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Note: throughout this report Sustaining Tenancies (ST) refers to the project titled Sustaining Tenancies Following Exits from Correctional Facilities (Far Western NSW Broken Hill Transitional Support Program).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOD</td>
<td>Alcohol and other drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCMG</td>
<td>Community Compliance Monitoring Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSP</td>
<td>Community Offenders Support Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSNSW</td>
<td>Corrective Services NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Community Restorative Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>Department of Education and Training (now known as Education and Communities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNSW</td>
<td>Housing NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td>Individual Support Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LALC</td>
<td>Local Aboriginal Land Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSI-R</td>
<td>Level of Service Inventory - Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPAH</td>
<td>National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDRO</td>
<td>State Debt Recovery Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>Specialist homelessness services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Sustaining Tenancies project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THaSS</td>
<td>Targeted Housing and Support Services (Western Sydney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDO</td>
<td>Work in Development Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRHAP</td>
<td>Western NSW Regional Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRHC</td>
<td>Western Regional Homelessness Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“I have mental health issues - bad stress, depression; I am institutionalised, can’t get a job now ... before - I was in gaol every year – been all around the state. Retired from all that now and want to be there for my young fella.” (Sustaining Tenancies client #1)

“This project is a hugely valued resource to us, offenders and everyone else in the community. You know what – I have had people for the first time in years finishing supervised parole orders – quite often to do with having housing and attending programs – this lessens the stress and they have a refuge. They now have pride in having a place of their own for the first time in their life – men who have lived on the periphery, drifted, had no lease, no place, no ideas – are now maintaining a house, budget and cooking – this is a big difference.” (Probation and Parole)

“They are doing an absolutely fantastic job – structured for prison release – put plan in place, support and deal with barriers – case manage on a one to one basis until the clients are engaged back into the community.” (Broken Hill Police)

The “Sustaining Tenancies Following Exits from Correctional Centres” (Sustaining Tenancies) project in Broken Hill is a response to Priority 2 of the NSW Homelessness Action Plan, to “Transition and maintain people exiting statutory care, correctional and health facilities into appropriate long-term accommodation” (NSW Government, 2009).

Corrective Services NSW (CSNSW), as the lead agency for the project, has a partnership with the Community Restorative Centre (CRC) to deliver the transition service for people exiting Broken Hill Correctional Centre. Broken Hill is an area of high need for such a service, with high rates of homelessness (particularly among Aboriginal people), limited accommodation and homelessness services, a very high proportion of Aboriginal prisoners (estimated at 75-80% by Broken Hill Correctional Centre staff) and high rates of re-offending (NSW FACS 2012). There is scant evidence to date of effective interventions to reduce homelessness and recidivism in Aboriginal offenders although they are recognised as a priority target population.

The Sustaining Tenancies project targets people released from custody in the Broken Hill area who have complex needs, are at risk of homelessness and have a high risk of re-offending. The majority of these are Aboriginal men. The goal of the project is to prevent clients exiting into rough sleeping, reduce homelessness, and reduce re-offending. The project commenced in November 2010, and was funded to take 15 clients at a time with an overall target to the end of June 2013 of 45 clients.

The service model

The Sustaining Tenancies multifaceted service model provides access to accommodation (through a close partnership with Compass Housing) together with case management and individually tailored “wrap-around” transition support. Support is offered over 12 months, ideally commencing three months prior to release. It is underpinned by a central focus on client empowerment and building self-efficacy to maintain tenancies over the longer-term, and to facilitate integration into family and community. The small team of a manager and an Aboriginal caseworker provide case management at varying levels of intensity according to client needs, with a particular focus on support in the first three months post-release, which is a recognised period of high risk of re-offending. There is a strong focus on addressing drug and alcohol abuse issues, and family mediation. The project also seeks to enhance service integration and coordination across government and non-government services in the area.
The evaluation

The evaluation has a strengths-based approach, focussing on what is working well. It is of necessity largely descriptive, drawing mostly on qualitative data combined with the available administrative and reporting data. The small sample size and lack of a matched control group of clients limits the extent to which the findings can be extrapolated more generally. Also there was a lack of baseline data on homelessness in the client group against which to compare, and limited mechanisms for follow-up to determine longer-term outcomes for clients who have either left or been exited from the service for a range of reasons.

The methodology involved a literature review, a review of available project documentation and an extensive stakeholder consultation process with 29 informants; this included five clients of the service as well as a cross-section of service providers in Broken Hill along with other key informants. A site visit was undertaken for face-to-face interviews and to view the service delivery setting.

Findings

The project commenced taking clients in November 2010 and, up until the end of June 2012, 29 new clients\(^1\) had been supported by the service over the two financial year periods, which is less than the original target of 37 clients over the time frame. The total number of clients the project actually worked with both in the community and in prison was 15 in year one and 26 in year two. Three clients exited in year one and 18 in year two. Of the 25 clients whose risk for re-offending was assessed by Corrective Services NSW,\(^2\) the majority (24) were assessed as either high or medium-high risk of re-offending, with one being assessed as low-medium risk of re-offending.

The clients, all of whom have extremely disadvantaged backgrounds, have been assisted to establish and maintain tenancies, build life skills (literacy, numeracy, financial management, house-keeping), access services and programs to address health, address issues of substance dependence and social and emotional well-being issues, increase employment readiness, and address risks for re-offending. There has been close collaboration with a wide range of other services and agencies in Broken Hill to deliver the service.

The evaluation findings confirm that the Sustaining Tenancies service has filled a very important gap in Broken Hill and achieved significant, albeit modest, outcomes for clients across a range of factors; it has benefited other service providers and also reportedly had positive effects on the Aboriginal community more broadly. This is despite the relatively modest size of the project and not inconsiderable challenges it has faced given the complex nature of the client group and their entrenched problems.

There has been a reduction in homelessness directly attributable to the project, with some clients maintaining a stable home for the first time in their lives. It was reported that eighty per cent of clients have been able to sustain their housing, even over short periods of re-incarceration and this is an important outcome for this group who are at high risk of homelessness.

---

\(^1\) The targets were set before confirmation of the definition of “new client” which was that only those who were released would be counted. The overall total of eligible people receiving support from the service was greater when including those who were being supported while still in custody.

\(^2\) Corrective Services NSW uses a validated actuarial risk assessment tool (LSI-R) for inmates to assess risk of re-offending and key domains for intervention. It comprises a number of static and dynamic factors giving a risk score (LSI-R) that are then used by correctional staff to develop a case plan.
According to client and service provider accounts, re-offending was reduced. Probation and Parole informants stated that a number of clients have completed supervised parole for the first time in their lives. Due to the short timeframes of the project to date, Corrective Services NSW was not able to undertake analysis of reoffending rates,³ however a total of 13 clients were recorded as having returned to CSNSW up until the end of December 2012.

A range of tangible client outcomes was reported by Probation and Parole, Police and other Broken Hill services such as the Job Networks agency, all of whom commented on tangible progress in clients and improvements in their circumstances. There have been changes in significant social integration factors and extraneous factors linked to re-offending such as reduced drug and alcohol dependence, improved mental health and well-being, increased literacy and numeracy skills, engagement in the Choppa Weed employment initiative, increased confidence and self-esteem and family reconciliation. A number of clients’ comments were reflective of having “broken the cycle” of incarceration due to the support of the project.

The Choppa Weed enterprise was established to provide an opportunity for clients to engage in meaningful work in an area where there are very limited employment opportunities, particularly for this group. To date 12 clients have participated in the venture and for some this has been their first ever experience of employment.

All service providers commented very positively on strengthened local capacity for providing effective services for this very challenging client group. An important benefit emphasised by Probation and Parole has been increased efficiency, with staff being freed up for other work. The project was able to collaboratively provide a more comprehensive “joined-up” support service for ex-prisoners. The intensive individual case management was reported to be invaluable in providing stability and re-engaging people back into community, or indeed, integrating some who have never previously been well integrated.

Several informants also commented that there have been wider positive impacts for the local Aboriginal community, and a sense of community being “more settled”. The project was reported to have been very well accepted and supported by the community.

The project has faced a number of challenges, not the least of which was the complexity and difficulty of the target group of clients with, typically, life-long histories of abuse and trauma, recognised low levels of help seeking behaviour and poor self-efficacy, compounded by low literacy and numeracy levels. Funding for the project has been relatively modest which limited resources for staffing and brokerage in the first year in particular. The demands of the casework have been high, and, as with other Aboriginal community interventions, community expectations and associated pressures on the Aboriginal caseworker have been considerable.

There are limited services in Broken Hill for referring clients for mental health, grief and loss and drug and alcohol issues, and there is no residential rehabilitation service locally. These factors have limited the specialised support available for clients. The project has also faced ongoing challenges with data collection and establishing robust systems for ongoing monitoring of client outcomes.

³ For the purposes of Corrective Services NSW (CSNSW) reporting, reoffending is measured at 24 months following release from custody or the end of a community based order. Therefore, for the purposes of this evaluation, reoffending cannot be analysed because the “time to re-offend” is insufficient for most of the sample.
Success factors

The success of the project can be attributed to a number of factors that together have been very effective in addressing the complexity of client needs:

- The combined elements of the Sustaining Tenancies service model (housing, case management and support over an extended period) have been important, and each alone was unlikely to have achieved the same impact;
- Delivery of the service in a culturally safe manner by a competent team who are well accepted and respected in the Aboriginal community has also been critical;
- The strong partnership with Compass Housing, including the co-location arrangement, has provided access to accommodation and ongoing collaborative support to sustain client tenancies as well as cost savings to the project;
- The focus on increased service coordination and integration has been a key contributor to success, facilitated by the relatively small community location, which enables ease of communication and networking locally. The recognition by others of the acute need for the service, and enthusiasm in supporting it, has been of additional importance; and
- The acceptance of the new service by the Aboriginal community and this has been essential in building trust and supporting clients resettle back into the community.

Conclusion and implications

The Sustaining Tenancies project has filled a critical service gap in Broken Hill, contributing significantly to both reduced homelessness and to some extent, reduced re-offending in this seriously disadvantaged client group. There have been improved outcomes across key social integration factors and also strengthened service capacity and integration locally. Without exception, service providers commented on the need to maintain the service; however in the absence of ongoing funding, sustainability of the project outcomes is unlikely to occur.

The project is still in relatively early days and a longer time period is needed to bed the project down, to increase efficiencies, establish mechanisms to track and analyse longer outcomes for clients and determine ways in which improvements can be sustained. There are also likely to be substantial benefits from longer-term support for clients beyond the 12 month period in light of their entrenched problems.

More broadly, the evaluation findings indicate that there is an additional need in Broken Hill for a supported transition accommodation facility for identified clients to support stabilisation in the 3-6 months high risk period following release.

Analysis of cost effectiveness of this type of intervention is recognised as being particularly difficult. However crude estimates are that the approximate average cost of service to individual clients is $39.22 per client per day ($14,316 per annum). This average does not account for varying durations of client support both in the community and in custody nor differing intensities of service provided. It does not claim to reflect the complete structural and institutional system costs including costs of other services. The added service capacity and integration in the area has however enabled efficiencies for other service providers whose time is less consumed by dealing with Sustaining Tenancies clients.
There were no evident cost savings to the prison system, as complex Treasury calculations are required to determine this and entire centres or wings closed to make cost savings. It is, however, worth noting that the daily cost of full time inmate custody is $174.74 (open custody) or $211.23 (secure custody) or $63,780 and $77,090 per annum respectively (Corrective Services 2012). The daily cost of supervision for a community based offender is $21.48. More detailed analysis will be needed to determine if the investment in a service such as Sustaining Tenancies would, over an extended time, reap savings for the service system overall in terms of reduced costs to justice and other services, factored against the additional costs related to increased client use of a range of services.

Also in the context of the recent study by Baldry et al (Baldry et al 2012), which estimated the life-course costs of similarly complex, disadvantaged people, there are likely to be longer-term cost benefits and system savings through investing as early as possible in intensive support such as that provided in the Sustaining Tenancies project. This is in addition to the considerable personal, family and community benefits identified in the evaluation. The lessons learned from the project confirm the need for greater access to similar services to prevent exits into homelessness for this very vulnerable group in the community.

The service delivery framework for the recently released NSW Government *Going Home Staying Home* Reform Plan for specialist homelessness services incorporates elements of prevention and early intervention, crisis and transition responses, provision of intensive responses for complex needs clients, and a focus on flexibility (NSW Government 2013). The Reform Plan recognises the relatively high rates of homelessness in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and the priority need for housing people exiting correctional facilities. The importance of close collaboration between government and non-government services is clearly acknowledged. The model adopted in the Sustaining Tenancies project is closely aligned with the proposed new service approaches articulated in the Reform plan to more effectively address homelessness in NSW.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview of HAP

In 2009, the NSW Government released the NSW Homelessness Action Plan 2009-2014 (HAP). It sets the direction for state-wide reform of the homelessness service system to achieve better outcomes for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. The HAP aims to realign existing effort, and increase the focus on prevention and long-term accommodation and support.

