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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview of project

This project has developed an evaluation framework to assess the implementation process and outcomes of Housing Ministers’ 10-year Statement of New Directions for Indigenous Housing: ‘Building a Better Future: Indigenous Housing to 2010’ (BBF). The evaluation framework is intended to be used for the mid-term review in 2005-2006, and for the final review due in 2011.

This report is in two volumes. The first volume describes the background to the project in terms of recent Indigenous housing policy developments and relevant evaluation concepts and techniques, and the methodology used to develop the evaluation framework, including details of consultation carried out. The second volume sets out the evaluation framework in detail, particularly the sources of data to answer the key evaluation questions.

Components of the framework

The evaluation framework for BBF provides:

- An overall five-stage process for the evaluation from a statement of requirements through to utilisation of findings
- A technical design that provides a detailed plan for answering the identified evaluation questions, through four components, using a mix of existing and additional data, and including a conceptual model for analysing patterns in the data to support appropriate generalisation to other sites, time periods and jurisdictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Statement of requirements</th>
<th>5. Processes for managing the evaluation process and products, including consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Technical design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Reporting across the breadth of BBF for each jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. In depth case studies of particular issues and examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Processes for additional input from those providing or receiving Indigenous housing services and related services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Co-operative process and conceptual model for analysing data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Implementation of data collection, analysis, interpretation and reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Using evaluation and developing action plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of the framework

The first part of the overall evaluation framework, the statement of requirements, briefly sets out the purpose of the mid-term review, the intended audiences, values on which the evaluation will be based, resources and constraints that affect the evaluation, and the key evaluation questions that it will answer:
Current Process:

- To what extent has BBF been implemented in each jurisdiction?

Outcomes:

- What have been the outcomes of BBF – intended and unintended?
- To what extent has BBF contributed to improved Indigenous housing outcomes as outlined in the document – better housing, better services etc.
- What has been achieved in each jurisdiction?

Future Process:

- How could BBF strategies be improved to deliver improved housing outcomes for Indigenous Australians?

The second part of the overall evaluation framework, the technical design, sets out a four-component process for data collection and analysis to answer these evaluation questions and meet the requirements for the evaluation.

- **Component A** focuses on the breadth of BBF-related activity in each jurisdiction and across all specified intended outcomes. It draws largely on available data, together with some reporting from jurisdictions.

- **Component B** focuses on particular issues and examples in depth, using strategic case studies. This second component can be expanded or reduced in scope in response to availability of resources for the evaluation (both in terms of funding for an external evaluator and in-kind support from jurisdictions).

- **Component C** provides an opportunity for input into the mid-term review from those who provide or receive Indigenous housing services, in addition to the consultation processes currently in place in each jurisdiction.

- **Component D** involves co-operative analysis between the external evaluators and jurisdictions to interpret the data to identify areas where the implementation of BBF could be improved and develop appropriate recommendations (the fifth evaluation question). This component includes a conceptual framework for analysing data and reporting within and across jurisdictions: under what circumstances have particular activities contributed to particular outcomes? This conceptual framework will facilitate appropriate generalisation of findings from the review to future implementation of BBF at different sites and jurisdictions, and will be particularly relevant in the in-depth case studies.

The rest of the evaluation will be completed in a separate project. The third part of the evaluation process, implementation of this plan for data collection and analysis, is expected to take place during 2005. The fourth part of the evaluation involves processes for using the findings and recommendations from the evaluation, including guiding development of specific policies, strategies, action plans within housing departments, and using them in discussions and negotiations with other government departments, central government agencies, and other relevant organisations. The fifth part of the evaluation process, the processes required for effective management of the process and products, continues throughout the evaluation process.
1 INTRODUCTION: RESEARCH AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 Introduction

The aim of this project was to develop an evaluation framework to assess the implementation process and outcomes of Housing Ministers' 10-year Statement of New Directions for Indigenous Housing: *Building a Better Future: Indigenous Housing to 2010 (BBF)*. The evaluation framework will then be used for the mid-term review due in 2005, and at the end of the strategy in 2010.

The framework has developed specific evaluation questions and practical methods to answer them, including identifying appropriate data sources and analysis techniques, drawing on the work of the Standing Committee on Indigenous Housing (SCIH) in developing reporting frameworks and data collection systems. The framework also articulates a strategy for reporting and utilisation of the information generated through the mid-term and final reviews.

The general evaluation questions to be answered through implementation of the framework are:

**Process:**
- To what extent has *BBF* been implemented in each jurisdiction?
- Could *BBF* strategies be improved to deliver improved housing outcomes for Indigenous Australians?

**Outcomes:**
- What have been the outcomes of *BBF* - intended and unintended?
- To what extent has *BBF* contributed to improved Indigenous housing outcomes as outlined in the document - better housing, better services etc
- What has been achieved in each jurisdiction?

The framework was developed in consultation with a range of stakeholder agencies responsible for the implementation, reporting and evaluation of the strategy, including government and non-government as well as Indigenous and mainstream agencies across all States and Territories, and the Housing Ministers' Advisory Committee (HMAC), its subcommittee, the Standing Committee on Indigenous Housing (SCIH), and the Policy Research Working Group.

An interdisciplinary team from RMIT, comprising researchers in Indigenous housing and researchers in evaluation, developed the framework. The framework was developed through a process of firstly framing the requirements for evaluation - scope, purpose, audience, timing, specific evaluation questions - then designing methods for collecting, analysing, reporting and using information, doing some preliminary work to trial these, and revising the framework as needed. It is strongly suggested that the evaluation framework be subsequently applied using a staged roll-out, where it is applied to one area, reviewed and revised if needed before full implementation. This would allow review of the framework in terms of collection, analysis, reporting and some use of the evaluation findings.
1.2 Project Aims and Scope

The aim of the project was to develop a credible and feasible framework to evaluate Building a Better Future, that is suitable for use at the mid-point review and the final review, and which also creates value for participating agencies in planning separate evaluations of particular projects and initiatives.

This project is the first part of a proposed two-part project, the second part, implementing the evaluation, will be a separate project that will be commissioned separately.

**Part One: Developing the evaluation framework (March 2004-September 2004).**

**Stage One: Framing the evaluation framework**

The first stage in developing the evaluation framework involved establishing agreement on: the intended outcomes of the framework, processes for developing the framework (including consultation and approval processes), key evaluation questions, scope and scale of the evaluation, intended audiences and the timing and format of reports.

**Stage Two: Designing the evaluation framework**

The second stage in developing the framework was to identify sources of information to answer the key evaluation questions, and to develop processes for facilitating the use of these answers.

**Part Two: Implementing the evaluation framework for the midterm review (and subsequently for the final review) (2005)**

**Staged rollout of the evaluation framework**

Putting the framework to use to evaluate an agreed project, site, component, or jurisdiction, including trialling reporting and at least rehearsing use of the information produced by the evaluation

**Reviewing the staged rollout**

Gathering feedback from a range of stakeholders

**Preparation for subsequent use in the mid-term review and final review, and potentially during implementation**

Making changes to the framework in response to feedback as needed, and preparing material.

**Using the framework to evaluate BBF.**

Using the framework to gather, analyse, report and use information about BBF.

1.3 Methodology for development of the Evaluation Framework

**STAGE ONE – Framing the Evaluation Framework**

This stage involves detailed development of the research proposal and the requirements for the evaluation framework.

The elements of framing that needed to be agreed prior to designing the framework for the mid-term review were:

- What is being evaluated? (What are the boundaries of BBF for this evaluation)
- What is the purpose of the evaluation?
- What values underpin the evaluation?
- Who is the audience? and
- What are the resources and constraints?
**Step 1 – Developing and consulting with a User Group**

The Project Leader worked with the Research Centre Director to develop a user group to:

- Provide advice about the policy focus of the research
- Provide information about the progress of policy development
- Provide a forum for discussion of the research findings for policy development
- Review progress with the research
- Provide advice and support for the work

**Step 2 – Reviewing and revising as necessary the research proposal**

Members of the project team met with AHURI and key audiences for the evaluation to review the research proposal. As the research proposal contained a number of assumptions it was important in the early stages to ensure that these were correct and that all parties were clear about expectations. The purpose of consulting with the User Group was to:

- Gain agreement on specific parameters for the project;
- Agree on all reporting, administrative and timetable arrangements for the project;
- Define major roles and responsibilities and identify positions/persons as contact points for the evaluation;
- Following the feedback from the User Group, we will present a redraft of the research proposal to AHURI.

**Step 3 – Review of current documentation of BBF**

Review documentation of BBF and specific projects that it incorporates to:

- ensure that the evaluation team has a comprehensive understanding of the diversity of activities funded under the umbrella of BBF and their contexts; and
- provide a more informed basis for finalising the requirements for the evaluation framework

**Step 4 - Literature review**

In order for the evaluation framework to make best use of previous work, and to ensure agreement on what previous work is considered relevant, and in what ways it is necessary to review available literature, which includes:

- Previous evaluations of similar policy documents
- Evaluations of projects and activities funded under the umbrella of BBF
- Relevant research literature on Indigenous housing
- Relevant research literature on evaluations methods

The purpose of the literature review was to ensure that the framing of the framework, and the data collection and analysis methods, was built on best available knowledge.

**Step 5 - Consultation with key stakeholders about framing the evaluation**

Integral to the process of refining the evaluation framework was the consultation process with key stakeholders who include:

- The Housing Ministers Advisory Committee
- The Standing Committee on Indigenous Housing
- Policy Research Working Group members
- Government and non-government, Indigenous and mainstream agencies across all States and Territories
The different perspectives that each of these stakeholders may bring to bear on the evaluation framework needs to be reflected within the final evaluation framework in order to maximise stakeholder “buy-in” to the evaluation process.

To maximise the opportunities for consultation, the researchers endeavoured to consult with each of the States and Territories to enable relevant stakeholders to share their views with the evaluators. This also provided the very important contact with the evaluators that stakeholders need to begin establishing effective working relationships for the duration of the project. The research team negotiated with AHURI and the SCIH to identify and contact relevant stakeholders.

