Corporation in England, Scottish Homes in Scotland, and Ty Cymru in Wales.

Capital funding has been greatly reliant upon Social Housing Grant (SHG)[2] and the supported housing funding system which are both operationalised through the housing association movement in the UK and were well established before foyers were introduced. Both have been significant sources of funding. In effect, the 'trick' was to marry job training and job search functions together (these had been largely conducted by separate government agencies) and then weld these onto a well established supported accommodation sector. In the main, housing associations have provided the development expertise and retain ownership of the property and responsibility for repairs, while management of completed schemes is often passed on to specialist managing agencies.

In the event, the funding regime within which the UK foyer movement has emerged has been complex. In addition to SHG, regeneration funds such as the Single Regeneration Budget and City Challenge[3] have been extensively used to meet development costs, as a range of other funds, including European Union social funds, National Lottery funds, charitable and private sector funds. Capital funding is therefore highly mixed in origin (Anderson and Quilgars, 1995).

---

[2] Social Housing Grant is the main capital subsidy paid to housing associations to support the development of new social housing in the UK.
[3] Single Regeneration Budget is a competitively allocated central government funding program to support local renewal projects. City Challenge is a similar central government competitive grant scheme for inner city regeneration projects.

On the revenue side, rents are charged that reflect costs of provision, offset by Housing Benefit and other supported housing funding arrangements. Funds to run the foyers also come from a wide range of sources, including some commercial activities on the premises (Foyer Federation for Youth, 1997). The funding model is therefore highly complex and each scheme operates with its own set of funding arrangements and partners.

Links with broader social and welfare policy initiatives such as the New Labour Government's New Deal Initiative, aimed at getting young people into work are clearly evident (Scottish Homes, 1998). For example, recently foyers have been chosen as the site for a national hi-tech learning network in disadvantaged areas as part of the UK Online strategy, a partnership between the UK Government, the Foyer Federation and ICL and leading to the creation a 48 Foyer IT Centres (Foyer Federation, 2000b).

The policy context in which foyers operate is therefore also characterised by complexity, cutting across departmental boundaries, policy concerns and funding structures. This reflects the holistic approach to the issue they aim to address.

The physical form foyers have taken in the UK also varies considerably, both in size (8 to 177 bedrooms) and origin: some are adapted from existing homelessness hostels while some are completely new-build schemes. The location is widespread in most main cities and towns, and in urban and rural areas. Typically, accommodation is provided in single rooms with communal facilities for other needs, and often including provision of training facilities on site, although some accommodation is in the form of flatlets with cooking facilities (Foyer Federation for Youth, 1997). The aims to foster independent living skills. Standards of accommodation and finish are high and tailored to the client groups needs. Staff are often provided on a 24hr basis, but with floating support for training and counseling needs.

The Foyer Federation, as it is now called, plays an influential role in the development of the sector, as advocate, sponsor, network, enabler and trainer through a national accreditation system. It is steered by a board of directors drawn from the social and public housing movement, training and employment fields, youth organisations, Foyer operators and the private sector. Funding for the Foyer Federation comes from the private sector, some government and European Grants, charitable trusts and subscriptions for membership and services.

The network began with a pilot of 5 YMCAs, which adapted their services by incorporating training and employment access to their programs (these were subsequently evaluated by Anderson and Quilgars (1995) – see below), and 2 new-build projects including one that was the subject of an architectural competition.

By 1998, 78 Foyers were in operation throughout the UK with a further 43 in development.

The Foyer Federation outlined five constituent fundamentals of what a foyer appeared to be to them. These are:

- "Affordable rents.
- General intake of young people aged 16-25, aiming at those who are working or want to work, rather than just special needs.
- A programme of social education, counseling, training and employment advice offered to residents as appropriate. This would be defined in an agreed action plan.

- The social integration of young people.
- Part of a national network." (Shelter 1992, p 67).

All foyers would need to keep in mind the synergy of support that was necessary to make the project successful: social and personal development, job search, counseling, advice, information, basic education and vocational training were all to be a part of the foyer, and what identified the project as a foyer.

Recently the Foyer Federation has celebrated the opening of the 100th Foyer in the UK. The accompanying report celebrates the growth and successes of the movement but laments the lack of basic skills among young people and the continued lack of a proper revenue funding source which has resulted in some Foyers being closed by their development agencies (Foyer Federation, 2000a). Others have been unable to resource the training and employment parts of their services.

Revenue funding problems have therefore been a major issue for some foyers, leading to a number of closures. Importantly, despite the initial public-private partnership basis of the early foyer initiatives, it is the Government, rather than the private sector, which is being looked to develop solutions to these issues. The recent Information Technology Network initiative noted above is illustrative of the likely wider development of the program and broadening of the revenue support base.

The Foundation's report also points to new areas in which foyers may develop in the future, including:

- pre-Foyer projects to prepare care leavers for independent living;

- more community benefits to non-residents as learning centres develop;

- increasing focus on evaluation and long-term follow-up.

Clearly, the foyer movement in the UK is evolving in new directions, partly in response to changing conditions, partly in response to funding issues and partly in response to changed government agendas. The apparent reduction in role and importance of the public-private partnership concept and the increasing reliance on government to support the movement since the early phase of development is also worth noting.

However, more recently, the foyer movement has begun to attract criticism from a number of researchers. This has focussed predominantly at the actual outcomes for residents. In a recent article, Chris Allen has argued that "there is no credible evidence to support the claims that are being made for foyers" in the UK (Allen, 2001). His criticism of the work of foyers stems from an evaluation of a foyer in northern England he conducted for a major housing association and funded by the UK Housing Corporation. In particular, Allen found that residents' experience of living in this particular foyer fell well short of the rhetoric claimed for foyers by their supporters and the Foyer Federation itself. Allen argues that residents often found them selves in a "them and us" situation with foyer staff and were penalised for transgressions of the rules of residency, with managers operating a "zero tolerance regime towards breaches of the rules. In the event, the report he delivered has yet to be published.

Whether or not Allen's criticisms are generalisable to the rest of the foyer sector in the UK, they nevertheless raise important questions concerning the way the Action Plan based mutual obligation approach is managed in practice. There are significant implications for the way the Australian model might emerge and the management practices that are adopted to structure the relationship with the residents.

2.3   Other European Developments

In Germany the current infrastructure for young people's accommodation and training was set up after the Second World War, with the founding in 1949 of Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft Jugendsozialarbeit (BAGJAW). This is a large umbrella group bringing together several networks of national and regional organisations including the German branch of the YMCA. All participants are concerned with the voluntary sector socio-educational provision for young people, (the closest equivalent to French/UK foyers) providing a network of 350 youth villages (Jugendwohnheim) with 35,000 beds. The youth villages aim to enable young people to learn skills of how to cope with everyday life and live independently within a community. The ages covered by BAGJAW range from 14 to 27 (Foyer Federation for Youth, 1997).

In addition there are 500 reception centres receiving about 140,000 young migrants from Eastern Europe annually. There is also a distinct program of social work with girls to try to redress the structural disadvantages perceived to be faced by many girls and young women in Germany.

Several other European countries have shown considerable interest in the principals and concepts of Foyers. These include:

- Denmark- counseling and support services in Jutland;
- Portugal-3 pilot projects in partnership with local authorities;
- Ireland- 2 pilots, Limerick and Dublin;
- Netherlands-pilot of 11-Foyer network;
- Greece;
- Italy;
- Poland; and
- Spain.

Information on these in English is limited and time considerations made access to literature difficult. They will not be covered in the current review[4].

2.4   United States

A further element in the evolution of the foyer concept comes from the United States (US). At least one foyer-type scheme has been developed in the US. The Tubman Foyer in Minneapolis was established in October 1997, housing 57 people in 15 apartments, with a focus on women escaping domestic violence and their children. This group had difficulty in both accessing affordable and appropriate housing and access to stable job opportunities. No existing social program was effectively operating to bridge these two issues. The project

---

[4] At this stage, documentation from OEIL has not arrived and will be included in later reporting.

is seen as assisting people in a transitionary position in housing and employment terms, as well as emotional and domestic terms (Gaussiran and Brinda, 1997; Gaussiran, 1999).

The Tubman Foyer rose from a local partnership between the Minneapolis Neighbourhood Employment Network (NET), a well established employment program that assists in job placements, training, job preparedness and living skills (including local business partners), the Harriet Tubman Centre, which provided assistance and accommodation for battered women and their families, and Loring Nicollet Bethlehem Centre, an established employment services agency and an affiliate of the NET.   The partnership approach gave the benefit of reducing funds necessary for the establishment of the Foyer and utilised existing expertise in the neighbourhood. However, this partnership was never formally established which did lead to implementation problems.

However, the Minneapolis context differs significantly to the Australian. Firstly, in the face of quite limited access to public money the dominant focus of the Tubman Foyer project was to become established utilising existing centres and resources for a low budget implementation. Grant funding was received from the Minneapolis Employment and Training Program and from the private sector. However, total amounts were relatively small (the program implementation budget was US$50,320).

Secondly at the time, the Minneapolis economy was buoyant with statistically near full employment. The target was therefore to assist the 'hard to employ'.

Thirdly the Tubman Foyer was an extension of existing integrated accommodation provision for vulnerable women. Thus the real impact of the project is whether the addition of the employment services is successful, not the additional contribution of housing provision.

Fourthly, the project was set up and maintained as a locally driven project without the vision of wider geographical application by the existing partners or the formation of a national Foundation.

Finally, the target group of the Tubman Foyer is 21 to 65 year old women with or without families that have been the victim of violence in their relationship. The target population was a natural consequence of involving the Harriet Tubman Centre who already serviced such clientele. With such a vulnerable target group no commercial activities (such as an attached restaurant or other business scheme) are likely to be possible and the identity of the individuals is often protected, so follow up and monitoring activities are limited.

3   THE FOYER CONCEPT IN NSW

3.1   Introduction

This chapter sets out the background to the development of the Miller Live 'N Learn Campus pilot to early 2001 and outlines its main objectives and characteristics. The current position regarding the management model for the pilot scheme is also discussed (where known) and the relationship between the Live 'N Learn Foundation and the Miller Campus is established.

3.2   The initial development of the foyer concept in NSW

Following a visit by the Director General of the NSW Department of Housing (DoH) to the UK, a Working Group was set up in 1998 to consider bringing the Foyer concept to NSW and adapting it to the Australian setting. This section sets out the development of the concept and its implementation up to October 2000, drawing on internal DoH documentation.

An initial move was to appoint a consultant to prepare a report on the feasibility of adapting the model to Australia. The resulting report concluded that the model could be adapted to NSW albeit in a smaller format. The basic requirements of foyers as defined by the UK Foyer Federation could be met and NSW was well placed to integrate accommodation, training and employment because of the experience of key government and non-government agencies in interagency working. The report acknowledged that a funding package for capital and recurrent funding would have to be developed (Woodhouse, 1998).

The Working Group within the DoH was set up comprising the Regional Director of the North Region as the 'Corporate Sponsor' within the DoH, together with representatives from the Office of Community Housing, and the Federation of Housing Associations. (This working group was initially attended by the Consultant Joy Woodhouse and was subsequently attended by South West (SW) Sydney DoH regional representatives.) Two pilots – a regional one and a metropolitan one – were proposed, in Kempsey and Liverpool/Fairfield area respectively.

In December 1998 the Human Services Senior Officers Group[5] was briefed about the proposals and agreed to promulgate the concept within their agency and keep a whole of Government watching brief on the project and assist where necessary. The briefing noted the role of four key partnerships in the model – government, the community, the private sector and non-government agencies – as well as the four key 'ingredients' of the approach – the linked provision of accommodation, employment opportunities, support, and education and training (McCairns 1998).   At the same time the Federation of Housing Associations was given a grant of $20,000 to help in the research and development of a foyer model in particular the potential role of the business sector in Live 'N Learn campuses.

---

[5] Human service governmental agencies are Housing, Health, Education & Training, Community Services, Ageing & Disability and Juvenile Justice.

3.3 The Miller Pilot

A regional working party to consider the development of the Liverpool/Fairfield foyer pilot comprising the SW Region of the Department of Housing, Hume Community Housing Association and Cabramatta Community Centre arranged a workshop that was held in September 1998 in Liverpool. All interested agencies were invited to participate in a steering group to get a pilot off the ground in SW Sydney. (See Appendix 2 for agencies attending Workshop and subsequent membership of Steering Group.)

Following the workshop, a Steering Group was set up in 1999 and the South West Sydney DoH Regional Director subsequently became the DoH 'Corporate Sponsor' for the Miller pilot.

During 1999, both the Working Group and the SW Sydney regional steering group continued to meet. The former considered the state-wide aspects of foyers and their funding, and the latter focussed on the pilot in the SW Sydney region.

The SW Sydney regional steering group met monthly, hosted by the DoH. Models for foyer set-up and management were considered, as well as potential funding sources. A case was made to the Department of Family and Community Services that the positions of potential foyer managers and/ or caseworkers should be eligible for funding under the new SAAP agreement being negotiated at the time. At the time of writing, it is not known what the outcome of this was.

During this time research was conducted as to the need for such a facility in the area and focus groups were held in two locations: Miller and Liverpool. Liverpool Council had recently set up Community 2168, a community–based social renewal initiative (Randolph and Judd, 2000a) and considerable resources were available to put into the Miller area, both from the Council and the Department of Health. This coupled with the high levels of youth unemployment in the area and some perceptions of youth nuisance activities near and within the shopping centre resulted in Miller being selected as the location for the pilot scheme. A suitable property comprising 35 one bed and bedsit units was identified in Cabramatta Avenue, Miller. It was agreed that the Miller pilot will be limited to 25 residents on this site. The extent of direct consultation with local youth was limited to involving local youth representative agencies in the discussions.

Other projects in NSW were visited in order to see whether an appropriate model already existed for delivering youth accommodation and education/employment support. The closest was the innovative Wollongong Youth Accommodation and Support Association which runs a number of projects catering for a range of different client groups from those requiring crisis refuge accommodation to those funded through the Job Placement Employment and Training program run through Centrelink.