The HAP also aims to:

- Change the way that homelessness and its impact on the community is understood;
- Change the way services are designed and delivered to homeless people and people at risk of becoming homeless; and
- Change ways of working across government, with the non-government sector and with the broader community to improve responses to homelessness.

Under the HAP there are three headline homelessness reduction targets, which are:

- A reduction of 7% in the overall level of homelessness in NSW;
- A reduction of 25% in the number of people sleeping rough in NSW; and
- A reduction of one-third in the number of Indigenous people who are homeless.

The HAP includes approximately 100 NSW Government funded local, regional and state-wide projects which assist in achieving the homelessness reduction targets. As at June 2012, 55 of the projects were funded through the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness (NPAH). The remaining projects include other programs or services that contribute to addressing homelessness.

The projects are aligned to one of three strategic directions:

- Preventing homelessness: to ensure that people never become homeless;
- Responding effectively to homelessness: to ensure that people who are homeless receive effective responses so that they do not become entrenched in the system; and
- Breaking the cycle: to ensure that people who have been homeless do not become homeless again.

Ten Regional Homelessness Action Plans (2010 to 2014) were developed to identify effective ways of working locally to respond to local homelessness and provide the focus for many of the HAP projects.

HAP Evaluation Strategy

The HAP Evaluation Strategy has been developed in consultation with government agencies and the non-government sector. It involves three inter-related components, which are:

1. **Self-evaluations** – The purpose of self-evaluation is to gather performance information about each of the HAP projects across key areas in a consistent way, and to collect the views of practitioners about the effectiveness of their projects.
II. **Extended evaluations** – The purpose of the extended evaluations is to analyse and draw conclusions about the effectiveness of 15 selected projects and the service approaches to addressing homelessness that those projects represent. The service approaches covered by the extended evaluations are:

- Support for women and children escaping domestic violence;
- Youth foyers;
- Support for people exiting institutions;
- Tenancy support to prevent evictions; and
- Long-term housing and support.

III. **Meta-analysis** – The purpose of the meta-analysis is to synthesise the aggregated findings from the self evaluations and extended evaluations as well as other evaluations available on HAP activities.

The HAP evaluation will assist with measuring progress towards meeting the HAP targets as well as provide evidence of effective responses and lessons learnt that should be considered in the future response to homelessness in NSW.

### 1.2. Overview of service model and projects included in this evaluation

The first strategic direction of the NSW Homelessness Action Plan is preventing homelessness and a key priority is to “transition and maintain people exiting statutory care/ correctional and health facilities into appropriate long-term accommodation”. A number of projects were funded to assist these target groups and of these, four projects providing support for people exiting institutions were selected for the extended evaluations. The four projects were:

- **Project 2.8** Targeted Housing and Support Services (Western Sydney) (THaSS)
- **Project 2.10** Sustaining Tenancies Following Exits from Correctional Facilities (Broken Hill)⁴ (Sustaining tenancies)
- **Project 2.21** Young People Exiting Juvenile Justice Centres (North Coast)
- **Project 2.22** Young People Leaving Care Support Service (North Coast)

The service model for projects 2.8 and 2.10 is based on “housing first” principles with the provision of accommodation and wrap-around support tailored to the individual needs of the client and provided either in homes on an outreach basis or in service settings. The project 2.10 Sustaining Tenancies Following Exits from Correctional Facilities is the subject of this evaluation report.

### 1.3. Key contextual factors from the literature

The two projects (2.8, 2.10) that aim to reduce homelessness in people exiting correctional centres also have a secondary goal of reducing re-offending. Aboriginal people constitute the majority of clients of the Sustaining Tenancies project and a high proportion of clients in the THaSS project.

---

⁴ The project has had a number of different titles, and for the purpose of this project the Sustaining Tenancies Following Exits from Correctional Facilities title will be shortened to Sustaining Tenancies.
The key contextual factors in the literature related to these projects are the following:

- Homelessness is a risk for incarceration and also believed to be a risk for re-offending and re-imprisonment following release; there are many identified barriers to finding accommodation post release (NSW Homelessness Alliance 2011, Meehan 2002, Fontaine and Biess 2012);
- The multiple factors of disadvantage which prisoners face and the fact that many have lived on the margins and never been well integrated into the community poses challenges to effective settlement following release from prison (MCREU 2005, Desai 2012);
- Women are particularly vulnerable to homelessness following release and have multiple additional needs which need to be addressed; housing alone is insufficient and a key factor in sustaining accommodation can be safety (Baldry et al 2003, Baldry and McCausland 2007, WIPAN 2012, Desai 2012);
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are disproportionately represented in the prison population and are at far greater risk of incarceration due to multiple factors of disadvantage including higher rates of homelessness, problems with substance abuse, intergenerational trauma and mental health issues (Australian Human Rights Commission 2005);
- Aboriginal people, and Aboriginal women in particular, have some very specific needs that need to be addressed in the transition from prison back to the community; there is a dearth of literature about what works for Aboriginal people in successful transition from prison to the community (AHURI 2004, Baldry and McCausland 2007, Desai 2012);
- Stable, secure accommodation is integral to re-integration and settlement in the community following release from prison and thought to be linked to reduced re-offending; links between housing and reoffending are complex and not well understood and research is limited on the specific characteristics of alternative housing models which lead to better outcomes for ex prisoners (Meehan 2002, Fontaine and Biess 2012);
- Stable housing is not necessarily a predictor of reduced offending; stable housing alone is insufficient and access to suitable accommodation needs to be linked with support services tailored according to individual needs and also linked to criminogenic factors (Fontaine and Biess 2012);
- Support for ex-prisoners to facilitate settlement in the community should ideally commence prior to release (AHURI 2004);
- The “What works” to prevent re-offending literature demonstrates that adhering to the principles of Risk, Needs and Responsivity (RNR) will impact on reducing further offending. The risk principle means prioritising medium, medium-high and high risk offenders using an actuarial risk assessment tool with interventions. The offence related Needs are specific, dynamic (changeable) needs/ factors related to offending with the most important ones being pro-criminal attitudes (thoughts/ values), antisocial personality/ low self control, and pro-criminal associations. Responsivity relates to those factors that impede or enhance an offender’s learning or response to interventions (e.g. gender, culture, disability and others) (Andrews and Bonta 2010); and
Integrated models of service delivery with collaboration and effective working processes are most likely to be effective in addressing the specific needs of people leaving prison, and collaboration between different government and non-government services is a key factor (NSW Homelessness Alliance 2011).

Although these projects are not primarily criminal justice interventions explicitly addressing criminogenic factors, they have a focus on reducing re-offending as well as reducing homelessness. Caution has been noted regarding use of re-offending rates as a sole measure of effectiveness of programs aiming to address the complex factors linked with homelessness and recidivism (Cunneen and Luke 2007). Rather, it is important to also capture the impacts of the intervention on other factors related to non re-offending such as pro-social behaviours and evidence of social integration.

For the Sustaining Tenancies project in Broken Hill there are some additional contextual factors of relevance noted in the report of Broken Hill Homelessness Forum (NSW Family and Community Services 2012) which include:

- There is an acute shortage of affordable rental housing in Broken Hill and higher rates of housing stress;
- Homelessness is identified as a key issue of concern, reflected in an over-represented homeless population of 56 per 10,000 compared with Sydney 39 per 10,000;
- There is a lack of crisis accommodation and transitional housing, particularly for men, and support services for people who are homeless;
- Aboriginal people are at particularly high risk of homelessness; and
- There is reported to be a high rate of prisoner return – which is in part attributed to lack of appropriate sustainable accommodation.

Broken Hill is part of the Western NSW Regional Action Plan (WRHAP) and comes under the scope of the Western Regional Homelessness Committee (WRHC). The WRHAP 2010-2014 notes:

- Aboriginal people are a priority group due to their particular vulnerability to homelessness; and
- The need for more flexible, client focussed systems and shared case management to support prevention of institutional exits into homelessness, along with financial management education and counselling to relieve financial stress.
2. EVALUATION SCOPE AND METHODS

This section describes the scope of the evaluation, the evaluation questions, the ethics process that was undertaken, the evaluation methods employed to address the evaluation questions and the limitations of the evaluation.

The key evaluation questions for the extended evaluations were the following:

1. What is the impact of the project on a reduction in homelessness?
2. What is the project potential to achieve sustainable reductions in homelessness into the future?
3. What is the impact of the project on service system change and improvement?
4. What is the extent of influence on service integration and how this was achieved?
5. What is the impact on client outcomes (intended and unintended)?
6. What are the critical success factors and barriers?
7. What is the cost effectiveness of each project?

2.1. Ethics process

The lead agency for the projects is Corrective Services NSW who requires ethics approval through the Corrective Services NSW Ethics Committee. A formal ethics application was submitted followed by a hearing with the Committee on 14 September 2012; amended documents were subsequently submitted to the Committee and formal ethics approval was granted on 9 October 2012 (Appendix 1).

A plain English information sheet and informed consent form were developed for client consultations (Appendix 2). Clients were offered a $30 supermarket voucher as an incentive for participation in face-to-face interviews with the evaluator.

2.2. Summary of methods

The evaluation project has involved the following processes:

1. A brief literature review focused on what is known about what works in supporting people who are exiting institutions.
2. A review of available documentation from Community Restorative Centre (CRC) and Corrective Services NSW.
3. Initial briefing meetings with key informants including CRC and Corrective Services NSW staff.
4. Teleconference meeting with the Regional Western Homelessness Committee (RWHC).
5. Development of data collection and interview instruments reflecting evaluation questions for Corrective Services staff, other service providers and clients (Appendices 3, 4, 5).
6. Review of relevant administrative data and reports:
   a. Portal data submitted to Housing NSW for each of the quarters of the project from September 2010. The June 2012 figures were used for the analysis of 2011/2012 outcomes;
b. Self evaluation data provided by CRC to Housing NSW in the report to the end of June 2012;
c. Financial acquittal data; and
d. Client case notes (for interviewed clients only who had given informed consent).

7. Key informant and stakeholder interviews and site visit to Broken Hill. The site visit was an opportunity to see the setting of the service and to visit the various service providers for interviews as well as conducting interviews with clients. Stakeholders consulted included:
   a. Corrective Services NSW Head Office key informants (Partnerships and Community; Engagement Unit and Research and Evaluation and Statistics representative);
   b. Community Restorative Centre staff:
      i. CRC – Director and Program Manager;
      ii. CRC Broken Hill workers.
   c. Client interviews:
      i. Interviews were arranged by CRC staff with 8-10 clients in Broken Hill, however on the day of the field visit only five were available to be interviewed. These included four Aboriginal men and one non-Aboriginal woman, who were interviewed face-to-face in their home setting.
   d. Service providers:
      Interviews were held either face-to-face in Broken Hill or by telephone:
      i. Community housing provider – Compass Housing;
      ii. Corrective Services NSW staff from Broken Hill Correctional Centre;
      iii. Community Offender Services:
         1. Probation and Parole;
         2. Community Compliance and Monitoring Group (CCMG);
      iv. Broken Hill Police;
      v. Maari Ma Aboriginal Medical Service;
      vi. Western NSW Health District Primary Health Service staff and mental health service providers;
      vii. Murdii Paaki Job Network Agency (Inland Employment Services);
   8. A focus group discussion was held in Broken Hill attended by staff from Centrelink, Far West Indigenous Church (Uniting Church), Centacare and CRC staff.
2.3. **Limitations**

The findings of the evaluation, while strongly indicative of a range of positive outcomes in relation to factors associated with reducing both homelessness and re-offending in the target group, have a number of limitations.

- The evaluation is of necessity largely descriptive in nature and the data is mostly qualitative and based on consultations with a cross section of key stakeholder groups, including clients of the service and a range of service providers. While the feedback from clients and others is strongly indicative of positive outcomes from the service, the small scale limits the extent to which the findings can be extrapolated to a larger group; the small numbers cannot claim to be statistically representative of all clients in the target group;
- The evaluation study did not have a matched sample of a comparison group of clients;
- The broad objectives of the project (to reduce both homelessness and reoffending) were not underpinned by a clear change theory or logic model; there were no clearly defined outcomes and indicators that could be measured against in the evaluation;
- While the target group of the project is people leaving custody in Broken Hill who are assessed to be at risk of homelessness, the majority are Aboriginal men and women, and there is no reliable data specifically on rates of homelessness in this group from which comparisons can be drawn;
- Other than for the clients who were available to be interviewed, it was not possible to look at longer term outcomes (in relation to homelessness and re-offending) for the complete sample of clients, and particularly for those who have either left or been exited from the service and were not available for follow-up. There are limited sources of routine data collection for tracking client outcomes other than data from Corrective Services NSW for those who may have re-offended 12 or 24 months post-release;
- Regarding client data, there is potential selection bias in clients who have done well with the service, being willing to be interviewed. Also several of the clients interviewed have degrees of cognitive impairment and/or acquired brain injury that may have limited the accuracy of their feedback; and
- There was incomplete client data available due to a range of reasons and this has limited the extent to which data can be analysed for some evaluation purposes such as details of client service use, individual client outcomes and costing analysis.
3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This section of the report provides a description and background of the service, the aims and objectives and target group and the service model employed as well as the project management and governance arrangements, staffing and budget allocation for the delivery of the service.