As part of these consultations a broad model of the strategy’s theory of change (or causal map) was developed and reviewed to guide development of the detailed evaluation plan. These consultations also investigated values clarification – identifying, articulating and addressing the different evaluative criteria that different stakeholders may use to evaluate projects, initiatives and the overall strategy.

**Step 6 – Statement of the framing of the framework**

Based on the previous steps, a detailed statement will be prepared by the research team for approval that sets out the intended scope and scale of the evaluation framework including

- Purposes of the evaluations to be conducted using the framework – learning, accountability, improvement, contributing to the evidence base, providing comparative data to guide benchmarking?
- Audiences for the evaluations
- Intended scale of resourcing (both financial and staff time) for the evaluations to be conducted
- Draft models of how BBF is understood or intended to contribute to improvements in Indigenous housing outcomes, in conjunction with other factors and activities
- Specific evaluation questions
- A range of data sources that are considered credible for various purposes

This specification for the evaluation framework was presented to SCIH for feedback and approval prior to the commencement of Stage Two.

**STAGE TWO – DESIGNING THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK**

**Step 1 – Designing data collection and analysis to answer identified evaluation questions**

This step will involve designing a framework that will answer the specific evaluation questions, and be useful in the ways outlined in the previous phase. The framework will focus on being the basis of the mid-point review and final review, but may also be useful as a guide for evaluation of individual initiatives funded under the BBF umbrella, and for individual States and Territories.

**Step 2 – Designing reporting and utilisation processes for identified evaluation questions**

This step will involve designing the processes to take forward the information generated through the framework. It is very important that the evaluation framework is not only thought of as a process for generating information, but be conceptualised as part of a system for responding to this information.

**Step 3– Preparing a final report on the project**

This step will involve writing a final report, including the detailed evaluation framework, and a report suitable for publication in AHURI’s Research and Policy Bulletin.
2 REVIEW OF INDIGENOUS HOUSING POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 “Building a Better Future: Indigenous Housing to 2010”

The Australian Housing Ministers’ Ten Year Statement of New Directions For Indigenous Housing, ‘Building a Better Future: Indigenous Housing to 2010’, is a commitment by Commonwealth, State and Territory Housing Ministers, together with the Commonwealth Minister for Reconciliation and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, to work cooperatively to improve Indigenous housing.

The Housing Ministers’ statement commonly referred to as Building a Better Future (BBF), outlines an agreed vision and new directions for achieving better Indigenous housing over 10 years. The statement articulates seven desired outcomes, eight guiding principles and four objectives for achieving the vision as well as 22 implementation strategies that relate to the objectives. The Housing Minister’s statement is summarised in the table below and is presented in full in Appendix One.

BBF is also the vehicle that Housing Ministers have adopted to fulfil commitments to the Council Of Australian Governments’ reconciliation agenda, which has 3 priority action areas:

- Investing in community leadership initiatives;
- Re-engineering programs and services to ensure they alleviate social problems and community dysfunction; and
- Improving links between business and Indigenous communities to help promote economic independence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people throughout Australia have access to housing that is:</td>
<td>Better housing</td>
<td>Collaboration between Governments and the Indigenous community</td>
<td>Identify and address unmet housing needs of Indigenous people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td>Better housing services</td>
<td>Partnership between Governments and Indigenous community housing sector</td>
<td>Improve the capacity of Indigenous community housing organisations and involve Indigenous people in planning and service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>More housing</td>
<td>Best practice in service coordination, housing provision and asset management</td>
<td>Achieve safe healthy and sustainable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well designed</td>
<td>Improved partnerships</td>
<td>Adequate resources will be provided to support the vision</td>
<td>Coordinate program administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately maintained</td>
<td>Greater effectiveness and efficiency</td>
<td>Policy will promote environments that strengthen community capacity and involvement and is responsive to local needs and initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>Improved performance linked to accountability</td>
<td>Advance Indigenous self management and economic independence through employment, training and enterprise development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to health and well being.</td>
<td>Coordination of services</td>
<td>Those who provide and use housing have a shared responsibility for achieving sustainable housing outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigorous and sustainable Indigenous community housing sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>All stakeholders are accountable for outcomes and the proper use of public funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Recent Indigenous housing policy development

The Council of Australian Governments (COAG) endorsed the National Commitment to Improved Outcomes in the Delivery of Programs and Services for Aboriginal Peoples and Torres Strait Islanders in 1992. This agreement identified Government responsibilities and provided a framework for the development of bilateral agreements to deliver specific programs and services, including housing, more efficiently and effectively.

In 1996 a meeting of Commonwealth, State and Territory Housing Ministers identified the following major impediments to improving indigenous housing:

- duplication between existing Indigenous housing programs;
- lack of coordination between housing and infrastructure programs;
- need for training in Indigenous community housing organisations; and
- insufficient funds to address housing need.

The Commonwealth State Working Group on Indigenous Housing (Working Group) was established at this meeting to develop practical strategies to overcome these impediments.

The April 1997 Housing Ministers’ meeting focused on Indigenous housing issues and “...marked an important shift, with ministers acknowledging the nexus between improved housing for Indigenous people and improved health outcomes. Ministers agreed to give priority to maintenance of health-related aspects of housing such as water and waste disposal, to remove overlap and duplication in program administration, to improve data collection so that funds can be targeted to areas of greatest need, and to introduce voluntary rent deduction schemes.” (Report to Commonwealth, State and Territory Housing Ministers, May 2001, p15)

The Commonwealth-State Working Group on Indigenous Housing reported to Ministers at the 2001 Housing Ministers conference on work in the areas of:

- Identifying and measuring Indigenous housing need;
- Improving coordination; and
- Building the Indigenous Community Housing Sector

The Housing Ministers statement: Building a Better Future: Indigenous Housing to 2010, was the outcome of this meeting reflecting a continuing commitment to a coordinated national approach to improving Indigenous housing.

The Standing Committee on Indigenous Housing (SCIH), a sub-committee of the Housing Ministers Advisory Committee, has responsibility for developing and implementing the national work plan to operationalise BBF. The SCIH reports to the Housing Ministers’ Advisory Committee, which in turn reports to the Housing Ministers’ Conference. There are 10 jurisdictions represented on SCIH: all states and territories, FaCS, ATSIS, TSRA. The Policy Review Working Group (also a sub committee of the Housing Ministers Advisory Committee) and the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute are observers at SCIH meetings.

A National Policy Officer and secretarial resources support the SCIH which has formed four working groups to progress the objectives of BBF. The membership, goals, strategies and anticipated outputs in 03/04 for each working group are outlined in the 2003/2004 SCIH work plan. The work groups are:

- Work Group 1: Advocacy, Policy & Research Coordination, & Evaluation (APARCE)
- Work Group 2: National Indigenous Housing Information Implementation Committee (NIHIIC)
- Work Group 3: Sustainability
- Work Group 4: National Skills Development Strategy (NSDS)
Development and implementation of the NSDS commenced prior to BBF. The SCIH has specifically requested that an evaluation of the implementation and outcomes of the NSDS be incorporated into the midterm review of BBF.

At the time of preparing this report the Australian Government is winding down the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC). The Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination has been established and Indigenous Coordination Centres will coordinate the delivery of programs previously managed by ATSIC, including the Home Ownership Scheme and the Community Housing Infrastructure Program.

2.3 Scope of BBF

One of the tasks in developing the evaluation framework, to be discussed in more detail in the next section, is to set boundaries around what is being evaluated. This is particularly important in the case of BBF which is not defined by discrete program guidelines or funding source.

2.3.1 Diverse stakeholders

There are multiple stakeholders involved in implementing, and interested in the achievements of BBF. All jurisdictions are working in partnership and there is a commitment to the participation of Indigenous communities. Within jurisdictions there is a need to work across departmental boundaries to coordinate housing with other services contributing to health and well being.

2.3.2 Diverse programs and funding sources

The implementation of the BBF vision involves all housing tenures and a wide range of housing and related health and community service programs. The key commonwealth funded housing programs are:

- Aboriginal Rental Housing Program (Indigenous specific)
- Community Housing Infrastructure Program (Indigenous specific)
- Public Rental Housing (Mainstream)
- Community Housing Program (Mainstream)
- Rent Assistance (Mainstream)
- Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) (Mainstream)

At State and Territory level there are additional programs such as:

- Fixing Houses for Better Health
- Indigenous homelessness projects, for example, community patrols
- Neighbourhood renewal and estate re-development projects
- Army Community Assistance Program
- National Aboriginal Health Strategy

2.3.3 Diverse structures for implementing BBF

Different States and Territories have varying arrangements for implementing BBF strategies. For example, while most States have bilateral agreements with the Commonwealth Government the Northern Territory has a trilateral agreement between the Northern Territory Government, Commonwealth Government Department of Family and Community Services and ATSIC. Similarly all jurisdictions have processes for involving Indigenous communities in planning and monitoring Indigenous housing programs however structures and processes for community participation and levels of involvement vary.
2.3.4 Diverse related sectors

Related service sectors include: environmental and primary health, education and training, employment programs, income support programs, and transport.

2.3.5 Geographic and social diversity

The aims of BBF apply to Indigenous housing in urban, regional, rural and remote areas where there are very different issues to address to improve Indigenous housing. Discrimination in the private rental market is very real in urban areas and likely to be irrelevant in remote areas, conversely, a safe water supply may be a major concern in a remote community and is unlikely to be an issue in urban and regional centres.

While BBF acknowledges that other policy areas influence outcomes of housing programs the implementation of BBF has focussed on those areas under the most direct control of housing ministers. The National Reporting Framework (NRF) indicators are largely based on data provided by Indigenous Community Housing Organisations and State Owned and Managed Indigenous Housing programs. The collection and analysis of qualitative data in the NRF, for example, on the level of coordination with other policies and programs is in early stages of development.