In April 2000, the status of the steering group was changed to an Interim Board of Management. It was subsequently decided to progress the foyer pilot by formally establishing a Live 'N Learn Campus Foundation (with limited company and charitable status) to act as an umbrella organisation to raise funds and widen the scope of the initiative beyond the initial pilot in Miller and the proposed second pilot in Kempsey. This development was resourced and managed by the SW Regional Office of NSW DoH and was achieved in September 2000 (see Appendix 2 for membership organisations).

In many respects, the establishment of the Live 'N Learn Foundation adopts the UK and European 'Federation' model to assist in broadening the support and funding for the expansion of the foyer model in NSW and possibly beyond.

3.4   The Miller Live 'N Learn Campus

Following this development, in mid-2000 the name of the pilot was changed to the Miller Live 'N Learn Campus. At the same time the Foundation has stated that the "key consistent and essential criteria" of each Live 'N Learn Campus will be:

- A focus on assisting vulnerable or disadvantaged young people aged 16 – 25 years;

- Providing affordable, safe and stable accommodation accessible to public transport, services and amenities including recreation areas;

- Supporting access to and creative approaches to training, education and employment;

- Providing an integrated and holistic service response to the range of needs young people may have;

- Exposure to employment through engaging with local employers and business;

- Supported access to 'move-on' accommodation.

Residents will be male or female of any ethnic, religious or cultural background, and single parents and couples may also be accommodated. Importantly, each campus will need to reflect local community needs and characteristics.   Campus residency will be limited to two years and the client group will not be those with crisis needs.

In many respects the Miller pilot has adapted much of the package of basic characteristics of the UK model, including the latter's heterogeneous and welfare approach and the focus on the "no home no job no home" cycle of youth disadvantage, but adapted to the specific circumstances of the Miller area. In this it contrasted with the looser French foyer model. Most significantly, three of the "essential Campus criteria" listed by the Interim Board have been adapted directly from those developed by the UK Foyer Federation and noted above.

The Mission Statement of the Foundation also stresses the holistic nature of the links between young people with housing, education, employment and their communities through:

- **Living** – by providing a safe and stable living environment;

- **Learning** – supporting the development of life skills and education opportunities;

- **Earning** – providing links to employment opportunities.

The Campus will therefore enable "…the development of life skills, esteem, networks and a transition to independence." (Live 'N Learn Foundation Limited, 2000, p3).

The Campus management will achieve these goals by providing:

- personal counselling;

- independent life skills and personal development programs;

- personal financial budgeting counselling;

- educational or vocational training programs provided within or linked to the Campus (e.g. at TAFE, university or high school);

- labour market participation programs; and

- through well managed, secure and affordable accommodation.

The aim is to provide all the necessary support in one package to the resident.

A key issue for this evaluation is the distinction between the Foundation and the local management of the Miller Campus. It is an evaluation of the latter with which this evaluation exercise is concerned.

3.5   The Miller Campus management model

At the time of writing, the management model of the Miller Campus is still to be finalised. The evaluation team have worked with the Interim Board to establish the goals and objectives as part of the evaluation exercise and the outcomes of this will be reported in the forthcoming Work in Progress Report for AHURI. However, a number of key features of the management model are fairly clearly established and have been developed in several iterations of the Business Plan for the Foundation (Live 'N Learn Foundation Limited, 2000). These include:

- Development and refurbishment costs of the Miller Campus will be met in the first instance by the NSW Department of Housing, who will retain ownership of the property and responsibility for cyclical repairs. The site will be leased to the Foundation for an initial two years at a peppercorn rent. At the time of writing, site redevelopment options were still being assessed.

- The running costs of the Campus will not be directly government funded – revenue funding will need to be obtained from a range of sources, including rents, business activities and charitable and corporate contributions. The revenue funding arrangements have yet to be finalised.

- The client target group will not be those in crisis or high need, that is people with serious behavioural problems, anti-social behaviour or ongoing/untreated substance abuse.

- Residents will be responsible for their own cooking, cleaning and upkeep of their accommodation.

- Rents will be charged at an affordable level. Residents will formally be tenants under the Residential Tenancies Act 1998 on fixed term tenancies.

- Residents will be selected on set criteria (to be agreed) and will receive a "Scholarship" to become eligible for the subsidised accommodation, education and support services at the Campus. A mix of high school, TAFE and University students will be sought. Referrals will be encouraged from youth refuge projects to help clients break out of the homeless cycle. The aim is therefore to act as an option for people in crisis accommodation who are ready to move on to a more focussed and independent living and learning arrangement.

- An individualised time-limited support and training package will be negotiated between each resident and the Campus management and a realistic "Transition Plan" will be agreed between the two parties. The Plan will set out the goals the resident aims to achieve while at the Campus, and the steps they will take to achieve those goals. The aim will be to achieve the transition to independent living, essentially by gaining a job or further training/education and/or moving into independent accommodation, and maintaining that position.

- The achievement of the Transition Plan will be the joint responsibility of both the resident and Campus manager, the former by complying with the conditions of their License Agreement and Transition Plan, and the latter by negotiating for and providing the appropriate training and support needs of the resident.

- Residents who purposely or knowingly abandon their Transition Plan will risk losing their Scholarship (and potentially their accommodation at the end of the fixed term tenancy). Counseling and support provision will be provided. The Scholarship would be withdrawn after a second "offence".

- The Miller Campus management agency will be selected through a tendering process, with successful tenders selected on the quality of local contacts with community, government, business and welfare service groups. They will also need to demonstrate an appropriate track record of experience and skills to deliver the required package of outcomes, including provision of welfare and accommodation services, training and life skills programs and willingness to work with the Live 'N Learn Foundation to develop the management model.

It should be noted that at this stage, direct consultation or involvement of local young people from the target groups has not been entered into. Whether this will be a feature of the management model when it is finalised remains to be seen. There seems to be a case for involvement of young people in the development of the model and possibly management of the project when it moves into management

3.6   Recent developments

In August 2000 the Interim Board approved the advertising for expressions of interest for management agencies to tender for running the Campus. At the time of writing this process has been held over while committed funding is obtained for the first stages of the project.

In October 2000 the Interim Board held its final meeting, handing over to a small group of key sponsors who are to become the directors of the Live 'N Learn Foundation. These directors represent the following organisations:

- NSW Department of Housing;
- Youth Accommodation Association NSW;
- Construction Forestry Mining Energy Union;
- In addition three corporate members and an independent chair will be appointed.

This meeting also received a report from the NSW Federation of Housing Associations on Residential Tenancy Agreements and how their use will affect the Campus management (NSW Federation of Housing Associations, 2000). After reviewing the current legal position and established best practice surrounding the likely tenancy options available to the Campus management, as well as the Campus's own aims, the report recommended that all Campus residents be put on fixed term tenancy agreements, probably for an initial period of three months or less for more "risky" residents.

This option provides the best compromise between providing for the tenancy rights and independence of residents as well as providing control for the management over residents' behaviour and compliance with their Transition Plans. Under this proposal, residents would be provided with clear guidelines as to how their tenancies would be terminated or renegotiated. However, under this proposal, the individual Transition Plans could not form part of the tenancy agreement, nor would breaches of the Plan be grounds for eviction or termination. Adequate management procedures would need to be developed to ensure that inappropriate residents are legally evicted without unlawful action.

It would appear that there is now less emphasis on a "whole of government" approach which was initially envisaged and more emphasis on a public/community/business partnership. While this parallels the initial partnership focus in the UK, the subsequent experience in the UK has shown that foyers have increasingly relied upon government funding of some form to support and underwrite the expansion of the program. At the time of writing, the partnership arrangements and funding opportunities remain to be identified.

In the meantime, the property identified for the Campus in Miller has been vacated by permanent residents and let on a short-term basis pending upgrading works and the appointment of a managing agency for the Project. In August 2000, the NSW DoH estimated that it had committed $395,000 to the development of the pilot since 1998. A further $29,000 had been committed by the NSW Youth Accommodation Association. The budget for the further development costs of the Miller pilot for the period mid-2000 to mid-2001 was set at $500,000 for management costs and $250,000 for refurbishment work. The original timetable for the pilot envisaged the first residents moving into the refurbished premises by March 2001. This target has not been achieved, as the financing arrangements and detailed management model for the pilot have yet to be finalised.

3.7 The foyer concept elsewhere in Australia

A limited amount of research has also been done to establish what other similar projects may exist or be in development in other states.

- **The Youth Transitions Model, Melbourne, Victoria**

This project is in the formation stage, we have thought it important to overview it here regardless due to the similar nature that this project is intended to take – it is also based on the Foyer model.   At the time of writing, it is understood that the site has been identified and some renovations of the building are taking place, funding has also been secured to further the project. It is to be piloted over a period of three years.

A number of key organisations public and private have been involved in the development and financing of the project: the Sidney Myer Fund, Department of Human Services, Victoria, The City of Melbourne council, Gospel Hall Trustees, Melbourne Lions Club and the Office of Housing. These stakeholders have together secured the funding and a site for the project. Redevelopment is yet to be completed.   The role of private funding form philanthropic sources is a key feature of this scheme.

The Youth Transitions Model (this name may change) is aimed at assisting young people, between the ages of 15 and 24, with a focus on those aged between 16 and 21. It has been designed and supported in an effort to assist young people in the inner city region of Melbourne who are at risk of long term homelessness. It is an early intervention program by design. It is intended that youth will be accommodated for up to three years in a supported environment.   The initial pilot will accommodate up to 8 young people, this having been determined by the availability of suitable premises, although it is aimed that at the end of the three year pilot period a total of 30 accommodation places will have been established.

Key characteristics of the Youth Transitions Model:

- Formalised partnerships between services – a number of existing services will operate to support the youth in their goals of independence.

- Provision of secure housing and access to education and training – provided to all young people involved as the foundation of the program.

- Ongoing case management support and assistance with access to a range of support services – to address key health and other life issues.

It is envisaged that residents will enter the program via a referral system which is to be established. They will commit to a plan of action that is developed with a focus of leading to independent living. This is to be developed in conjunction with the support worker (two support workers will be employed to live on the initial premises. All residents will be case managed in a flexible manner throughout their stay in the project.

The pilot project will be run by a central support unit and steered by two advisory committees, although this is yet to be finalised. The management of the scheme involves a manager who will be responsible for the connectivity of the project with key organisations and the development of policies/procedures/partnership agreements.   Case managers/support workers will work directly with residents to implement the action plans, including the co-ordinating of other support services.   The management team will be completed by the appointment of a 'partnerships and service development' worker who will market the program and expand relationships and a reception/administration worker. At the time of writing, no date has been established for when the project will open for its first residents.

- **Youth at Risk, Melbourne, Victoria**

This is a Melbourne based non-government agency that focuses on training and education for young people leading to employment. It runs courses across Victoria and some in NSW. Success rates are very high, 65% gaining employment after 2 months rising to 90% after 12 months on the program. The program attracts extensive involvement from the private sector, co-ordinates a large number of volunteers and has a board of Directors including high profile individuals from the corporate sector. However, it does not include an accommodation component.

Other than those mentioned above, no other foyer-type projects seem to be operating in Australia at the present time.

4 THE POLICY CONTEXT

4.1 Introduction

As we noted in Chapter 2, foyer–type projects have been generally seen as a preventative model aimed at youth homelessness, youth unemployment and alienation of young people at risk. They can deal with young people who have a background of these problems. However, they are not generally seen as part of the crisis response sector.

The main focus of the Miller Live 'N Learn pilot parallels that of the British model: namely a transitional sector, bridging the gap between moving from home or institutional care into independent living for vulnerable to marginally placed young people. A potential role has emerged more clearly in the NSW case of these projects acting as an intermediate "move on" option for people coming out of crisis accommodation and into a more independent and focussed learning environment.

This places the Live 'N Learn model in an interstitial policy area. The proposed Live 'N Learn model has relevance for at least three distinct policy contexts – youth housing and homelessness, youth unemployment, and the social issues surrounding the transition from school into independent living. As a result the social policy context in which the model operates is complex.

In the following section a range of related policy initiatives and developments are reviewed briefly. This is not intended to be an extensive discussion of the policy implications of the Miller Campus pilot, which will be developed in the later Work in Progress Report once the formal management model and funding structures have been finalised.

There are at least four key policy contexts within which the Miller Campus model is developing: housing and homelessness policy, income support policy, youth employment policy and supported accommodation policy. There are also overlaying Federal and State policies that interact in these areas. The following section reviews the most relevant.

4.2 The New South Wales policy environment

Housing policy

In NSW, Live 'N Learn fits within two of the NSW Department of Housing's (DoH) key objectives:

- **Assisting those with priority needs**- this includes people with support needs and people vulnerable to homelessness;

- **Building successful tenancies and communities** – helping to ensure that young people do not enter the spiral of low skills, unemployment and homelessness which can lead to substance abuse and criminal activities in the neighbourhood.

Part of the DoH's policy with regard to serving its customers is to improve the supply of supported accommodation and to work in partnership with other agencies to ensure the supply of support services (NSW Department of Housing, 2000).

The current role of the NSW DoH in sponsoring and resourcing the development of the Miller pilot and the Live 'N Learn Foundation has been highly significant and it remains by far the major stakeholder in the program. The extent to which the Campus model will become more or less associated with the DoH depends greatly on the funding arrangements that are created by the Foundation.   At present the future role of the DoH appears to be in maintaining interim resourcing for the Foundation and the provision and refurbishing of properties.

In addition, the Office of Community Housing, which is part of the NSW DoH, funds and regulates the community housing association (CHA) sector in NSW.   Given the role of housing associations in the UK foyer program, it was thought initially that CHAs could play a role in the development of the model in NSW.   However, to date, this seems less likely as there is no obvious specific role for CHAs, as they own few properties and have no development skills (unlike the UK) and can provide only tenancy management skills which are a relatively minor part of the Campus package.

Youth Policy

The New South Wales Office for Children and Young People (part of the Cabinet Office) has a Youth Policy which lists 6 principles of providing services to young people: Co-ordination; Access; Equity; Participation; Rights and Responsibilities; and Early Intervention (NSW Office of Children and Young People, 2000).

The co-ordination ('Government organisations or agencies working with each other to provide better services') and early intervention principles are directly relevant for the Live 'N Learn or Campus model.