3.1. Service origins and description

Priority 2 of the NSW Homelessness Action Plan is to “transition and maintain people exiting statutory care correctional and health facilities into appropriate long-term accommodation” (NSW Government 2009). The Sustaining Tenancies project in Broken Hill is a response to this priority.

Broken Hill comes under the scope of the Western Regional Homelessness Committee and is part of the Western Regional Action Plan. As noted in 1.3 above, Broken Hill has proportionally higher rates of homelessness, an acute shortage of affordable accommodation, very limited emergency accommodation and homelessness services, a high proportion of Aboriginal prisoners and higher rates of re-offending which have been attributed in part to lack of suitable accommodation locally (NSW Family and Community Services 2012). There is a shortage of homelessness and emergency services for men, in particular. Aboriginal people are a priority target group under the Regional Action Plan.

Corrective Services NSW is the lead government agency for the Sustaining Tenancies project and has partnered with the Community Restorative Centre as the non-government agency to deliver the service. The service model builds on previous successes of CRC in providing transition and accommodation support for prisoners who are at high risk of returning to prison, and was established in Broken Hill to fill a major identified gap in services in the area. The project commenced in November 2010 with funding through to June 2013.

The CRC (www.crcnsw.org.au) is a specialist service, with a mission of changing lives and reducing crime through delivering post-release services for people leaving prison to support their resettlement back into the community. CRC aims to reduce re-offending and return to prison, and to prevent homelessness in this vulnerable client group during a difficult transition period back into the community. It has been a leader over the past decade in delivering best practice post-release and transitional support programs in NSW.

CRC targets in particular those who are at highest risk of returning to prison and has a demonstrated track record in achieving positive outcomes with clients through locations in Central Sydney, Western Sydney, Newcastle/ Hunter region and more recently Broken Hill. The service adopts a holistic approach that is reflective of the complex needs and levels of disadvantage of the target client group with intensive intervention and support. CRC receives funding from a number of sources including Corrective Services NSW, Ageing Disability and Home Care, and Ministry of Health.

The range of support services provided to prisoners, ex-prisoners, and their families and friends address issues that include:

- Transport to prison;
- Drug and alcohol dependence;
- Homelessness and emergency accommodation;
- Unemployment;
- Skills development;
• Training;
• Information, advocacy and referral service for people in crisis via telephone;
• Mediation; and
• Family support services.

3.2. Aims and objectives

The major goal of the Sustaining Tenancies project is to prevent exits into rough sleeping or transient, unsuitable accommodation, for people exiting custody and subject to supervision by CSNSW in Broken Hill.

Objectives

The stated objectives of the project are to:

• Identify the support needs of each participant and provide a tailored support package to assist in the successful transition from custody to community of prisoners released in Broken Hill;
• Obtain suitable long-term accommodation for the target group following release from custody;
• Provide intensive support and access to treatment and social services where required to sustain tenancy;
• Reduce re-offending in the target group; and
• Increase collaborative service delivery from Government agencies and NGOs.

Specific goals of the project stated in the contract were also the following:

• Sustain tenancy;
• Reduce risk of re-offending;
• Improve living skills and maximise independent living;
• Improve health outcomes;
• Utilise mainstream services to meet needs;
• Decrease social isolation;
• Increase compliance with parole conditions;
• Maintain or create positive family/ friendship roles and relationships;
• Increase access to community based support services;
• Increase access to psychiatric/ psychological treatment;
• Increase engagement with drug and alcohol treatment;
• Increase engagement in vocational, educational, training and employment; and
• Increase engagement in meaningful and goal directed leisure and recreational activity.

---

5 Corrective Services NSW recognises the difficulties in analysing reoffending rates due to small numbers of participants and lack of control group of matched participants. (Source: extract from contract between Corrective Services NSW and Community Restorative Centre, 2010)
3.3. **Target group**

The target group is people released from custody in the Broken Hill area who have complex needs and are at risk of homelessness. Aboriginal people are reported by Broken Hill Correctional Centre staff to constitute 75-80% of the Broken Hill inmate population. Remandees are not included in the target group. The group are identified as having high criminogenic risk levels with high levels of alcohol and drug addiction, and mental health issues, which affects access to accommodation.

There is a high proportion of alcohol fuelled domestic violence and inter-generational offending in the target group who also demonstrate low help seeking behaviours, and are often excluded from services due to the complexity of their needs and low levels of responsiveness to local service provision. A high proportion of clients have cognitive impairment, acquired brain injury and mental health problems.

3.4. **Service model**

The Sustaining Tenancies project is delivered from the CRC office in Broken Hill, servicing mostly people in Broken Hill Correctional Centre with a broad intake from across the western region of NSW. The service is co-located with Compass Housing. The service model is based on “Housing first” principles and provides accommodation together with wrap-around “floating” support services tailored to each individual client for a period of 12 months, commencing where possible three months prior to release. There is a strong focus on outreach and the intensity of support provided is ideally intended to reduce over time, depending on levels of client stability and integration into the community post-release. In reality ongoing support beyond 12 months is often required for maintaining client stability in this group of complex clients.

The model operates through a partnership with Compass Housing, the sole community housing provider in Broken Hill, to facilitate access to suitable accommodation for prisoners on release and to support transition to stable, sustained accommodation over time.

**The model**

The model is broadly based on a five stage process illustrated in Fig 1 below. However, due to the recognised client complexity and the contextual setting of the project in an isolated regional location, the service delivery model is implemented with a great deal of flexibility. The project is funded to accept up to 15 clients at any one time with caseworkers providing varying levels of intensity of support according to client need, broadly as follows:

- High level – 8-10 hours per day, 5-7 days per week with 24 hour on call – first three months;
- Medium level – 2-5 visits per week; and
- Low level maintenance – 1 visit per week.

The floating support is delivered on an outreach basis to the client’s home and in community service settings and is intended to be flexible and responsive to specific client needs, difficulties, and inevitable crises and setbacks. The level of support is stepped up or down accordingly. The post release period of three months is recognised as being a critical time for people leaving prison and

---

6 Sustaining Tenancies Self-evaluation Report. June 12 provided by Housing NSW.
intensive support is provided in this period with daily contact or as needed through outreach and telephone contact. Caseworkers have a relatively low caseload to enable provision of intensive services as required; support hours provided are often high.

**Figure 1: CRC Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-release</th>
<th>Post-release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Promotion, referral, assessment, engagement</td>
<td>3. Intensive post-release support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Low level support &amp; disengagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An underpinning focus of the model is empowerment of the individual and slowly building self-efficacy to enable clients to move towards independent living. Developing a strong client/ worker relationships and high level of trust is critical to the effectiveness of the model.

**3.4.1. Services provided**

The model ensures that services are specifically tailored to each client in the Individual Support Plan (ISP) with post-release support and planning and intensive post-release support either directly from the CRC caseworker or through referrals to other services and programs. Coordination of services and support is a central aspect of the model, supported by extensive networking and liaison with relevant local services.

Support is provided to meet the following client services:

- To assist in personal and administrative matters including accessing proof of identity documents, completing forms etc.;
- To establish and sustain tenancy – including accessing accommodation, submitting applications and organising tenancy agreements;
- To ensure housing is adequately set up;
- To assist with development of living skills;
- To assist in financial management – including establishing Centrelink payments, bank account, financial literacy skills;
- To assist in family reconciliation/ mediation and child support issues;
- Referrals to health services for health assessments, general and specialised health care, psychological/ mental health issues;
- Referrals to relevant programs – alcohol and drug issues, impulsivity, anger management, parenting etc;
- To establish community based service contacts and support attendance at appointments through providing transport;
- To assist in addressing legal issues, access Legal Aid, attend court hearings etc;
- To support participation in education, vocational and training courses, increase employment skills;
- To support getting a drivers license; and
- To assist establishment of new social networks and engagement in meaningful activity.
Service delivery model approach

Building family relationships (commencing prior to release) and addressing alcohol abuse are priorities for the caseworkers, along with advocacy for clients to facilitate access to services and to address problems and issues as they arise.

1. Pre-release

- Ideally the client is referred three months prior to release, which allows time for the caseworker to carefully assess client needs, jointly develop an ISP and also build a trusting relationship with the client; and
- Compass and CRC work together to get the correct papers and client documentation (such as identity confirmation, confirmation of Aboriginality) for Centrelink, applications to get onto Housing NSW priority housing list, Rent Assistance and so on. The staff work together informally, talk though tenancy issues, risks, location etc. and endeavour to avoid clustering on estates where there are networks of other offenders or negative social peers. There are a number of high density social housing areas in Broken Hill recognised as high-risk areas and efforts are made, to the extent possible, and depending on housing availability, to avoid providing accommodation to those areas.

2. Post release

- The client’s caseworker meets them at the prison on the day of their release to drive them to their accommodation and assist in attending Centrelink and other services as well as shopping and setting up their household. CRC works closely with Centrelink and through close collaboration with the Aboriginal Liaison Officer;
- Clients are assisted to both establish and to maintain tenancies in a number of ways: assisting with tenancy agreements, supporting development of financial literacy and budgeting, managing and maintaining the household, and advocating for clients as issues arise;
- All clients receive case management and a range of other supports through referrals to community health, welfare and other services, and transport to attend appointments, hearings etc. Services are provided on an outreach basis to the client’s home or in community based services and programs;
- There is a major focus on working with families and facilitating family mediation to support effective family reconciliation, which can be a vital issue for this group of clients. Assistance with family issues can involve, for example, assistance with child support issues, supporting children’s access to programs such as Brighter Futures, legal services and advice on family law matters;
- Providing transport and accompanying clients to appointments ensures attendance and comprehension of information and implications for follow-up and so on;
- CRC works closely with Centacare who deliver financial literacy programs and run “Strive to Drive” learn to drive programs;
- Clients are all referred for general health checks at the Maari Ma Aboriginal Medical Service and to mental health services for those who are known to have mental health issues;
- Clients are assisted to deal with debts to SDRO through Work in Development Orders (WDO) with hours being credited for participation in identified programs (e.g. Alcohol and Drugs, Probation and Parole, Department of Education and Training) to reduce their debt. Debt restrictions are lifted and clients can learn to drive and get a license, which can facilitate access to employment; and
- Clients are also supported to attend the Job Network agency and comply with the requirements of the Job Seeker benefits that in turn provide a pathway into accessing programs to build literacy and numeracy and work readiness.

### 3.4.2. Assessment and referral process

#### Eligibility criteria

Eligible clients are parolees and offenders released from a custodial sentence at Broken Hill and nearby correctional centres, who are at risk of homelessness and re-offending and have other complex needs. The referral criteria are the following:

- Must be sentenced (not on remand);
- Must be voluntarily seeking support; and
- Must be willing to live in Broken Hill.

The CRC Sustaining Tenancies referral form is at Attachment 5. The referral information required includes client personal details, sentence details and offending history, support needs, health and medication status, drug and alcohol dependence, risk history, and programs undertaken in custody. For some clients the LSI-R scores are provided by Corrective Services NSW as a measure of risk of re-offending.

#### Assessment and referral process

The majority of clients are referred from Broken Hill Correctional Centre with occasional referrals from Ivanhoe Warakirri Correctional Centre, and are almost all Aboriginal people. Clients are referred from Community Offender Services (Probation and Parole) and Offender Services and Programs staff located in the referring correctional centre. Ideally clients are referred and commence participation three months prior to release; however, notification is sometimes made only days or a week before release. Several clients have also been referred to CRC post-release when they were deemed by Probation and Parole to be not coping and in urgent need of accommodation and intensive support. It was commented by several stakeholders that the CRC referral processes are unnecessarily long and time consuming and would benefit from being streamlined.

Each referred person is allocated to one of the CRC caseworkers who visits the inmate to undertake an initial assessment and commence planning for post-release accommodation, services and support according to client needs. An Individual Support Plan (ISP) is developed with input from the client.

---

7 Corrective Services NSW uses a validated actuarial risk assessment tool (LSI-R) for inmates to assess risk of re-offending and key domains for intervention. It comprises a number of static and dynamic factors giving a risk score (LSI-R) that are then used by correctional staff to develop a case plan.
3.4.3. Coordination structures

A key responsibility of the CRC is coordination of services and support for clients, which is provided by the manager and assisted by the Aboriginal caseworker using a strongly client-focused approach.

The CRC workers liaise with other services and coordinate access for each client, assisting with transport and accompanying clients to appointments and undertaking follow-up. This has filled a critical gap in supporting clients to navigate the various agencies and services available.

3.4.4. Partnerships

A formal partnership was established between Corrective Services NSW as the lead agency and CRC to deliver the Sustaining Tenancies service. CRC also entered a formal partnership with Compass Housing through an operating agreement built on an existing partnership in the Newcastle region. The partnership also included a co-location arrangement, which was invaluable in facilitating rapid establishment of the service initially, and cost savings for ongoing premises and operational expenses. The co-location arrangement was also noted to be important in building collaborative relationships between the services and facilitating ongoing formal and informal information regarding clients. This has been important in being able to respond quickly to a variety of client issues that have arisen.