2.4 Existing data about Indigenous housing needs, implementation, service delivery and outcomes

2.4.1 Identified Need for Better Data

The need for improved data about Indigenous housing need and service provision has been widely recognised. A joint review of the National Housing and Data Agreement and the Agreement on National Indigenous Housing Information focusing on the most appropriate governance arrangements and working relationships to facilitate data development is currently underway. The objectives of the review are:

- To propose a governance framework that maximizes the potential of the housing data agreement(s) to deliver comprehensive and accurate data to:
  o fulfil reporting requirements; and
  o inform decision makers on progress against key objectives and outcomes under the CSHA;

- To review data development that has been undertaken in other sectors eg health and community services for applicability to housing;

- To identify opportunities for Indigenous housing data development to make use of work that has been undertaken in the mainstream;

- To identify the roles of the housing data agreement(s) in relation to other processes involving housing data development, such as the Report on Government Services and the Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage Report;

- To propose mechanisms to encourage jurisdictions to actively participate in housing data development;

- To propose mechanisms to engage the community sector in collecting and using housing data for planning and service delivery;

- To inform the development and resourcing requirements of new data agreement(s); and

- To review the co-ordination of data collection, reporting and analysis under the NHDA and ANIHI.
2.4.2 Developing a Reporting Framework

The common reporting framework was developed as a tool to assist in the development of Indigenous Housing Strategic plans by ATIC and State and Territories. The framework was based on the four BBF objectives and also considered plans developed by States and Territories to implement Housing Ministers’ reforms.

The framework applied from 2002/03 and was concerned with establishing baselines against which to measure improvements in Indigenous housing and related services. National goals, baseline information, current year targets, strategies and reports on achievements against targets were detailed for each of the four BBF objectives by jurisdiction.

The 2003 National Reporting Framework (NRF) consists of 36 performance indicators linked to the seven BBF outcome areas rather than the four BBF objectives. The Framework clarifies definitional issues and identifies data sources for each indicator. It is important to note that the NRF applies only to Indigenous and mainstream social housing and does not report on changes in homelessness, private rental and home ownership.

As the NRF develops additional indicators are added, in 2003-04 jurisdictions are asked to report on an additional thirteen indicators as compared to 2002-03.

A total of 37 indicators are proposed, seven of these require qualitative information from jurisdictions. Nine indicators are identified as needing further data development work, most of these will not be reported on in 2003-04. A data manual is due for completion by June 2004 which will include detailed definitions of the indicators.

The NRF for Indigenous housing has been developed to inform assessments of the impact of BBF strategies over time and has been agreed to by ATSIS and all Australian Governments.

2.4.3 BBF Reporting

States and Territories report annually against BBF desired outcomes using the quantitative and qualitative indicators in the National Reporting Framework. Data provided by Indigenous Community Housing Organisations and State Owned and Managed Indigenous Housing is incrementally updating and refining data sourced from the 2001 Census and the 2001 Community Housing Infrastructure Needs Survey.

As part of the NRF there are plans to collect data from Indigenous housing clients about their satisfaction with the location and amenity of their housing as well as satisfaction with the quality of services provided however these indicators will not be reported on in the 2003/04 Outcomes report.

An Annual Report to the Council Of Australian Governments uses the National Reporting Framework to report on BBF implementation and outcomes. This report also includes background data on:

- Indigenous population,
- Indigenous housing status,
- Institutional and service delivery arrangements,
- Reporting responsibilities,
- Future reports,
- Data sources,
- Conceptual and data development issues

It is clear that significant work has been done to develop common reporting frameworks and datasets in the area of Indigenous housing, and these are still being developed. There are generally good data available about the quantity and quality of Indigenous housing provided by Indigenous Community Housing Organisations and State Housing Authorities, but little reliable information about housing assistance provided to Indigenous people through mainstream housing and homelessness assistance programs.
The qualitative reports provided by jurisdictions for the Annual Report on Outcomes 2002/03 are a rich source of information and an initial analysis suggests some scope for increasing the standardisation of qualitative data through a level of common reporting.

2.4.4 Measuring Indigenous Housing Need

The Multi Measure Modelling of Indigenous Housing Data currently measures the following dimensions of housing need:

- Homelessness;
- Overcrowding;
- Affordability;
- Dwelling condition; and
- Connections to services (power, water and sewerage)

Additional measures have been recommended but are not yet measurable and have not yet been endorsed by Ministers, these are:

- Emerging need;
- Appropriateness; and
- Security of tenure.

Further work is required to translate improved data on housing need to an agreed, need based resource allocation model.

2.4.5 Indigenous Homelessness

Census data informs the measures of homelessness used in the multi measure model of housing need. In 2001 the Australian Bureau of Statistics implemented strategies to improve the reach of the census to homeless people and remote Indigenous communities.

The concept of Indigenous homelessness is multifaceted. A recent AHURI research projects (Memmott et al, 2004) has made clear that the term 'homeless' can mean different things in an Indigenous context - people may have a sense of home and belonging, recognition and acceptance without having conventional accommodation. Conversely, people may have conventional accommodation but be spiritually homeless not having a sense of belonging, recognition and acceptance. Three broad categories of Indigenous homelessness identified in the research are; a) public place dwellers, b) having accommodation and at risk of homelessness and c) spiritual homelessness. The types of services wanted and needed by public place dwellers are not necessarily concerned with housing or accommodation issues.

2.4.6 Measuring Indigenous Health and Wellbeing

Given that the ultimate intended outcome of BBF is improved health and well-being for Indigenous people, a recent AHURI research project on ‘The effects of New Living on Indigenous wellbeing: a case study on urban renewal’ (Walker et al, 2003) could potentially provide guidance on appropriate measures and indicators, including existing data. The project aims to identify social indicators on Indigenous social and community wellbeing in order to assess the impact of urban renewal programs.
3 REVIEW OF EVALUATION THEORY AND PRACTICE

3.1 Defining evaluation and the focus of evaluation

3.1.1 Defining evaluation

Evaluation is both a universal activity and a specialist discipline. The dictionary definition of evaluation, to ascertain the value or amount of; to appraise carefully, covers both of these. Throughout history, people have evaluated their work and their situations, identifying successes to be emulated and errors to be avoided or corrected.

Much more recently, perhaps since the 1970s, a specialist discipline of evaluation has developed in Australia and internationally, now evidenced in national and international evaluation societies, courses, textbooks, journals and conferences, and increasingly diverse approaches to doing evaluation.

3.1.2 The focus of evaluation

It is important to understand the range of choices available in designing and implementing an evaluation, and to not erroneously narrow the focus of evaluation. Evaluation is not only about measuring whether objectives have been met – unintended outcomes (positive and negative) can be very important, and should be included in the evaluation of overall value. Evaluation is not only about identifying errors, gaps and failures – identifying areas of strength for continuation or replication is also important in most evaluations. Evaluation is not only about supporting improvement – sometimes it is intended to inform decisions such as whether to continue or terminate or replicate, or which option to select. Evaluation is not only used for projects and programs – policies, strategies, products and other tangible and intangible entities can be evaluated. Evaluation is not only about using social science research methods – it can often usefully draw on research methods from history, economics, law, systems theory and other disciplines. Evaluation is not only about quantitative data nor only about qualitative data - there is growing support for mixed-method approaches to evaluation, which use a combination of quantitative and qualitative data (Greene et al, 2001; Greene & Caracelli, 1997; Mark et al, 2000).

Owen (1999) provides a useful array of forms of evaluation, each relating to a different stage of a program, project or policy. Before implementation, evaluation might focus on needs analysis, and review of research and best practice to develop an agreed understanding of what the program intends to achieve, and how it might be able to do this. During implementation, ongoing monitoring can provide indicators of progress, while more detailed evaluation can be used to document and improve processes. After a program has ended, evaluation may document and analyse its impact, drawing also on evidence gathered during implementation.

3.2 Evaluation planning

Given all these choices and options, the development of an evaluation framework is therefore not simply a technical issue of developing a research design. Before this can be done, agreement needs to be reached about the purpose (or purposes) of the evaluation, its main intended audience (or audiences), its scope, level of resourcing, and who will control it. It is tempting to rush ahead in an evaluation to data collection issues, without working through the first stage explicitly, but this is likely to result in an evaluation that does a good job of answering the wrong question, or that fails to be useful in some other fundamental way.
It can be helpful to think of evaluation as consisting of four stages (Rogers, 2000). The first stage is framing the evaluation – developing an agreed statement of what is required. This produces a detailed design brief for the evaluation. The second stage is developing a technical design that covers not only data collection/retrieval, but also data analysis, reporting, and intended processes for utilisation. This produces an evaluation framework. The third stage is implementation of the framework to conduct the evaluation. This produces one or more evaluation reports. The fourth stage is utilisation of the evaluation, review of the evaluation, and planning for the future. Throughout the evaluation there is a need for appropriate management – including clarity about who makes decisions throughout the evaluation, who controls reports, and how decisions will be made about the evaluation findings.

This project was concerned with the first two stages of the evaluation process, framing and designing the evaluation. Volume two of this report presents the resulting detailed design brief and evaluation framework.

The elements of framing that needed to be agreed prior to designing the framework for the mid-term review were:
- What is being evaluated? (What are the boundaries of BBF for this evaluation)
- What is the purpose of the evaluation?
- What values underpin the evaluation?
- Who is the audience? and
- What are the resources and constraints?

The shaded areas in the table below indicate the scope of the current project.

Table 2 Evaluation stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. FRAMING</th>
<th>MANAGING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process:</strong> Consultation, Review of Research, Documentation and Available Data</td>
<td><strong>Process:</strong> Identifying and involving stakeholders; defining roles (advice or decision-making); reviewing each stage and revising or authorising as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product:</strong> Detailed design brief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. DESIGNING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process:</strong> Consultation, Review of Research, Documentation and Available Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product:</strong> Evaluation Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. IMPLEMENTING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process:</strong> Collecting, creating, retrieving data, analysing it and reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product:</strong> Evaluation Report(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. UTILISING AND REVIEWING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process:</strong> Facilitating use of the report, possible follow-up, possible formal review of evaluation, re-planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Criteria for evaluating evaluation

3.3.1 Standards for evaluation

There are, not surprisingly, diverse views on what constitutes good evaluation. Some evaluation writers, practitioners and commissioners focus on ethical conduct during the evaluation, some focus on the technical adequacy of the report, some on the perceived usefulness of the findings, and some on the match between the available resources for evaluation and the scale of the undertaking.