The Policy also has four goals:

1. Giving young people a bigger say in government policies, programs and services;

2. Providing young people with skills and resources for employment and independent living;

3. Encourage a healthy lifestyle and provide a safe environment;

4. Improve access to community space recreation and cultural facilities.

Some of the key actions promised by the state government, particularly those relating to goals two and three would fit well with the Live 'N Learn Campus model. For example: a fair share of government jobs and training are to go to young people, small business training for young people is to be improved and special assistance given to students staying away from school to help them return to learning.   These policies could all be delivered through a Campus which could provide services to non-residents as well as residents. The policy also refers to the provision of more community housing for young people and better accommodation and support for young people in care.

The goal of giving young people more say in policies and programs could be positively incorporated into the Miller Campus pilot. As we noted above, young people have not been directly involved in the development of the model so far. It seems that this is an area that could be developed further as the Miller pilot evolves.

Whole of Government policies

In addition, the model fits with the Whole of Government approach promoted by the NSW Premiers Department (1998), and based on the belief that collaboration often produces better outcomes for the community when several agencies are involved in a service. Collaboration in this context means agencies working together to achieve joint outcomes, not just consulting each other or sharing information. This means agencies changing the way they do things. It is acknowledged that such an approach generally takes longer and costs more and so should only be done if the increased benefits are substantial and the issues are important. The NSW Premier's Department provides a useful planning document containing checklists to test whether a particular project would benefit from a collaborative approach.

Tracking the involvement of Government agencies other than the Department of Housing will be an important feature of this evaluation.

Affordable Housing Strategy

The NSW Department of Urban Affairs and Planning (DUAP) has an affordable housing program. This program was established to encourage the development of affordable housing in NSW. The program is promoted by the Advisory Housing Service, located within DUAP.

The strategy was initiated in response to the observable affordability problems for many low-income households. The purpose of the strategy is to provide long-term affordable rental housing for households earning up to the median income ($36,400 across NSW) in areas targeted as having high need.   Action to promote the development of affordable housing is being taken through amendments to the State Environmental Planning framework, principally through the introduction of developer contributions and planning bonus arrangements for affordable housing. Whether such initiatives could assist in funding Campus developments or appropriate move-on accommodation has not been considered to date.

4.3   The Federal Government policy environment

Supported Accommodation Assistance Program

The Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) has been in operation since 1985 and operates as a joint initiative between the Commonwealth and State/Territory governments. The stated aim of the SAAP program is:

" to provide transitional supported accommodation and related support services to help homeless people achieve the maximum possible degree of self-reliance and independence."
(SAAP National Data Collection Annual Report 1996-97, New South Wales, p1)

Funding is provided by the Commonwealth and NSW State Governments to agencies across the state. These agencies operate under service delivery models and provide crisis or short term accommodation, medium to long term accommodation (which were the majority in South West Sydney in 1996/97) and multiple service delivery models.

The SAAP model has provided some of the impetus behind the development of the management model for the Miller Campus. However, the different nature of the Campus and its focus on transitional accommodation rather than crisis accommodation, together with an explicit training and employment focus makes the SAAP model less relevant. The issue of whether SAAP funding could be used to fund recurrent costs of the Miller Campus has yet to be considered by the Live 'N Learn Foundation.

Public Housing Assistance

Public rental housing is a major form of housing assistance. It refers to the government provision and administration of publicly owned dwellings funded through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement and used to provide appropriate, affordable and accessible shelter for low to moderate income earners and their families unable to access the private market or those otherwise in housing need. At present the delivery of these services are devolved to the States (see above). Whether a future Federal government might introduce funding for the Campus model under this or a similar arrangement is an unknown factor.

National Homeless Strategy

A discussion paper on the development of a National Homelessness Strategy was released by the (then) Minister for Family and Community Services in May 2000 (Commonwealth Family and Community Services, 2000**)**. The Strategy has four key objectives:

- To provide a strategic framework to improve collaboration on all levels to enhance client outcomes;

- To identify best practice models to further develop existing policies and programs;

- To build the capacity of the community sector to improve linkages:

- To broadly raise awareness about homelessness.

The paper focuses on four key intervention areas: working together, prevention, early intervention and crisis transition and support. As such, the Campus model offers a clear option for policy development under any future homelessness strategy to be developed by the Federal Government.

The Youth Homeless Pilot Program

The Youth Homeless Pilot Program aimed to examine and evaluate innovative early intervention service models which can make a contribution to improving the impact of the government's response to the needs of families and young people facing difficulties that could or have led to family breakdown (needs completing).

As a result of the 26 pilot programmes, a Youth Homelessness Taskforce was established, which released three reports. These included an outline report (June 1996), an interim report (March 1998) and the final report which summarised the outcomes of the pilot and offered recommendations. The recommendations centered around three basic pillars:

- Early intervention, in this case aimed at families and youth prior to leaving the family home;

- Clear access mechanisms to homelessness allowance; and

- Improved co-ordination of government and community services.

Some of the findings of this research could have relevance of the Miller pilot.

Centrelink Programs Aimed At Youth

Centrelink has in place youth teams which are located in Centrelink Customer Service Centres. Workers can provide short term counseling to young people and their families. If a young person has a serious reason why they can not live at home a higher rate of allowance can be paid to them. Centrelink also offers the following services, all of which are likely to become included in the training and job seeking packages utilised by Campus residents:

- *Reconnect*
Reconnect is funded by the Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services. Its aim is to provide early intervention focusing on youth in transition, that is people between the age of 15 and 21 years old. Its focus group is youth at risk of becoming homeless.

- *Job Placement, Employment and Training (JPET)*
JPET is a further early intervention program aimed at 15 to 19 year olds who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless, ex-offender, refugees and wards of the state. The program is designed to "provide assistance to overcome a range of personal barriers preventing young people from participating effectively in employment, education or training and having a sustainable future" (Centrelink 2000 – 2001 Information booklet, p5 Ch 7, www.centrelink.gov.au/internet/ internet.nsf/publications/index.htm). The program offers a holistic approach to assist young people maintain stable accommodation and enter full-time employment, training or education. There were around 100 JPET services in 1998/99. This initiative closely parallels the aims of the Miller Campus other than the accommodation function and could offer a model for future Federal funding.

- *New Apprentice Access Program*
This program provides pre-apprenticeship and pre-traineeship training to those who require assistance to become competitive for apprenticeships and traineeships.

- *Green Corps – Young Australian for the Environment*
This program is for youth between the ages of 17 and 20 years old. It provides accredited training for participants who volunteer to become a part of the scheme for six months full time. This scheme is based mainly in remote or rural areas.

- *Other Courses Available*
Career Counseling
Literacy and Numeracy Training
Mutual Obligation Requirements (training)
Work for the Dole scheme
Intensive Assistance

Job Search Training Community Development Employment Project (CDEP)
Community Support Program (CSP)
Wage Assistance Card (Indigenous)
National Office for Overseas Skills Recognition (NOOSR)
Advanced English for Migrants Program (AEMP)
New Enterprise Incentive Scheme
Self Employment Development Program (SEDS)

Youth Allowance
Youth Allowance (YA) came into existence in 1998. It replaced five former schemes for young people, namely: Youth Training Allowance; AUSTUDY for students aged 16-24 years; Newstart Allowance for the unemployed aged 16-20 years; and Sickness Allowance for 16-20 year olds and those secondary students aged 16 and 17 years attracting more than the minimum rate of Family Allowance.

YA is now the main income support payment available to young unemployed people aged 16 to 21, and to students aged from 16 to 25. Young people receive the same payment whether they are studying, training, looking for work or are sick, or a combination of these. YA is subject to personal and parental means testing.

Youth Allowance Supplementary payments
This scheme provides additional financial support for people on Youth Allowance. In certain circumstances recipients of Youth Allowance may also be able to receive:

- Health Care Card;
- Pharmaceutical Allowance;
- Remote Area Allowance;
- Rent Assistance;
- Fares Allowance;
- Financial Supplement loan;
- Lump Sum Advance; and
- Higher rates for those dependant on parents but who must live away from home.

Newstart Allowance
Newstart allowance is provided for unemployed adults aged 21 or over. In as much as the Campus model includes unemployed young people up to 25, then this income payment will play an important element in the funding equation for the project.

Austudy
Austudy is paid to full time students who are 25 years or older. Austudy has been partly replaced by the Youth Allowance. As this is a phased approached there are currently some recipients that will be under the age of 25 years who are receiving Austudy payments. Austudy is paid to persons who are undertaking approved courses of education at approved institutions. These are mainly secondary, graduate, undergraduate, associate diplomas and certain other diplomas and TAFE courses.

ABSTUDY
ABSTUDY provides a living allowancefor eligible Indigenous Australians who are undertaking full time secondary or tertiary studies. The basic payment rates for the living allowance for individuals under the age of 21 is the same as the Youth Allowance, for those over the age of 21, the rates are equivalent to Newstart Allowance. part-time students may be eligible for one or more of these benefits depending on their personal circumstances and level of study. ABSTUDY also provides a living allowance for eligible full-time students undertaking higher degrees at the Masters and Doctorate levels. The maximum rates of payment are equivalent to those payable under the Australian Postgraduate Awards. In addition to the means-tested living allowances payable under ABSTUDY there are a number of supplementary benefits, some of which are income-tested. Eligibility for these supplementary benefits depends on personal circumstances and the level of study being undertaken. Supplementary benefits available under ABSTUDY are eligibility for:

- Health Care Card;
- Pharmaceutical Allowance;
- Remote Area Allowance;
- Rent Assistance;
- Fares Allowance;
- Student Financial Supplement Scheme;
- Lawful Custody Allowance;
- School Fees Allowance;
- School Term Allowance;
- Under 16 Boarding Supplement;
- Incidentals Allowance;
- Additional Allowances for Masters and Doctorate Students;
- Away-from-base Assistance; and the Pensioner Education Supplement.

Higher rates for those dependent on parents but who must live away from home are also payable.*Aboriginal Tutorial Assistance Scheme*
The Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs arranges for tutors to give supplementary tuition to Indigenous students and trainees. It is available to students in primary, secondary and tertiary students. The programme is cash limited and priority for tutorial assistance is given to students who are assessed as requiring additional assistance with basic literacy and numeracy.

Vocational and Education Guidance for Aboriginals Scheme
The Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs provides funding to organisations that undertake projects which assist Indigenous school students to make informed education and career choices.

4.4   Youth services in the immediate Liverpool Local Government Area

There are 45 youth accommodation, job training, employment skill training or job placement and social welfare agencies in the Liverpool Local Government area (see Appendix 3). The extent that these services offer a range of potential management and service delivery skills and expertise that could be the basis for future bids for Campus management remains to be seen. While not all of these are directly relevant to the Miller Campus model, the list indicates a broad range of relevant expertise already exists in the community and welfare service sector in Liverpool at the present time.

5   LITERATURE REVIEW

5.1 Methodology review

Given the novel concept of Foyers in Australia, the local published literature on this subject is non-existent. However, there is a developing literature on the subject overseas, principally in the UK and Europe, but also in the US. This literature review covers all the known English language literature from overseas relating to studies or evaluations of foyer developments. These relate mainly to the UK with one US study.

The following section reviews the main reports in chronological order. The aim of this review is essentially to highlight aspects of the evaluation approach that can be built into the method for this research project. The project proposal document noted that the method would be based on that used by Anderson and Quilgars (1995) in their study of the first five YMCA pilot schemes in the UK. However, aspects of the methods used in other reports may also be useful in contributing to the evaluation method used here. Key findings from each report have also be reviewed to explore issues that may have relevance for the development of the Miller pilot model. These are presented separately in Appendix 4.

5.2   The evaluations

Crook, J. (1994) *The YMCA foyer pilots: the first six* months, Employment Service, Department for Education and Employment, HMSO, London.

The earliest evaluation of the pilot YMCA foyers in the UK was conducted by the Department for Education and Employment who were major partners through the Employment Service's Jobclub scheme for young people (Crook, 1994; Crook and Dalgleish, 1994). As a participant in the pilot projects the Employment Service assisted in establishing a monitoring system to track referrals, clients and leavers. This evaluation took place 6 months into the operation of the pilot Foyers.

The evaluation utilised in-depth interviews. Interviews were conducted with representatives from all the staffing groups. These included project leaders, support staff, residential managers and secretaries of both the management team and housing sector.

Interviews took place 6 months after the beginning of operation and were centered on discovering what processes/aspects were working well in their opinion and what was not. Staff attitudes and future vision of the campuses were also explored. The interview schedule included such topics as:

- Concept of the foyer;

- Setting up the programme;

- Operation of the programme;

- Referral process;

- Client entry;

- Action plan – employment;

- Move-on accommodation;

- After care;

- Achievement of the foyer so far; and

- Future development of foyers.

In total 18 interviews were performed as a part of this evaluation. This methodology provides a number of important methodological pointers as to how the first phase of program monitoring can be conducted for the current Miller pilot evaluation.

Anderson, I. and Quilgars, D. (1995) *Foyers for young people: Evaluation of a pilot initiative*, **Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.**

A second and more thorough evaluation of the operation of first two years of the pilot UK foyers was undertaken by Anderson and Quilgars (1995) at York University, funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. This evaluation included the five YMCA's foyers developed in existing hostels and the establishment of two new purpose built foyers.

The aims of the evaluation were to:
- examine the implementation processes and funding aspects of each foyer;

- monitor the development of the individual campuses;

- assess the contribution the foyers were made to tackling the target issues of youth unemployment and homelessness in their areas;

- to assess the scope for replicating the pilots throughout the UK.

The methodology used incorporated:
- an examination of background literature;

- attendance of liaison meetings;

- visits to each of the pilot schemes;

- scheme monitoring data collection

- in-depth interviews of key personnel;

- monitoring the characteristics of clients utilising the employment and training services

- survey of employers who were involved.

- qualitative interviews and discussion groups with individual foyer clients.

A study visit to France was also undertaken which facilitated the research into the background of foyers in France and included interviews with practitioners and researchers.

In addition, the York University research team also prepared a set of comprehensive monitoring forms for the five YMCA pilots. The forms used included:

- Foyer referral form
- Foyer entry form
- Foyer activity form and the
- Foyer leaving form.

Each of these forms are available through the YMCA to distribute to all Foyers. The staff are required to complete all but the equal opportunities form. It was requested that all forms be completed together with the residents of the Foyer, staff were to fill them out though to ensure all questions were understood and some level of consistency. These forms were completed and returned quarterly until the final pilot date. The UFP evaluation team intends to review these forms as a basis for the monitoring system to be developed for the current evaluation.