There are also extensive informal partnerships and working arrangements with a range of local services, for instance Uniting Church, who have provided support in terms of crisis accommodation, lent vehicles and equipment for the Choppa Weed enterprise, and provided support for staff in the way of informal mentoring. CRC works closely with Centrelink, together with Centacare, Probation and Parole and other agencies.

Informal networking and liaison is also enhanced through the monthly Aboriginal Community Working Group Meeting focused on broader community issues.

3.4.5. Brokerage

With the limited budget available for the project, it was necessary in the first year to use brokerage funds for additional staffing and vehicle costs. An additional $100,000 was made available for brokerage in 2011/2012 (for expenditure through to June 2013) in recognition of the high levels of disadvantage of clients.

Brokerage funds have been used predominantly to support clients to get established in homes: most have either never had a well-equipped home or have lost everything during periods of incarceration. Funds have been used for purchase of basic household items such as white goods, bedding, basic household equipment, food, clothing, access to specialist services (especially those outside Broken Hill area) and other needs or emergencies which have arisen - for instance accessing personal documentation.
3.5. **Management and governance arrangements**

Corrective Services NSW is the lead government agency for the project and is a member of the NSW Homelessness Interagency Committee. In the early stage of project implementation there was no formal Steering Committee, however a support committee of local committed people and organisations was established to advise on project implementation. The local Probation and Paroles staff and the Program Manager at Broken Hill Correctional Centre were involved and supportive from the outset.

Subsequently a Steering Committee was established with key stakeholders including CRC, Compass Housing, Local Aboriginal Land Council, Corrective Services NSW, TAFE, NSW Attorney Generals, Far West Indigenous Church, Maari Ma Health Aboriginal Corporation, and Housing NSW. The Committee has reportedly worked well to support and guide the project, particularly more recently. Steering Committee meetings are held twice a year in Broken Hill, chaired by head office staff from the Partnerships and Community Engagement unit of CSNSW.

3.6. **Staffing**

The project is staffed with a small team of two workers comprising a male manager (who also provides case management) and a female caseworker whose hours were recently increased from 30 to 38 hours per week. A part time administrative support position for one day per week has been added in the third year of the project.

Both staff members are apparently well known, respected members of the Broken Hill community and the female caseworker is a trusted and highly regarded member of the local Aboriginal community. This was reported to have been critical in ensuring the service is culturally safe and accepted by the community.

3.7. **Budget allocation**

The budget allocations as stated in the contract were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget allocation (ex GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$192,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 2 and 3 combined</td>
<td>$405,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actual funding amounts varied from the contractual amounts above and Section 5 below considers the funding issues in further detail.
4. ANALYSIS OF CLIENT AND SERVICE SYSTEM OUTCOMES

The following section of the report details the findings in relation to client services provided, client housing and non-housing outcomes, and the impacts on addressing homelessness. The outcomes for service systems and staffing issues are then described. Specific details of numbers of services accessed by clients and occasions of service were not available.

4.1. Client services and outcomes

This section provides information about the services that have been provided, client numbers and outcomes, and feedback about the project impact on the service systems in Broken Hill, in the period from establishment of the project in November 2010 up until end of June 2012. The information was provided by CRC, other stakeholders consulted, or extracted from reports and administrative files.

4.1.1. Clients assisted

The project had an overall target of 45 clients by June 2013, but did not start supporting clients until almost half way through the first year of funding. The following table (Table 1) represents the new clients registered to the service following release in each of the years who were housed in the community. The definition of “new client” was agreed to be only those clients who were released from custody. Thus clients who were being supported but were still in custody are not reflected in the figures below. Also the figures do not necessarily represent the total numbers assisted during that year, as there were a considerable number of clients being assisted in the community on an ongoing basis but registered to a previous year. During year 1, the project worked with 15 clients in total and 26 in year 2, which is in excess of the nominal target set for that two year period.

Assessed Risk of Reoffending (the following information has been provided by CSNSW)

For the Sustaining Tenancies Far West Project, of the 29 clients in the sample, four did not have a current assessment of risk of reoffending. Of the 25 that were assessed using the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R), the majority were medium-high or high risk of reoffending (24) with 1 being assessed as medium-low risk of reoffending. The service delivery for this project was therefore well directed to the medium-high risk of reoffending target group (Corrective Services NSW 2013).

Table 1: Sustaining Tenancies client numbers exited from custody and housed in the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual (new clients)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>29 assisted to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exited</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 A LSI-R is administered for offenders serving sentences of six months or more. Therefore if CRC serviced a client serving less than six months or a client serving more than six months but with a “back-dated” sentence, the LSI-R would not have been administered.

9 Source: CRC client data revised provided by CRC January 2013.
Of the clients accepted into the program over the first two years, 29 clients participated in the service (not all were released in this period). All except two were Aboriginal, six were female and 21 were male and the ages ranged from 20 to 53 years.

A total of 27 clients were unemployed prior to their incarceration; most had long histories of drug and alcohol abuse, with alcohol being the most common first drug of choice; most had not completed secondary school.

### Table 2: Sustaining Tenancies client profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosed mental illness</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding debt</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior adult incarcerations</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 prior adult incarcerations</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous juvenile incarcerations</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the two year period 21 of the 29 new clients taken into the service exited the program.

- Three were exited by CRC having obtained all their goals;
- Six moved out of the area;
- Eight returned to custody (one for breach of parole, two for lesser offences, two for similar offences, three for greater offences);
- Two withdrew from the program; and
- One died.

A majority of clients were on supervised parole orders and many would have also accessed programs through Probation and Parole both pre and post-release, however data on the specific details of other programs accessed by clients was not available.

### 4.1.2. Services provided

#### Case management support

- CRC staff provided intensive case management and support for all clients, varying in intensity and length of time depending on individual needs and contexts. Support provided included face-to-face meetings/consultations, home visits, telephone calls to clients, transport to services, telephone or face-to-face meetings with other service providers for referrals or advocacy on behalf of clients;
- The available data did not provide a breakdown of the amount of time spent by the workers on different activities nor amounts of time spent with individual clients;
- The case management has needed to be very flexibly adapted due to the highly complex needs of the client group and the importance of responding to crises and setbacks as they have occurred. Although clients ideally commence three months prior to release, not all were referred within this timeframe, which has created a challenge for the team to arrange accommodation and support in time for release;

---

10 Source: Client profile data supplied by CRC.
Due to the intensity of support required, the workers frequently share case management of clients. The average support hours per week were reported to be 38 hours over a period of up to 12 months with some clients needing ongoing support beyond the 12 months period (up to two years in one case) due to ongoing problems and issues. The shortest period of support reported was seven days; the longest period with the service was two years;

- The CRC workers commented that due to the complex and entrenched issues for some clients at high risk of re-offending, it is not possible to exit them from the service without increasing the risk of re-offending. In such cases the decision was taken to continue working with the clients; and

- Collecting clients directly from prison at the time of release was noted to be very important to support them in avoiding the immediate pressures and temptations from family and antisocial peers that may lead them back to risk taking behaviours.

Service referrals

- The project clients have been referred to a range of local services, but the details of occasions of service for each client with each of these services was not available;

- Transporting and accompanying clients to services and to fulfil various administrative, justice or legal obligations was reported to be important for this client group. Most were reported to have very low help seeking behaviours and lack confidence in negotiating service systems, which is particularly exacerbated if they have had lengthy periods of incarceration;

- The caseworker support has ensured client attendance with consequent benefits from the various services. It was noted that for some clients this has also built client confidence in accessing services. Attending appointments also provided opportunities for advocacy with service providers; and

- It was noted by the workers that the time during driving to appointments allows for informal mentoring, exchange of information and checking in with how clients are managing.

The summary breakdown of services received as reported in the project self-evaluation is in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Services received\(^{11}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>No of clients assisted</th>
<th>No of clients referred to other services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and alcohol</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training &amp; employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; relationship counselling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) Source. Sustaining Tenancies Self Evaluation Report. June 12. Provided by Housing NSW.
4.1.3. Housing outcomes

Through the close working partnership with Compass Housing all clients have been assisted with access to accommodation on release, usually within 48 hours. This is despite a very limited stock of available accommodation in Broken Hill. Compass Housing works very closely with CRC and the client to determine an appropriate location, to the extent possible avoiding problematic areas; for some clients there are key issues of location to be considered related to their being on the Child Protection Register. Emergency accommodation is at times accessed through the Far West Indigenous Church (Uniting Church), which runs a hostel for crisis accommodation in Broken Hill.

Table 4: Accommodation assistance provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of housing assistance provided</th>
<th>2010/2011</th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social housing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living temporarily with family/ friends</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to maintain tenancies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustaining tenancies

“Good to have a roof over my head – going good now – much better than sleeping rough and using public toilets.” (ST Client #1)

“The support process – some with long-term re-offenders – now have been out for over six months, could never stay out longer – have pride, living skills; huge benefits and successes.” (Probation and Parole)

It was reported that the majority of clients (around 80%) have been able to maintain their tenancies, even with some periods of re-imprisonment. If they are returned to prison and incarcerated for a period of less than 3 months, CRC arranges to hold the properties for the minimal amount of $5 per week.

Ongoing client support to maintain tenancies involved individual skills development and mentoring to build capacity together with extensive advocacy by caseworkers – for instance with real estate agents and during property inspections. CRC works very closely with Compass Housing, which is facilitated by the co-location arrangement; for instance early notification of rent arrears is flagged so that issues can be addressed early to prevent escalation and risks to the tenancy. Compass Housing also proactively assists in sustaining tenancies, including appearing at tribunals if necessary.

The key issues identified in clients being able to sustain housing were availability of suitable housing, appropriate location of housing, assistance with documentation and financial matters, assisting with financial literacy to sustain tenancy and skills to maintain the household to a decent standard. The individual support to address drug and alcohol abuse and other psychosocial issues was also noted to have been a major contributor in stabilising clients and supporting their capacity to sustain their tenancy. All of these factors can be directly attributable to the role of the project and the service model that it delivers.

From the perspective of Compass Housing, the Sustaining Tenancies project has been critical in these clients sustaining their property tenancies; the close working partnership has been integral to this: “without their support we would not have had as many sustained tenancies”. Several clients and other service providers commented on the fact that some have had stable homes and maintained their tenancies for the first time in their lives, and are proud of this.

Compass staff interviewed commented that houses are often better maintained than for other tenancies, which they attributed to the intensity of support and the regular monitoring of these clients by a number of services, including the Community Compliance and Monitoring Group (CCMG) who can drop in at any time to clients’ homes without prior notice.

Another important outcome for clients has been that through sustaining their tenancy they have established a rental history.

Having a stable home for a client and their family and support to sustain the tenancy has broader benefits as observed by a Sustaining Tenancies worker:

“To see families re-unite and connect again is a humbling experience, they now grow together as they have an opportunity to live as a family, rather than living with an extended family, which is normally over-crowded, financially challenging, with no privacy. They are now budgeting to look after their own immediate family (rent and food).”

### 4.1.4. Non-housing outcomes

“They’ve (CRC) got it right – I am good now – helped others as well.” (client #2)

There have been many tangible non-housing client outcomes from the Sustaining Tenancies project reported by all stakeholders along with significant benefits for service providers and also for the community more broadly. The outcomes noted for clients ranged from improved health and well-being, accessing vocational training, reduced substance abuse, reduced re-offending, securing a driving licence, restoration of children and improved family relationships, participating in employment initiatives (e.g. Choppa Weed), improved self-esteem and self-efficacy.

All clients interviewed spoke positively of the impact of the Sustaining Tenancies project and the personal benefits and significant influence this has had on their lives; they commented that without the support of CRC they would have returned to their old behaviours and been back in prison. All have been able to sustain their tenancies and several commented on this being the first time they have had any help at all to resettle and being the longest period they have been out of gaol.

A key issue identified by a number of service providers, as well as several clients, is that the period of leaving prison is very stressful and causes great anxiety, which can in turn lead to reverting to substance abuse and other behaviours resulting in re-incarceration.

“CRC are enabling them to not go back into that risky environment – filling a void – in the culturally unsafe environment. The first 24 hours out of prison can be the most risky.” (CCMG)

“CRC has patience with the guys when they come out – lot of patience. It saves us from a lot of drama ... big stress ... would need time out.” (client #5)

The immediate intensive support provided by CRC in the initial post-release period has been very important in addressing this extreme stress and assisting clients to navigate the necessary systems outside prison.
In addition, it was noted that long-term detainees are out of contact with current systems and administrative requirements, and this is a particular source of stress and confusion, especially for those who have low literacy skills. Advising these clients and linking them with Centacare support has been very important:

“Some of the guys are really petrified when they come in ... without support they would give up – too hard to do all paperwork.”

**Improved health and enhanced social and emotional wellbeing**

“Gives people hope that there is support beyond the prison system. Builds self esteem and trust – hope for a better quality of life.” (Uniting Care)

As a result of referral for health checks and ongoing care for health and medical needs at the Maari Ma Aboriginal Medical Service several clients reported that their health has improved, with, for instance, consistent management of diabetes, losing weight etc. For some it has been the first time they have accessed primary health care services at all.