These four different criteria have all been addressed in standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981). While initially developed for educational evaluation in the United States, and therefore with some details less appropriate for wider use, the four broad criteria identified in these standards have relevance beyond education: utility; feasibility; propriety; and accuracy.

These criteria can be used as principles to guide the framing, design, implementation and reporting of evaluation, and to guide discussions about trade-offs between them – for example, trading off some accuracy for utility in providing an interim report in time for key decisions, or understanding the limitations of the accuracy of information because of feasibility constraints.

While the initial standards referred to utility in terms of the use of evaluation findings, there is now increasing emphasis on the impact of the process itself on programs, organisations, staff and clients, and recognition that evaluation itself can either support or weaken the intervention it is studying (Rogers and Fraser, 2004). In particular, there is discussion about the need to ensure that evaluations document and encourage success, as well as identifying problems and difficulties, using approaches such as Appreciative Inquiry (Elliott, 1999).

These four broad criteria for evaluation were presented to the Standing Committee on Indigenous Housing and used as the basis for discussion about the evaluation.

3.3.2 Ethical guidelines for evaluation

The Australasian Evaluation Society (2002) has developed a set of ‘Ethical Guidelines for the Conduct of an Evaluation’ (Appendix 4) which in addition to addressing issues of honesty and fair treatment, specifically address issues of working with people who have been previously disadvantaged:

“Account should be taken of the potential effects of differences and inequalities in society related to race, age, gender, sexual orientation, physical or intellectual ability, religion, socioeconomic or ethnic background in the design conduct and reporting of evaluations. Particular regard should be given to any rights, protocols, treaties or legal guidelines which apply.”
3.4 Using a causal map (‘theory of change’) for evaluation

An increasingly widespread approach to evaluation involves the articulation of a causal map showing how the intervention being evaluated is understood to contribute to the intended outcomes (Rogers, Petrosino et al, 2000). These causal maps, which are variously called ‘theory of change’, ‘program theory’, ‘logic model’, ‘intervention logic’ among other labels can serve a number of functions. A causal map can be particularly important when there are diverse stakeholders, providing a common conceptual framework for the evaluation, or several maps to show different perspectives about how the intervention is understood to work. This can then be used for planning, for management (including communication), for monitoring and for evaluation (Rogers and Ministry of Education 2003).

Causal maps are particularly useful for planning evaluations. They identify intermediate outcomes that can be studied in the evaluation, particularly when the final outcomes are long-term and beyond the timeframe for the evaluation. They identify possible factors within the intervention that might affect outcomes (which can then be studied in the evaluation and addressed in a cycle of improvement) and external factors that might affect outcomes (which can also be studied in the evaluation so that valid conclusions can be drawn about the contribution of the intervention), and suitable generalisation of results to other sites and to the future.

The theory of change underlying the implementation of BBF has not been fully articulated in the BBF documentation. Clearly BBF involves a focus on improving processes as well as housing outcomes, moving away from past “build and abandon” approaches to the provision of Indigenous Housing. Commitments to improved partnerships with Indigenous Housing providers and working cooperatively in consultation with Indigenous communities demonstrate an understanding of the importance of intermediate outcomes in achieving desired changes. Beyond this, the connections between the different intended outcomes have not been specified, particularly given the different listing of intended outcomes under the headings of vision, intended outcomes, principles, and objectives.

An initial overall causal model, which has been developed on the basis of BBF documentation and revised in the light of initial feedback from SCiH, is included in Appendix 3. This map is not intended to represent the only way of viewing the intended impacts of BBF. It is expected that it will be further revised during the next stage of the project, and possibly articulated differently for particular sites or jurisdictions.

The BBF Draft Causal Map shows the ultimate intended outcome goes beyond housing outcomes to improved health and wellbeing for Indigenous people. Three causal strands are seen to contribute to this outcome: improved housing; better co-ordination of housing and housing related services (implicitly contributing to better services); and increased Indigenous employment in housing and housing services. The housing strand explicitly includes the full range of housing tenures (community housing, government housing, and private sector rental and ownership).

The map is intended to provide a common reference point across different jurisdictions and initiatives, which might each focus on particular components of the map. For the evaluation, the map can assist data collection to ensure all components are included – for example, much of the existing data collection focuses on social housing, with little information available about private sector housing.

Appendix 6 in Volume 2 sets out a “Program Logic Matrix” for BBF. A program logic matrix (Funnell, 2000) sets out for each of the outcomes in the causal map a description of what success looks like, the factors that affect it (both those within and outside the control of the intervention), activities and resources directed at it, what would constitute useful performance information (relating to all three of the previous categories of success, factors and activities), including appropriate comparisons, and availability of information. This document summarises the currently available information, and would be revised at the point of undertaking the actual evaluation. Appendix 7 shows how specific causal maps can be developed for particular case studies.
3.5 Issues in evaluating programs and policies with multiple stakeholders and values

There is increasing discussion about the implications of network governance for monitoring and evaluation. Instead of a single organisation (or a funding agency and a service delivery agency) being responsible for implementation, many programs and policies such as BBF are implemented through a network of separate organisations, each with their own accountability requirements, information systems, and decision making processes. This makes it more difficult both to understand implementation, as both implementation activity and information about implementation is widely dispersed, and to inform implementation through evaluation.

Recent evaluations of multi-stakeholder initiatives with possible relevance for the development of the evaluation framework include: the mid-term review of SAAP IV (Supported Accommodation Assistance Program) (SAAP Implementation Committee, 2003); the review of the implementation of recommendations of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (ATSIC, 1995); and the evaluation framework developed for the New Zealand 10-year strategic plan for early childhood education (Rogers & Ministry of Education, 2003).

The evaluation framework therefore needs to recognise the different information needs of the various audiences, the challenges in accessing consistent data, and the need for synthesis that is more than simple aggregation.

3.6 Issues in evaluating complex, emergent programs and policies

Much evaluation theory and practice has been developed for relatively small, discrete projects and programs, where it is possible to specify in advance the specific intended outcomes. Programs or policies that are more emergent are not well served by these approaches to evaluation. While the overall goals of such programs are clear (for example, improved housing, social and health outcomes for Indigenous communities) the specific activities and causal paths are expected to evolve during implementation, to take advantage of emerging opportunities and to learn from difficulties.

The evaluation framework therefore needs to be coherent but flexible, useful as a guide to ongoing implementation as well as for assessment of progress.

3.7 Issues in evaluating Indigenous programs and policies

A number of recent and current AHURI research projects are directly relevant to the framing of an evaluation framework for BBF in terms of the processes for the evaluation (and for the development of the evaluation framework) and for the evaluative criteria to be used. These projects have recently reviewed relevant literature pertaining to the evaluation of Indigenous Housing Programs.

Walker, Ballard & Taylor (2003) recently completed a project to develop more appropriate evaluation frameworks for Indigenous housing programs. The starting point for the research was questions about the adequacy and appropriateness of existing evaluation methods and indicators used to assess Indigenous housing programs and interventions. The report argued that evaluation and research need to be understood and conducted within a framework of human rights and social democracy – and that this requires recognition by all levels of government of the right of Indigenous people to be self determining.

The report argues that evaluation approaches should involve an Indigenous theory building process through the use of qualitative and Indigenist research methodologies, that is research developed by, with and for Indigenous people.
A key finding from the research was the need for a comprehensive evaluation framework encompassing housing and other social variables which:

- considers historical and geographic contexts, cultural diversity & demographic trends in the assessment of how social, economic and political changes will impact on Indigenous communities in different urban, rural and remote contexts
- builds knowledge about how system wide variables impact on Indigenous participation in home ownership and rental markets and the imperative for maintaining a distinctive indigenous housing sector
- sheds more light on the interrelationship between shelter and non-shelter variables and their influence on individual, family and community wellbeing in different geographic contexts
- contributes to qualitative and quantitative models to assess risks of housing tenure policies and practices in terms of their impact on Indigenous people's wellbeing

The report argued that frameworks should encompass Indigenous principles and process indicators essential for conducting evaluations in Indigenous contexts. Research findings confirmed that evaluation frameworks need to:

- help build understanding of how the structural and procedural mechanisms of linkages between housing and other social programs support or hinder the strengthening of Indigenous families and communities;
- improve measurement of the extent to which types of housing assistance (both housing and housing support programs) meet the diverse needs, aspirations and interests of Indigenous people in urban, rural and remote areas;
- assess the enhancement of Indigenous self-determination through key principles and processes such as: equal partnership; dual accountability and negotiation in housing programs and interventions;
- serve as criteria for assessment/critique of appropriateness and usefulness of existing indicators for measuring success/effectiveness of housing programs; and
- provide an inventory of different context specific best practice examples to enhance program delivery in similar settings to more accurately inform policy decisions and resource allocations.

The report argued that evaluation approaches and indicators in Indigenous housing contexts need to recognise and promote: Indigenous self-determination; social sustainability; and social transformation.

"...both planning and evaluation frameworks are still primarily focused on assessing the efficient delivery of specific programs and the accountability of Indigenous program providers in doing so. ...there is a need for a substantial reframing of evaluation approaches to encompass these other policy parameters to gauge how well governments are successfully working towards Indigenous self-determination by maintaining partnerships, engaging in dual accountability and implementing effective program linkages." (pv)

"As such we have presented an evaluation paradigm, underpinned by a human rights discourse, provides a crucial resource/mechanism for Indigenous organisations/programs to negotiate on their own terms with government and funding bodies; to hold these bodies accountable to the principles of Indigenous self-determination, and to educate and decolonise governments to rethink the meaning of concepts such as equality and partnership." (piii)

"The establishment of processes to identify and eradicate institutional racism from the social policy arena is an area which requires serious and urgent attention by policymakers and funding bodies" (pv)
3.7.1 Ethical Guidelines for Research in Indigenous issues

The Agreement on National Indigenous Housing Information, and the AHURI Ethical Principles and Guidelines for Indigenous Research make commitments to applying the principles of recommendation 51 of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody as agreed by all Australian Governments. Recommendation 51 states:

“That research funding bodies reviewing proposals for further research on programs and policies affecting Aboriginal people adopt as principal criteria for the funding of those programs:

- The extent to which the problem or processes being investigated have been defined by Aboriginal people from the relevant community or group;
- The extent to which Aboriginal people from the relevant community or group have substantial control over the conduct of the research;
  - That Aboriginal people from the relevant community or group receive the results of the research delivered in a form which can be understood by them; and
  - The requirement that the research includes the formulation of proposals for further action by the Aboriginal community and local Aboriginal organisations.