In addition, an analysis of the pathway of residents into and through the foyer process indicated four key stages for any foyer resident:

- Initial referral and assessment

- Detailed case assessment and Action Planning

- Delivery of the individual Action Plan program

- Move on (leaving the project)

These stages are likely to be replicated in the Live 'N Learn process and thus will form the key milestones in framework for assessing the impact of the Miller Campus for individual residents the current evaluation.

Anderson, I. and Douglas, A (1998) *The Development of Foyers in Scotland***, Scottish Homes, Edinburgh.**

The development of Foyers in Scotland began with three schemes in Kirkcaldy, Glasgow and Aberdeen. These formed the basis of the evaluation. The research methodology was primarily qualitative as it focused on development of the foyer not the outcome to the client. The research methods included:

- A review of relevant literature, initial contacts, and collection of background information on the three foyers;

- Fieldwork in the three foyers: interviews with staff/board members and clients;

- Workshop discussion with key actors involved in funding and developing foyers;

- Workshop discussion with key actors in the youth housing/employment field who had not been directly involved in developing the three foyers.

This evaluation was limited due to timescales and budget and no detailed monitoring of clients was undertaken. In this respect, the workshop discussions appear to have been cost effective and useful in stimulating discussion around outcomes.

Maginn, A., Frew, R., O'Regan, F. and Kodz, J. (2000) *Stepping Stones: An evaluation of Foyers and other schemes serving the housing and labour-market needs of young people*, **Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions, HMSO, London.**

This report was commissioned by the UK Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) and the UK Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) in 1997. It reported in 2000 and compares foyers in the UK to other projects with similar aims and client groups. The study findings reflected the nature of provision in 1997/98. The results of this evaluation offer more in terms of the longer term development of the initiative in Australia and the clear need for proper and consistent monitoring frameworks.

The methodology for the study took two forms. A detailed questionnaire was sent out to foyers across the UK and to other comparable schemes in December 1997. In-depth fieldwork was then undertaken in a more limited number of localities. In total, 36 foyer schemes and 57 other comparable non-foyer schemes responded.

The research was conducted in a number of stages. Stage One included the preparatory work such as reviewing of literature available, undertaking of a series of visits to Foyers where data availability and clarity issues were discussed, working with the Foyer Federation and government departments to identify appropriate schemes. From these exercises the parameters of the sample were set, i.e. projects were identified for inclusion or rejected at this stage.

Stage two involved two targeted postal surveys – one of operational schemes, the other of planned schemes. The response rate achieved was 64% overall and 68% for Foyers.

Stage three comprised of a series of case studies. These were used to examine the evaluative issues and draw out the range of perspectives in the field. The case studies involved face-to-face interviews and an analysis of management data. A total of 14 schemes were studied with schemes being selected on the basis of being widely representative schemes (criterion included size, ownership, age of schemes and geography). Eight Foyers and six other schemes were studied.

A number of problems were encountered by the research team during the above process. In particular, two types of interviews were problematic in obtaining. These were interviews with employers (at times indicating weak links with local employers for that scheme) and interviews with young people. Follow up information regarding former clients of a scheme was also hard to obtain.

Maginn, *et al*, also report that monitoring was poorly developed in many of the schemes. Monitoring of Action Plans was highly variable and there was often little monitoring of participation in training schemes or other activities. Much of the data kept by the schemes was incomplete or varied to such an extent as to be not comparable. Funding agencies did not required comprehensive data or common measure of outcomes, so there was little incentive to collect such data.

However, this report points clearly to the need for monitoring of residents of the Miller Campus pilot to focus on at least three key areas: where are clients coming from, what are there needs and preferences, and what other options do they have?

Christine Gaussiran (1999) *The Tubman Foyer: Evaluation of a pilot initiative in Minneapolis*, **Minneapolis Neighbourhood Employment Network, Minneapolis.**

The evaluation of the Tubman Foyer took place one year into its operation. The Tubman Foyer aimed to assist hard to employ women between the ages of 16 and 65 who were escaping situations of domestic violence. For this reason the methodologies used had to take into consideration the privacy and need for complete confidentiality of identity of participants. This evaluation took the form of a review of the available literature, which included some of the UK documents and other pieces relating to the process of establishment. Interviews with the staff members were also undertaken.

6   METHODOLOGY

6.1   Introduction

This research project aims to monitor the development of the Campus from its early stages into management and then into the first year of operation to assess the impact on the first intake of residents.

The methodology for this evaluation will essentially involve a Program Monitoring approach with an emphasis on process effectiveness and outcomes for recipients (see Appendix 5 for a discussion of this approach).   However, the research will also involve monitoring the development process and the manner in which the project was implemented to identify good practice.

6.2   Research methods

The methodology to be adopted for this study will be based on that developed by Anderson and Quilgars in their evaluation of the UK pilot foyers (Anderson and Quilgars, 1995 – see Chapter 5) and informed by the subsequent evaluations discussed in Chapter 5.   The approach will involve a mix of qualitative and quantitative research methods.   The approach will involve the following elements:

- an review of background literature;

- attendance of relevant Campus Management Board meetings and collection of minutes and key documents, including details scheme costs and the capital and revenue funding for the Miller Campus;

- site visits to the Miller Campus during and after the development period;

- development of a program data monitoring system in conjunction with the Campus management team;

- in-depth interviews of key Campus management and personnel;

- in-depth interviews of key stakeholders;

- interviews with Campus residents at entry and exit (or at a fixed point in time if the project ends before exit is achieved);

- monitoring the characteristics of residents and their use of the employment and training services;

- possible survey of employers who provide employment opportunities.

The latter three elements will be dependent on continued funding for the evaluation research. Interviews with Campus staff and stakeholders will be conducted during the development phase and after implementation.

6.3   Research stages

These methods will be used during the four basic stages of the research:

Stage 1   Clarifying and setting program objectives

In order that outcomes can be realistically and meaningfully selected, it is essential that clear objectives are initially defined. Part of the research approach will be for the Evaluation Team to work with the Campus management to define these.

A number of draft objectives were stated in the Draft Business Plan for the Live 'n Learn Foundation and agreed by the (then) Interim Board (see Figure 1). Many of these relate to the *processes* involved in setting up the pilot and the type of services to be provided rather than the ultimate objectives of the program in achieving an increase in the independence level of participants in terms of housing, education/skill levels, employability, economic independence and self esteem. The last objective 'Residents independent by end of program' is the only one that specifically relates to outcomes.

Figure 1: Draft Miller Campus process objectives, August 2000

1 Development Phase
Establish the Foundation
Site development
Achieving funding and resource commitments
2 Campus Implementation Phase
Management model developed
Campus operational
Strategic partnerships developed
Key sponsors identified
Resource commitments achieved
3 Management Phase
Accommodation provided
Training opportunities provided
Employment opportunities provided
Residents independent by end of program

 (Source: Draft Business Plan for the Live 'N Learn Foundation, August 2000)

The Evaluation Team have discussed these draft objectives with the Foundation Board and it was agreed that a workshop to review and re-specify these objectives, expected outcomes and the performance indicators that will be needed to assess their success will be held. The results of this workshop will be reported in the forthcoming 'Work in Progress' report from this project.

The outcomes identified should be those which are important to achieving the mission of the project and those for which the project should be held accountable. They also need to be useful to the program managers and effective in communicating the activities and benefits of the project to the outside world.

The Audit Trail

A key issue of any evaluation is to link program outcomes to program objectives. It is also important to establish the costs of specific activities and assign these to project objectives. The method for achieving this is through establishing an *Audit Trail* that assigns specific project activities and budgets to overall project objectives (Randolph and Judd, 2000b). The intention will be to set up this audit trail once the objectives of the Miller Campus are determined.

Stage 2   Monitoring the Development Period

This part of the research will follow through and document the phases of this pilot from conception to implementation. This will be assisted by access to the Live N'Learn Foundation Board and, when it is formed, the Miller Campus Management Board, during the development process. This will include access to all relevant documentation, and appropriate minutes of meetings and any other working papers reports, business or implementation plans. Access to these documents has been agreed with the NSW DoH. In this way the 'history' of the project can be documented (see Chapter 2).

The Evaluation Team has already negotiated status as observers to the Management Board of the Live 'N Learn Foundation and in future to the Management Board of the Miller Campus and access to relevant documents, bearing in mind issues of commercial in confidence. Appendix 6 sets out the formal Partnering Agreement between the Urban Frontiers Program and the NSW Department of Housing which outlines the basis of the relationship between the Evaluation Team and the Miller Campus for the purposes of the evaluation.

There are a number of key issues to be monitored throughout the development process and into the operational phase, many of which are derived from the findings of the evaluation reports reviewed in Chapter 4 and Appendix 4. These will mainly, but not exclusively, be assessed though the qualitative findings of a range of stakeholder interviews.

- **The funding model**
Co-ordination of funding, both capital and revenue, is a crucial issue, including whether any funds will be committed from the private sector. The successful funding model for the Campus will clearly need to be documented including sources, quantity, who is responsible for raising funding, how it is to be used, what the requirements of the funder are, the level of implicit government support, etc. Any sensitivies relating to commercial confidentialities will need to be born in mind when presenting these data.

- **The management model**
The specific management model that will evolve for the pilot Campus will also need to be documented. An assessment of the effectiveness of this model will be included in the evaluation. Here, both the qualitative information derived from the stakeholder interviews, especially those conducted at the end of the evaluation period, as well as the findings from the outcomes analysis of residents experiences will be important elements of the assessment process. Outcomes will also be measured in so far as the management model delivers the objectives of the Campus within the times and costs expected.

- **Whole of government approach**

The success of the pilot will depend on a range of government agencies working together with a 'can do' attitude and allowing the formation of a multi-agency partnership in the provision of funding and service delivery. The development of these linkages and an assessment of the success in coordinating decision making will be achieved through stakeholder interviews.

- **The integration of services**

The integrated approach of linking accommodation services to training and employment should be monitored for evidence of additionality i.e. that this approach delivers better outcomes than the provision of such service separately, albeit in a co-ordinated way by other youth service providers. Again, this will largely be assessed through stakeholder interviews.

- **Involvement of the private sector**

It appears that one of the key attractions of the pilot to the politicians supporting it is the proposal to involve the private sector in both the funding and the management of the campus. This is something which does not appear to have developed widely in France or Germany, but has to a certain extent been the case in the UK. It will be interesting to see how this side of the network of partners develops during the development period.

- **Working with support agencies**

Support agencies who were involved in developing the initial concept of the pilot ranged from Government departments to not-for-profit agencies, both national and local. However, whether these or other agencies will eventually be involved in the final implementation remains to be seen. The involvement and role of all such partners needs to be documented and evaluated. An objective framework will be developed to evaluate the roles of the various partner/participating organisations e.g.

- What is the role, funding, service delivery, referral in terms of the Miller Campus?
- Is it a new role for that organisation?
- Would participants have access to those organisations if it were not for the Campus structure etc?

It is clear from the above that the key stakeholder interviews will play an important part of this stage of the evaluation process. Stakeholders will be identified when the project becomes operational but it is likely that many will be those listed in Appendix 2 who have been involved during the formative stages of the project. These interviews will be semi-structured in-depth one-to-one interviews with key personnel. It is expected that two rounds of stakeholder interviews will be conducted: during the latter part of the development phase and then at the end of the evaluation period.

Stage 3   Developing the outcomes monitoring system

This stage will effectively begin when the first residents enter the Miller Campus. During this stage of the evaluation, the research will try to measure the difference the Campus has on the lives of the young people it sets out to help through the outcomes achieved by the first cohort of Campus residents.

Focussing attention on program outcomes does not mean that inputs, activities and outputs do not need to be measured. Basic management information systems will be needed to provide regular monitoring information for management to inform operational decisions making. Several of the foyer evaluation studies discussed in Chapter 4 noted the inadequate and inconsistent management information that was available for basic monitoring purposes in many of the foyers studied. The Evaluation Team, in consultation with the Campus management, will need to devise a robust and effective management information system to record information on residents and their activities while residents in the Campus. It is also important to collect basic data of this kind to provide information on factors that may influence the results of the outcome measurements.

These data will be collected by two means:

- A suite of monitoring pro-formas that will be used by the Campus management to record basic details of each applicant, each resident on arrival and their subsequent progress in achieving the goals set for each resident in terms of training and skills development while at the project (these will be base don those developed by Anderson and Quilgars for their study of the YMCA pilots in the UK). These could include a form at each of the following stages: referral to the project; entry to the campus; activities undertaken; and exit for the campus. Forms will need to be easy to use by Campus management to ensure regular use. Data will be collected and inputted by the Evaluation Team.

- Face-to-face interviews by the Evaluation Team at the point of entry to the Campus and at exit, or at s fixed time into their stay, depending on the timescales for the research. These interviews will concentrate on obtaining more qualitative information on attitudes, and expectations on entering the program and perceptions and intentions on leaving.

The range of data to be gathered by these two means will comprise of the following:

- Basic demographic data about each residents. In the future, cross-referencing different categories of Campus residents or other service users and outcomes as measures by the management monitoring system and face-to-face interviews will help identify characteristics which influence the success of programs. Typically we might wish to monitor demographic data such as:
  - Age
  - Gender
  - Race/ethnicity
  - Language skills
  - Education and skills levels
  - Disability or other handicap
  - Employment history
  - Housing histories and housing vulnerability
  - Care history

  In addition, data on residents' expressed needs and preferences, and the other options they might have (other than entering the Campus) will need to be explored.

- Consideration may be given to defining the level of need by standard criteria in order to establish how effective the program is for young people with varying support needs. It may be possible to define low, medium and high needs clients. Procedures for staff to establish and record such categories will be necessary.

- Amount or type of services accessed ad activities under taken during the stay at the Campus e.g.

    - Number of job skills training hours provided
    - Mentoring
    - Job search activity
    - Accommodation search activity
    - Independent living skills training
    - Other developmental activity (e.g. volunteering)

- Qualitative information on the perceptions, attitudes and expectation of residents. These types of questions will need to be asked when the resident enters the Campus and on exit, or at the end of the evaluation period, whichever is sooner. It is proposed that each resident is interviewed by a member of the research team soon after arrival.