The range of different client comments about the benefits from the Sustaining Tenancies service included for instance:

“... feeling settled, having more positive thoughts.”

“... I know they are there for me – if I am stuck they are there.”

“... I’ve been out about 12 months now ... been able to stay well off grog.”

It was noted that clients who have mental health issues, are often well managed on medication in prison, however on release there are barriers with getting scripts filled and continuing medication which can result in significant deterioration in mental health, further feeding into the cycle of re-offending. The Sustaining Tenancies referrals to appropriate services and support in purchasing prescriptions and complying with medication has assisted to address this with consequent less decline in mental health for these clients.

There has been a significant positive impact on a range of aspects of social and emotional well-being, commented on by clients and by other stakeholders. Clients commented on feeling calmer and being more in control as a result of the CRC workers involvement. For several clients interviewed there was a clear sense of having turned their life around and feeling more positive and optimistic about their futures. Knowing there is the backup and support of a reliable case-worker was identified as a common success factor.

**Other benefits**

“Clients want to get their license for the first time in life at 40 years – this is an important vision.” (Probation and Parole)

The support from the caseworkers enabled clients to meet their Job Seekers obligations and access benefits; according to Jobs Network staff:

“Without XX (manager) and YY (caseworker) they would be at risk of losing the (job seeker) benefit – they accompany clients – take in information and reinforce it and follow up with them to ensure they understand.”
Through this support Sustaining Tenancies clients have been able to be properly assessed to Stream 4, which gives them access to programs for building literacy and numeracy. The service provider commented that the majority have improved and been able to progress to sitting for the “L” plates test and, with SDRO fines dealt with are able to attend “Strive to Drive”. This is turn has provided clients with opportunities to develop work readiness and to take up work opportunities. This has been greatly facilitated by the establishment of the Choppa Weed social enterprise established specifically to provide work opportunities, recognising the limited employment available for the target group in Broken Hill (see profile page 30).

The observations of the CRC caseworkers about client improvements are illustrative:

“To see clients work for the first time through the Choppa Weed program is amazingly rewarding; clients are so thankful for the opportunity and you can see that they are humbled by someone showing faith in them.”

Reduced re-offending

Broken Hill Corrective Services NSW staff identified lack of stable, suitable accommodation as a major factor in the high rates of return to prison. There was a lack of stable housing due in large part to the lack of parole housing or emergency housing in the area. There are known to be very high levels of recidivism in this client group and the majority of the clients of the service were assessed as being at medium-high or high risk of re-offending according to CSNW data.

Probation and Parole interviewees commented that clients of the service have, for the first time in their long dealings with them, completed supervised parole orders. It was reported that some long-term serial offenders have now been out of gaol for more than six months, which is the longest ever, and are demonstrating pride and enhanced living skills.

CRC liaises closely with other justice agencies (Police, Probation and Parole, CCMG) about clients and in particular those who are identified as higher risk offenders to collaborate on support, monitoring and information sharing on client progress.

“I gave him three weeks early this year – he is still out, not drinking, not offending. No doubt if not for CRC this person would be back in custody (high risk offender ... with history of being in and out of gaol all his adult life).” (Police)

“Assist in keeping clients compliant and out of gaol – they have been a godsend – an alternative we did not have before.” (Probation and Parole)

“Getting past parole in first time in years – in their lives – also risky transition time – when almost through parole – and then when through parole.” (CCMG)

Based on consistent service provider feedback there were significant impacts on re-offending in the clients or behaviours related to offending, which is particularly noteworthy in this group of individuals who have long histories of incarceration and high criminogenic risks. Despite the fact that there were a number of clients returned to CSNW, this is likely to have been fewer than would have otherwise been the case without the project.

Clients themselves commented that without the Sustaining Tenancies support they would have been back in prison.

“... I’m not wanting to get caught out again.” (Sustaining Tenancies client #6)
Return to gaol and/or CSNSW (analysis below provided by Corrective Services NSW)\(^\text{13}\)

Re-offending is defined as a person being charged and convicted of another offence. For the purposes CSNSW reporting, re-offending is measured at 24 months following release from custody or the end of a community based order.

Therefore, for the purposes of this evaluation, re-offending cannot be analysed because the “time to re-offend” is insufficient for most of the sample. Notwithstanding, CSNSW is able to report on how many of the sample has returned:
- To gaol; and
- To CSNSW.

For the Sustaining Tenancies Project out of a sample size of 29,\(^\text{14}\) provided by Community Restorative Centre (CRC), a total of 13 clients returned to CSNSW, with 12 of these returning to gaol. It should be noted that a number of clients had not been on the project for the full exposure time (in the community) of 12 months. This project exposure time also (in many cases) includes up to three months in custody, meaning the “time to re-offend” in many cases is further reduced.

The return to gaol/ CSNSW does not account for offences committed where the person was not imprisoned or placed under a CSNSW supervised order. Examples of such penalties include fines and unsupervised bonds.

“Return to gaol” means the person returned to custody and can include breach of parole or new offences. The data provided do not include the delineation of justice process returns (e.g. revocation of parole/ breach of parole order) and/or new offences.

“Return to CSNSW” includes those who have returned to gaol OR a community based order (i.e. returned to the supervision/ management of CSNSW).

While the results above indicate relatively low return to custody rates, there was no way to identify the time of offence, therefore it is unclear (without much detailed manual analysis) if participants’ reoffending occurred while on the project or after the period of support ended.

The figures/ rates should be interpreted with caution for the following reasons:
- The figures represent a “snapshot” on a given day and are not indicative of published reoffending rates which are examined after a two year period and include robust analysis of NSW court data (analysed and provided by the Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research);
- There is no control group;
- There is no way to attribute reoffending rates to exposure to the project; and
- There was significant manipulation of the data, especially the exit dates from custody and exit from the project by CSNSW and CRC, due to issues with the CRC database.


\(^\text{14}\) CRES recommended that the analysis use raw numbers and not percentages due to the small sample size.
Client case study (client #3)

“... now on a positive strong road ... put me on the right track – makes me feel proud and happy – just turned 50. I’m thinking good positive thoughts.”

Rob is a 50 year old Aboriginal man suffering long-term depression and stress, anxiety, alcoholism (drinking since 20 years of age) and also using cannabis; he is on a disability support pension. His first conviction was at 15 year of age and he has had numerous adult sentences (malicious damage, sexual assault, domestic violence, malicious injury, burglary/theft, serious assault, arson). He has an Apprehended Violence Order not to be near his partner and children while intoxicated.

He has been assisted with accessing documents - application for birth certificate, bank statement, income tax statement, establishing a home (Compass Housing) and household items, food vouchers, transport and keeping appointments. He has also been referred to Maari Ma for health check, and to mental health workers for treatment for his depression.

Rob has sustained his tenancy since his release more than 12 months ago and has not re-offended and is confident he can continue to maintain his tenancy. He is expressing a positive outlook and confidence about his future, wanting to be available for his children.

Other outcomes for clients and community

“Family impact perspective – can create enormous benefits.” (Probation and Parole)

Some broader benefits to the Aboriginal community were reported, due to the presence of the CRC and the project. The CRC workers have a high presence in the community and both are well respected; it is of additional importance that the female caseworker is a trusted and highly regarded member of the local Aboriginal community.

Several stakeholders commented that in the Aboriginal community there is a feeling of being more settled, for instance:

XX (manager) and YY (caseworker) have been here (in the CRC) only a short time but have already developed status – go out there and see how people are living – have a presence in the community – they are making a big difference. (Aboriginal Community Justice)

(There has been) ... broader community impact – reduced offending – very positive, people case managed and police back off. (Community Elder)

---

15 Not the real client name.
Social enterprises established by the project

The CRC has established two social development programs – Choppa Weed and Aboriginal Art Program, to foster opportunities for client skills development, employment, building self-esteem and connecting with community and culture, the goal being to facilitate a move towards independent, meaningful lifestyles that will contribute to a reduction in homelessness, increase community participation and reduce offending behaviour (see side bar).

4.2. Impact of the project on addressing/reducing homelessness

4.2.1. Impact of the project on reducing homelessness

It is believed that the majority of Sustaining Tenancies clients would have previously experienced either primary or secondary homelessness, and the project has clearly had a demonstrable impact on reducing homelessness in a considerable number of clients in the target group, however the exact impact on reducing homelessness could not be determined by the evaluation.

All clients have been provided with accommodation. For some this is the first time in their lives they have had appropriate, stable accommodation and been able to sustain a tenancy. The project has also contributed to addressing a range of factors that are known to contribute to homelessness through provision of intensive tailored support.

“If it wasn’t for XX (manager) and YY (caseworker) I would be on the streets.” (client #3)

It was noted that for some high-risk clients, whose families would not have taken them back, the accommodation provided would not have been previously available to them, particularly as there is no Community Offender Support Program in Broken Hill.

Choppa Weed

Choppa Weed has been established to provide employment for the ST clients, based on a model successfully trialled by CRC in the Hunter region. The enterprise is set up with a registered business name and provides garden and yard maintenance services for households around Broken Hill (mowing lawns, whipper-snipping, painting and general yard work). Business comes mainly through recommendations and word of mouth and the work is coordinated by the CRC Manager. Through the Murdi Paaki Job Network agency clients on release get an ABN and are supplied with a working kit. They are able to earn an additional $60 a fortnight before it affects their Centrelink allowance. CRC provides funding for machinery and fuel and clients share the workload according to level of need.

To date a total of 12 CRC clients have worked with the enterprise and overall the workers were reported to be very hard working and reliable. CRC has a goal to make the enterprise self-sustaining, which will require having a suitable vehicle.

Aboriginal Art Program

CRC secured a small grant to purchase art materials for Aboriginal clients for painting and drawing and to undertake creative work to express and showcase their culture. The initiative is in partnership with Maari Ma Health Corporation. CRC has negotiated with the local Broken Hill Art Gallery to hold an exhibition of the clients’ art works in early 2013.
4.2.2. Considerations for Aboriginal people

The Sustaining Tenancies target group is specifically relevant for Aboriginal people and this is a primary consideration for the project service delivery, which operates in a culturally safe way and is very well accepted and supported by the local Aboriginal community. The clients of the service are some of the most extremely disadvantaged members of the community, with life-long histories of trauma and abuse, cycles of homelessness and incarceration, many with co-existing cognitive impairment and mental health issues together with drug and alcohol dependence.

An essential factor in the service model is having a team member who is Aboriginal and who has detailed knowledge of community dynamics and issues and a highly nuanced ability to navigate sensitively through these. The other staff member is a local man who is also reportedly well known and highly regarded in the Aboriginal community.

As a team, the Sustaining Tenancies’ staff is aware of, and able to respond effectively to, the very high support needs of the Aboriginal clients. For many, this requires intensive and extended support due to the complex and entrenched nature of the client profiles, reflecting intergenerational Aboriginal disadvantage. The CRC team works very closely with local families and links clients into relevant Aboriginal services and other workers.

4.3. Service system and delivery outcomes

“There was a huge gap in supporting clients to transition back into the community.”
(Corrective Services NSW)

“I use them wherever I can – it has added great benefit.” (Probation and Parole)

The consultations confirmed that the Sustaining Tenancies project has added significant service capacity and filled a very important gap in Broken Hill. This was particularly emphasised by all of the service providers consulted for the evaluation. There was consistent and unreserved positive feedback about the value and benefits it has brought for service providers as well as for clients; increased effectiveness and efficiency of services has been a very important outcome. The project has developed new referral pathways, enhanced service integration and improved co-ordination across multiple agencies and there was reported to be improved discharge planning from prison.

Service providers commented on the significant time that has been saved for their staff, freeing them up for other high priority work.

“They have taken such a load off us – hugely important to us – we work in tandem to support each other – we have huge caseloads – we would see these people at high risk ... it is helping us to do our job much better. Having their first homes ... safe place for children.” (Probation and Parole)

“We do not have the time to spend with clients – they (CRC) ensure they get onto the right payment – getting right documentation – to access additional payments. Made our role easier as it helps clients to get information, so payments are not suspended, getting rent assistance and so on so they are not struggling as much.” (Centrelink)

The overall service system in Broken Hill has been strengthened by the intensive client focussed coordination of services and providing referrals and follow-up and ensuring clients attend appointments, rather than just referring them. The collaboration, networking and sharing of
information about clients has brought a more comprehensive approach, with tangible benefits for clients. It was also noted that clients are more likely to trust Sustaining Tenancies staff, as they are not Probation and Parole and not a government department.

The Sustaining Tenancies staff were observed to have excellent knowledge of available services, networks and local systems and have been able to support clients to navigate them effectively to the benefit of clients and service providers.

“I do not get as many complaints from their clients – used to have many complaints about all services – clients are better able to navigate the systems effectively.” (Aboriginal Community Justice)

There were several areas identified where the service integration and coordination can be strengthened. For instance staff from services that are currently working closely with CRC commented that there would be benefit in having a regular monthly meeting, convened by CRC to share information across all relevant service providers.

It was reported that some non-government services locally were unaware of the Sustaining Tenancies project indicating a need for wider promotion of the service locally.