AHURI also endorses an additional principle:

That the research should support education and training to increase the capacity of Indigenous researchers, communities and organisations

The Guidelines for Ethical Research in Indigenous Studies (May 2000) developed by the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies are explicit in stating that: “A researched community should benefit from, and not be disadvantaged by, the research project” and “The negotiation of outcomes should include results specific to the needs of the researched community”.

3.8 Summary of key issues arising from review of evaluation theory and practice

3.8.1 Scope of Building Better Futures: Indigenous Housing to 2010

The vision for improving Indigenous Housing articulated by Housing Ministers in 2001 is broad ranging, encompassing a number of different Commonwealth and State and Territory housing and related programs and all housing tenures. BBF also aims to improve the coordination of housing services with other services contributing to the health and well being of Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islanders.

This represents a challenge in providing the right mix of breadth and depth in the evaluation. This challenge has been addressed in the Evaluation Framework by developing four different components. Component A achieves breadth through reporting across all jurisdictions on what has been implemented and achieved (in macro terms). Components B and C address depth through strategic case studies of particular projects, interventions or sites, and through processes for additional input from a range of stakeholders including those receiving or providing Indigenous housing services about achievements, difficulties and issues.

3.8.2 Jurisdictional Differences

The evaluation of BBF needs to provide information to the different jurisdictions that will be useful for guiding the next 5 years of implementation. This will require information about their own jurisdiction, and information that can be appropriately generalised from other jurisdictions. Jurisdictions vary markedly in the relative proportions and demographic profile of indigenous people.
Other differences between jurisdictions that may impact on the design of the evaluation framework are:

- Historical differences in the relationship between governments and Aboriginal people.
- Different political structures in Indigenous communities
- Different status of Indigenous communities (whether they have local government status)
- Differences in housing markets – both the availability and affordability of home purchase and private rental as well as the availability of mainstream public and community housing.
- Different homelessness service systems
- Differences in the provision of related services that contribute to Indigenous health and well-being.
- Differences in the quantity and quality of Indigenous Housing stock
- Different arrangements for the management of Aboriginal Rental Housing Program stock.
- Different levels of Indigenous community involvement in the development of BBF
- Different levels of investment in developing consultative mechanisms

This challenge has been addressed in the Evaluation Framework by reporting separately for each jurisdiction, including information about the impact of contextual factors, and appropriate comparisons. It has also been addressed by including Component D of the Evaluation Framework which involves collaborative review and interpretation of results in each jurisdiction and nationally for an overall report.

3.8.3 Theory of Change

While an initial theory of change has been developed for BBF overall, the Evaluation Framework is premised on further developing this. In particular, it involves the use of a ‘Program Logic Matrix’ to identify relevant performance information for each identified outcome. It also involves the use of a conceptual framework for the strategic case studies, which involves articulating the particular context within which specific activities contribute to the intended outcomes.

3.8.4 Availability of existing data

The evaluation should, wherever possible, draw on existing data and reporting processes. There is, however, considerable work still to be done to develop appropriate process and outcome indicators across the diverse domains and jurisdictions of BBF. Given the timeframe of the evaluation and the difficulties already identified, there will be limited scope to develop additional measures.

This challenge has been addressed in the Evaluation Framework by identifying in detail currently available data. Final decisions about the variables to be included will depend on the availability of resources, including assistance from jurisdictions to provide data in a common format for analysis.

3.8.5 Ethical issues in evaluating Indigenous programs

Previous work advocating full Indigenous participation in, and control over, evaluation of Indigenous programs presents a challenge given the timeline and resource constraints and the national focus of this current project (developing the evaluation framework). The evaluation framework was required to be completed by October 2004 in order to meet timelines for the development of a subsequent research proposal to undertake the evaluation in 2005.
This project therefore undertook consultations to the extent possible within time and resource constraints, as outlined in the next section. For the actual evaluation, Component C of the Evaluation Framework seeks input into the evaluation, from service providers and service users, and Component D involves collaborative processes for review and interpretation of results. While the Evaluation Framework sets out some possible processes for this consultation, the processes will be further developed in consultation with jurisdictions and Indigenous Advisory Groups.

4 CONSULTATIONS WITH STAKEHOLDERS

4.1 Background and process

In accordance with the project brief and agreed project design, confidential consultations were conducted as a key component of the methodology. Interviews with jurisdictions were conducted by videoconference, teleconference, face-to-face interviews and the provision of written responses. In addition to group interviews, targeted telephone discussions were held with recommended key informants. In the main, those unable to attend the consultations were invited to participate in a telephone discussion or to add comments to the consultation notes once approved. A list of people and jurisdictions who participated in the consultation is in Appendix 5.

Before the interviews, an information package was forwarded to respondents, including the interview schedule. The notes from the consultations and interviews were returned to participants for checking and amendment.

This section captures the broad findings in the substantive sections of the interview schedule, drawing on themes, ideas and recommendations that emerged. The consultation process, together with the literature sources, informs the evaluation framework.

4.2 Consultation Findings

4.2.1 Importance of BBF

There was unanimous support for the concept of BBF. A high level of commitment clearly emerged and participants saw the signing off on the document as a watershed event. The agreement of all ministers was of paramount importance, offering potential to reverse the devastating state of Indigenous housing that had come to their notice. Despite some perceived flaws, the importance of the concept was acclaimed.

Responses about the importance of BBF centred on:

- Vision,
- Process improvement
- Outcome focus
- National strategic direction and coordination
- Facilitating support and cooperation, rather than competition between jurisdictions
- Potential for collective advocacy from jurisdictions to the Commonwealth
- Policy shift away from ‘build and abandon’
- Providing a practical map
- Assisting jurisdictions in their strategic planning
- Assisting jurisdictions in requesting increased resources
- Providing direction and clarity
- Reversing previous patterns that ignored Indigenous housing
- Integration with health and wellbeing
- Whole of government approach
• Articulating government responsibility for Indigenous housing
• Recognising the importance of a policy mix
• Dividing the work to be done into manageable and identifiable components

4.2.2 Principles, objectives, strategies and outcomes of BBF

On the whole there was wide support for the underpinnings of BBF, but reservations included:
• An absence of clear direction
• The frequent non-alignment of the rhetoric with practice
• Lack of attention to contextual and locational issues
• Problems of implementation because of resourcing difficulties
• Competing objectives

On the positive side, BBF underpinnings were seen as providing:
• A sound strategic point of reference
• Flexibility rather than specificity
• A robust, current and relevant document

With a few exceptions, respondents did not advocate for changes, and it was the view of most that BBF had been agreed upon by all ministers and should not be subjected to tampering. It was emphasised that BBF is still at a relatively early stage of grappling with complex and long-standing problems, and work in this area should not be seen as easily and quickly implemented.

4.2.3 The 22 strategies and evaluation

There was a consistent view that all strategies should be included, in order to maintain and affirm momentum and strategic direction. Some reservations emerged, including:
• The need to recognise that not all strategies should have equal weight
• Outcomes evident from some strategies are long term
• Some jurisdictions are still grappling with specific strategies
• Problems exist where a whole of government approach is not evident and where there may be competing policy imperatives.

There was a minority view that some strategies could be reshaped, but this was not generally supported. However, there was concern that difference and diversity in policy, activities and functioning required recognition, particularly in the light of:
• Different emphases in jurisdictional contexts
• Urban/rural/remote differences.

4.2.4 Priority evaluation strategies

In responding to this questions jurisdictions emphasised their own achievements. In so doing there was still relative consensus that priority should not be given to any particular strategies in the evaluation. However, there was recognition of a ‘hierarchy of need’ and the fact that Indigenous people in some jurisdictions were living in dire conditions. Rather than focusing on the strategies themselves, there were strong views that all strategies should be assessed in relation to:
• Progress to date
• Relevance to jurisdictions
• Performance assessed against a set of indicators
• Prominent success stories
Recognition of difference was again raised, especially as jurisdictions placed resources into their own priority areas. Specific areas considered of prime importance varied, often according to jurisdiction and context. Some that recurred and which highlighted the diversity of emphasis were the importance of:

- A skilled, competent Indigenous housing sector as the building block to success
- Access to mainstream housing
- Affordability and discrimination issues
- Rural and remote service provision and management problems
- The extent of implementation of a reform agenda

4.2.5 A successful BBF

When asked what BBF would look like if it were working, there was considerable consensus on a range of responses:

- The existence of a strong, functioning housing sector
- Indigenous people would have better and longer lasting houses
- Culturally appropriate housing provision and services
- Better material improvement overall, including health outcomes
- The mainstream would cater better for Indigenous people.
- Indigenous people would have greater input into policy, design and implementation
- The place of BBF in improving Indigenous wellbeing would be better understood in jurisdictions
- Overlaps would be reduced
- Clarity of terminology/language
- Clarity of sites of responsibility
- Better functioning at all levels: national, state/territory, community
- Effective coordination within jurisdictions
- Better policies in place in all jurisdictions
- Good data collection systems in place
- Adequate resources
- More agreement on resource allocation, and less competition between jurisdictions
- Effective accountability
- Some jurisdiction-specific ideas included redressing homelessness, resolution of border issues and tackling affordability problems.