    A short survey questionnaire can then be administered to collect additional data not covered by the management monitoring forms mentioned above, as well as a longer semi-structured in-depth interview. A similar exit interview will establish perceptions of residents about the Campus on leaving and expectations on making a transition to independent living.

- Given the small number of residents, it is envisaged that this kind of data will be best utilised in developing illustrative 'camios' of residents trajectories through the Campus, as well as more quantitatively based analysis.

- Data progress towards meeting individual residents' Transition Plans will need to allow for the fact they will all start from very different bases in terms of skills and experience.

6.4   Issues

A number of issues will need to be resolved in developing the research method. First, it will be necessary to monitor 'creaming' i.e. selecting a sample of participants who are more prone to success than the average. This can be assessed by including all Campus clients in the monitoring exercise (including applicants and referrals). In reality, a degree of 'creaming' will be justified to allow the service to develop a good reputation, and reinforce the skills of its staff and volunteers before trying to take on some clients from a higher need category. In this context, transparency of the eligibility criteria for access to the Campus will be important to make the process and its selection criteria open and accountable. It will also be very important to allow an assessment of the equal opportunities performance of the pilot Campus in relation to the known demographics of the local pool of unemployed and/or homeless youth in the area.

Secondly, the sources of data, the methods of data collection and the procedures to enable regular and accurate collection will need to be coordinated. In devising this monitoring approach, the Evaluation Team will review the monitoring tools developed for the UK evaluation exercises discussed in Chapter 4 above, particularly those developed for the YMCA evaluations. Much data collection will come from the records of the Campus itself and the Evaluation Team will need to work with the Campus management to ensure that a monitoring system is devised to keep the data necessary for measurement of the selected outcomes. Some data may need to be collected by written questionnaires, surveys or evaluation forms. There will also be pre- and post- program evaluation of participants for some outcomes e.g. self-esteem, attitude to education and learning. All data referring to particular residents will need to be coded to allow for integration for analysis purposes.

Thirdly, and following from the issue of data integration, the issue of confidentiality will need to be addressed. Residents' willingness to be involved in the monitoring exercise will be critical to the success of the research and it has been proposed that the 'contract' agreed between each resident and the Campus management will include an agreement to participate in the research.

Fourthly, the Team will need to work closely with the Miller Campus management to implement these monitoring tools. To achieve this, it is proposed that monitoring and data collection procedures should be discussed in a separate workshop with Campus managers. This should be held as soon as the Campus Management has been appointed and a day should be spent working on the outcomes, indicators and data collection methods for the evaluation. The workshop will be facilitated by the Evaluation Team. It should be noted that the Evaluation Team has been asked by the Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services to collect data in a form which is compatible with the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) national data collection.

Fifthly, the implementation of the data collection and analysis cannot be piloted in the normal manner due to the small numbers, the indeterminate timetabling for the implementation of the Miller Campus, and short time available for the study (12 months). Rather the implementation will be regarded as the pilot and the Evaluation Team will make recommendations for changes and improvements for the continued program in the future to address such potential problems as e.g. missing data, low response rates, uncontactable former participants, collection errors etc.

It should be noted that the Evaluation Team have negotiated with the Live N'Learn Foundation that a condition of the agency obtaining the contract to management the Miller Campus will be a willingness to work with the Evaluation Team in implementing and conducting the monitoring and evaluation method outlined above.

Sixthly, there is scope for the data monitoring system to be made compatible to that collected by under the SAAP national data collection system.. This will be useful in assessing over time how residents entering the Miller Campus (and subsequent campuses) compare to those in 'mainstream' SAAP youth projects.

6.5   Steps in implementing the monitoring framework

Figure 2 sets out the implementation plan for developing the monitoring and evaluation framework for the Miller Campus over a 12 month period. Precise timings of the stages will be dependent on the progress of the Campus through the development phase.   The timetable in indicative only, and assumes the Campus moves into management after month 6, allowing for six months to assess the outcomes of the initial activities of the first cohort of residents. Further monitoring of residents will be the subject of a follow up project.

The implementation plan indicates that three workshops with appropriate Campus staff will be conducted to discuss and agree the project objectives, the monitoring tools and procedures and to present the findings of the first agreed monitoring period back to the management. The latter workshop will allow the monitoring framework to be assessed and modified if required.

Figure 2: Implementation plan for developing the management and outcomes monitoring arrangements for the Miller Campus	
Task	**Month**
1. Define project objectives (**Workshop 1**)	1
2. Select outcomes to be measured and define the audit trail	2 – 3
3. Specify indicators for outcomes	2 – 3
4. Prepare data monitoring tools (**Workshop 2**)	4
5. Pilot outcome measurement system	5
6. Analyse and report findings	6
7. Refine outcome measurement system	6
8. Implement mainstream data collection	6
9. Feedback findings to management (**Workshop 3**)	12

This framework will be progressed in parallel to the monitoring of the development period, which will be undertaken during the first six months after the submission of this Progress Report.

REFERENCES

Allen, C. (2001) Criticism of foyers is being stifled, The Guardian, Monday June 18, 2001, London.

Anderson, I. and Douglas, A (1998) The Development of Foyers in Scotland, Scottish Homes, Edinburgh.

Anderson, I. and Quilgars, D. (1995) Foyers for young people: Evaluation of a pilot initiative, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.

Anderson, I. (1998) The Development of Foyers on Scotland, Scottish Homes, Edinburgh.

Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services (2000a) The Government Response to Welfare Reform: Ministerial Statement, DfaCS, Canberra.

Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services (2000b) National Homeless Strategy: A Discussion Paper, DfaCS, Canberra.

Crook, J. (1994) The YMCA foyer pilots: the first six months, Employment Service, Department for Education and Employment, HMSO, London.

Crook, J. and Dalgeish, M. (1994) Homeless people into jobs and homes – a study of the Foyer pilots, Employment Gazette, March 1994, London.

Dolton P, Makepeace G, Hutton S and Audas R (1999) Making the Grade-Education, the Labour Market and Young People, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.

Eurostat (1997) Youth in the European Union from Education to Working Life, European Community, Luxemburg.

Foyer Federation for Youth (1997), Foyer Handbook-a guide for developers and managers of foyers, Version 1, Foyer Federation for Youth, London.

Foyer Federation (2000a) 100Foyers: 25,000 New Futures, The Foyer Federation, London.

Foyer Federation (2000b) DfEE to invest £6.5 Million in Foyer IT Centres, www.foyer.net, 19 September 2000, The Foyer Federation, London.

Gaussiran, C. and Brinda, M. (1997) Foyer: a study of European transitional housing that is linked to employment and training and an implementation plan for Minneapolis, Minneapolis Neighbourhood Employment Network, Minneapolis.

Gaussiran C. (1999) The Tubman Foyer: Evaluation of a pilot initiative in Minneapolis, Minneapolis Neighbourhood Employment Network, Minneapolis.

Live 'N Learn Foundation Limited (2000) Live 'N Learn Foundation Business Plan 2000, NSW Department of Housing, Liverpool.

Maginn, A., Frew, R., O'Regan, F. and Cods, J. (2000) <u>Stepping Stones: An evaluation of Foyers and other schemes serving the housing and labour-market needs of young people,</u> Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions, HMSO, London.

McCairns, G. (1998) <u>Presentation to the NSW Senior Officers Group Meeting</u>, 14 December, Sydney.

NSW Department of Housing (2000) <u>1998-99 Annual Report.</u>

NSW Federation of Housing Associations (2000) <u>Campus Model of Youth Accommodation and Residential Tenancy Agreements,</u> August 2000.

NSW Office of Children and Young People (2000) <u>Focus on Young People: NSW Youth Policy.</u>

NSW Premiers Department (1998) <u>Whole of Government Strategy Project, Phase 1: Report and Discussion Paper</u>, 30 April 1998.

Randolph, B. and Judd, B. (2000a) <u>Community Renewal and Large Public Housing Estates: Some preliminary comments,</u> Urban Policy and Research, Vol 8 No 2.

Randolph, B. and Judd, B. (2000b) <u>Salisbury North Urban Improvement Project: Monitoring and Evaluation framework</u>, Report to the City of Salisbury and South Australian Housing Trust.

Reference Group on Welfare Reform (2000)

Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H. E. and Lipsey, M. W. (1999) <u>Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (6th Edition)</u>, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Scottish Homes (1998) <u>Foyer Development in Scotland</u>, Guidance Note 98/19, Scottish Homes, Edinburgh.

Shelter (1992) <u>The Foyer Project – A Collection of Background Papers – Part I and Part II</u>, Shelter, London.

United Way of America (1996) <u>Measuring Program Outcomes: A practical Approach,</u> Virginia.

Welfare Group on Welfare Reform (2000) <u>Participation support for a More Equitable Society.</u>

Woodhouse J (1998) <u>Foyers for Young People: Adaptability of the Foyer Model in NSW,</u> for NSW Department of Housing.

YMCA (2000) <u>The YMCA Foyers Manual</u>, YMCA, http://housing.ymca.org.uk/manuals/foyer/index.htm.

APPENDIX 1

Role of the UK Foyer Federation and a description of a Foyer.

1.1   Role of the UK Foyer Federation

The Foyer Federation for Youth was founded in 1992 and is supported and steered by a Board of Directors drawn from the housing movement, training and employment fields, youth organisations, Foyer operators and the private sector. Funding for the Foyer Federation comes from the private sector, some government and European grants, charitable trusts and subscriptions for membership and services.

The Federation exists to raise awareness of the Foyer movement and to help bring together partnerships of public, private and voluntary sector organisations to develop Foyers. In addition, it acts as the leading source of information on standards and best practice, offering training and advice to both existing projects and those seeking to develop them. The Foyer Federation maintains a strategic overview of the development of Foyers throughout the UK and acts as the link to the European network. It will also liaise with national organisations and the government to help bring about more favourable conditions for Foyers.

Vision of the Foyer Federation

A national network of Foyers providing safe and affordable accommodation with access to training, education and employment opportunities from which young people are empowered to become socially and economically active citizens.

Mission of the Foyer Federation

The Foyer Federation for Youth aims to:

a)   **promote** the development of a national network of Foyers

b)   **provide** advisory services and information for developers, managers or supporters of Foyers, with regional networking and mutual support

c)   **facilitate** the exchange of models of good practice in the development and management of Foyers

d)   **influence** central and local government and the private and voluntary sectors, on the need for Foyers as part of a national strategy for young people and their responsibility to provide adequate funding

e)   **research** new and better means of providing support for all Foyer residents

f)   **encourage** innovation and diversity among Foyers in order to respond effectively to the needs of young people

g)   **establish** a quality framework for the accommodation, guidance, support and training available for Foyer residents

h)   **champion** fair and equal access and opportunities for young people including those with special needs

i)   **evaluate** the performance of Foyers especially in terms of the outcomes for young people

j)   **develop** constructive links with European partners

1.2   Definition and characteristics of Foyer as defined by Foyer Federation for Youth

Foyer definition

The Foyer Federation has issued a definition of a Foyer which requires projects to meet three basic conditions:

-     is the focus on helping disadvantaged young people, aged 16-25 who are homeless or in housing need, achieve the transition from dependence to independence?

-     is it based on a holistic approach to the young person's needs, offering integrated access to, at a minimum, accommodation, training and job searching facilities?

-     is the relationship with the young people based on a formal agreement as to how the Foyer's facilities and local community resources will be used in making the transition to independence, adherence to which is a condition of continued residence in the Foyer?

Other Foyer characteristics include:

1.   Affordable and safe accommodation of a good standard.

2.   Comprehensive use of action planning as a tool for achieving young people's aspirations.

3.   Supported access to training, education and employment including where possible vocational guidance, job-search, FE courses, volunteering, work experience placements, pre-vocational training and independent living skills.

4.   Participation in the Foyer network, both national and in the longer term, European.

5.   Early contact and ongoing involvement with the business community.

6. Supported access to move-on accommodation (not necessarily all social housing).

7. A mixture of public and private communal and leisure space/facilities.

8. The opportunity, through services and the programme, to bring young people into contact with others who are non resident and members of the general public.

9. The opportunity for young people to be involved in the management of the Foyer and/or areas of the project/programme.

10. Some personal support and access through multi-agency partnership, to non-core services such as regular counselling, drug/alcohol advice, medical support etc.

11. A multi-agency advisory or management group formed at an early point, assessing/responding to local need and involving, as a minimum, training/employment agencies, housing and the private sector.

12. A balanced resident community referred from a broad range of organisations with only small numbers of young people with higher support needs.

13. An understanding by residents and staff of the transitional nature of the project.

14. A central location and high public profile which encourages a positive image of the young people and services offered.

(Taken from the Foyer Handbook-a guide for developers and managers of foyers- Foyer Federation for Youth, London November 1997)

APPENDIX 2

Agencies attending initial Foyer Workshop in September 1998 and subsequent membership of SW Sydney Foyer Steering Group

Workshop Attendees

1. Department of Community Services
2. NSW Premier's Department
3. Department of Disability and Ageing
4. Member of Parliament for Liverpool
5. Gandangarra LALC
6. Department of Housing
7. SW Sydney Area Health Service
8. NSW dept of Education and Training
9. Fairfield City Council
10. Migrant Resource Centre
11. Centrelink
12. Liverpool Young Women's Resource Centre
13. Fairfield Youth Accommodation Service
14. Police Service NSW
15. Liverpool City Council
16. Cobham Juvenile Justice Centre
17. Department of Social Security
18. Liverpool Youth Needs Committee
19. NSW Federation of Housing Associations
20. Cabramatta Youth Team/ Cabramatta Community Centre
21. Department of Juvenile Justuice
22. Hume Community Housing Association
23. Burnside
24. Miller TAFE
25. St Vincent de Paul
26. Office of Community Housing
27. Liverpool Youth Refuge
28. Centacare
29. Green Valley Youth Centre
30. The Ted Noffs Foundation
31. Liverpool/Fairfield Mental Health Accommodation
32. University of Western Sydney
33. Liverpool Youth Accommodation Association
34. Rotary

Membership of the SW Sydney Foyer Steering Group

Department of Community Services
1. Department of Family and Community Services (Federal)
2. Centrelink
3. Fairfield Youth Accommodation Service
4. Department of Housing
5. NSW Federation of Housing Associations
6. Cabramatta Youth Team/ Cabramatta Community Centre
7. Liverpool Youth Accommodation Association
8. Liverpool Youth Refuge
9. Liverpool/Fairfield Mental Health Accommodation
10. Liverpool Youth Needs Committee
11. TAFE
12. University of Western Sydney
13. Liverpool City Council
14. Shelter NSW
15. Salvation Army Employment Plus
16. Mission Employment
17. Hume Community Housing Association
18. Department of Social Security
19. The Ted Noffs Foundation
20. Fairfield City Council

APPENDIX 3

List of youth services within the Liverpool local government area

The following list is taken from the Liverpool Council Community Services Handbook published on their web site; www.liverpool.nsw.gov.au. There are 45 youth accommodation, job training, employment skill training or job placement and social clubs/groups/organisations listed below.