4.3.1. Impact of staffing issues on the project

As noted previously, selection of effective and appropriate staff has been critical to the success of the Sustaining Tenancies project. Staff were recruited at the beginning of the project and have been retained throughout; this continuity of staffing has been important for the project stability and consistency.

Staff came to the project with different qualifications and skills and professional backgrounds. Until recently the Aboriginal caseworker position was funded only for 30 hours a week, however this has recently been increased to 38 hours reflecting the demands of the project workload.

As the backbone of the project, the workers have been able to build vital trust with clients; they are viewed by all informants to be very approachable and clearly well respected as reflected in the following service provider comments:

“The Integrity of the workers is very good – open and honest.”

“Dedication of staff – fantastic, ability to connect with a lot of people and their knowledge of services out there to assist people.”

There are however considerable risks to sustaining the positions, with significant risk of worker burn-out. It has been difficult to access appropriate staff professional and clinical supervision locally. The roles are often stressful, carrying high demands of client complexity, together with close engagement with, and high expectations from, the Aboriginal community.

4.3.2. Skills needed by staff

The work with Sustaining Tenancies clients requires a combination of formal qualifications in welfare, counselling and advocacy combined with practical skills to support day to day living, along with strong service networking and coordination capacity. In particular it is critical for staff to be skilled in providing culturally safe services and able to liaise effectively and sensitively with the Aboriginal community.
Given the high prevalence of mental health issues in the client group, the staff team would be strengthened by the addition of formal mental health assessment and management skills.

4.3.3. Staff training

Staff were provided with core CRC training and education (Families of Prisoners, From Prison to Community) along with Mental Health First Aid, and have had access to training according to their specific needs as identified in supervision. They were also required to undergo training in Child Protection, First Aid and Safety Awareness in Prison. The Sustaining Tenancies staff have also undertaken training in Aboriginal trauma at Redfern Aboriginal Medical Service with Dr. Judy Atkinson who is a specialist in the field.

Each CRC staff member has an annual allocation of $1,000 for training and conference attendance and is also able to access a wide range of free training available in the sector. Advice is also available from CRC in-house, staff expertise on an ongoing basis.
5. COST ANALYSIS

5.1. Total project budget and expenditure

The following section provides the details of the project budget with a crude estimate of average client services costs and brokerage. The information presented is based on financial data provided by CRC.

Table 5 table shows the yearly budget and expenditures for the 2009/2010, 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 years.

Table 5: Total project budget and expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRC-Sustaining Tenancies in NSW</th>
<th>2009-10 Budget</th>
<th>2009-10 Expenditure</th>
<th>2010-11 Budget</th>
<th>2010-11 Expenditure</th>
<th>2011-12 Budget</th>
<th>2011-12 Expenditure</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Total Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client service staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7896</td>
<td>83912</td>
<td>119063</td>
<td>127905</td>
<td>197659</td>
<td>211817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin and management staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>17000</td>
<td>19000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other admin expenses (non staff)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32956</td>
<td>74919</td>
<td>48136</td>
<td>58526</td>
<td>81092</td>
<td>133445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokerage - goods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokerage - services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Year Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116552</td>
<td>164078</td>
<td>179199</td>
<td>200431</td>
<td>295751</td>
<td>364509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss Written Off F11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contracted budget amounts varied from the actual funding amounts, which was rectified by CSNSW in negotiation with Housing NSW (HNSW). Underspend amounts from 2010/2011 were rolled over into 2011/2012 to account for the incurred deficit that CRC reported to CSNSW. These discussions also resulted in CSNSW negotiating with HNSW to use surplus HAP funding from THaSS ($100,000) to inject much needed funding for brokerage, support for staff to travel for training and administrative support into the project one day a week. Permission was granted in 2012 to pool funds for THaSS and Sustaining Tenancies to allow greater flexibility across both projects.

5.2. Issues with expenditure

The project has operated with modest resources and the original budget allocation allowed for only limited staffing which was not deemed adequate for the project to operate effectively. CRC used brokerage money for additional staffing costs in the first year and funded purchase of an additional vehicle in the second year. Underspends of budget in the first year were due to the timing of the project and its late commencement in November 2010. The additional brokerage funds were of considerable benefit to project capacity to support clients and existing staff as well as much needed administrative assistance. However due to timing issues and uncertainty about future funding, the benefits of the pooled funding arrangement had not been fully optimised at the time of the evaluation.

5.3. Client costs (using 2011/2012 data)

For comparability across the HAP evaluations, Housing NSW requested that detailed project costings be considered for the financial year 2011/2012. The costings for the Sustaining Tenancies project for 2011/2012 can be found at Attachment 4.
The total expenditure for 2011/2012 was $200,431 and 14 new released clients were recorded to have been supported by the project in that year.\textsuperscript{16} Clients would have been serviced for varying lengths of time over the 12 months, but this gives an average service delivery cost per client of $14,316 a year or $39.22 per day. In effect, the actual numbers of clients being assisted on a daily basis would have been greater, taking into account clients from previous years still with the service and clients still in custody, so the average daily cost of client support is likely to be less.

This annual average figure is broadly indicative only and does not take into account a number of other pertinent factors:

- Not all clients received that length of support due to exits from the project, including return to custody;
- The costs of other services and programs accessed by the clients which all add value and complement the role of the transition service (including Probation and Parole programs, health, housing, medical and other mainstream services);
- The cost of re-incarceration for those who return to custody;
- Savings to other services due to staff time not used for dealing with complex Sustaining Tenancies clients; and
- The additional benefits leveraged for clients from Centrelink, Rent Assistance, Job Seekers for example.

On the other hand, an additional factor is the cost savings for other services where there have been increased staff efficiencies through less staff time being taken dealing with the complex Sustaining Tenancies clients.

To demonstrate cost savings to the justice system, complex calculations are required by Treasury and entire centres or wings need to be closed to down in order for those costs savings to be made. While there are no evident savings to this system, it is worth noting that by comparison the daily cost of full time inmate custody is $174.74 (open custody) or $211.23 (secure custody) or $63,780 and $77,090 per annum respectively (Corrective Services 2011). The daily cost of supervision for a community based offender is $21.48.

Although a detailed cost analysis was not possible in this evaluation, some additional observations can be made, particularly in the light of a recent study by Baldry et al (Baldry et al 2012). The study analysed the life-course institutional costs of homelessness for a range of vulnerable groups with a particular focus on those with mental health disorders and cognitive impairment and histories of multiple disadvantage and interaction with the criminal justice systems. Using a case study approach, pathway costings were developed for a sample of 11 people with histories of homelessness and criminal justice system involvement, a significant proportion of whom were noted to be of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander backgrounds. As many of the clients of the Sustaining Tenancies project reflect a very similar profile to the study subjects these costings provide an indicative benchmark for the ST project over a longer period.

\textsuperscript{16} Due to administrative data errors it is not clear how many additional clients who had entered the service previously were still being assisted.
As an example the life course costings for two of the Aboriginal male subjects of the study were $1,327,818 and $1,958,291. Based on these costings, the Sustaining Tenancies per client estimated costs indicates considerable value for money, particularly with a longer-term view of potentially significantly reducing the future interactions of clients with criminal justice systems.

Clearly intensive intervention as early as possible will yield the greatest cost benefits.

5.4. Use of brokerage funding

Access to brokerage funds has been very important to assist clients in establishing their homes, and dealing with emergencies. Getting well established in a home was a priority as most clients have either never had a well equipped home, or have lost everything during periods of incarceration. Funds were used for purchase of basic household items such as white goods, bedding, basic household equipment, food, clothing, access to specialist services (especially those outside Broken Hill area) and other needs or emergencies including securing personal identification documentation.
6. ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MODEL

Section 6 of this report provides an analysis of the effectiveness of the Sustaining Tenancies service model, based on the findings and identifies the key success factors and challenges faced in the implementation of the project.

“Really important to have both accommodation and support – they are released from custody and may have no support base ... are very vulnerable and at the first opportunity will fall back to committing offences. Having the rounded structures – the model is really important and works with all available agencies – needs linkages and interagency.” (Police)

“Without the CRC project – inmates will come out with no vision – no options – back into gaol. (they are) a hugely valued resource to us, offenders and everyone else in the community.” (Probation and Parole)

“You know what – I have had people for the first time in years finishing supervised parole orders – quite often to do with housing – and attending programs – lessens stress, have a refuge – it is important. They have pride in having a place of their own for first time in life – men who have lived on the periphery, drifted, no lease, no place, no idea – are now maintaining a house, budget, cooking – it is a big difference.” (Probation and Parole)

The Sustaining Tenancies service model has been effective in filling a major gap in service provision in Broken Hill, with demonstrable impacts for the clients of the service, other service providers and anecdotally positive impacts for the Aboriginal community even after a relatively short period of operation. The service model and its mode of delivery has been well directed to the target group and their assessed levels of risk.

As outlined in Table 6 below, the project has made achievements in most of the goals originally articulated, however the goals are broad and do not have success indicators or measures defined. There were no mechanisms for assessing changes or monitoring progress in each of these goals for each client. When clients leave the project (for a range of reasons including moving away from Broken Hill or re-imprisonment) or are exited there is limited follow-up data.

Although the extent of achievement for each client was not determined, based on the available mostly qualitative findings, there are strong indications of positive change at least for some clients across many of the domains.

Table 6: Achievements against goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project goal</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustain tenancy</td>
<td>Numbers uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce risk of re-offending</td>
<td>Reports from service providers, clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of rates by CSNSW problematic due to short timeframes. Rates not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve living skills and maximise independent living</td>
<td>Reports from service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve health outcomes</td>
<td>Client self reports, service provider observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilise mainstream services to meet needs</td>
<td>Service provider reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistance with transport to attend has been important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project goal</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease social isolation</td>
<td>Engagement with Choppa Weed and Aboriginal art program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase compliance with parole conditions</td>
<td>Very positive reports from Probation and Parole, CCMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or create positive family/ friendship roles and relationships</td>
<td>Anecdotal reports – clients and service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase access to community based support service</td>
<td>Client and service provider reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase access to psychiatric/ psychological treatment</td>
<td>Limited mental health services available, still a service gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase engagement with drug and alcohol treatment</td>
<td>Lack of available local services, no residential rehabilitation service available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase engagement in vocational, educational, training and employment</td>
<td>Literacy and numeracy sills, Job Seekers, Strive to Drive, participation in Choppa Weed (12 clients)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement in meaningful and goal directed leisure and recreational activity</td>
<td>Art work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.1. Success factors for the model

“... the people (clients) are very complex and difficult – they (the CRC workers) offer a wider range of support – people who would normally be thrown to the wolves – they educate them, they learn life skills. A lot of clients never had these opportunities – they have thrived on it.” (Police)

This service model in the particular context in which it operates (remote setting, with limited mainstream services and a predominantly Aboriginal client community) consists of a number of elements, each of which is individually important and all of which combine for success. As the service model is multifaceted and aims to address many linked complex issues in the target group, it is difficult to specifically isolate individual success factors and the relative importance of each in contributing to positive outcomes. It is unlikely that any single element alone would be adequate to make a difference.

The key success factors identified in the evaluation are:

1. **Model elements and design**
   - The **combined elements** of the Sustaining Tenancies service model - housing, intensive tailored support and outreach over an extended time frame, coordination of services and advocacy delivered by an effective team;
   - **Provision of post-release accommodation** with attention to suitability and location to minimise risk of re-offending, together with support to establish and sustain tenancy over the longer term;
   - **Coordination of post release processes and services** which is client focussed and takes into consideration low levels of literacy and numeracy and the complex needs of the highly disadvantaged client group;
- **Provision of intensive support at critical transition times**, particularly in the time immediately post-release and over an extended period, responding to crises and problems that arise to facilitate settlement into the community;
- The **provision of transport** and ensuring clients get to appointments and services and are supported to follow through with administrative and other matters; and
- **Support to sustain tenancies** over an extended period.

2. **Culturally appropriate team**
   All stakeholders (clients and service providers) commented on the quality, importance and value of the Sustaining Tenancies team and their capacity to work effectively with very challenging clients and in the Aboriginal community. Key factors in the team success include:
   - **An effective, culturally competent team** with an Aboriginal staff member who is well regarded in the local community, which is critical in this setting to build trust with the local community;
   - **Building strong worker client relationships** based on respect, non-judgement and professionalism and working in a culturally safe manner; walking beside the clients to build confidence, skills and self-efficacy over time;
   - **Providing strong client focussed advocacy** with other service providers, which is important for this target group with low levels of literacy and limited capacity for self-advocacy;
   - **Keeping clients and families informed** about services, processes and obligations;
   - **Adopting a holistic approach** including health, social and emotional well-being, living skills development, employment, social integration and cultural expression; and
   - **Working with families** to support mediation, reconciliation and restoration.

3. **Partnerships and collaboration**
   - **Strong partnership** with Compass Housing and **effective service networking and collaboration** with a wide range of other services to address a spectrum of client needs.