4.2.6 BBF on the ground: Strategies implemented

The responses were variable, reflecting such factors as jurisdictional priorities, interpretation of need and structural arrangements. For those who considered they had implemented (or were in the process of) all or most strategies, there was recognition that they were at different stages with specific strategies. Some successful strategies that were apparent were the implementation of a multi-measure approach to need, ongoing development of useful data systems, support for research endeavours, developing the capacity of the Indigenous housing sector, addressing Indigenous homelessness, contributing to Indigenous employment and the development of a range of effective partnerships.
4.2.7 BBF on the ground: Strategies not implemented

Most jurisdictions were clear on where they lagged and presented a rationale for either lack of process or lack of relevance. At times, some strategies were discarded as they were seen as inappropriate to the context. Despite the justifications, some consultation participants expressed concern about jurisdictions abandoning specific strategies as all had signed the BBF document. This presented a challenge for the evaluation framework i.e. how to ensure that evidence for non-inclusion or non-compliance is incorporated sensitively in areas identified as strategically important.

4.2.8 Specific jurisdictional factors helping or hindering BBF implementation

It was generally lauded that BBF transcends party politics and is driven by agreement, not by the Commonwealth alone. Specific areas of strength identified include:

- Bilateral agreements
- An involved Indigenous sector at all levels
- A well-trained, supported and respected Indigenous housing sector
- Strong personal commitment of key Departmental staff in particular jurisdictions

Yet within the jurisdictions some acknowledged problems include:

- Programmatic boundaries that hamper ownership of BBF by a wider sector of government
- Competing plans and strategic directions
- Some sectors of government abdicating responsibility for Indigenous policy and practice
- Unsatisfactory funding levels and allocation processes, including a mere re-arrangement of funds in some instances
- Continuing levels of disadvantage on a range of indicators
- Poor policy development in some jurisdictions
- Lack of cultural understandings
- High staff turnover in government and Indigenous housing sectors, at both policy and service delivery levels
- Lack of adequate service coordination
- Ineffective governance in some sections of the Indigenous housing sector
- Lack of understanding of jurisdictional issues by some in the Commonwealth bureaucracy
- The lack of commitment of some housing department senior officers
- Changes in personnel
- The abolition of ATSIC and the incursion of politics into service provision and the policy domain
- An increasing lack of tolerance for Indigenous control across a range of sectors

Issues concerning the ATSIC funded community housing sector were raised. The lack of consultation and connection between the different funding bodies caused confusion and concern. It remains unclear to many, whether BBF is applied in the former ATSIC’s policy processes and reporting frameworks. The demise of ATSIC raises issues for the jurisdictions. Although it may be easier for jurisdictions to deal with one Federal Government agency, the consultative structures through the regional councils will eventually be lost.

One respondent pointed out how Australia lagged behind other countries, such as New Zealand, in terms of acceptance, acknowledgement and policy and practice developments.
4.2.9 Success stories in Indigenous housing

The stories varied, but some interesting models were highlighted. Some achievements were evident through careful planning and implementation, where others were seen as haphazard and requiring a better focus on outcomes. Successes included:

- Increased capacity of the Indigenous community housing sector, particularly through skills development
- Policy review processes with a change and improvement focus
- Indigenous input at a range of levels
- Bilateral agreements
- Priority to models that fit appropriately within the jurisdiction concerned
- A range of partnerships
- Achievements of particular Indigenous community housing providers
- Increased Aboriginal employment
- Development of models that provide Indigenous community control and movement towards self-management
- Improvements in housing quality and standards
- Attention to maintenance
- Increased commitment evident through more expenditure
- Programs to decrease Indigenous homelessness

4.2.10 Important aspects in framing the evaluation

Some key responses when asked what was wanted from the evaluation were:

- Identifying progress to date and areas where this is not occurring
- Establishing why some aspects of BBF are not working in some areas
- Presentation of a national picture
- Assessment of how much progress is in fact attributable to BBF
- The influence of BBF in shaping policy and reform agendas and activities
- Changes in policies, actions and outcomes
- Recognising success and achievement
- Demonstrating the link to health outcomes
- Taking a holistic approach
- A realistic assessment of progress, recognising that change is evolving
- A sense of what jurisdictions can learn from each other
- Recounting the BBF story and journey, including events and activities that preceded BBF
- Assessing the policy and practice shifts across a range of indicators including sustainability, health functionality, building standards, maintenance and a viable Indigenous housing sector
- An examination of whether the range of necessary building blocks of BBF are in place
- Predicting the impact of the abolition of ATSIC on Indigenous housing
- Providing direction about what will make a difference by the end of the BBF timeline, and how this can be achieved in the five years following the mid-term evaluation
- Assessing how the contributors to BBF could improve their practices
- Developing a roadmap for the future
- Avoiding becoming embroiled in Indigenous politics
Although some informants felt that jurisdictions should not be compared, others considered that those who were not undertaking a sound reform agenda should be exposed. Yet there was a view that jurisdictional difference in priority setting and action must be acknowledged. This serves to create some tensions in the evaluation process.

**4.2.11 Conducting the evaluation**

This was an area of controversy, with a range of views varying from a desk/document process to in-depth consultation with Indigenous communities. In advocating for a specific type of consultation process, reference was made to both resource restrictions and limitations on knowledge about BBF. Some suggestions were made:

**Data**

- Collecting and analysing reporting data, review documents, state and national inquiries and other relevant literature sources that would be identified by each jurisdiction

**Consultations**

- Senior public servants and policy personnel, who have the detailed knowledge and expertise about BBF
- Mainstream service providers whose programs are utilised by Indigenous people
- Indigenous housing organisations and providers
- Service users
- Indigenous communities

Some practical suggestions for finding a pathway through included:

- Using a mixed methodology
- Allocating a proportional component to different aspects of the methodology in order to present some validity to different data gathering techniques. There is the dilemma that ‘hard’ data is generally given more credence than qualitative and narrative data and this tension needs resolving.
- Using Indigenous communities to validate information coming from other sources
- Ensuring a well targeted and purposive approach to consultations, including utilising key informants

In establishing the consultation process, it is clear that issues of representation need to be adequately addressed. There were suggestions that the ATSIC regional councils would be a useful medium for the consultations. There was a view that, even though Indigenous communities may not have heard of BBF, that they would clearly articulate what would make a difference for them. It was also believed that the communities and others have stories about Indigenous housing that need to be documented, and many of these stories predate data. The Building Better Futures document (2001) states that the review process in 2005 ‘will provide for consultation with key stakeholders, including the Indigenous community’. This is consistent with a range of ethical Indigenous research guidelines. When consulting with communities, one jurisdiction firmly believes something needs to be given in return.

A second area of controversy is where the emphasis of the mid-term evaluation should focus i.e. process or outcomes. Some asserted that it is too early in the mid-term evaluation to look at outcomes, whereas others argued for clear identification of progress to date, in order to establish direction for the following five-year period. This would however, need to account for those strategies that require a significant time frame before outcomes can be measure.
4.2.12 Resources for the evaluation

There were mixed views on the resources required for a useful evaluation, with some advocating a minimalist approach at the midway point. Others advocated strongly for more extensive Indigenous community consultation, proposing that resources should be tailored to what was needed to do the job properly. There were varying commitments on the capacity of jurisdictions to contribute funds to the evaluation.

4.2.13 Challenges for the national evaluation

Challenges for the national evaluation identified through the consultation process include:

Data: Taking care with the data by recognising problems associated with availability, consistency, comparability and reliability. Although there was uniform recognition that good work was being done on improving data, there are still significant problems. The Evaluation Framework seeks to build on available data where possible.

Usefulness: The need to ensure that the evaluation is useful to the jurisdictions in terms of directing future planning. This means that appropriate methodological tools must be applied to measure successes and failures at the level of both process and outcome. Attribution questions need to be effectively tackled to illuminate the ingredients for success in relation to BBF.

Consultation and representation: This was raised consistently in relation to post-ATSIC considerations. Advice will be needed during implementation of the evaluation framework on the most appropriate processes for consultation and representation.

Repetition: Ensuring that the evaluation does not get swamped with the type of detail that is captured in formal reporting requirements. The Evaluation Framework pays considerable attention to interpreting and reporting data, with a Component D that involves collaborative review and interpretation of data.

Assessing whole of government: Examining how BBF links with other Indigenous policy areas to achieve outcomes and how complementary or otherwise the varying strategies are, particularly in relation to Indigenous wellbeing across a range of socio-economic indicators.

Difference: How to account for jurisdictional differences in priorities, processes and outcomes.

Realistic: Affirming success stories, rather than focusing on failures. Component B of the Evaluation Framework takes an appreciative inquiry approach, documenting and learning from examples of success under BBF.

Changing policy environment: This includes a shifting emphasis to the mainstream. The Evaluation Framework includes both Indigenous services and mainstream services with Indigenous clients (or potential clients).

4.3 Summary of key issues arising from consultations

The consultation process provided a rich source of data and information to guide the evaluation framework. Although some key themes emerged, there were key differences on emphasis and suggested evaluation methodology. Two clear areas of consensus were around the importance of BBF and the significance of the evaluation framework.

5 CONCLUSION

This research project has developed a framework for the mid-term review and final evaluation of the implementation process and outcomes of Housing Ministers’ 10-year Statement of New Directions for Indigenous Housing: ‘Building a Better Future: Indigenous Housing to 2010’. The framework has taken into account the purpose of the evaluation, the intended audiences, available resources and information, and the intended impact of the evaluation. The second volume of this report sets out the statement of requirements for the evaluation and the evaluation framework.
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Appendix 1  BBF Statement

Building a Better Future: Indigenous Housing to 2010

Housing Ministers’ Conference 4 May 2001

The Vision

A VISION FOR BETTER INDIGENOUS HOUSING

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples throughout Australia will have:
- access to affordable and appropriate housing which contributes to their health and well being;
- access to housing which is safe, well-designed and appropriately maintained.

There will be a vigorous and sustainable Indigenous community housing sector, operating in partnership with the Commonwealth and State, Territory and Local Governments.

Indigenous housing policies and programs will be developed and administered in consultation and cooperation with Indigenous communities and with respect for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures.

The Challenge

As the new century begins, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people still typically endure much lower standards of housing than other Australians. Redressing this unacceptable situation will be one of the important challenges for public policy over the next decade. It will require a sustained and concerted effort by governments in close partnership with Indigenous people.