Centrelink Multilingual Service (CMS)
Locked Bag 7004, Liverpool Bc NSW 1871
Phone: 13 12 02 **Fax:** 02 9203 5099 Web Site
Allows people to speak to Centrelink staff in their own language. Is not an interpreter service.

St Vincent De Paul Night Patrol
63 Goulburn Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: 63 Goulburn Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone: 9602 9139, 0417 408 632 **Fax:** 9602 9139
Provides food, information and referral to homeless and street youth. Assists on health issues by providing links to other youth and community services.

Children's programmes - Community Counselling Team
Health Services Building, Level 3, Cnr Campbell and Goulburn Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 3084, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone: 9828-4844 **Fax:** 9828-4800
During the year, a groupwork programme that includes the following children's group: children and separation; social skills/self-esteem; witness to domestic violence; aggression; strett management

Liverpool Youth Accommodation Assistance Company (LYAAC)
Level 1, 272-274 George Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 601, Liverpool Bc NSW 1871
Phone: 9600 6011, 9600 6420 **Fax:** 9602 3638 Email Web Site
Provides semi-independent medium-long term accommodation for young people aged between 16-25 years. Does not provide crisis accommodation.

Liverpool RSL Youth Club
John Edmondson VC Memorial Club , 185 George Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: John Edmondson VC Memorial Club, 185 George Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone: 9826 0152
Provides a number of activities for youth including gymnastics, ballroom dancing, chess, and softball.

Youth Outreach Project
Liverpool Community Complex , Mill Road, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 742, Liverpool NSW 1871, 1871
Phone: 9601 7347 **Fax:** 9601 7347
Youth project to assist youth 12-24 years with outreach work to Lurnea and Warwick Farm.

Liverpool Youth Needs Committee Inc - Liverpool
Speed Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 79, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone: 9601 2503, 9600 9957 **Fax:** 9601 2503
Provides information, recreation and referral for young people (12-25 yrs) at drop in centres

Liverpool Intensive Programs Unit
7 Speed Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: 7 Speed Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone: 9821 1644 **Fax:** 9821 3470
Counselling services for young offenders.

Liverpool Youth Fellowship
Liverpool Baptist Church , Cnr Norfolk & Castlereagh Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 191, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone: 9602 4573
Club for teenagers 12-18. Provides outings, hikes, camps, videos, discussions and bible studies.

Salvo Youth Line
Phone: 9360 3000 **Fax:** 9380 9029
Youth suicide, crisis intervention and prevention, general counselling, referral.

St Vincent De Paul Society
102 Bigge Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 265, Miller NSW 2168
Phone: 9823 1222 (Head Office), 9602 3039 (Liverpool) **Fax:** 9823 6206 (Head Office), 9602 7774 (Liverpool)
Provides support and aid to families and individuals.

Liverpool College of TAFE - Labour Market Programs
College Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 319, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone: 9827 5264 **Fax:** 9827 5164
Vocational training programs for unemployed adults and youth

Liverpool Youth Workers Network
Liverpool City Council , 1 Hoxton Park Road, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 7064, Liverpool Bc NSW 1871
Phone: 9821 9346 **Fax:** 9822 5692
Support group for youth workers. Lobby group, Information exchange, special projects on issues relating to young people and youth service providers.

Liverpool Christian Fellowship Youth Group
11 O'Brien Parade, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: 11 O'Brien Parade, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone: 9824 0072 **Fax:** 9730 0368 Email
Christian youth group for Bible studies and social events.

Liverpool Baptist Church
Cnr Norfolk & Castlereagh Streets, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 191, Liverpool NSW 1871
Phone: 9610 4794 **Fax:** 9610 4794 Email
Provides services for worship - activities for pre-school children - children of all ages (primary to high school). Group fellowship meetings in various homes. Social activities for young people and adults. Counselling service is also available.

Department of Education and Training
Level 1, 108 Moore Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 197, Liverpool Bc NSW 1871
Phone: 9600 3110 **Fax:** 9821 3575
Provides assessment of overseas qualifications, administration of apprenticeships and traineeships, keeps copies of the public service job notices, assists out of work apprentices, and provides information on vocational education and training.

NSW Department of Community Services, Liverpool, (DoCS)
Level 4, 33 Moore Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 17, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone: 9602 8044 **Fax:** 9601 1553 Web Site

Help, protect and care for children and young people and support their families, -provide and monitor care and support for children and young people who can't live with their families, - assist people with intellectual disabilities, increase their wellbeing and gain greater independence and involvement in their communities; these include assessment, therapy, behaviour management, social work, community nursing and day program services -manage residential and respite care for people with intellectual disabilities, - provide and regulate adoption services, - help people separated from their families trace their records, - fund and regulate children's services, - regulate children's employment, - meet the basic welfare needs of people affected by natural and other disasters, - provide travel and other concessions for low income earners.

Centacare Employment
Suite 1, Level 1 , 45 - 47 Scott Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 1141, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone: 9822 7922 **Fax:** 9822 2433
Parent Organisation: Centacare
The agency is a member of the "Job Network", and register unemployed people, recruit vacancies, and match registered job seekers to vacant positions.

Liverpool Youth Council
Liverpool Council Chambers, 1 Hoxton Park Road, Liverpool NSW 2170
Postal Address: Locked bag 7064, Liverpool NSW 1871
Phone: 9821 9346 **Fax:** 9822 5692 Email
Parent Organisation: Liverpool City Council
Role is to identify issues and problems pertinent to young people and formulate strategies to address these issues. Involved in working parties and also suggest recommendations to Liverpool City Council.

Lunch Club - Warwick Farm
Warwick Farm Neighbourhood Centre , Cnr Lawrence Hargraves Road & Gallop , Street, Warwick Farm NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 742, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone: 9601 7347 **Fax:** 9601 7347 Web Site
Information on training, careers and how to look for a job for unemployed 16-24yrs.

Liverpool Youth Needs Committee Inc - Moorebank
Lot 1 Greenhills Avenue, Moorebank NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 79, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone: 9601 2503, 9600 9957 **Fax:** 9601 2503
Provides information, recreation and referral at drop in centres for young people. Liverpool Centre, Tues - Fri, 10:30am - 4:30pm

Moorebank Church of Christ Youth Group
33 Maddecks Avenue, Moorebank NSW 2170
Postal Address: 33 Maddecks Avenue, Moorebank NSW 2170
Phone: 9822 4003 **Fax:** 9822 4005
Provides a range of activities for high school age youth on Friday nights.

Lotus House Indo Chinese Young Women's Refuge Inc
PO Box 679, Cabramatta NSW 2166
Phone: 02 9727 0836 **Fax:** 02 9727 0836 Email
Supported accommodation service catering mainly for young Indo-Chinese women aged 14-18. Emphasis on living skills and transition into independent housing when appropriate.

Medley Community Inc.
9 Old Kurrajong Road, Casula NSW 2170
Postal Address: 9 Old Kurrajong Road, Casula NSW 2170
Phone: 9601 2267 **Fax:** 9601 2267
Medium term accommodation service for youth aged 14-18 years. Specialize in the education needs of our clients.

Lunch Club - Lurnea
Lurnea Neighbourhood Centre, Cnr Hill & Wonga Roads, Lurnea NSW 2170
Postal Address: PO Box 742, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone: 9601 7347 **Fax:** 9601 7347 Email
Information on training, careers and how to look for jobs for unemployed youth aged 16-24 years.

Fairfield/Cabramatta Police & Community Youth Club
162 Railway Parade, Cabramatta NSW 2166
Phone: 97279808 **Fax:** 97241658
The club has facilities for basketball, boxing, body building, gymnastics; martial arts and many more.

Chilean Community Services Network
Cnr McBurney Rd & Railway Pd, Cabramatta NSW 2166
Postal Address: PO Box 367, Cabramatta NSW 2166
Phone: 9726 8570 **Fax:** 9728 6080
The Network offers migrant information and cares for welfare of women and youth from Spanish speaking countries in Latin America.

Fairfield Multicultural Youth Project
Cabramatta Community Centre, Cnr Railway Pd & McBurney Rd, Cabramatta NSW 2166
Postal Address: PO Box 367, Cabramatta NSW 2166
Phone: 9727 0477 **Fax:** 9728 6080
Parent Organisation: Cabramatta Community Centre
Providing youth services to young people from ethnic minorities, with educational and recreational activities for young women 12-25yrs. They also help with street frequenting young people.

Circuit Breaker Programme
Oliveri Hall , Jindabyne Street, Heckenberg NSW 2168
Postal Address: PO Box 280, Miller NSW 2168
Phone: 9826 0642 **Fax:** 9826 0642 Email Web Site
An educational and career information program for students in years 9, 10, 11 and 12 from NESB who attend Ashcroft, James Busby and Miller Technology High Schools. It aims to assist students to make decisions regarding employment, training and further education. Circuit Breaker provides free after school classes in Math and English, career information, career guidance counseling, job search skills, study assistance, TAFE information, industrial visits, social/life skills and holiday excursions.

NSW Indo-China Chinese Association Inc. (NSW Indo-China Chinese Association Inc.)
10/124-128 Railway Parade, Canley Vale NSW 2166
Postal Address: 10/124-128 Railway Parade, Canley Vale NSW 2166
Phone: 9728 1773, 9726 0554 **Fax:** 9727 4561 Email

Alternative Names:ICCA
Provides welfare services for youth, elderly, new migrants, families and gambling counselling.

Miller Community Baptist Church
Cnr Cartwright & Corriedale Streets, Miller NSW 2168
Postal Address: PO Box 14, Miller NSW 2168
Phone: 9825 0049
Kids club Thursdays 6:30pm - 7:45pm, Junior youth club Fridays 6:30pm - 8:00pm, Huz 'n' Buz Day Care Centre, general Christian services.

Mission Employment Green Valley
66 Shropshire Street, Miller NSW 2168
Postal Address: PO Box 273, Miller NSW 2168
Phone: 9607 0522 **Fax:** 9607 2252 Email
Job placement centre for unemployed people. Services are free and participants must be registered with the CES.

Green Valley Community Centre - Sydney City Mission
Lot 14 Shropshire Street, Miller NSW 2168
Postal Address: PO Box 35, Miller NSW 2168
Phone: 9607 0666 **Fax:** 9607 5230
Charitable organisation providing welfare assistance, counselling, group work, financial counselling, family support, after school care, Latin American program, youth program, coffee shop, second hand clothing and playgroup.

Liverpool Youth Refuge Incorporated
PO Box 116, Miller NSW 2168
Phone: 9824 0192 **Fax:** 9602 4446
Crisis short term accommodation for 12 to 17 year olds (male & female), up to 3 months. We assist with income support, information referral and constructive activity.

Post School Options Program/Adult Training, Learning and Support
11A Landon Street, Fairfield East NSW 2165
Postal Address: PO Box 52, Fairfield NSW 2165
Phone: 97272791 **Fax:** 97272128
Provides training in basic living skills and pre-vocational skills. They also have recreational activities.

Home School Liaison Programme
Dept of Education and Training , Roy Watts Road, Glenfield NSW 2167
Postal Address: PO Box 21, Gelfield NSW 2167
Phone: 9203 9900 **Fax:** 9203 9999
Program created to help parents, students and schools who may be having difficulty in
attending school or in getting students to attend school.

Student Services - Department of Education and Training
Roy Watts Road, Glenfield NSW 2167
Postal Address: PO Box 21, Glenfield NSW 2167
Phone: 9203 9900 **Fax:** 9203 9999
Provides student advisory and advocacy services; support for parents, students and schools
in the area of student welfare, special education and equity programs.

Westside Youth Centre
179-183 Wilson Road, Green Valley NSW 2168
Postal Address: PO Box 1122, Green Valley NSW 2168
Phone: 9608 2370 **Fax:** 9608 2370 Email
Information support referral service for youth aged 12-24 years. Educational and recreational
activities, workshops and excursions.

Cornerstone
20 Wrentmore Street, Fairfield NSW 2165
Phone: 02 9726 3251 **Fax:** 02 9726 3251
Provides medium to long term semi-independent living accommodation for homeless young
people aged 15-18. Priority given to residents of Fairfield LGA. (Presbyterian Social
Services)

Fairfield Community Resource Centre
Level 1, 25 Barbara Street, Fairfield NSW 2165
Postal Address: PO Box 52, Fairfield NSW 1860
Phone: 97274333 **Fax:** 97274943
Non profit organisation acting on issues in the local area & sponsoring a range of programs
in the areas of youth services, childrens services, community development and the arts.

Assyrian Australian Association Welfare Office
7 The Crescent, Fairfield NSW 2165
Postal Address: PO Box 101, Fairfield NSW 1860
Phone: 97282594 **Fax:** 97230897
Provides welfare and community services such as, immigration, education, housing, youth
groups. Assyrian language classes are available on Saturdays from 10:00am-1:00pm.

Fairfield City Youth Refuge
PO Box 414, Fairfield NSW 1860
Provides short term accommodation for young people between 12-17 years old.

Fairfield Youth Education Service
25 Barbara St, Fairfield NSW 2165
Postal Address: PO Box 52, Fairfield NSW 1860
Phone: 9727 4333
Provides free courses and educational advice for young adults. Also offer assistance to early school leavers.

Youth Emergency Accommodation
Phone: 9267 5918
Recorded information on youth refuge vacancies for emergency accommodation.

Cornerstone Youth Accommodation Service
20 Wrentmore St, Fairfield NSW 2165
Postal Address: 20 Wrentmore St, Fairfield NSW 2165
Phone: 9726 3251 **Fax:** 9726 3251 Email
Provides medium to long term semi-supported accommodation for youths at school or employed, between the ages of 15-17. Also focus on living skills.