4. **Additional factors** that contribute to the success of the model are:
   - The **three month pre-release period**: where possible is important in building the relationship and trust between the caseworker and the client, developing an ISP, setting up a bank account, establishing identity, accessing documents, contacting families as well as arranging accommodation. However there have also been successes with clients who have been referred close to release or following release from prison;
   - **Strong local support by service providers**, agencies and other community organisations with high recognition of the issue of homelessness in the area. The small size of the Broken Hill community also facilitates ease of communication and liaison with other services; and
   - **The experience and expertise of CRC** as an established organisation working with prisoners and complex issues over many years.
6.2. **Challenges for the model**

There have been a number of challenges for the Sustaining Tenancies model which in particular include:

**Insufficient suitable accommodation**
- The key challenge has been not having access to sufficient accommodation in Broken Hill and no Nation Building properties in the area. Compass Housing is the only provider in the region and, while a very willing partner, has limited housing stock;
- Some available properties are located in unsuitable areas where clients are at high risk of negative influences; and
- Clients need to be transitioned out of social housing into alternative long-term housing options (LALC or private rental) to free up housing for other priority clients.

**Limited project resourcing**
- The funding base for the model has been limited, allowing only for minimal staffing and administrative costs, which has limited some important aspects of service delivery. For instance the Aboriginal caseworker until recently was only recently funded as a full time position and in the initial year of the project brokerage funding was not available due to the priority need for adequate staffing to run the service; and
- There is need for an expanded staffing capacity and in particular access to formal mental health qualifications in the team.

**Client complexity and service demands**
- The high levels of disadvantage of clients calls for an intense level of service provision over an extended period, but particularly in the first three months post-release period. The transition from institutional life to independent living in the community is extreme. This frequently requires building basic living skills as well as supporting client stabilisation and (re-)orientation to an integrated life in the community, dealing with multiple pressures and temptations which this client group faces; and
- The complexity and high demands of clients has also meant that it is not feasible to exit some clients from the project after 12 months due to some level of continued risk of re-offending reflecting the entrenched nature of client problems.

**Staffing overload and access to supervision**
- A key challenge for the workers has been the size of the workload, the intensity of support required and the need for responsiveness to emergencies, client setbacks, and consequent difficulties in time management. This also carries the added risk of serious staff burnout;
- Aboriginal community expectations contributes to the risk of worker burnout; and
- Sourcing adequate professional supervision for the workers locally has been difficult.
Short referral time

- The model ideally calls for clients to commence with the service three months prior to release to establish relationships and post-release planning, however this lead time is often not available due to clients cycling in and out of custody.

Limited availability of rehabilitation and other services

- There are limited services to refer clients to in the area, particularly for alcohol and drug (AOD) rehabilitation, diversionary and healing programs. Murri Ma has limited support for AOD issues and the nearest rehabilitation facilities are at Warricoo, Wentworth, Mt Gambier and Orange;
- For clients with dual diagnosis issues there is an acute lack of access to appropriate services; and
- Service providers identified the issue of loss and grief as being an enormous issue and a key challenge for clients and the Aboriginal community in general in Broken Hill. There are no existing healing programs to address this locally.

Dealing with negative and family network influences

- A key challenge identified by the workers is “keeping people away from negative dynamics” and supporting clients to resist/ manage pressure from family and networks to resume drinking and/or other negative habits, which carry a high risk of breaching parole;
- Supporting clients to resist family demands for money as during incarceration prisoners can accumulate significant funds and there can be pressure to share this on release; and
- Supporting clients to manage and maintain tenancies adequately - financially and socially through keeping disruptive family and friends away, avoiding partying and so on.

Other challenges included:

- The risk for workers of over servicing clients and fostering dependence;
- Maintaining client relationships and trust and also “calling bad behaviour as needed”;
- Need for more employment and study opportunities to be available locally; and
- Information sharing and networking is generally strong, however would benefit further from a regular monthly networking interagency meeting with all the various service providers – beyond the broader Aboriginal Community Working Party meeting.
7. CONCLUSION

7.1. Summary of key lessons learnt

The Sustaining Tenancies model has effectively addressed a major gap in service provision in Broken Hill for a very vulnerable target group in a high need setting; it has impacted significantly on the lives of individual clients of the service in multiple ways. Preventing homelessness has been an important outcome for clients who now have sustained accommodation, coupled with a range of other positive benefits. It has provided opportunities for “breaking the cycle” of homelessness and incarceration – often a lifelong cycle; it has enabled clients to integrate into the community, some of whom have never been integrated, but lived marginal lives since childhood. It is, however, early days and it will be important to follow up over a longer timeframe to determine the extent to which improvements in client circumstances have been maintained.

Also of importance are the benefits of the project for other services and service providers through increased efficiencies and use of staff time and greater capacity to provide more effective multidisciplinary services for a very complex client group.

Although the project has operated with a very modest funding base, the evidence points to likely considerable longer term cost benefits associated with reduced impost on criminal justice and other systems for those clients who are successfully supported to integrate into the community. However the current funding for the project appears inadequate to meet a range of costs associated with adequately supporting clients and sustaining staffing. The project outcomes are unlikely to be sustained should the dedicated project funding not continue.

The key lessons learned through the evaluation are the following:

- Providing intensive client focussed support and accommodation for this high-risk client group can contribute to breaking the cycle of homelessness and incarceration;
- The holistic approach to client-centred support is very important in addressing the multiple complex and interconnected needs of the client group who mostly have experienced lifelong trauma and disadvantage. This includes illiteracy, lack of basic independent living skills, low self-efficacy that can be significant barriers to integration into the community;
- Even with relatively limited resources and small staff capacity, a critical service gap can be addressed, and much can be achieved for an extremely disadvantaged group of people. Providing a service that is culturally safe and accepted by the Aboriginal community is essential to success;
- There are significant benefits for other services and cost efficiencies through savings in staff time dealing with complex challenging clients and reducing client “churn”;
- Innovation with establishing a social enterprise has the potential for added and sustained benefits for clients as an employment opportunity and to contribute to a sense of well-being and social inclusion. This is particularly important in areas where there are limited employment opportunities for people with low-level skills;
- The importance of intensively supporting clients at point of exit with options to take a positive route;
- There is a need to support longer term transition out of social housing to LALC housing, private rental and other housing options, to free up available housing stock with community housing providers for other potential priority clients exiting prison;
Addressing the intensity of support needs for some clients in the target group may be more efficiently addressed through provision of supported transitional accommodation for an initial period between exiting prison and attempting to live independently;

- There is an identified need to also focus on people cycling in and out of prison on shorter terms who miss the longer-term support and access to programs in prison;
- There are likely benefits to be gained from closer attention to the processes for tapering the intensity of services, and consideration of longer term lower level case management and/or mentoring support beyond the 12 months. This could potentially ensure that the target group, with their long entrenched issues and problems, can be supported to continue to access services and thus increase the likelihood of positive outcomes being sustained for a more extended period. This needs to include ongoing mentoring to support decision making and continuing individual development and may require a pool of trained voluntary mentors. Models such as the Gamarada Men’s Healing Program could be of benefit; and
- Greater attention to following up with addressing issues of illiteracy after leaving prison for this highly disadvantaged target group would be of benefit as many vocational courses have literacy as a pre-requisite. There can be limitations to, for instance, getting a drivers licence which can be a potential entry point for employment. It was reported by a Probation and Parole informant that it can be difficult for clients to understand what is happening in court and be disadvantaged in presenting their case. Also presentencing reports prepared by Probation and Parole can be inaccurate because the clients are unable to read them to check the veracity of what has been documented.

7.2. Implications for the future response to homelessness for the client group

The Sustaining Tenancies service provides a tailored model for the client group with valuable lessons for developing effective approaches to reducing homelessness in Aboriginal people leaving correctional centres in other settings. In particular, a multi-faceted, culturally appropriate support model with wrap around services over an extended period, which combines accommodation that is suitably located and support to maintain tenancy and build basic life skills to enable integration into the community.

The lessons learned from the project confirm the need for greater access to similar services to prevent exits into homelessness for a highly disadvantaged group in the community.

7.3. Implications for the homelessness system in this region

“It would be a great loss not to have this in Broken Hill – it really has made a big difference here, given a focus on community rehabilitation – not custody.” (CCMG)

There is stakeholder consensus that it is vital that the Sustaining Tenancies service be continued as it has filled a very important gap, and the service model has resulted in multiple benefits for a range of stakeholders including service providers as well as clients.

- The feedback from a range of stakeholders also indicates that there is a need for a model of transitional accommodation and support in the area to span the period from immediate post-release to a higher stage of readiness to deal with independent living in the community for identified clients;
Given the issues of acute housing and accommodation shortage in the area there is a need for stronger advocacy from the region for emergency accommodation and more social housing to be made available;

Access to rehabilitation services is an important element in breaking the cycle of alcoholism, addiction, homelessness and incarceration, and there is a need for stronger advocacy from a coalition of voices, to establish accessible rehabilitation services locally. The idea of a working farm for residential rehabilitation was suggested as an option;

Stakeholders identified the need for a young people’s hostel in Broken Hill – where young people in stressful family situations with nowhere else to go can be accommodated. These young people are at high risk of slipping into homelessness, alcohol and drug abuse and offending behaviours. Such a hostel could be very cost effective with early intervention strategy to divert young people from entering cycles of offending and incarceration, which if unchecked can continue into adulthood (Baldry et al 2012); and

With identified gaps in important services and difficulties recruiting to positions reported by local services (such as Sentencing Coordinator, Diversionary Programs), there is an opportunity to look across the region and identify gaps and possibilities for sharing resources and services. For instance looking at innovative ways of sharing services/ staff and programs to address mental health, dual diagnosis and grief and trauma issues.

### 7.4. Other insights gained that can enrich the evidence base

Other insights from the project include:

- There are potential savings and efficiencies for other services through the provision of intensive client focussed case management and support of high need clients by a target service such as the CRC service;
- The potential longer-term benefits of the innovation of CRC in establishing a social enterprise that provides an opportunity for meaningful engagement and employment of ex-prisoners as an additional aspect of the model;
- The need to better understand the intense impact of stress on release for prisoners and the need to respond and address this effectively, including a greater focus on preparing inmates prior to release;
- The need to recognise the broader Aboriginal family impacts, influences and shame factors and the ways in which the whole family dynamics is affected by incarceration. Working holistically with families is important in a smaller community context to support the transition back to families, relationships and extended family for Aboriginal communities; and
- The multiple linked functional issues which exist for this client group – illiteracy, lack of understanding and capacity to navigate systems, fear of systems, lack of capacity to self-advocate which can in large part be addressed by intensive interventions such as this project in collaboration with other services.
7.5. **Future research that could strengthen the evidence in this area**

A range of areas for future research are suggested to strengthen the evidence base for addressing homelessness and re-offending in this client group which include:

- Longer term follow up of outcomes for Sustaining Tenancies clients to determine the extent to which benefits are sustained and particularly with reference to re-offending rates;
- Developing and trialling a transition accommodation model for the three month period following release with minimal supervision, access to services and support to develop living skills prior to moving to independent accommodation;
- Testing of similar models with additional elements of access to healing programs or other interventions to address underlying issues of loss and grief;
- Trial of the model in other rural Aboriginal communities where there are correctional centres; and
- Intervention research to examine more closely the immediate pre and post-release period to identify critical issues and most effective support to assist clients through the high-risk period.

Margaret Scott
Senior Consultant
WestWood Spice
4 March 2013
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Corrective Services NSW
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The aim of the study is to undertake an external evaluation of two Homelessness Action Plan (HAP) funded projects in which Corrective Services NSW (CSNSW) is the lead agency. The data will be collated and analysed to evaluate evidence of what works in reducing homelessness for offenders.

I am pleased to inform you that conditional approval has been given for your research project. The conditions of approval are that you comply with the “Terms and Conditions of Research Approval” [Attachment 1].
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[Signature]

Commissioner
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APPENDIX 2: CLIENT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

NSW Homelessness Action Plan Evaluation
Consent Form

Project 2.10: Sustaining tenancies following exits from correctional facilities

Project Evaluators:
- Margaret Scott, Senior Consultant, WestWood Spice
- Susan Warth, Senior Consultant, WestWood Spice

Name of project participant (print): ___________________________

I have been told about the evaluation project and why it is important.
I understand that taking part in the evaluation is voluntary and I can withdraw my consent at any stage and drop out if I want.

I understood the explanation.
The information will only be used to see how the program works and to find ways to improve the program for others in the future.

I understand that any information used for an evaluation will not use my name and that I will not be able to be identified in final reports in any way.

I understand that taking part in the evaluation will not effect me or access to services or programs in any way.

I have been given a copy of the information sheet.

I have been able to ask questions and get answers.
I agree to take part in this project. I agree that information I provide or that is provided by CRC from other sources with my consent can be used to evaluate this project.

Signature: ___________________________ Signature: ___________________________
(Participant) (Witness)
Date: ________________ Date: ________________

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________
APPENDIX 3: CLIENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Key HAP project extended evaluation questions:

1. What is the impact of the project on a reduction in homelessness?
2. What is the project potential to achieve sustainable reductions in homelessness into the future?
3. What is the impact of the project on service system change and improvement?
4. What is the extent of influence on service integration and how this was achieved?
5. What is the impact on client outcomes (intended and unintended)?
6. What are the critical success factors and barriers? and
7. What is the cost-effectiveness of each project (including systemic savings)?