Commonwealth, State and Territory Housing Ministers, together with the Commonwealth Minister for Reconciliation and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, affirm their commitment to a national effort to make a real difference in housing and environmental health outcomes for Indigenous Australians.

This document outlines the new directions for improving Indigenous housing over the next ten years.

Indigenous community housing organisations have played an important role in providing housing in all parts of Australia, and under the new directions their role will be further strengthened. Indigenous control and management of housing enables communities to make or influence decisions about their future. It also facilitates community ownership of housing resources, contributing to the economic independence of communities.

Desired outcomes

The new directions for Indigenous housing aim to achieve the following outcomes:
o **better housing**: housing that meets agreed standards, is appropriate to the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and contributes to their health and well being;

o **better housing services**: services that are well managed and sustainable;

o **more housing**: growth in the number of houses to address both the backlog of Indigenous housing need and emerging needs of a growing Indigenous population;

o **improved partnerships**: ensuring that Indigenous people are fully involved in the planning, decision making and delivery of services by governments;

o **greater effectiveness and efficiency**: ensuring that assistance is properly directed to meeting objectives, and that resources are being used to best advantage;

o **improved performance linked to accountability**: program performance reporting based on national data collection systems and good information management; and

o **coordination of services**: a ‘whole of government’ approach that ensures greater coordination of housing and housing-related services linked to improved health and well being outcomes.

**BUILDING A BETTER FUTURE**

This part sets out the principles, objectives and implementation strategies for achieving substantial and enduring improvement in Indigenous housing outcomes over the next decade.

**Principles**

The guiding principles for achieving the vision for better Indigenous housing are:

1. Governments and the Indigenous community will work collaboratively in policy development, planning, service delivery and evaluation.

2. The Indigenous community housing sector is recognised as a vital partner in Indigenous housing provision and will be involved in all aspects of service planning and delivery.

3. Best practice will be encouraged in service coordination, housing provision and asset management.

4. Adequate resources will be provided to support the vision.

5. Policy will promote an environment that builds and strengthens community capacity and involvement and is responsive to local needs and initiatives.

6. Self-management and socio-economic independence will be advanced through employment, training and enterprise development opportunities for Indigenous people in housing and infrastructure construction, maintenance and management.

7. Responsibility for achieving sustainable housing will be shared by those who provide housing and those who use housing.

8. All stakeholders will be accountable for outcomes and for the proper use of public funds.

**Objectives and Strategies**

The Governments of Australia in developing the new directions are committed to achieving the following objectives through the implementation strategies outlined.
Objectives

There are four objectives for achieving the vision for Indigenous housing:

1. Identify and address unmet housing needs of Indigenous people.
2. Improve the capacity of Indigenous community housing organisations and involve Indigenous people in planning and service delivery.
3. Achieve safe, healthy and sustainable housing.
4. Coordinate program administration.

Each objective has a number of implementation strategies.

Implementation strategies

1. Identify and address unmet housing needs of Indigenous people

1.1 Develop and use a multi-measure approach to quantifying Indigenous housing need, and to assist in informing resource allocation at national, State, Territory and regional levels.

1.2 Develop an effective balance between new housing provision, upgrading and maintenance, and housing management.

1.3 Ensure policies, plans and service provision take account of the needs and aspirations of Indigenous people and communities with regard to:

- the mix of housing type, tenure and location;
- the desire for home ownership;
- cultural, social and environmental factors; and
- people's life stages and special needs.

1.4 Continue to improve Indigenous access to mainstream public and community housing programs.

1.5 Implement the Agreement on National Indigenous Housing Information, including data collection to support national performance indicators, a national minimum data set and reporting systems that will facilitate performance appraisal at the national, State, Territory, regional and local levels.

1.6 Maintain a national Indigenous housing research program and clearing-house.

1.7 Encourage development of improved technologies for housing and infrastructure in remote areas, and dissemination of information on developments.

2. Improve the capacity of Indigenous community housing organisations and involve Indigenous people in planning and service delivery.

2.1 Implement the National Skills Development Strategy for Indigenous Community Housing Management.

2.2 Link training opportunities with the Indigenous community housing sector's need for skilled employees in housing and project management and administration.

2.3 Maximise opportunities for Indigenous people to be involved in housing construction and maintenance, including:
investigating a tender preference system and building incentives into the tender process; and
voluntary registers of Indigenous companies and tradespeople, and companies that employ Indigenous people.

2.4 Develop principles and standards for service delivery by Indigenous community housing organisations, and ensure Indigenous people are fully consulted about, and involved in, planning and delivery of housing and related services.

2.5 Encourage streamlining of the sector and provide incentives to organisations to achieve effective and efficient management practices.

2.6 Support organisations to develop housing management plans containing:
- objectives for housing assistance delivery;
- an asset management plan, including a cyclical maintenance program;
- a tenancy management plan, including client consultation and feedback mechanisms, and appropriate information and training for tenants to ensure tenants' responsibilities are understood and their rights protected;
- rent collection policies and systems; and
- financial practices and reporting systems that link resources to outcomes.

2.7 Outsource tenancy management and support services, where practicable, to Indigenous organisations to foster enterprise development and employment opportunities.

2.8 Foster the capacity of the Indigenous housing sector to represent and advocate its own interests.

2.9 Investigate recurrent funding options for Indigenous community housing organisations that are linked to effective asset management and recognise regional differences.

3. Achieve safe, healthy and sustainable housing

3.1 Target resources to reduce the backlog of maintenance and upgrades in order to improve health and safety.

3.2 Implement the National Framework for the Design, Construction and Maintenance of Indigenous Housing.

3.3 Implement the National Strategic Asset Management Best Practice Principles.

4. Coordinate program administration

4.1 Finalise and implement Indigenous housing agreements between the Commonwealth, State/Territory housing agencies, ATSIC and the Torres Strait Regional Authority (where appropriate).

4.2 Maximise outcomes by coordinating planning and delivery across governments, ATSIC, the Torres Strait Regional Authority (where appropriate) and communities with respect to:
- infrastructure programs;
- primary and environmental health programs;
mainstream public and community housing;
the income support system;
community services programs;
Community Development Employment Projects (CDEP);
education, training and employment programs; and
communication technology.

4.3 Establish Indigenous employment policies in State, Territory and Commonwealth housing agencies.

Evaluation and Review
In order to monitor the progress of the implementation of the new directions and make appropriate program delivery decisions, it is agreed that:

- All jurisdictions will work to improve availability of good quality data through the Agreement on National Indigenous Housing Information.
- All jurisdictions will develop and implement reporting systems that will facilitate performance appraisal at the national, State/Territory, regional and local levels.
- All jurisdictions will implement a regular program of evaluations of all aspects of the strategy that will assist in ensuring that problems are promptly addressed, assistance is properly directed and resources are used efficiently.
- All jurisdictions will report annually to Housing Ministers and the Minister for Reconciliation and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs against the desired outcomes defined in this strategy, and make recommendations for action to address any shortfalls in performance.
- Ministers will ensure that a full-scale review of the new directions is undertaken in 2005. The review process will provide for consultation with key stakeholders, including the Indigenous community.
Appendix 2  National Reporting Framework Data Items

This section lists the quantitative data items and the qualitative data to be provided by jurisdictions and FaCS (ATSIS) for 2003–04. The majority of the data items specified in the data manual are for Indigenous community housing. There are also some data items in the manual for State owned and managed Indigenous housing (SOMIH). Most of the data for SOMIH that is to be reported under the National Reporting Framework is already collected by the AIHW through the annual Commonwealth—State Housing Agreement data collection process. This data will be provided by the AIHW. This manual includes data specifications only for those SOMIH data items that are not already collected through this process.

List of quantitative data items

Indigenous Community Housing data items

D1 Number of permanent dwellings at 30 June 2004
D2 Number of improvised dwellings at 30 June 2004
D3 Total number of new dwellings in 2003-04
D4 Number of new dwellings meeting national standards in 2003–04
D5 Number of major upgrades in 2003-04
D6 Number of major upgrades meeting national standards in 2003–04
D7 Number of permanent dwellings not connected to water at 30 June 2004
D8 Number of permanent dwellings not connected to sewerage at 30 June 2004
D9 Number of permanent dwellings not connected to electricity at 30 June 2004
D10 Total number of households living in permanent dwellings at 30 June 2004
D11 Total rent collected from tenants for the year ending 30 June 2004
D12 Rent charged to tenants for the year ending 30 June 2004
D13 Total recurrent expenditure for the year ending 30 June 2004
D14 Total capital expenditure for the year ending 30 June 2004
D15 Total direct costs for the year ending 30 June 2004
D16 Total number of permanent dwellings occupied at 30 June 2004
D17 Total number of days that permanent dwellings were vacant for the year ending 30 June 2004
D18 Total number of vacancy episodes for the year ending 30 June 2004
D19 Total number of households with overcrowding at 30 June 2004
D20 Total number of households requiring additional bedrooms at 30 June 2004
D21 Total number of additional bedrooms required at 30 June 2004
D22 Total number of households for which household groups and dwelling details were known at 30 June 2004

(If unable to provide D19, D20, D21 and D22 data items, please provide D23 and D24 instead)

D23 Total number of bedrooms in permanent dwellings at 30 June 2004
D24 Total number of people living in permanent dwellings at 30 June 2004
D25 Number of Indigenous Community Housing Organisations at 30 June 2004
D26 Number of Indigenous Community Housing Organisations with a housing management plan at 30 June 2004
D27 Total number of Indigenous employees in ICHOs at 30 June 2004
D28 Number of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who had completed accredited training at 30 June 2004
D29 Number of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who were undertaking accredited training at 30 June 2004
D30 Total number of employees in ICHOs at 30 June 2004

State owned and managed Indigenous housing data items

D13 Total recurrent expenditure for the year ending 30 June 2004
D14 Total capital expenditure for the year ending 30 June 2004
D27 Total number of Indigenous employees in ICHOs at 30 June 2004
D30 Total number of employees in ICHOs at 30 June 2004
D31 Total amount spent on repairs and maintenance for the year ending 30 June 2004