APPENDIX 4

Key Findings from Reviewed Foyer Evaluations

This Appendix presents the key findings of the foyer evaluations discussed in Chapter 5. Where relevant, implications of the findings for either the evaluation methodology of the Miller Campus or the development of the Campus model are draw out comments

Crook, J. (1994) *The YMCA foyer pilots: the first six months*, **Employment Service, Department for Education and Employment, HMSO, London.**

The Employment Services research looked into the first six months of operation of each of the pilot foyers. Following is a list of the key findings that have relevance to the Australian context.

The main advantage of the foyer was found to be its flexibility of approach towards the client. Clients responded positively to having more control in regards to developing their action plans and in not having to follow a formulaic relationship of reporting and assessment which was previously the case with job search programs. This flexibility of approach will need to be built into the management system of the Miller pilot – often flexibility of staff time etc does entail greater funding.

It was found that the majority of new Foyer clients were reported not to be job ready and in need of skills and training. Many also had social and psychological difficulties which needed to be addressed before they were ready for formal job training. This serves a s a warning to the Miller pilot, that is despite the screening process and the desire to establish a client group that is not of a high support need the Foyer system is about more than accommodation and employment training/placement. The more holistic view (inclusive of recognition of personality type, moral support and confidence boosting prior to interviewing and/or training) of client needs will need to be established from early on in the pilot so as to ensure a more rapid transition to independence.

Some residents were resistant to the need to move on once they had obtained employment and there was some indication that these may not have been ready for fully independent living. This relates to the above lesson learned. The Miller pilot scheme will need to establish living skills training and may need to do this early in the process so that successful and timely throughput of clientele can be maintained.

Lack of suitable move-on accommodation was an external problem that reduced the numbers able to achieve the goal of independent living. This will need to be addressed by the management staff of the Miller pilot as one of the stated aims of the Live 'N Learn Foundation is to assist local youth to remain in their local area, if accommodation shortages do not allow this then alternative mechanisms will need to be developed by either the foundation or the pilot staff. An example of this is one UK Foyer has developed their own move on affordable accommodation in the light of limited availability of commercially available properties.

A range of management issues were identified in the report, including:

• Staffing

Having a variety of staffing personnel with different expertise and personalities permitted a shared approach to clients which helped to reduce staff stress and cover any absences. It was noted that to work there staff did need a wide range of skills which included counselling, motivation, presentation, negotiating etc.

Clearly established management and communication structures were necessary to promote understanding and prevent frustration, thus they are also important for the development of positive staff morale. This was particularly important in the light that the client group being serviced were of higher need than originally anticipated, thus staff needed good support levels all round.

• Foyer clients

Clients were in need of greater support than those usually dealt with in Jobclubs thus the advantage of the foyer approach was that it entailed the flexibility to be able to deal with these individuals. Not all foyers remained stringent on the age restrictions with 8% of participants under 18 years old and 15% between the ages 26 and 30.

• Foyer programme

Working with participants on a one-to-one basis was found to be successful and the main approach that was utilised, although there is the ability to include group work. The flexible approach to attendance, according to what the participant could cope with "…was considered fundamentally important for the success of the Foyer programme." (Cook 1994, p9).

The assessment process was problematic in some foyers, as clients had long waiting periods for appointments. A two tier assessment process was proposed where one would relate to life skills and the second to training needs.

The acceptance of the foyer program amongst YMCA residents and the wider youth relied upon the presentation of the scheme as not another government scheme. Word of mouth seemed to be the best way of disseminating information about the foyer amongst youth.

• Move-on Accommodation

Many clients faced the difficulty of trying to find suitable accommodation to move into. Lack of savings for the rent deposit was another common problem.

The following comments were also made:
• a well defined operating base within the hostel and a supportive team approach to staffing had the most success;
• many of the clients had a range of special needs, and could not be described as "job ready";
• although highly appropriate for young people who require more support than, say, Jobclub can offer, the service was not for the very vulnerable;
• many had already rejected formal structures, and an informal "drop- in" approach was proving more successful;
• a more holistic approach was evident, the Foyers are more than a Jobclub;

- a notable success was in encouraging young people to enter training, particularly some who would not otherwise have considered it;
- networks and contacts were being made with referral agencies, training providers, employers and housing organisations;
- the flexibility in relation to client needs and the individual approach to the client was seen as the main advantage of the Foyer.

The report concluded that the initial period of the foyers was proving to be a success. The foyers had succeeded "…in placing clients into employment, in placing clients into training, in raising self-esteem and self-motivation of clients, …" (Cook 1994, p12).

Anderson, I. and Quilgars, D. (1995) *Foyers for young people: Evaluation of a pilot initiative*, **Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.**

In all, 170 of the 519 foyer residents gained some form of employment in the first two years, a 33% 'success' rate. The older and more job ready an applicant was initially, the greater his or her chances were of finding employment while in the scheme. A further 50% went into training or further education or temporary work.

Foyer clients did find temporary work whilst participating in the scheme, at times though the resultant confusion in benefit payments often acted as a disincentive to temporary work, one foyer encouraged voluntary work as a means to overcome this problem. A few residents were successfully placed on literacy courses while in the foyer which was greatly needed for them to become eligible for employment. Life skills courses were also in short supply and much of that kind of work was done informally by foyer staff.

The report concluded with 42 recommendations, many of which have a relevance to the planning the Miller Campus. Overall the report concluded that "…foyers provided a mechanism to help less able young people to compete for existing training, employment and housing opportunities. Whilst they were successful in starting to change attitudes (for example, of employers to homeless people), they could not change wider structural factors like the level of unemployment and housing provision, and their success was directly influenced by these factors." (Anderson and Quilgars, 1995b p3). However, it is notable that only 25% of residents were recorded as having achieved the "ideal" outcome of finding both a job *and* an independent home. But there were other positive outcomes. These included the development of successful approaches to interagency working. The main weakness lay in the complexity and uncertainty surrounding the revenue funding.

Some of the relevant issues that were raised included:

Move on accommodation proved problematic with lack of supply being perceived as the main constraint. Nevertheless, more residents moved on to secure accommodation than achieved full time employment. This issue and its relevance to the Miller pilot and Live 'N Learn foundation has previously been discussed.

Of those that left the foyer within the pilot period 83 left with a job and accommodation, 248 decided to leave under different circumstances. A problem that all foyers had to face was the difficulty of those that had to be evicted due to tenancy requirements. Those that were evicted were subsequently banned from using the support services which some would have continued to make use of. Many staff believed that "a service not tied to accommodation

would not experience this problem to the same extent." (Anderson and Quilgars, 1995a, p 36). It was also perceived to be somewhat inappropriate that those that did not maintain training requirement did not have their accommodation rights removed. This is an issue that will need to be anticipated and a method of resolution developed by the Miller pilot and Live 'N Learn foundation as it is fundamental to the nature of provision that will be supplied.

Interestingly, sources of revenue funding in the first year came mainly from the Department of Employment's budget. The resources utilised included Programme Development Fund (administered by the Employment Services Area Offices), Local Initiative Fund (administered through local Training and Enterprise Councils), National Development Fund (administered by the Training, Education and Enterprise Directorate). Departmental staff were appointed as a part of the secondment program from the Employment Services. This close linkage with employment services has not yet emerged in the Miller model, the development of these will need to be closely monitored as it is a crucial element of achieving a successful outcome for/by the client.

Moreover, securing funding for the training and job search programs beyond the initial two year pilot period proved difficult as the combined training and job search facilities meant that they did not fit into any one government funding scheme. "The lack of single and long term funding mechanism for foyers resulted in considerable uncertainty for the YMCA foyers" (Anderson and Quilgars, 1995a, p18). As to be expected, the authors found that this uncertainty effected staff moral and the intake of new clients.

The Live 'N Learn Foundation are attempting to overcome this by establishing a high level of corporate/business funding from the outset (the stated aim is one million Australian dollars). The achievement of this aim and its impact on the staff and clientele of the eventual funding mechanism will need to be monitored by the evaluation team. In particular the cost of one million Australian dollars being the preemptive figure will need to be accessed – example the effect on time delay etc.

Anderson, I. and Douglas, A (1998) *The Development of Foyers in Scotland*, **Scottish Homes, Edinburgh.**

The study noted that there was a heavy involvement of local authorities in all three schemes. Also the schemes developed with a very strong local partnership basis, involving a wide range of local public, private and voluntary stakeholders. Management structures were variable: one developed around a lead agency, the other two involved the creation of separate charitable agencies to oversee the project. As in England, capital and revenue funding models were complex. Each scheme also adopted different targeting strategies aimed at the specific needs of the local community, ranging from an "open door" self referral approach to more constrained and targeted eligibility rules. Despite the differences between each scheme "There was a broad consensus among foyer representatives that the development of a foyer should be seen as a part of a wider youth strategy in any area…..foyers needed to be part of a broad range of provision to meet local needs…" (Anderson and Douglas, 1998, p 25). This is particularly relevant for the Miller Campus project as it has been developed within and alongside the Community 2168 regeneration project.

Financial difficulties were once again noted. No clear source of revenue for vocational services and possible supported accommodation funding allocation changes were problems experienced by the whole supported accommodation sector that were not overcome by the

implementation of the foyer model. In light of the Live 'N Learn Foundation's aim to become wholly funded by corporate sponsorship over time, the issue of the stability of revenue funding for the Miller Campus is also likely to be equally problematic.

A number of lessons drawn from this study have a relevance for the Miller pilot. These include:

- careful research, planning and co-ordination to meet the local needs is crucial to the success of a foyer as is the physical design and the approach to working with young people;

- all three foyers required complex packages of capital and revenue funding, necessitating multi-agency negotiation in order to cover housing and non-housing costs;

- the development process was lengthy in all cases and Kirkcaldy foyer was affected by changing local needs and alternative provision. Future projects need to take account of changing local social and economic circumstances;

- all three foyers experienced difficulties with revenue funding and affordability for young people moving off benefit and into work, reflecting a common problem across the supported accommodation sector.

Maginn, A., Frew, R., O'Regan, F. and Kodz, J. (2000) *Stepping Stones: An evaluation of Foyers and other schemes serving the housing and labour-market needs of young people***, Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions, HMSO, London.**

Overall this report found that the main difference that exists between foyers and other schemes centre on the job search, careers advice and employment aspects of the service. No clear line could be depicted to describe the characteristic of provision and organisation that distinguishes a foyer from a non-foyer scheme. In effect the main objective and assumed benefit of the Foyer scheme has been the additionally of the services provided. However, this report concluded that that additionally of the foyer model *did not* add significantly recognisable benefits/advantages over other schemes that are in play. This finding is significant to the Live 'N Learn foundation and pilot scheme. Whilst the findings reflect to the fact that the UK has a well established history of youth accommodation provision which is not directly comparable to the situation in Australia, it would be interesting to compare the initial results of the Miller pilot evaluation to those of a control sample of comparable schemes. At this stage it is suggested that SAAP data may be utilised to achieve this aim. However, this aspect of the evaluation is not currently part of the present research method for the project.

The idiosyncratic nature of foyer development was also noted. The development of schemes in particular locations seemed to depend mainly on an individual or agency to advocate and mobilise action towards implementation. Local "social entrepreneurs" are therefore important in pushing through local schemes. In fact, there was an element of randomness to development decisions. The authors expressed a concern over role the Foyer Federation for Youth played in promoting a policy of expansion whilst not enforcing robust local needs analysis. The fact that foyers and other schemes both had similar target groups suggested an element of unnecessary duplication in some areas. This will be an issue to address for the Live 'N Learn Foundation.

The report confirmed that the sources of capital funding were diverse and varied from scheme to scheme. Foyers tended to have a funding sources from a larger number of schemes than other schemes. Information on value for money issues suggested that foyers

tend to cost more to operate than other schemes, probably due to their size and their role as providers of accommodation.

As with earlier reports, the DETR report found that revenue funding posed a problem for many schemes. It appeared easier to obtain development funds than income to cover running costs. This led to some foyers to providing high quality accommodation whilst running on frugal budgets. The long term security of funding is a clear issue. Many of the funds being received were time limited making strategic term planning difficult and costly in terms of staff time needed to chase funds. However, the benefit of not having one large funding source means that the schemes are not as reliant on the continued existence of one funding source. In any country funding is an issue that can effect the successful operation of the scheme and the level of enthusiasm and resultant success rate of those personally involved in the scheme. The Live 'N Learn Foundation is attempting to secure long term and stable funding for its pilot scheme, although at this point in time the desire to secure longer term funding in advance of development work starting on site could jeapordise the establishment of the pilot itself.

Security issues were evident in some schemes, especially the larger ones. "The kind of management problems cited by residents and staff included the use and sale of drugs on the premises, violence, vandalism, burglary and problems caused by guests." (Maginn, Frew, O'Regan and Kodz, 2000, p59). In fact, 22% of residents had had drug or alcohol abuse problems of some sort and 20% were ex-offenders. This issue will need to be carefully managed in the Miller Campus.

The average stay or participants in schemes was just six or seven months. This was an unexpected finding and raises "…questions as to the extent to which schemes will have time to fully address the various problems and needs their clients have been described as possessing." (Maginn, Frew, O'Regan and Kodz, 2000, p 67). Currently it is envisaged that clients will be a part of the Miller pilot for a period of up to two years, move on provision may have to be established earlier in the intended scheme of operation.

Overall, male participants outnumbered female by three to two. Participants of the foyers schemes were on average younger than others and a high proportion of clients presented with high support needs, although a wide range was recorded. Results consistently report that Foyers in the UK service a higher level of need than was originally anticipated. The Live 'N Learn Foundation also envisage that the client group will be a balanced community that will not have high level support needs, this situation will have to be monitored as support needs may only arise once the client has begun participation and will therefore need to be catered for on the run.

Monitoring was poorly developed in many of the schemes. Much of the data kept by schemes was incomplete or varied to such an extent as to not be comparable. Funding agencies did not require comprehensive data or common measures of outcomes.

This last finding highlights the importance of collecting significant data in a comparable format systematically from the inception of the project in order to address the issues outlined in the methodology section below i.e. outcome information for funders, information to make management decisions about such things as eligibility criteria, length of stay, services offered etc.