Client questions

- Could you please describe your experience of the THaSS/ST project?
  - How long?
  - Nature of involvement?
  - Assistance provided, services, housing, case management, referrals?
- What is your current housing situation?
  - e.g. Do you have a lease; are you living the family/friends; are you expecting to have to move in the near future and if so why (e.g. are they in transitional housing; are family relationships breaking down; are they in crisis accommodation)?
  - Permanent/transitional – please describe?
  - How long has this been for? How long have you been able to sustain your current tenancy?
  - How well is your current housing situation working?
  - What things have been particularly helpful in assisting you to sustain your tenancy?
  - Is there anything that is not working for you regarding your housing?
- How has your housing situation changed compared with before your period of detention?
  - Why type of housing situation were you in when you came into custody the last time?
  - Where were you planning on going to (live) if this project was not available?
  - What was your previous experience of homelessness? (# of times homeless/duration of homelessness?)
  - What has made the biggest difference in helping you to change your housing situation?
  - Do you now expect to be able to avoid homelessness for the foreseeable future?
- Do you expect to be able to continue with your current housing situation?
  - What could be barriers to this? Or put this at risk for you?
  - What support do you currently still have and how often is the support available to you (organised by THaSS/ST organised by self/others?)
- In what other ways have you benefited from involvement with the THAS/ST project?
  - Health improvements – mental health, physical health?
  - Family connections/child restoration?

17 Key: THaSS (Transitional Housing and Support Service), ST (Sustaining Tenancies following exits from correctional facilities)
- Social/ community engagement?
- Income/ financial situation?
- Drug dependence reduction?
- Sense of well-being?
- Support in completing or meeting requirements of a supervision order e.g. parole and if so, how/ what way – as returning to custody is major issues in terms of not maintaining a tenancy?
- Reduction in incidence of re-offending?
- Other?

What factors have made these changes possible for you at this time? What if they are back in custody/ you will need to ask different questions and this questionnaire seems to rely on talking with people still on or successfully exited rather than those who may not have been ‘successful’.

How confident do you feel that you can maintain the gains that you have made?

What is your overall rating of satisfaction with the service provided by THaSS/ ST? (very satisfied/ satisfied/ neutral/ unsatisfied/ very unsatisfied)

What suggestions do you have for how the services could be improved?
APPENDIX 4: CORRECTIVE SERVICES NSW STAFF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Key HAP project extended evaluation questions:

1. What is the impact of the project on a reduction in homelessness?
2. What is the project potential to achieve sustainable reductions in homelessness into the future?
3. What is the impact of the project on service system change and improvement?
4. What is the extent of influence on service integration and how this was achieved?
5. What is the impact on client outcomes (intended and unintended)?
6. What are the critical success factors and barriers? and
7. What is the cost-effectiveness of each project (including systemic savings)?

Corrective Services staff questions

▪ What has been your role in the HAP (THaSS/ST) project? Could you please describe the nature and extent of your involvement?
  o How long involved?
  o How many THaSS/ST clients have you dealt with?
  o What processes were involved for you in dealing with THaSS/ST clients?
▪ What selection criteria were used to identify appropriate individuals? (OSP/ P&P staff)
  o How appropriate were these?
▪ What is your understanding of the key features of the HAP (THaSS/ST) model? How does this differ from other models or ways of working to house inmates on release who are at risk of homelessness?
▪ What have been the service arrangements/ referral pathways with CRC for the project? – (gaol staff primarily/ P&P Broken Hill may play a role)
  o How well have these worked?
  o What would have improved the arrangements?
▪ What services has CSNW delivered to assist the THaSS/ST clients?
▪ What do you know of the impact the THaSS/ST project has had in reduction of homelessness for this target group?
  o What have been the success factors for this?
  o What has not worked well?
▪ How the project has impacted on the management of the order?
▪ What in your knowledge have been the other benefits and outcomes for the THaSS/ST clients?
  o Health improvements– physical and mental health?
  o Connection with family?
  o Substance abuse reduction?
  o Social integration?
  o Other?
▪ What impact has this had in reduction of recidivism (for individual clients)?
▪ What are the implications of the project outcomes for future service delivery?
- Have there been any disadvantages of the THaSS/ST model from the perspective of Corrective Services? If so, what is the nature of these?
  - What have been the challenges?

- To what extent have there been improvements in service systems for the target group? What are these improvements?
  - How sustainable is this model as an approach to reducing homelessness in this group?
  - What aspects can be integrated into ongoing service delivery?
APPENDIX 5: OTHER SERVICE PROVIDER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Key HAP extended evaluation questions:

1. What is the impact of the project on a reduction in homelessness?
2. What is the project potential to achieve sustainable reductions in homelessness into the future?
3. What is the impact of the project on service system change and improvement?
4. What is the extent of influence on service integration and how this was achieved?
5. What is the impact on client outcomes (intended and unintended)?
6. What are the critical success factors and barriers?
7. What is the cost-effectiveness of each project (including systemic savings)?

Service provider questions

- What has been your role in/relationship to the HAP project?
- What is your opinion about this HAP model? How does this differ from other models or ways of working?
  - Would you have been involved without THaSS/ST support?
- What have you provided? How much and how often? For how many clients?
  - What have been the service arrangements/referral pathways?
- How well has this worked for this particular HAP client group?
  - What have been the benefits and outcomes for HAP clients referred to you/more generally?
  - Have there been any disadvantages for clients? If so what have these been?
- What factors in your view have contributed to success in:
  - Reducing the risk of homelessness?
  - Client engagement in the service?
  - What are the challenges and barriers to success?
- What impact has this project had in reduction of homelessness for the project participants?
  - How has this made a difference?
  - What is the potential of the project for providing future sustainable reductions in homelessness? (if it continues/ if it winds up?)
- How could the benefits of the HAP project be sustained beyond June 2013?
  - What role could your service have on an ongoing basis?
  - What would the barriers be to your service’s continues involvement beyond June 2013?
  - What would assist your service to be involved on an ongoing basis?
- What changes have there been in service integration?
  - What are the implications of this for service delivery for you?
  - How sustainable are the changes?
- To what extent have there been improvements in service systems? Describe
- What suggestions do you have for improvements in the future
APPENDIX 6: CRC CLIENT REFERRAL FORM

Community Restorative Centre (CRC)

Referral Form – Transition Program

Email: dale@crcnsw.org.au  Telephone: 0416 419 427  Fax: (08) 80883731
Email: brenda@crcnsw.org.au  Telephone: 0415 562 094

Transition Program - intensive post-release support

DATE OF REFERRAL: / /  (Referrals must be received minimum 3 months prior to release)
CORRECTIONAL CENTRE: ____________________________________________________________
NAME OF REFERRER: ____________________________________________________________
CONTACT DETAILS: Telephone: ______________________ Fax: ______________________
Email: ______________________________________________ DOB: / / AGE: ________
INMATE NAME: __________________________________ CULTURAL ID: __________ MIN: __________
INMATE ACCOMMODATION ON RELEASE: Address: _____________________________
Contact number: ________________________________________________________________

SENTENCE:
Length of full sentence __________________________________________________________
Earliest Release Date: / / Date of next parole hearing: / /
Current Conviction: (plus breach of Parole) __________________________________________
Has client been on protection ________ Yes ☐ No ☐
If Yes Why _________________________________________________________________

REFFERAL INFORMATION: YES ☐ NO ☐
MUST BE SENTENCED (not on remand) ☐ ☐
MUST BE VOLUNTARILY SEEKING SUPPORT ☐ ☐
MUST BE WILLING TO LIVE IN BROKEN HILL ☐ ☐
MUST RECEIVE REFERRAL MINIMUM 3 MONTHS PRIOR TO RELEASE ☐ ☐
Have they served a previous gaol sentence? ☐ ☐
Are they identified as medium to high risk of re-offending? ☐ ☐
Do they have complex needs including AOD issues? ☐ ☐
Are they compliant in taking medication if mental illness is present? ☐ ☐
Are they at risk of homelessness? ☐ ☐
Are they a previous CRC client? ☐ ☐
If yes what program and when__________________________

OFFENDING HISTORY:
Past Offences and Dates: __________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
Number of previous incarcerations: Adult: ______ Juvenile: ______
Detail of Charges Pending, Date and Court_________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

History of violence in custody or community?: YES ☐ NO ☐
If yes, please outline: __________________________________________________________

__________________________
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Community Restorative Centre (CRC)
Referral Form – Transition Program

Email: dale@crcnsw.org.au  Telephone: 0416 419 427  Fax: (08) 80883731
Email: brenda@crcnsw.org.au  Telephone: 0415 562 094

PRIMARY CONCERNS AND RISKS: (include details of mental health/self harm and any physical health/illness concerns, high risk drug use, violence etc.)

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

CURRENT MEDICATION / DOSAGE:

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

PROGRAMS COMPLETED IN CUSTODY AND DATES:

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

GENERAL COMMENTS BY REFERRING OFFICER:

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

I hereby give my permission for confidential information relating to my case management to be accessed by Community Restorative Centre. All identifying information will be withheld by CRC when recording our statistics.

______________________________________________________________________________  ______________________________________________________________________
Client Signature/Date  Worker: Signature/Date
Community Restorative Centre (CRC)
Referral Form – Transition Program

Email: dale@crcnsw.org.au  Telephone: 0416 419 427  Fax: (08) 80883731
Email: brenda@crcnsw.org.au  Telephone: 0415 562 094

REFERRAL OUTCOME AND FOLLOW UP:
For CRC office use only

REFERRAL ACCEPTED: □  REFERRAL NOT ACCEPTED: □
ASSESSMENT COMPLETED: □  DATE: / /
MAIN REASON IF NOT ACCEPTED:

ALLOCATED TO:

REFERRER CONTACTED: □  DATE: / /
COMMENTS:
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### APPENDIX 7: YEAR 2011/2012 COST ANALYSIS SPREADSHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSW Homelessness Action Plan Evaluation - Cost Analysis</th>
<th>2011/12 Units</th>
<th>2011/12 Quantity</th>
<th>2011/12 $ Value</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRC-Sustaining Tenancies in Far West NSW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project income - Inputs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAP funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 200,431</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Government funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 200,431</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>Direct Client Services</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>$ 107,785</td>
<td>53.7865329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>Admin and support</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>$ 6,957</td>
<td>3.47101995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>Staff related on-costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 19,683</td>
<td>9.82033717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>External consultants / professional services</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
<td>2.9935489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Staff costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 140,405</td>
<td>70.051539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs</td>
<td>Meetings, workshop, catering</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs</td>
<td>Staff training and development</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,500</td>
<td>0.74838723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs</td>
<td>Motor vehicle expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 40,381</td>
<td>20.147083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs</td>
<td>Other travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs</td>
<td>Host Organisation Management Fee and Administration costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,806</td>
<td>2.29804771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,539</td>
<td>1.76569493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs</td>
<td>Property Related Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>4.98924817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 60,026</td>
<td>29.9484611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokerage Outputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>Groceries</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>Home establishment packs (eg linen, beds, mattresses, whitegoods, furniture, crockery/cutlery, cleaning equipment, lawn mower, tools)</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>Educational/vocational items (eg computers, protective equipment)</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>Children's items (eg school uniforms/textbooks, pushbikes)</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>Safety &amp; security</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>Health items (eg essential medication, spectacles)</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>Petrol</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>CRC-Sustaining Tenancies in Far West NSW</td>
<td>2011/12 Units</td>
<td>2011/12 Quantity</td>
<td>2011/12 $ Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Goods</td>
<td>Total Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Psychological services (eg. drug &amp; alcohol/ trauma counselling)</td>
<td>Sessions delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Life skills (financial counselling, Rent It Keep It, tenancy management skills, property maintenance and care services, property care mentors)</td>
<td>Sessions delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Specialist health services (eg rehabilitation, dental/medical)</td>
<td>Sessions delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Legal services</td>
<td>Sessions delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Education/training (eg specialist educations services, school/TAFE fees, employment assistance, driving lessons)</td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Case management (external)</td>
<td>Sessions delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Urgent home repairs</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Removalists (eg furniture, rubbish)</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Initial housing hygiene clean</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Furniture storage</td>
<td>Length of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Brighter Futures</td>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Disability Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Services</td>
<td>Total Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments</td>
<td>Rent arrears</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments</td>
<td>Utilities bills</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments</td>
<td>Bond assistance</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments</td>
<td>Motor vehicle expenses (eg registration, maintenance)</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC-Sustaining Tenancies in Far West NSW</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Payments</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Transport fees for clients, not staff (eg. bus/rail)</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Accommodation (eg emergency, temporary)</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Identification documents</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Social integration/ Community engagement/cultural and sports activities for children (eg swimming lessons, dance lessons, parenting groups)</td>
<td>Clients assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other</td>
<td>Total Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Brokerage costs</td>
<td>Total clients assisted</td>
<td>Household s</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>$ 200,431</td>
<td>$ 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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