List of qualitative data items

**Indigenous community housing**
Q1 Whether new houses meet minimum standards
Q1 Whether major upgrades meet minimum standards

**Indigenous community housing and State owned and managed Indigenous housing**
Q2 Allocation of resources on the basis of need
Q3 What jurisdictions are doing to assist ICHOs in developing and implementing housing plans
Q4 Strategies and outcomes to increase Indigenous employment in housing services
Q5 Mechanisms for Indigenous input to planning, decision making and delivery of services
Q6 Co-ordination of housing and other services that seek to improve the health and well-being of Indigenous people
Appendix 3  BBF Draft Casual Map

DRAFT CAUSAL MAP FOR BBF
Presented to SCIH 23 April 2004 (with suggested changes)

Improved health and wellbeing for Indigenous people

Better housing for Indigenous people: (Meets standards and appropriate to needs)

Housing Tenure Type
- Housing needs met through community housing (Indigenous and mainstream)
- Housing needs met through government housing (Indigenous and mainstream)
- Housing needs met through private sector (rental and ownership)

Increased Indigenous Employment in housing and housing services

Intermediate Outcomes
- More appropriate housing
- Additional housing
- Better maintenance of existing housing
- Coordination of housing services

Greater efficiency and effectiveness (in planning, management and delivery) (including appropriate mix)

Improved partnerships (Indigenous people involved in planning, decision-making and service delivery)
- Better housing services (well managed, sustainable)
- Improved performance linked to accountability
- Needs-based resource allocation

Coordination of (housing and housing related) services
Appendix 4  Australasian Evaluation Society Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Evaluation

A COMMISSIONING AND PREPARING FOR AN EVALUATION

PRINCIPLE All parties involved in commissioning and conducting an evaluation should be fully informed about what is expected to be delivered and what can reasonably be delivered so that they can weigh up the ethical risks before entering an agreement.

PRINCIPLE All persons who might be affected by whether or how an evaluation proceeds should have an opportunity to identify ways in which any risks might be reduced.

GUIDELINES

Briefing document
1. Those commissioning an evaluation should prepare a briefing document or terms of reference that states the rationale, purpose and scope of the evaluation, the key questions to be addressed, any preferred approaches, issues to be taken into account, and the intended audiences for reports of the evaluation. The commissioners have an obligation to identify all stakeholders in the evaluation and to assess the potential effects and implications of the evaluation on them, both positive and negative.

Identify limitations, different interests
2. In responding to an evaluation brief, evaluators should explore the shortcomings and strengths of the brief. They should identify any likely methodological or ethical limitations of the proposed evaluation, and their possible effect upon the conduct and results of the evaluation. They should make distinctions between the interests of the commissioner and other stakeholders in the evaluation, and highlight the possible impacts of the evaluation on other stakeholders.

Contractual arrangement
3. An evaluation should have an agreed contractual arrangement between those commissioning the evaluation and the evaluators. It should specify conditions of engagement, resources available, services to be rendered, any fees to be paid, time frame for completing the evaluation, ownership of materials and intellectual properties, protection of privileged communication, storage and disposal of all information collected, procedures for dealing with disputes, any editorial role of the commissioner, the publication and release of evaluation report(s), and any subsequent use of evaluation materials.

Advise changing circumstances
4. Both parties have the right to expect that contractual arrangements will be followed. However, each party has the responsibility to advise the other about changing or unforeseen conditions or circumstances, and should be prepared to renegotiate accordingly.

Look for potential risks or harms
5. The decision to undertake an evaluation or specific procedures within an evaluation should be carefully considered in the light of potential risks or harms to the clients, target groups or staff of the program. As far as possible, these issues should be anticipated and discussed during the initial negotiation of the evaluation.

Practise within competence
6. The evaluator or evaluation team should possess the knowledge, abilities, skills and experience appropriate to undertake the tasks proposed in the evaluation. Evaluators should fairly represent their competence, and should not practice beyond it.

Disclose potential conflict of interest
7. In responding to a brief, evaluators should disclose any of their roles or relationships that may create potential conflict of interest in the conduct of the evaluation. Any such conflict should also be identified in the evaluation documents including the final report.

Compete honourably
8. When evaluators compete for an evaluation contract, they should conduct themselves in a professional and honourable manner.

Deal openly and fairly
9. Those commissioning an evaluation and/or selecting an evaluator should deal with all proposals openly and fairly, including respecting ownership of materials, intellectual property and commercial confidence.
B CONDUCTING AN EVALUATION

PRINCIPLE An evaluation should be designed, conducted and reported in a manner that respects the rights, privacy, dignity and entitlements of those affected by and contributing to the evaluation.

PRINCIPLE An evaluation should be conducted in ways that ensure that the judgements that are made as a result of the evaluation and any related actions are based on sound and complete information. This principle is particularly important for those evaluations that have the capacity to change the total quantum and/or distribution of program benefits or costs to stakeholders in the program.

GUIDELINES

Consider implications of differences and inequalities

10. Account should be taken of the potential effects of differences and inequalities in society related to race, age, gender, sexual orientation, physical or intellectual ability, religion, socio-economic or ethnic background in the design conduct and reporting of evaluations. Particular regard should be given to any rights, protocols, treaties or legal guidelines which apply.

Identify purpose and commissioners

11. Evaluators should identify themselves to potential informants or respondents and advise them of the purpose of the evaluation and the identity of the commissioners of the evaluation.

Obtain informed consent

12. The informed consent of those directly providing information should be obtained, preferably in writing. They should be advised as to what information will be sought, how the information will be recorded and used, and the likely risks and benefits arising from their participation in the evaluation. In the case of minors and other dependents, informed consent should also be sought from parents or guardians.

Be sufficiently rigorous

13. The evaluation should be rigorous in design, data collection and analysis to the extent required by the intended use of the evaluation.

Declare limitations

14. Where the evaluator or evaluation team is faced with circumstances beyond their competence, they should declare their limitations to the commissioner of the evaluation.

Maintain confidentiality

15. During the course of the evaluation, the results and other findings should be held as confidential until released by the commissioner, and in accordance with any consent arrangements agreed with contributors. Confidentiality arrangements should extend to the storage and disposal of all information collected. Consent arrangements may include provision for release of information for purposes of formative evaluation and for purposes of validation of evaluation findings.

Report significant problems

16. If the evaluator discovers evidence of an unexpected and significant problem with the program under evaluation or related matters, they should report this as soon as possible to the commissioner of the evaluation, unless this constitutes a breach of rights for those concerned.

Anticipate serious wrong doing

17. Where evaluators discover evidence of criminal activity or potential activity or other serious harm or wrong doing (for example, alleged child sexual abuse), they have ethical and legal responsibilities including:

- to avoid or reduce any further harm to victims of the wrongdoing
- to fulfill obligations under law or their professional codes of conduct, which may include reporting the discovery to the appropriate authority
- to maintain any agreements made with informants regarding confidentiality

These responsibilities may conflict, and also go beyond the evaluator's competence. For a particular evaluation, evaluators should anticipate the risk of such discoveries, and develop protocols for identifying and reporting them, and refer to the protocols when obtaining informed consent from people providing information (Guideline 12).
C. REPORTING THE RESULTS OF AN EVALUATION

PRINCIPLE The evaluation should be reported in such a way that audiences are provided with a fair and balanced response to the terms of reference for the evaluation.

GUIDELINES

Report clearly and simply
18. The results of the evaluation should be presented as clearly and simply as accuracy allows so that clients and other stakeholders can easily understand the evaluation process and results. Communications that are tailored to a given stakeholder should include all important results.

Report fairly and comprehensively
19. Oral and written evaluation reports should be direct, comprehensive and honest in the disclosure of findings and the limitations of the evaluation. Reports should interpret and present evidence and conclusions in a fair manner, and include sufficient details of their methodology and findings to substantiate their conclusions.

Identify sources and make acknowledgments
20. The source of evaluative judgements (whether evaluator or other stakeholder) should be clearly identified. Acknowledgment should be given to those who contributed significantly to the evaluation, unless anonymity is requested, including appropriate reference to any published or unpublished documents.

Fully reflect evaluator’s findings
21. The final report(s) of the evaluation should reflect fully the findings and conclusions determined by the evaluator, and these should not be amended without the evaluator’s consent.

Do not breach integrity of the reports
22. In releasing information based on the reports of the evaluation, the commissioners have a responsibility not to breach the integrity of the reports.
Appendix 5  Details of participants in consultations

Consultation process
The consultation process focused initially on jurisdictions. These interviews were held in three modes: video-conferencing, face-to-face interviews and teleconferences. Participants were provided with an information package before the meetings, including the discussion questions. Notes from each meeting were sent to all participants and in some cases to others suggested by participants. Any suggestions and additions were incorporated.

The second stage of consultations comprised individual interviews with key informants using purposive sampling methods derived from recommendations arising in the project process. A number of people approached either declined or did not respond to the requests. These interviews were conducted by telephone and the same follow-up methods ensued.

Participating Jurisdictions
- Western Australia, 23 June 2004
- Australian Capital Territory, 24 June 2004
- South Australia, 25 June 2004
- Victoria, 28 June 2004
- Tasmania, 29 June 2004
- Queensland, 30 June 2004
- New South Wales, 7 July 2004
- Northern Territory, 26 July 2004

Additional key informants
- Alex Ackfun, SCIH
- Julie Conway, FaCS, Queensland
- Chris Larkin, SCIH, South Australia
- Joanne Malpas, FaCS, ACT
- Joseph Murphy, FaCS & Health and Aging, ACT
- Barry Smith, Founding SCIH member
- Sue Summers and Anita Maynard, Cape Barren Island, Tasmania
- Peter Taylor, ATSIS, Victoria
- Bernie Yates, DIMIA, ACT
AHURI Research Centres

Sydney Research Centre
UNSW-UWS Research Centre
RMIT Research Centre
Swinburne-Monash Research Centre
Queensland Research Centre
Western Australia Research Centre
Southern Research Centre

Affiliates

Northern Territory University
National Centre for Social and Economic Modelling