Christine Gaussiran (1999) *The Tubman Foyer: Evaluation of a pilot initiative in Minneapolis,* **Minneapolis Neighbourhood Employment Network, Minneapolis.**

As noted in chapter 1 above, the Tubman Foyer in Minneapolis opened in October 1997 to house 59 people in 15 apartments (14 apartments for families and one for women without children). The target population was battered women between the ages of 21 and 65, including their children. This population has difficulty in accessing the job market due to a number of factors, including a lack of up-to-date work skills, a lack of business behaviour skills, housing instability and the commitment to raising children alone.

The lessons from the Mineapolis pilot project were related in the main to the form of collaboration which is not directly relevant to the path the Miller pilot project is taking.

APPENDIX 5

Program Monitoring: A note on method

The conceptual framework for the evaluation of the Miller Campue pilot has been derived from Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey (1999) and United Way of America (1996).

The form of evaluation to be adopted in this research project can be termed "Program Monitoring". Program monitoring essentially involves the "systematic documentation of key aspects of program performance that are indicative of whether the program is functioning as intended or according to some appropriate standard" (Rossi, *et al*, 1999, p 192). As such, this will involve both a stage of "process or implementation evaluation", where the programs objectives, activities and intended functioning is assessed, and a second stage "impact evaluation" which assesses the effect of the program on the intended recipients of the programs outputs.

The program evaluation model therefore essentially has four main components:

1. Inputs (resources)
2. Activities (processes)
3. Outputs (services delivered)
4. Outcomes (benefits)

- **Inputs**
Inputs are the resources used by a program e.g. staff, volunteers, money, facilities.

- **Activities**
Activities are what the program does with the inputs to fulfill its mission i.e. the types of services provided such as accommodation, training, counseling, careers advice, mock interviews etc.

- **Outputs**
Outputs refer to the direct products of the program itself in terms of achieved activities or events. They are often quantitative such as the number of participants housed, the number of training sessions provided, etc.

- **Outcomes**
Outcomes are benefits or changes for participants during or after their participation in the activities of a program. Outcomes may relate to behaviour, skills, knowledge, attitudes, values, or other attributes. They are what participants know, think or can do or how they behave that is different following the program. Another term for this is *additionality* i.e. what 'additional' value has the program achieved: what *difference* has it made.

It is important not to confuse 'outcomes' per se with outcome indicators or targets.
Outcome indicators are the specific items of information that track a program's success on outcomes. They describe observable, measurable characteristics or changes that represent achievement of an outcome, e.g. number and percentage of participants achieving a qualification from TAFE.

There are a number of benefits from the measurement of program outcomes. Perhaps the most important, particularly for funders, is that of **accountability**, that the resources used actually produce the benefits for the clients that are claimed. Of equal importance to the managers of the program is the feedback loop it provides to enable **service improvement**. It can help with such things as focusing on staff training needs, services which need strengthening, services which need to be re-targeted, preparation of budgets or long-term plans. Other benefits are various but include:

- Attracting new residents
- Attracting partners
- Retain or increase funding
- Achieve status as 'model' project
- Gain public support and recognition.
- Recruiting and retaining skilled staff
- Enlisting and motivating able volunteers

Limitations of an outcomes focus

There are three key limitations to outcome measurement:

- If outcome findings show that participants are not experiencing intended benefits, they do not show here the problem lies;

- If desired outcomes are achieved, it does not prove that the program and the program alone caused the outcomes. (In order to measure this it would be necessary to do program impact research and have control groups for a random sample of participants);

- The findings of outcome measurement don't reveal whether the outcomes being measured are the right ones for a particular program.

Measuring Outcomes

In order to measure outcomes, it is necessary to go through the following steps:

1. State the objectives or mission for the program
2. Identify the outcomes expected from these objectives you want to measure
3. Specify the performance indicators expected of these outcomes
4. Establish the appropriate monitoring system to collect the required data
5. Analyse the data.

The results will allow the systems and activities to be reviewed with the benefit of objective feedback.

Outcomes can be measured in levels and it is likely that this approach will be useful for the Miller Campus evaluation.

- **Initial outcomes** are the first changes participants benefit from and are closely related to the program's activities. They often relate to a person's knowledge, attitudes or skills e.g. an increase in the perceived value of education following a mentoring program or pre-vocational course.

- **Intermediate outcomes** are often changes in behaviour resulting from these newfound attitudes or skills e.g. attending school more regularly or enrolling at college or obtaining a qualification.

- **Longer-term outcomes** are the ultimate outcomes – the vision or mission of the program. These would be represented by a change in the status of the participant e.g. becoming employed or living independently. These longer term outcomes are more difficult to measure, as they often mean tracing or tracking program recipients after they have left the program or after it has finished.

It will be recalled that one of the recommendations from the DETR (2000) *Stepping Stones* report was that consideration should be given 'setting and monitoring intermediate goals.' This was because of the poor level of outcome data available to the researchers conducting this evaluation. It is therefore highly likely that the evaluation of the Miller Campus will benefit from the measurement of both initial and intermediate outcomes, rather then form longer term outcomes, which are likely to require a more extended study period than that proposed.

Performance Indicators

Indicators describe observable, measurable and unambiguous characteristics or changes that represent achievement of an outcome. One of the most difficult areas in this type of analysis is establishing the indicators and the measurement methods for the outcomes selected for study. For example, if one of the objectives is to reduce youth unemployment and the outcome to be measured is the number of young people getting a job, it must be decided when this measure is taken, i.e. during their period of accommodation at the campus, on the day they leave, three months after they have left etc. And is a job a job if they turn up for work on day one, or is it only a job if they still have it after three months. All these criteria need to be agreed with the Campus management as part of the evaluation project.

As mentioned above, the indicator should also specify whether time is measured, either in terms of measuring an outcome indicator after a certain length of involvement with the program, or measuring an outcome indicator after a certain length of time having left the project to ascertain longer-term benefits.

APPENDIX 6

Partnering Agreement between the Urban Frontiers Program and the NSW Department of Housing

Evaluating the Miller Live 'N' Learn Campus Pilot Project

PARTNERING AGREEMENT

between

NSW Department of Housing

and

The Urban Frontiers Program, University of Western Sydney

September 2000

Evaluating the Miller Live 'N' Learn Campus Pilot Project Partnership Agreement

Objective of the Project

To monitor and evaluate the development of the pilot Live 'N' Learn Miller Campus. The evaluation team from Urban Frontiers Program (UFP) will work with the Department of Housing's (DoH) Live 'N' Learn team to monitor the development of the Miller campus from its early stages into management and then into its first year of operation. Monitoring into the first year of development is dependent on the securing additional AHURI funding as that stage approaches.

Key Elements of the Research Method

1. Developing a monitoring and evaluation framework

> A framework for internal evaluation will be established in conjunction with the Department, the Miller campus management team and will involve input from the Live 'N' Learn Foundation. This will set out to;
- Define the key objectives of the Live 'N' Learn pilot
- Define key performance indicators to measure these objectives.
- Establish and set up the monitoring and evaluation framework to track the development of the pilot over the lifetime of the research project.
- Provide the Department with a set of long term Performance Indicators and monitoring arrangements for internal management information and project monitoring.

2. Documentation of the management organisation, processes and outcomes

> The development period of the Live 'N' Learn foundation will be monitored and documented. This will serve as input into Live 'N' Learn Handbook.

3. Stakeholder interviews

> UFP will conduct in-depth interviews with stakeholders at the beginning of the Miller campus development period, towards the end of the development period and at the end of the first year of operation (funding permitting). The stakeholders will be jointly identified at the time of the commencement of the Live 'N' Learn Miller campus and is likely to include direct campus sponsors (as distinct from foundation sponsors) and supporters, campus staff, other interested participants and members of the community (if appropriate). A maximum of 20 stakeholder interviews will be included at each stage (unless otherwise agreed by the UFP and the Advisory panel).

4. Residents interviews

UFP will seek to interview all residents of the Miller campus on arrival and will then seek to interview them on leaving the project or after one year, whichever comes sooner (funding permitting). Agreements for new residents to the Campus over the period of the research will include a requirement to allow the Research Team to conduct an entry and exit interview with them.

Memorandum of Understanding

The Project Partners

The partners to this agreement (hereafter known as the Project Team) are the NSW Department of Housing (the Department), and the Urban Frontiers Program, University of Western Sydney (The UFP).

The Project

The Project Team jointly agrees to co-operate to complete the "Evaluating the Miller Foyer Pilot Project" (hereafter known as "the Project") based on a research proposal developed by the Urban Frontiers Program and funded by the Australian and Urban Research Institute (AHURI).   Copies of the UFP project proposal and AHRUI/UWS contract are appended (Attachments A and B).

Project Management

The Research Project will be guided by a project Advisory Panel convened by the DoH and comprising nominees of the Project Team and sponsoring organisations. The nominee of the Department of Housing will chair the Advisory Panel. A list of Advisory Panel members is appended.

Formal management of the research project will lie with the Urban Frontiers Program.

Publication and Authorship

The Urban Frontiers Program will submit a position paper during November 2000 for comment. This will be presented to AHURI by 31st November. A final report together with key findings will be submitted to AHURI according to the agreed timetable in the AHURI/UWS contract (see Attachment B). While the dissemination of the report and key findings will be the responsibility of AHURI, the Urban Frontiers Program retains the right to disseminate its own key findings document and research report. Copyright of the positioning paper and final report will vest entirely with AHURI. Copyright of the reports and findings published by the UFP will vest with the UFP. No UFP documents from the Project will be published without the prior sighting of the Department.

The Urban Frontiers Program will produce an input to the Live 'N' Learn Handbook document that will be delivered to the Department of Housing at an appropriate stage. Input from the Urban Frontiers Program is to be acknowledged upon production of the Live 'N' Learn handbook, copyright of said handbook vest entirely with the Department.

Expectations of the research partners.

The project team will need to work together to achieve a thorough evaluation of the Live 'N' Learn Miller campus pilot. In addition to the outputs specified in the AHURI/UWS contract document appended, it is agreed that the Department can expect the following conduct and results from the Urban Frontiers Program.

- Input into the Live 'N' Learn Handbook. Urban Frontiers Program will provide input documentation that will focus on such issues as the action plan and evaluation methods/explanations.

- Stakeholder and resident interviews. The UFP will consult the project Advisory Panel to develop a list of the stakeholders (sponsors, supporters, community members and relevant staff). Members of the UFP project team will conduct all interviews in a professional, confidential and timely manner, and will update the Advisory Panel on a regular basis. The UFP will agree to discuss the questionnaire during its development phase with the Advisory Panel and the Youth Accommodation Association (YAA). UFP staff will conduct all interviews in a manner consistent with ethical principals, UFP will gain clearance from the University of Western Sydney ethics committee for the interviews that they are to undertake wherever relevant..

- Attendance at Miller Live 'N' Learn Campus Board Meetings. The Department has agreed that the UFP Project team will attend the Board Meetings as an observer. UFP recognises that sensitive issues may be discussed, and the Board may request the physical removal of observers when discussing confidential or commercially sensitive information. Any UFP members present as an observer will abide by the Board's decision to have them removed during the given periods and will observe confidentiality of the proceedings from these meetings.

- Live 'N' Learn Foundation Board Meetings. Urban Frontiers Program staff will present to the Foundation Board the evaluation project outline and Position Paper at an appropriate meeting and request permission to attend as observers. The same conditions recognised above would apply, namely: we observe full confidentiality over issue discussed, and the Board may request the physical removal of observers when discussing confidential or commercially sensitive information. Any staff member present as an observer will abide by the boards decision to have them removed during said periods and will remain mindful of the sensitive nature of discussions that they are an observer to.

- Advisory Panel for Evaluation Project. UFP and DoH will convene a system of monthly meetings (or as often as deemed appropriate) of **a** small Advisory Panel to assist in the research. DoH will convene the initial meeting. UFP will convene and support future meetings.

- Documentation. UFP will pass all documents that are to be submitted to AHURI to the project Advisory Panel for prior reading and comment, where this is possible. UFP will keep confidential and in a secure location all documentation received relating to the Miller Live 'N' Learn Campus or the Live 'N' Learn Foundation.

It is agreed that the UFP can expect the following from the Department.

- Stakeholder and residents interviews. To assist in the success of attaining interviews the Department of Housing will enter into both the management contract and resident contracts the desire/need to part take in these interviews. The Urban

Frontiers Program will provide a brief document for all residents setting out the objectives of the evaluation and the interviews.

- Live 'N' Learn Foundation Meetings. If the board accepts the presence of the Urban Frontiers Program staff as observers the Department of Housing will forward all documentation, including minutes, discussion papers, reviews quotes, etc to the Urban Frontiers Program in a timely and accessible manner.

- Miller Live 'N' Learn Campus Advisory Board Meetings. The management and staff of the Miller campus will be expected to work with the Urban Frontiers Program to implement a data collection and management system that will allow easy and accessible reporting mechanisms. The Miller campus management will also work with the Urban Frontiers Program to conduct evaluations regarding those residents that leave the Live 'N' Learn campus.

- Documentation. The Department of Housing will forward documentation from working parties, quotes and board meetings, decisions, issues, etc. to the Urban Frontiers Program in a timely and regular manner. These documents are to be marked "confidential" if the Department wish their contents to be limited to the Research Team only.

Timescales

The Evaluation Project will commence on 1 September 2000. The completion dates of each segment/report will be specified according to the broader progress of the Miller Live 'N' Learn Campus. Indicative dates are provided in the appended copy of the AHRUI/UWS Contract.

The Department of Housing and the Urban Frontiers Program will ensure that the Research Project is conducted with all due diligence and expedition and in accordance with any and all laws and ethical conventions applicable to the jurisdiction in which the Research Project takes place.

SIGNATORIES TO THE AGREEMENT:

DATE

UFP/UWS/18.09.00

Miller Live N Learn Campus Evaluation Project Advisory Group (March 2001)

Ross Woodward	Director South West Sydney Region, Department of Housing, NSW
Cheryl Prosser	Business Development, Department of Housing, NSW
Damien Ferry	Department of Housing, NSW
Adrian Pisarski	Executive Officer, NSW Youth Accommodation Association
Dana Greenfield	Department of Housing, Public Housing operations group
Karen Cadwell	South West Sydney Region Senior Project Officer
Raoul Wainright	National legal and research manager, CFMEU
Lindsey Fraser	Assistant national secretary, CFMEU